

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

MARCH 14, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Ned Gay
Dr. Lester Johnson
Eric Meyerhoff
John Neely
Gene Hutchinson
Dr. Malik Watkins
Sidney J. Johnson

HDRB Members Not Present:

Dr. Charles Elmore
Dr. Gerald Caplan

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

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

RE: CALL TO ORDER

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

RE: Continued 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

Continued to the April 11, 2007, meeting at the request of the petitioner.

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

Continued to the April 11, 2007, meeting at the request of the petitioner.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Continued Agenda items as presented. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Meyerhoff recused on H-06-3711-2.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Dawson + Wissmach
Architects
Factor's Walk
H-05-3477-2
126 West Bay Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

RE: Amended Petition of Miles Small for
Signs for Minds
H-06-3704-2
24 East Broughton Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of W. Kenneth Swing, Sr.
H-07-3772-2
401 East Broughton Street
Rehabilitation

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Civvies Clothing
Robyn Reeder
H-07-3776-2
20 East Broughton Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Casey Crain
H-07-3778-2
218 Houston Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Jeffrey A. Downey
H-07-3780-2
48 Whitaker Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Marian Smith
H-07-3782-2
1 West Broughton Street
Awning/Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of James Reardon
H-07-3783-2
126 West Harris Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3710-2
305 – 311 Tattnall Street
New Construction Phase II, Design Details
Office Building

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Part II Design approval for a four- and five-story office building.

FINDINGS:

1. Part I Height and Mass was approved December 13, 2006.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Windows, Doors</p> <p>Double-glazed windows are permitted on new construction provided the muntin shall be no greater than 7/8 inch; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing;</p>	<p>There will be a minimum three-inch recess from the face of the wall plane to the face of the window.</p> <p>The proposed windows are by Peerless. Cast stone headers and brick sills.</p> <p>Storefront windows and doors are anodized aluminum by Kawneer or other industry standard storefront.</p>	<p>If another storefront or window product is chosen in the field, it shall be approved by Staff prior to purchase and installation.</p> <p>Clarify whether the glass is transparent and is it tinted?</p>
<p>Roof</p>	<p>The roof is not visible from the street. A synthetic stucco cornice is proposed.</p>	
<p>Balconies, Porches</p>	<p>Composite fiber cast columns; metal picket railing; synthetic stucco on metal framing at bands above columns;</p>	<p>The materials appear compatible for an office building. Brick is used elsewhere in the ward as the primary material of larger buildings.</p>
<p>Materials, Textures, colors</p>	<p>Brick: Carolina Brown wire cut 420 Mortar Polyblend “Light Smoke” Cast stone: Arriscraft “Pecan” Windows, columns, trim: ICI 569 “Almond Wisp” Storefront, Metal railings etc ICI 578 “Forest Black” Awnings: #1281 “Gulf Blue”</p>	<p>Verify the color of the ground floor cast stone façade.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval upon clarification of Staff questions above.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay stated he was representing Julius Bennett. The cast stone sample was the color, and the cornice was made of a synthetic material four stories above the street and matches the cast stone in color. The base and the top element will be a matching color, and the glass will be a lightly tinted light gray. They were trying to get a more high performance glass since there were many windows that faced south with no overhangs. No one should be able to tell the difference between the tinted areas and the clear glass.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Bill Stuebe (Historic Savannah Foundation - HSF) stated that the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the HSF was concerned about the Design Details on the Tattnall Street façade. The door opening for trash and utilities was larger than the other openings, which was supposed to conform to the other heights along the Tattnall Street façade. They wanted to know why there were double windows all the way up, and the top window didn't follow suit. There was no rear to the building because it was a through street and not a lane. The stair towers were not integrated into the façade of the structure, and they felt that it should be a design that incorporated the stair tower into the overall look of the façade.

Mr. Shay stated the drawing was from an earlier study, and the colors shown were not the colors. The colors were the samples that were presently being shown. Their intent was that the arched tops over the openings at the street level should be the same height and match, regardless of whether they have a roll-up garage door or whether they have a storefront. If the drawing were inconclusive, he would state it for the record. The height and mass were also addressed.

Mr. Neely stated he agreed with the comment of the Tattnall Street façade and the columns. He felt they were out of place and wanted Staff to bring the issue back up.

Mr. Gay stated it was close to the rear of the building, but it was not because Tattnall was a street and not a lane.

Mr. Shay stated he did not understand the concern.

Ms. Reiter stated she had no concern with it.

Mr. Neely stated it looked like an expansive area without ornamentation.

Mr. Shay stated it was a stair tower and a service space with no functional reason to have windows

Mr. Gay stated he was more interested in the look and did not like it. He said the other windows should have shutters and faux windows where the shutters closed. He didn't know how you could tell the difference.

Mr. Neely stated that at the base on the street level there was a blank space.

Mr. Steffen stated he did not want to cut off Board discussion but wanted to remind everyone that Height and Mass had been approved on the project, and that they were there for Design Details. If the Board was going by the shrink wrap idea which was decided it was the proper way to determine whether or not they were dealing with Height and Mass or with Design Details, he felt they were entering back into the area of Height and Mass with the discussion.

Mr. Gay stated it was like saying the Board did not like the way a door looked but it was part of Height and Mass.

Mr. Steffen stated Design Detail would allow you to say how the door looked. Whether or not there were doors, openings, divisions, and the size of decisions was Height and Mass. He was expressing what the Board's prerogative was and was not trying to cut off discussion, but where the Board was supposed to be.

Mr. Neely stated it could be ornamentation, a variety of change in the brick, or some kind of spacing.

Mr. Steffen stated Design Detail could talk about what to do with the mass itself, but the existence of the mass the Board could not address.

Mr. Neely asked if Mr. Shay had any thoughts on how to address the concern.

Mr. Shay stated what they were trying to do and what was presented in the Height and Mass stage was to use it to divide the façade into segments. If they changed the brick, it would look cute and not consistent with the massing of the rest of the building. He hears what Board members were saying, but if they felt that strongly, they could look at introducing a void element at the street level. The problem is that with stair towers they do a switch back, and if he makes the windows line up they would fall in the middle of landings and it would be ugly, especially at night when you could see the floor lines in the middle of a window. He said many of the buildings downtown have windows at the landings, but it makes a jarring look. You would not perceive them as strongly as you see in the elevation from the street level because Jefferson Street at that point is only less than 30 feet wide, and there was a six-story, block long parking deck on the other side. He said they could insert some kind of window element at the bottom of the stairs.

Mr. Neely stated it would help. He said it faces the garage.

Mr. Shay stated the elevation faces the parking deck.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed 6 to 1. Dr. Watkins was opposed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Deidrick Cody
H-07-3760-2
436 & 438 Price Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends a **continuance in order to receive requested materials.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Deidrick Cody.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations and additions as follows:

1. Repair or replace windows.
2. Repair or replace stoops.
3. Repair or replace siding.
4. Repair or replace cornice and brackets.
5. Repair or replace doors.
6. Repair or replace roof material.
7. Rebuild back porches and add second set of spiral stairs to match existing.

FINDINGS:

1. The windows are boarded up and their condition cannot be assessed. It is evident that one on Gordon Street is missing. They are wood, true divided light 2/2 windows. Existing windows should be repaired, rather than replaced. Any replacement windows should match the existing in material, profile etc.
2. The stoops shall be repaired in kind. The stoop canopies appear solid and should not be replaced. If it is absolutely necessary to replace a canopy it shall match the drawing (i.e. not a sloped roof). The picket railing detail submitted is not compatible. The drawing A101 does not indicate a bottom rail. The correct railing detail is a top and bottom rail that the square pickets dovetail into. (Not the side pieces to hold the pickets together as shown on the detail. This is an incorrect detail for a Victorian structure.)
3. Siding should be repaired rather than replaced as much as possible. The entire Gordon Street side was replaced with new siding without approval. Where wood siding is replaced it shall be replaced with wood.
4. Many of the cornice brackets are missing. Replacement brackets shall match the original in material and exact detail.
5. The doors are covered with plywood. Earlier photos indicated that they were wood, six raised panel doors. This is what should be repaired or replaced.
6. It is indicated on the drawings that the roof is standing seam metal. It should be repaired or replaced to match existing in height of seam and edge detailing.
7. The rear porches are new, however there should be a bottom rail.
8. Please indicate location of HVAC units and how they will be screened.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the following conditions:

1. Existing 2/2 wood, single-glazed, double-hung windows should be repaired rather than replaced. If replaced they should match the existing in size, material, and configuration.
2. Stoops shall be repaired rather than replaced, and if elements are replaced, they shall match existing. The railing detail shall be revised to match traditional relationship between pickets and top and bottom railing.
3. Siding should be repaired rather than replaced, and if some is replaced, it shall match the existing in material and dimensions.
4. All replacement brackets shall match existing in material and detail.
5. Doors shall be repaired or new solid wood six-raised panel.
6. Standing seam roof shall be repaired or replaced to match existing in width of pan and height of seam.
7. Staff to be provided with the colors and placement and screening of HVAC systems.

8. Any deviations from the stamped permit drawings and conditions shall be approved by Staff prior to execution.

Ms. Reiter stated that the project was continued for additional information; the Board wanted a site plan, they had in the original submittal to show the location of the stairs on the back. Staff needed verification that the two-over-two wood windows were still in the building as they were several years ago, and if they were going to be repaired and replaced in-kind.

Mr. Deidrick Cody stated the original two-over-two windows would be repaired or replaced in-kind.

Ms. Reiter stated the original picture showed a six-raised panel wood door on the doors.

Mr. Cody stated there were two steel doors there now, but they would replace them with six-raised panel wood doors.

Ms. Reiter asked if the stoops would be repaired with the low-hip or flat-top roof and not a shed roof.

Mr. Cody stated it would be the same as it were, but they were going to make repairs.

Ms. Reiter stated there was an existing spiral metal stair off the back deck. She said it was proposed to repair the deck and put a matching spiral stair on the south end.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the petitioner was going to do both.

Ms. Reiter stated Mr. Meyerhoff wanted a site plan of the stairs and it was in the original packet. She did not know what more they could provide, but Mr. Cody planned to duplicate the stairs that existed on the opposite end.

Mr. Steffen asked if the approval of the project was based on the condition that the windows be replaced in-kind, the doors be replaced in-kind, and the stoop be reconstructed as the original.

Ms. Reiter answered yes, and said the door would be replaced with a wood six-panel door because it was metal. The windows would be repaired if possible, or replaced in-kind.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the spiral stair shown on the site plan is a half circle, and on the elevation it is a full circle on the east side of the porch. He said the full spiral was on the outside of the porch. The reason he brought it up was that he wanted to know how close the spiral stairs would be to the adjacent property line.

Mr. Cody stated it was within six to ten feet away, and there was a wood fence along the property line.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it was a strong design element on the street side, and that was why he was questioning it. He was curious why they would need another set of stairs when they have one.

Mr. Cody stated they were trying to eliminate the people living on the left unit having to walk by the windows of the people on the right side, and they would have their own stairs to use.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed 8 to 1. Mr. Meyerhoff was opposed.

**RE: Continued Petition of James R. Higgins
H-07-3761-2
520 East Gwinnett Street
New Construction Part I and Part II**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design approval for a new single-family residence.

FINDINGS:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	Three-foot side yard setbacks have been provided. The front is built to the 0-lot line with an encroaching stoop step.	The setback standards are met. A city encroachment permit is required for the stoop steps. Encroaching steps is typical of this block.
Dwelling Unit Type	Single-family residential	Both single- and multi-family residences are found on this block.
Street Elevation Type: A proposed building on an east-west through street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.	Two and one-half story low stoop on a crawl space.	Low stoops over a crawl space are found in this block.
Entrances: On an east-west street the entrance should face the primary street.	The entrance faces the main street, Gwinnett Street.	This standard is met.
Building Height: The height map allows 2.5 stories at this location. In the Beach Institute neighborhood, floor-to-floor heights can be lower where it can be shown that the existing floor-to-floor heights are lower.	Based on the scale on the drawing, the crawl space is 24 inches; the first floor is approximately 10 feet and the second story is approximately 9 feet; the attic space appears to be approximately 11 feet to the ridge. The overall height is 32 feet.	
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade	The proposed façade consists of a two-bay structure (bay window and door).	Due to the narrowness of the lot, a three-bay proportion could not be used.

Proportion of Openings	A 3:4+ proportion is used. Windows are rectangular and vertically aligned on the public façade.	This standard is met.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	The rhythm of the openings includes a projecting three-sided bay and a recessed porch.	The rhythm of solids to voids appears compatible with the block face.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	It appears that the building covers 70 percent of the lot. Side yard setbacks are met.	The rhythm of the structure on the street appears compatible. It is a narrow lot. The building's footprint aligns with its neighbors.
Roof: Gable roof pitches shall be between 4:12 and 8:12. Gable and hip roofs in excess of 8:12 pitch are permitted, only where a similar historic building roof pitch exists within the same block front.	A front facing gable roof with a pitch of 8:12 is proposed.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	A recessed front porch is proposed. A two-story shed rear porch is proposed.	The porches appear compatible with the block face.
Walls of Continuity: Walls and fences shall not extend beyond the façade of the front elevation.	A four-foot-high wood picket privacy fence is proposed for the front.	The fences need to be pulled back to align with the main façade.
Scale		The scale appears appropriate for this size lot.

Part II Standards:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Windows and doors	Andersen 1/1, 200 Series	Please provide more information on the materials and a picture of the window if possible. Be sure the window meets the ordinance standards.
Roof	5V crimp 26 gauge steel roof; color white.	Clarify dimension of the ridges including height, width, and distance between ridges; that the edges are covered with a trim piece. White is not a typical color for roofs in the Historic District. Consider silver or gray.
Stoops porticos	Iron railing and corner brackets per detail. Iron balusters per detail.	
Materials, Textures, Colors	Siding: 8-inch Hardi Plank smooth lap siding. Color Siding: Behr Bristol	The colors and materials are compatible. Clarify the wood sample and that it is being

	Green Trim, doors, windows: White A wood sample was submitted.	used on the front porch floor. Clarify the step material.
--	---	--

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with clarifications requested by Staff.

Mr. Gay asked about the difference on the back door panels with one having six panels and the other having two panels. He said they did not match.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated on Staff’s findings regarding the porches, the wood railings on the existing front porch would be replaced in-kind with wood at 42 inches in height, and that wood-turned columns would be repaired and replaced to match the existing. He said the detail drawings show metal railings.

Ms. Reiter stated they were metal. That they were iron railing and corner brackets per detail, and iron balusters per details.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the railing detail was all metal. He did not understand because the entire block has wooden buildings with wooden railings.

Mr. Gay stated the brackets needed to be wood if they were going to be there.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he did not understand why an entire block in this building would have metal railings and brackets, when every other building was wood.

Mr. Gay stated it might be because of the spiral staircase in the back they might be trying to tie into.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the back did not bother him that much.

Ms. Reiter stated the back would not be visible.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated his concern was the front with the brackets and railing that was in question.

Mr. Steffen asked if Ms. Reiter had a concern with it.

Ms. Reiter stated she recommended approval, and said she could understand where he was coming from with new construction.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Russell Parmeter stated it was designed with the iron in mind, and they did not want wood due to maintenance. He said with wood it had to be replaced and repainted constantly, and with iron there were new finishes that would give a 40-year period in between redoing.

Mr. Gay stated they could have some sort of material that looked like wood.

Mr. Parmeter stated they did not want plastic, they wanted something that was structurally strong. They also wanted to use iron for the framework that would support the upper balcony.

The goal was to use the ironwork on the exterior; they did not know they were required to match the rest of the porches in the neighborhood.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he did not have a problem with iron in the back, which was not visible, but for compatibility, it would be the only building on the block with iron brackets and railing, and it was out of character with compatibility.

Mr. Parmeter stated he understood.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the base between the ground and the first level had brick corners with infilled stucco, or would it be continuous brick.

Mr. Parmeter stated it would be a continuous brick facing on the front of the structure, and the steps would be brick-faced. He said most of it would be a block structure infilled with dirt with a poured slab. There would be a brick facing that would have columns and infilled in between the columns with brick facing, which would give the appearance of continuous columns and brick.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it was brick or stucco.

Mr. Parmeter stated it was brick facing. He said the ones that were there have nothing because they were not finished.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it was a complete brick base on the front.

Mr. Parmeter stated it was six feet in on each corner.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it then went to stucco.

Mr. Parmeter said it would just be concrete masonry. He said the houses were three feet apart from each other, and with the picket fence, you won't see it.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what was Mr. Parmeter's consideration on his objections to the metal.

Mr. Parmeter stated he loved the metal. He said he would ask for a little leeway to be able to do the work in the neighborhood since it was on the outskirts, but he would leave it up to the Board.

Mr. Gay asked if he was willing to change to wood.

Mr. Parmeter stated they could go to wood.

Mr. Gay asked if the front door would be like the photograph in the back.

Mr. Parmeter stated the front door would be three panels that were picked out. He said the windows match what they were doing, but the front doors were going to be changed to three panels each. The downstairs door would have a light above it, and the upstairs would not. The back doors were slab security doors since it would not be seen because of the three unit structure behind it on the lane, which was two-story. That was why they decided to place the HVAC units on the roof, and because there was not enough room on the ground.

Mr. Gay asked if they would be willing to put wooden brackets where the metal brackets were on the front.

Mr. Parmeter answered yes.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he saw the vertical one in the middle and on the corner. He said if it was metal they were talking about a two-inch by two-inch column. If it was wood it would be a four-inch by four-inch and it gives more of an appearance of strength and compatibility with the other buildings. The metal was out of character on the front porch.

Mr. Parmeter stated what they would do to match the existing buildings would be to go four-by-four or six-by-six. Most of the buildings have six-by-six wood.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it would be more compatible.

Mr. Steffen stated there were three concerns of Staff, which was the color of the roof, the clarification of the dimensions of the ridges on the roof and the trim piece, and the material of the porch floor.

Mr. Parmeter stated there would be a standard five V-crimp, 16 gauge, with a two-foot wide spacing in between the crimps. It is standard galvanized in color. The panels were ordered to size and no cutting was done once they were installed, and their life expectancy was a minimum of five years prior to any kind of rusting or coating being needed. He said they could coat it in a gray or silver, which was recommended.

Mr. Steffen asked if there would be a trim piece.

Mr. Parmeter answered yes. He said all of the edges would get trimmed out like a regular tin roof.

Mr. Steffen asked about the material for the porch floor.

Mr. Parmeter stated what they had picked out if they were going to use the steel framework would have been the Epay. He said Epay was a South American solid wood that was comparable to the African ironwood. It naturally turns gray and doesn't need any kind of preservation or painting, and that was why they were going to use it on top of the steel to keep from adding more chemicals to the steel. If they do wood framing around the exterior decks on the front, the Epay would be replaced with the tongue and groove one-by-four decking to match the existing structures on the street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they had the same concern as Mr. Meyerhoff with an additional concern regarding the bay façade. They didn't understand why the whole bay front façade didn't reach the eave line, that it looked odd, and hoped the petitioner could explain what was going on with the section. They noted the stairs should be wood, as well as the columns and the gingerbread.

Mr. Bill Steube (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated typically wooden bays go up to the eave line, and this one stops short of the eave line. He said the whole bay structure should be integral to the pediment and not stop short, because the spacing appears to be incorrect.

Mr. Parmeter stated it was part of the attic that comes out to the front of the bay. He said it created the overhang for the balconies, as well as the overhang for the bottom porch as you walk into the house. On the left is a 45 degree part of the bay, which creates an overhang above the second story window. The façade seen before the gable starts was the bottom of the floor in the attic. The floor is in the attic because they wanted storage space, and from the floor to the peak is an eight-foot four-inch height where someone could walk all the way through the

attic from end to end. On either side is where the HVAC is running for the second floor, with three feet of wall space on either side of the building for running heating and air trunks.

Mr. Steffen suggested an option for the Board would be to approve Parts I and II for Height and Mass and Design Details, but allow the composition of the currently metal elements and the porch flooring material to come back to Staff with specific consideration, and that a submission be made with wood materials. He said it could be approved as is, or it could be denied as is.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Meyerhoff** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as amended, with the condition that the revised wood porch and trim be presented to Staff for approval. **Dr. Johnson** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Dr. Johnson asked if the handrails going up the front stairs were wood.

Mr. Parmeter stated that everything was iron.

Ms. Reiter asked if the motion stated no brackets at all because wood brackets would be appropriate.

Mr. Steffen understood the motion to be anything on the front that was currently metal to be wood, and that the specific types of wood, including the parth on the porch would come back to Staff to make sure it was appropriate wood.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated when the petitioner brings the wood in it would be his option to have wood brackets or no porch brackets.

**RE: Continued Petition of Barnard Architects
John Clegg
H-07-3762-2
534 – 538 East Gwinnett Street
New Construction**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. John Clegg.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a rehabilitation and addition to the building at 534 - 538 East Gwinnett Street and for new construction of a carriage house at the rear. The two-story addition is 10 feet deep and 43' - 8" wide proposed for the rear of the existing residence with a partial width two-story porch. The carriage house is also two-story with four garage door openings extending 45 feet at the lane, and 23' - 4" into the lot.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 534 - 538 East Gwinnett Street was constructed in 1914, and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density).

NOTE: The parcel is 5,477 square feet. With the proposed improvements, Staff calculated that the building footprint (not including the encroaching building), will cover approximately 78 percent of the parcel; however, dimensions were not provided. The applicant states that the 75 percent maximum is met and can be verified to the Zoning Administrator who reviews these standards. The Zoning Administrator has determined that only one off-street parking space for each new dwelling unit created is required, and the existing four-unit residence does not require any parking because it is existing. The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

Rehabilitation/Addition:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Additions shall be located to the rear, [and] shall be sited such that it is clearly as appendage and distinguishable from the main structure. Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.	A two-story addition is proposed with a partial two-story porch on the rear. The addition is setback on the sides from the existing residence and is located under a separate hip roof.	The standard is met.
Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material, and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features... designed to be reversible.	The building has suffered from deferred maintenance leaving the openings (especially on the rear) open and exposed to the elements. No character defining features exist on the rear.	The standard is met. The rear of the building will be mostly obscured from view by the construction of the proposed carriage house.
Exterior Walls:	Painted wood or smooth Hardi-Plank siding is proposed for the addition. Repair and replacement of wood siding on the existing building will be in-kind. Siding on the front will be replaced with siding from the sides when needed, and the sides of the building will feature new and historic siding. The photos indicate that all siding on the front will be replaced.	The standards are met. Staff does not recommend the wholesale replacement of historic siding, which should be repaired where possible. No siding exists on the side or rear elevations at this time, and photos indicate that all siding will be removed from the front facade. The original siding on the rear had already been removed prior to purchase.
Windows and Doors:	Existing building: 2/2 Double-hung sash, wood windows with TDL, single glazing. Addition: wood, aluminum clad Weathershield HR 175 windows, with 7/8" SDL and spacer bar.	Historic windows should be repaired when possible if any remain. The petitioner states than many of the original windows were removed prior to purchase of the property. The standards are met. These windows have been previously approved in the district for new construction. Verify door design and

		material.
Roof:	Replace existing metal roof with asphalt shingle roof. Eave and trim materials will be repaired/replaced in-kind to match existing.	Staff recommends approval. The roof is not visible from Gwinnett Street.
Porches:	Wood railings on existing front porches will be replaced in-kind with wood at 42 inches in height. Wood turned columns will be repaired or replaced to match the existing.	Staff recommends repairing the original turned columns if possible, otherwise they should go back to match the existing in dimension, material, and design. The balustrade should remain at its historic height.

Carriage House:

Part I Height and Mass		
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIP- zone. New carriage houses may provide up to a four-foot setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.	A two-foot setback is proposed at the lane, five feet on the east and 4.9 feet on the west. The neighboring building to the west encroaches onto the property 1.9 feet creating three feet of open space between the existing structure and proposed.	The standard is met.
Street Elevation Type	Four-car, two-story carriage house with one dwelling unit above.	Staff recommends approval. The carriage house is to the rear of a semi-attached residence and a double-carriage house would be appropriate.
Building Height: Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories	Two-story carriage house approximately 24 feet to the ridge of the roof. The main residence is approximately 33 feet tall.	The standard is met.
Proportion of Openings	Window openings fronting the lane have been enlarged as per staff's recommendation to approximately three feet wide by five feet tall.	Staff recommends approval
Rhythm of Structure on Street	Non-historic frame residences line the lane. The carriage house is setback two feet from the lane to apron into the garage.	Staff recommends approval.
Scale	The carriage house is subordinate in height, scale, and mass to the main residence.	Staff recommends approval.

Part II Design Details		
Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors	Weathershield HR 175 wood clad windows with insulated glass and 7/8-inch simulated divided lights with spacer bars.	The standard is met. These windows have been previously approved in the Historic District for new construction.
Windows and doors	8.5-foot-wide metal overhead garage doors with flat panels painted to match doors elsewhere.	The standard is met.
Roof Shape	Hip roof with a 4:12 pitch surfaced in gray asphalt shingles.	The standards are met.
Materials	Painted wood or Hardi Plank siding with a smooth finish.	The standard is met.
Color	Siding: Devoe Paint, Luminescence (Yellow) 1W23-3 Trim, Eaves: Devoe Paint, Cradle White 1W13-1 Doors and Garage doors: Devoe Paint, Shaded Moss 2C20-5 Roof: Charcoal Gray	Staff approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1) All historic fabric, including windows, siding, and porches be retained if possible.
- 2) Provide information on front doors (will they be retained or replaced).

Mr. Steffen asked if Staff wanted the design and materials to come back to Staff if approved, and if they wanted ongoing supervision of the work in progress.

Ms. Ward stated Staff went by the project, and they had stopped working on the project.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. John Clegg stated he apologized for the over-zealousness. He said in an effort to stabilize the building the siding was removed, and pieces that were salvageable and worth saving they saved and would be reinstalled. It was their intent to save as much historic fabric as possible (siding, windows, and doors). He said the contractor did survey the property and provided photographs with red and green arrows designating what he believed could be saved and what had to be replaced. Their intention was to retain the front doors so they do not have to be replaced.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Clegg understood that if the front doors had to be replaced, it would need to come back to Staff.

Mr. Clegg answered yes.

Ms. Reiter asked what were the front doors.

Mr. Clegg stated they were six-panel wood doors.

Mr. Johnson asked what kind of siding would be used if replaced.

Mr. Clegg stated it would be wood siding to match the profile and dimensions of the existing siding.

Mr. Steffen stated Staff would like the design and materials to come to them should they be replaced, and for Staff to supervise the project.

HDRB ACITON: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition, with the condition that any changes be resubmitted to Staff for approval. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Howard Reid
H-07-3777-2
549 & 551 East Harris Street
New Construction Part I and Part II**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Howard Reid.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to rebuild a double cottage with rear addition.

FINDINGS:

1. A permit was signed by Staff on November 28, 2006, for in-kind repairs to the historic duplex, and for alterations to additions in the rear not visible from a public right-of-way. Subsequently, advanced structural damage was discovered and the house collapsed during attempts to replace the sills. The applicant is petitioning to rebuild the house with a new addition on the rear.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	The original footprint will be replicated with an addition.	This standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type	Low stoop double cottage.	This standard is met.
Street Elevation Type	Low stoop double cottage.	This standard is met.
Entrances	Two six-raised panel front doors.	The plans indicate metal doors. Doors should be existing doors reused or wood six raised panel doors.
Building Height:	Measured drawings were made of the original duplex. It is proposed to duplicate the original duplex and add a rear	The height replicates the historic height.

	addition.	
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade	Each half of the duplex was three bays wide. This arrangement is to be duplicated.	This standard is met.
Proportion of Openings	The windows were included on the measured drawings. It is proposed to replicate the openings for the original windows and doors.	No deviation from the original opening sizes should be made.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	The original window-door-window window-door-window rhythm is to be repeated on the front façade.	This standard is met.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The original footprint along Harris Street is to be replicated.	This standard is met.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	The two-bay-wide porch is to be replicated.	This standard is met.
Additions: Additions that are equal to or exceed the size of the existing structure shall be treated as new construction. In such cases, the new construction shall be connected in such a way that visually separates the new construction from the existing structure. The addition shall be sited such that it is clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure. Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.	The depth of the original house is 21'-11 ½ inches. The proposed addition was 16 feet tied into the main structure by an intersection gable. Due to the siting of the double cottage, the rear addition will not be readily visible from the public right-of-way.	The impact of the addition on the historic house would not have been compatible in that it did not differentiate itself from the original house sufficiently. It is not clear what the attic is being used for, or the necessity to tie it in so high on the duplex roof. However, the historic house no longer exists, thus the new construction might be reviewed more in a different light. The addition is inset from both sides of the cottage.

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards	NA	
Windows and Doors	Wood 6/6 double-hung true divided light windows are proposed.	This standard is met. The windows specified on the drawings will not be used.
Roof Shape	Intersecting gable with Williamsburg Gray shingles.	This standard is met.
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches	Reconstruct original porch without stair railing.	The railing detail needs to be resubmitted to Staff.
Fences	Not addressed	Provide information on any gates or fences.
Overlay District Standards	NA	
Materials	Wood siding on the original	This standard is met.

	footprint and Hardiplank on the addition.	
Textures	NA	
Color	Siding: Benjamin Moore Windham Cream HC-6; Shutters: BM Sherwood Green HC-118; Trim: BM Lancaster White Wash HC-174.	These are compatible.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with revised railing detail to staff for approval; clarification regarding any fences

Mr. Steffen asked what clarification was needed for the fences.

Ms. Reiter stated it did not show any fences and she did not know if it was an oversight.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Howard Reid stated the fence would be a six-foot standard fence.

Mr. Steffen asked if they had a problem with a review of the railing detail and what the fence would look like coming back to Staff.

Mr. Reid answered no, and said it would not be a problem.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) asked about a particular window being the same size as the others, but on the floor plan it was a different sized opening. They were wondering if that was how it was supposed to be or if it was a mistake on the plan. They thought it should have the same windows across the entire front.

Ms. Reiter stated it was originally that way, but Staff told them they could have the same size windows all of the way across.

Mr. Steffen asked if the original window was a different size.

Ms. Ward stated it might have been modified over time, but there was no way to tell.

Mr. Reid stated the windows would be the same across the front.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted, with the condition that details of the railing and fence be brought to Staff for approval. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Poticny, Deering & Felder
Keith Howington
H-07-3781-2
417 East Charlton Street
New Construction Part I and Part II**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I and II, of a one-story garage with a roof deck above at the rear of the property at 417 East Charlton Street. A non-historic two-story carriage house exists at the rear of the property currently. The new garage will be sited immediately east of the existing building.

The petitioner is also requesting to replace an existing window opening with a door opening on the east elevation of the non-historic carriage house to access the rooftop deck above the new garage. The door will be a wood clad French door with a light above, and will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 417 East Charlton Street was constructed in 1872, and is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A-1 (Residential, Medium-Density). The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

Part I Height and Mass:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone. Carriage houses, garages, and auxiliary structures must be located to the rear of the property.	No setbacks are proposed.	The standard is met.
Street Elevation Type	One-story two-car garage.	The standard is met. Carriage houses are common at the lane.
Building Height: Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories	A one-story garage with a roof-top deck above is proposed. The overall height of the garage and parapet/privacy wall above is 15'-10".	The standard is met.
Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:	The proposed garage is 22'-6" wide and 15'-10" tall.	Staff recommends restudy of the parapet/privacy wall height. It creates the illusion of an exaggerated one-story garage, but is not quite tall enough appear as a two-story building.
Proportion of Openings	Two garage door openings are located at the ground level. They are 7 feet tall and 9 feet wide.	The standard is met. These openings are consistent with historic carriage houses.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	Two garage openings are on	Staff recommends restudy of

	<p>the ground level which is 9'-10" tall with a 6-foot parapet/privacy wall above.</p>	<p>the privacy wall. From the lane, it appears as an exaggerated parapet wall with no openings, creating a solid to void rhythm not typical of carriage houses in the district. Staff recommends that the wall appear as a true parapet at the roof line, with a privacy wall or trellis behind the parapet.</p>
--	--	--

The Following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p>Windows and Doors: Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width</p>	<p>Nine-foot-wide automatic garage doors to match existing are proposed.</p>	<p>Verify material. If using a metal or synthetic door, Staff recommends a flush panel door instead of the raised panels.</p>
<p>Roof: shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.</p>	<p>A flat roof is proposed behind a 6-foot parapet wall.</p>	<p>The standard is met. Staff recommends restudy of the height of the parapet.</p>
<p>Materials</p>	<p>The masonry building will be surfaced in a true stucco finish, and scorred to match the existing carriage house.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Color</p>		<p>Submit colors to Staff.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Approval to install new door and light, as they will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way if at all.
2. Approval of the garage with the condition that the parapet height be proportionate to the one-story building, and a trellis or privacy wall be used for the roof-top deck. Verify garage door material and design. Resubmit drawings and colors to Staff for final approval.

Mr. Gay asked why the windows were longer in one place than in every other place.

Ms. Ward stated they were existing, they do match, but they were not even in height. She said the building was shorter and the windows came down lower. They appeared to her to be the same height.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the petitioner was not going to have a deck on the one-story garage.

Ms. Ward stated they would. She said he had extended it to create a more proportionate façade. What Staff was charged with looking at was the impact on the public realm or the right-of-way, and it satisfied the compatibility factors.

Mr. Gay stated the windows don't look the same size.

Ms. Ward stated if you look at the scoring, they were just shifted down lower. She said the windows come up taller.

Mr. Steffen asked if Staff received verification of the garage door material and design.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Keith Howington stated he repeated the same design with the existing doors. He said they were a metal raised panel door, but they were not opposed to a flush panel wood door. Before handing out alternate drawings, he referred to the original design that the owner wanted. The windows would be the same size as the existing windows, and they looked longer due to the shutters. The privacy wall was higher because the owner of the property was concerned about security. The owner was in favor of the open parking and did not want to create a sense of a false wall. To create more of an open garden area behind the wall, they added the planters on top of the wall. He said it was six-foot because the petitioner had a large following and had privacy and security issues with the public on his property. The petitioner was asking for a higher wall without losing the sense of a carriage house. The petitioner liked the idea of it being open, opened on the other side, open to the garden, and lots of sunlight. He said it helped to create a staggered rhythm between the existing carriage house and neighboring carriage house. He looked at placing a railing or a wood fence above the first floor and it felt like it did not give a sense of security the petitioner desired. He would like to keep the privacy wall at or about six feet, and leave the open deck on the other side as opposed to a false sense of a carriage house. The reason for the staggering was the actual grade of the garage was higher than the infill. If they go as high as the existing carriage house roof it would create a large mass on the lane. He preferred the staggered look of the wall.

Mr. Steffen stated there was a submittal of original plans and a supplemental set of plans to Staff. He asked if they wanted the Board to approve the original ones.

Mr. Howington stated that was correct. He said he would like consideration on the original for the reasons stated.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he agreed that the original submittal in mass was better than to bring the wall the full height of the carriage house. He said if the original design could be lowered a foot or a foot and one-half to make it a wall, he thought it would be more compatible, than to go the full two stories at 20 feet. He said there would be plenty of privacy and security. He felt the alternate submittal was less desirable than the original submittal.

Mr. Gay asked if they were open to lowering the wall.

Mr. Howington said he would. He asked if five feet would be acceptable. He originally had it at four feet.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated four and one-half.

Mr. Neely said they could do lattice on top.

Mr. Howington stated they were trying to keep the sense of security. He said they could look at a possible foot of lattice. He said he had drawn it but felt like it was an add-on to a parapet. That was how they came up with the planter to give it an extra foot of height. He originally had it at four feet and the petitioner asked if it could be raised a couple more feet.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated they should reconsider lowering it and bring it back to Staff. He said the more you lower it the better it would be. He realized if it was four feet high it would be relatively low, but a foot and one-half would be a much better mass.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition, with the condition that the height of the parapet be restudied and lowered from six feet to four feet with planters above, and resubmit to Staff for final approval. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Johnson asked how much would Mr. Meyerhoff recommend lowering the wall.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated instead of the six feet from the deck finished floor, to four feet or four and one-half-foot from the deck finished floor.

Mr. Howington asked from the top of wall and not top of the planter.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated from the top of the wall. He said with the planters being attached to the wall it should be four feet to the parapet with the planters above it. That would be from the deck finished floor.

RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3784-2
501 West Bay Street
New Construction Part I Height and Mass –
Hotel/Condominium

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval for demolition; continuance for Part I to restudy height and form.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for Demolition of two non-historic structures and approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, of a seven- and eight-story hotel/commercial/residential mixed-use building at the southwest corner of Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard and West Bay Street.

FINDINGS:

Demolition: The existing buildings at 501 and 517 West Bay Street are one-story commercial buildings. Neither is contributing to the Historic District. The building at 501 West Bay Street was constructed sometime after 1954, and prior to 1973 as a filling station. The structure has undergone subsequent alterations and changes in use, most recently occupied by Crispy Chiks restaurant. There are no distinguishable architectural characteristics that make this building unique or indicative of its time. The building at 517 West Bay Street was constructed ca. 1950, also as a filling station. Numerous alterations and changes in use have modified the original appearance of this structure as well. Neither possesses any known historical or architectural

significance that would make them eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places or the local Historic District.

New Construction: The project is sited on two parcels zoned B-C (Community-Business). The findings below summarize staff comments and standards provided in the attached table.

- **Height:** proposed eight stories in a six-story height zone.
- **Tall Building and Large-Scale Development:** The building facades should be divided into 15' – 20' bays by window groupings or other mechanisms to meet the standards. Glass curtain walls should also be divided into these bays to meet this standard and to create a more balanced solid to void rhythm.
- **Directional Expression:** The corner form of the building at Bay and MLK should feature a base, middle, and top. The forms created in the design should more closely resemble building forms present in Savannah. If the former DeSoto is a model, its use of solids to voids, rhythm of bays, hierarchy of windows, etc. should also be examined.
- **Entrances:** The vehicular entrance and curb cut-out drop off on Bay Street should be restudied to provide a more pedestrian friendly experience at the street level.
- **Solids to Voids:** Although there are no visually relative historic structure to compare, the lack of solids within the glass curtain walls on the tower and central Bay Street façade are atypical of the Historic District. Dividing these elements into bays, as stated above, would help to achieve a more compatible appearance and create a more balanced rhythm of solids to voids.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Building Height: New construction shall be within the height limits as shown on the Historic District Height Map. Six stories.</p>	<p>The cylindrical form is eight stories tall at an overall height of 92'-6"; the center portion of the building along Bay Street is seven stories; the western portion of the building is seven stories tall.</p>	<p>The standard is not met. The adjacent building across former Olive Street/Lane is under construction and will be built within the height limit at five stories tall, with an overall height of 64 feet. The adjacent building across Ann Street is a non-historic one-story building. Very few historic buildings survive within this section of Oglethorpe Ward, including the First African Baptist Church, the Scarborough House, and the Yamacraw Administration Building. These are two- to three-story buildings. As such, there is very little historic context present which, does provide opportunities for more modern infill and possibly greater height. Studies to examine the impact of such buildings are underway and until findings can support a building of such height, Staff has a concern with</p>

		<p>recommending approval of a two-story height variance.</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...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...Large-scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width. Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street.</p>	<p>The east façade extends 80 feet along MLK, and is comprised of a two-story base, with a recessed corner entrance and a six-story cylindrical form above.</p> <p>The north façade along Bay Street is broken into three distinct sections with 16.5-foot-wide glass recesses and a connecting wall at the rear (south). The first section is similar to the MLK façade, with a 60-foot-wide storefront bay. The center section is comprised of a curved wall divided into three bays; a 60'-4" wide curtain wall in the center and 26.5 inch bay on either side with paired windows. The western section is 70.25 feet wide and divided into three distinct bays with approximately 28-foot-wide paired window bays and a central recessed balcony bay 13'-5" wide.</p>	<p>The standard it not met. As designed, the east façade cannot be divided into architecturally distinct sections. The recessed entrance and storefront element could serve as two 40-foot-wide bays, but do not relate to the six floors above in any way. The division of bays should read vertically throughout the façade.</p> <p>The Bay Street and the MLK elevations are divided into three building forms. They should incorporate window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays between 15 feet and 20 feet wide to meet the standards. The central glass curtain wall and glass tower element are not broken into bays and create more voids than solids.</p> <p>Staff recommends dividing the outer bays on the central and western façades along Bay Street further by breaking the paired windows into two individual window openings.</p>
<p>Directional expression of front elevation: A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures to which it is visually related in its directional character, horizontal character, or non-directional character.</p>	<p>The building is comprised of three sections, breaking up the horizontal appearance along Bay Street into three building forms. Each has their own distinct architecture, material, and form.</p>	<p>The proposed design is successful in breaking up the overall mass of the façade along Bay Street into three building sections with a connector at the lane. Staff recommends that the distinct forms relate more to each other in shape and form. The building appears to break down from a cylinder to a cube in form. While there are no neighboring historic buildings, this architectural expression is not found anywhere in the Historic District. The corner element with the tower</p>

		<p>above the rectilinear base seems incompatible with itself.</p> <p>Tall and/or monumental buildings such as this should have a defined base, middle and top. These elements are incorporated on the western half of the building, but not in the corner building form. Historic forms, such as the DeSoto, incorporated a base, center, and top as well as defined bays which created a continuous rhythm throughout the façade. The central curved form along Bay Street appears out of character with both the flatter western bay and round corner element.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids to Voids: The relationship of solids to voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure, shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>The building contains large amounts of glass with no divisions by solids in some areas, including the tower and central façade along Bay Street. There are no contributing buildings that relate to this structure.</p>	<p>The standard cannot be measured because the building does not visually relate to any contributing structures. As stated previously, Staff recommends dividing the glass curtain walls (including the tower element) and storefronts into bays, and breaking up the paired windows into independent openings to create a balance between solids and voids.</p>
<p>Proportion of Openings: The relationship of the width of the windows to height of windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>Glass curtain walls are used in the cylindrical tower, recesses, and central section on Bay Street. The ground floor features 10 feet by 12 feet storefront glass with 2 feet by 4 feet windows aligning above. Windows on upper floors feature PTAC (packaged terminal air conditioner) units below.</p>	<p>The standard cannot be measured because the building does not visually relate to any contributing structures. The design standards for Part II state that...all windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts and top-story windows shall be rectangular and have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.</p>
<p>Entrances: North of Broughton Street a corner building located adjacent to a north-south service street shall have an entrance on</p>	<p>The primary entrance for the hotel is located in the center curvilinear façade, with a cut in the sidewalk for vehicular access along Bay Street. An</p>	<p>The standard is met. The vehicular entrance on Bay conflicts with the floor plan provided. Please clarify. Staff recommends</p>

<p>the service street.</p>	<p>entrance for the ground floor restaurant is within a recessed corner at Bay and MLK. The western Bay Street façade features a vehicular drive through the center of the ground floor.</p>	<p>restudy of the vehicular entrance and parking along the ground floor of Bay Street. These entrances and uses on the ground floor stifle pedestrian activity, and contradict efforts to stimulate the public realm. Staff also has concerns about the curb cutout for vehicles at the front entrance. This design limits the amount of pedestrian sidewalk and does not comply with traditional streets and sidewalks in Savannah. Drayton Arms has a similar cutout while providing ample sidewalk for pedestrians. This is an excellent opportunity to connect the traditional Historic District with the area west of MLK. All efforts should be made to ensure viable connectivity.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies: The relationship of entrances, porch projections, and walkways to structures shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are visually related.</p>	<p>A recessed corner entrance is provided at MLK and Bay. Stepped balconies are proposed above the corner on the cylindrical tower. Recessed balconies are proposed on the central and western sections of the Bay Street elevation. Recessed balconies are also proposed along the lane facing elevations. Roof gardens are provided as well.</p>	<p>The standard cannot be measured because the building is not visually related to any contributing structures. The recessed corner entrance provides a channel for pedestrian activity, connecting the Landmark Historic District to the area west of MLK at an intersection where sidewalks are narrow and become unfriendly to pedestrians. Recessed balconies are found throughout the district.</p>
<p>Setbacks/Lot Coverage: No setbacks or maximum lot coverage are required in B-C zone.</p>	<p>Slight recesses are proposed along the Bay Street elevation. A majority of the building is built directly up to the street, with a corner cutout at the corner of MLK and Bay for an entrance to a restaurant.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Dwelling Unit Type</p>	<p>Hotel/Restaurant/Residential Condominium</p>	<p>The property is surrounded by hotels and commercial development.</p>
<p>Street Elevation Type: A proposed building located on an east-west through street</p>	<p>Hotel-condominium building elevation type broken into three facades; a cylindrical</p>	<p>The standard cannot be measured because there are no historic building types</p>

<p>shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.</p>	<p>form above a rectangular base at the corner of MLK and Bay, a curvilinear façade in the center of Bay, and a more traditional flat façade at the west end of the block.</p>	<p>fronting the street within this ward that are comparable. There is no other street elevation similar to what is being proposed in this ward or in any other ward in Savannah.</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade: The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front façade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is related.</p>	<p>The building is approximately 80-foot-wide along MLK and 305.5 feet along Bay Street at a height of seven and eight stories tall.</p>	<p>The standard cannot be measured, as this building does not relate to any historic structures in the district, nor is it adjacent to contributing structures.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street: The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjacent structures shall be visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing structures to which it is related.</p>	<p>Open space between buildings is defined by the width of the lanes separating this structure from its neighbors. The building is sited on an entire city block.</p>	<p>The standard cannot be measured because the building is not visually related to any contributing structures.</p>
<p>Scale: The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies, and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is related.</p>	<p>The mass of the structure is very large for the Historic District, consuming an entire city block at 80 feet wide by 305 feet long. The petitioner has tried to address this through breaking the building into three distinct sections divided by glass curtain walls and recesses.</p>	<p>The standard cannot be measured because the building is not visually related to any contributing structures.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Approval for the demolition of the buildings at 501 and 517 West Bay Street.
2. Continuance for Part I, Height and Mass, to restudy the height, division, and width of bays, creating independent windows from paired windows, forms of the three facades, and vehicular entrance and drop-off on Bay Street. Pedestrian connectivity along Bay Street to future development west of Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard should be a strong consideration. Building forms should more closely emulate forms within Savannah. The curved element of the former DeSoto, for instance, was also curved at ground level and not set on a podium. It featured a hierarchy of bays and openings that extended the full height of the building,*- with recessed and projecting balconies creating a base, middle, and top.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay stated that as shown in the model, the site was just across the street from the National Landmark Historic District on Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard (MLK). The site was lacking in historic context, and was similar to the site on Oglethorpe and MLK. When they were

exploring an appropriate expression, one thought was it was another opportunity to do a more contemporary building less neo-traditional in expression. They empathized with Staff because it was hard to interpret a building that was deliberately contemporary with the standards, because the standards reflect a neo-traditional outlook. He said at the hotel presentation last year there was a lot of sentiment with the Board, that a massive building needed to be dramatically and carefully articulated not to read as one mass. The building was designed ten years ago, was a solid mass with two sharp grooves that delineate and divide the mass. Whereas the one proposed today was clearly articulated into three segments. From the street level, it would read as three different buildings. They have worked with their client and franchiser to make sure the street level functions were engaging for pedestrian activity. Not just the hotel lobby, but also a freestanding restaurant that would engage the corner. In order to do them, they were subtracting an amount from the developable area allowed in a B-C-1 zone, which allows 100 percent lot coverage at the given height. What they had proposed was a stronger architectural expression on the corner, and a seventh story that was stepped back from Bay Street so that it would not be obvious to the passersby to recoup the volume. He said he would like the Board's view on the idea of going up a little, especially at the corner, to dramatically articulate what would be a large-scale building into discernable parts.

Mr. Saad Al-Jassar stated that because of the slope of Bay Street going down to the west, the existing hotel would end up being a two-foot nine-inch difference from the seventh floor. They would be adding another floor but it only uses less than 200 square feet; it was precisely 195 square feet, which was the circle at the top (8th floor). Up to the sixth floor, they were at 74 percent lot coverage of the whole site. They have given up lot coverage to break-up the building into three masses rather than a huge mass. They also agreed with the comment on articulating the windows, and it could be achieved by separating the windows. Regarding the round tower on a rectangular base, the tower actually extends all of the way down. There was a question about the sidewalks and not engaging the pedestrian; the floor plan showed that the entrance was eight feet away from the curb. It was purposely recessed to engage the pedestrian. The entrance on Bay Street was not a drop-off zone; the drop-off zone was located on Ann Street. It was intended for taxis or visitors. We have purposely recessed the entrances to engage the pedestrian. The transition of the building from a round to a curve is the nicest transition to a rectangular form. The curved curtain wall was incorporated into a previous submittal to a hotel on MLK. We were encouraged by those comments and used it in this design. We will take into consideration the articulation of the curtain wall.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Seiler stated the plans reminded her of several deserted hotels in Atlanta that were round, and you could see them from the interstate. She said on one of the previous elements last year she liked the rounded element, but this round one scared her, and in the petitioner's quest to look modern, there was nothing that could date something quicker than glass and roundness. It did not remind her of the elements of the Old DeSoto Hilton, which the petitioner provided pictures for the Board from years gone past, because it was not the same thing. She thought it would age the building fast, but she was fine with the rest of the building.

Mr. Steffen stated to the new Board members that with larger projects, particularly when Mr. Shay presents, they want the Board's input in this part of the process. He said it was a little bit unusual, but it was what they had asked for in many of the projects, and it was appropriate.

Mr. Shay stated over the years there had been a shift in protocol with what happens when a building was presented to receive a variance. He asked if it was fair to seek from the Board some kind of an indication that the Height and Mass was acceptable, and then go and seek the variance. He asked what was the procedure.

Mr. Steffen stated it was his understanding that the Board dealt with their business and other people dealt with theirs. He could not speak for every member of the Board, but felt it was also the Board's obligation to people who weren't aware of those restrictions of how important they were, and for the Board to let them know there may be a hurdle. He felt that Height and Mass were within their purview and the guidelines provided guidance to what must be done to a certain height. What the Board did beyond that was in the Board's and the City's purview on whether they provide a variance. The Board had the ability to make an approval subject to what the City might do.

Mr. Gay said what the Board had heard before was when the Board gives approval, the City would say if the Historic Review Board thought it was o.k. then it must be fine, and goes ahead with the project.

Mr. Steffen stated there was more communication now than in the past, and the Board had specifically stated in their motions that they were approving items subject to making determinations, as opposed to saying that the Board was telling them what to do. The concerns can sometimes be different.

Ms. Reiter stated the Board needed to make a finding of fact if there was a variance.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board makes decisions only on visual compatibility and the guidelines. They cannot tell the City what to do with the height map.

Mr. Shay asked Ms. Seiler if the building was a round expression that did not employ just a curtain wall but some glass and other materials shaped more like the model, would it be something she would find acceptable. He said the issue of whether a square podium with a round tower was something that Staff raised, and wanted feedback on it.

Ms. Seiler asked if he was referring to the model being more solid rather than what was shown on the drawing.

Mr. Shay asked if she would have fewer objections or be o.k. with it.

Ms. Seiler answered yes, and said that she kept going back to the old DeSoto picture. It had been discussed that if it had different stories added in she did not mind. She thought too much modern glass on that corner was very flagshipish for some hotel chains, but if it wasn't a Sheridan it certainly had to have been a Holiday Inn in the past.

Mr. Shay stated thinking about Atlanta helped him to frame his thoughts and he understood.

Mr. Steffen stated with the height issue in relation to visual compatibility was a trade-off sometimes, and they had taken back from other spaces. To have the corner of the property have an articulation that was larger did not bother him, but he was speaking for himself.

Mr. Neely stated he did not have a problem with the way the height was handled at the location. He said the transition from the square to the round with the steps he couldn't understand and it appeared incompatible. He liked Staff's comment about needing a more defined base, middle, and top. The Old DeSoto had an awning that was sloped and transitioned from the base to the top, and it softened it. The hard transition from a square to a round to him was too strong.

Mr. Gay stated the step part was rounded and hard to see on a flat picture, but it did mold around the whole thing. At the bottom it might be nice to have the roof effect.

Mr. Shay asked if they had less concerns about a square base and showing the roundness at street level then they did about the step.

Mr. Neely stated overall he would like to see the roundness brought down.

Mr. Shay stated if they address the things they heard today and come back, they did not know if they would be able to come back within a month. He asked if the issue of the height of the portion setback from the street level was going to be satisfactory.

The Board members answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they were confused about the procedure as well. She said in previous situations the Board would not hear a petition that had already obtained a variance.

Mr. Steffen stated it was not true. There had been some confusion but it was normally because one or two Board members insisted on doing something different other than what they do as a group. He said it was his view as Chairman, that they had the province to decide on visual compatibility. The Board was constricted by the wording of the City Ordinance that says if it was up to six floors, they shall grant it. He said there were specific restrictions that had been discussed at the last two meetings, that it needed to be cleaned-up and clarified, and when it goes further, the Board's only purview was to decide if the project was visually compatible. They could put it in the motion that it was visually compatible, "subject to the City granting a variance." The Board was not expressing an opinion on whether the City should or should not grant the variance because it was not their purview. Their purview was to decide visual compatibility. Since he had been on the Board that had been his view of the mission, and it was the view of the majority of the Board, although one or two might have a different view. They had talked about this as a group a number of times on the height and other issues.

Ms. Dolecki stated she just wanted to clarify it because there was confusion on their part about how it worked, and that they would prepare their comments differently.

Mr. Steffen stated the confusion was the result that in the past the Board had allowed many comments to come forward with little cohesion. He thought they were working hard as a group and had an understanding of what the rules were. He said they might disagree on the interpretation, but they understood what the rules were, what their purview was, and what was not.

Mr. Bill Steube (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated the property may be outside of the Landmark District, but it was still under the purview of the Historic Review Board and he thought it needed to be considered. It was all about scale and proportion, the building and eight stories was out-of-scale for the Historic District, and it should be considered not appropriate. He said the fact that it was downhill from the neighboring building did not justify going to seven stories when the height map was six stories and the neighboring building was six stories. The Historic District Ordinance also specified entrances of buildings on streets. One of the major concerns of this property was that it was a blockbuster building on this block of Bay Street. He said the ordinance reads, "...large-scale development shall comply with the following. Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street." In scaling it off, it was 120 feet from one point to another point, and another 120 feet from a second point to another point. He said there needed to be more entrances so the building related to the pedestrian on the street. The petitioner talked about the fact the pedestrian had to duck inside the building's entranceway, and could not walk down the sidewalk. He thought it was incorrect, and the

building needed to be rethought so there would be more entrances off the street. He cited an example of this failing like the Hampton Inn at the corner of Oglethorpe and MLK, where there were no entrances along Oglethorpe west of MLK.

Ms. Ida George stated that she felt Ms. Dolecki was scolded when she was merely trying to say that as a matter of procedure in the past, the Board had refused to hear any proposal until they received the variance. Ms. Dolecki was referring to previous times when the Board would not hear it until the variance was obtained, and that Ms. Dolecki was correct.

Mr. Steffen stated he did not mean to scold Ms. Dolecki, but wanted the public to understand the position of the Board.

Ms. George said that was not the question but it was a question of procedure. It was not a question of whose purview it was, it was a question of what should be undertaken first and second, and they were confused as a committee because it had been the procedure in the past. It had gone back and forth.

Mr. Steffen stated he would end the discussion and say that it had gone back and forth, and that was terrible for the Board. He said they should have a procedure that everyone agreed to, it was what the procedure was, and as long as he was Chairman that was what he would advise the Board.

Mr. Shay stated they understood the procedure, and said they agreed with the comment Mr. Steube made. They were going to work to make sure at the appropriate intervals there would be entrances into the building. He said it was something that activated the streetscape and gave people choices. They could not guarantee what was behind the storefront, and would try to design it so it would be engaging. If they provided the doors, there would be the option for street activated uses and more pedestrians.

Mr. Joe Saseen stated he felt the building was interesting compared to the boxes being built, that he had been asking the Board to let the architects design in the 21st rather than the 18th Century. He agreed with Ms. Seiler that there was too much glass on the corner and needed to be toned down. He liked the different shapes and design.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Shay was asking for the demolition approval and a continuance on the rest of the project.

Mr. Steffen answered that was right.

Dr. Watkins asked Mr. Shay to justify his design concept on why he needed to go two stories above the height map, and asked him to elaborate.

Mr. Shay stated the reason for the additional volume was they had given up a fair amount in terms of the number of hotel rooms and developable area by having deep articulations within the façade of the buildings. He said the reason for the height at the corner was that it was one of the most important corners in downtown Savannah with traffic volume and how it marks the map. It was one corner of the National Landmark Historic District that they felt deserved a special building. As new buildings were built, they would like to see the corner more prominent, and he suspected in the future that the other corners would have tall buildings as well. They liked it because it was a landmark and did not add a lot of programmatic area at the top, and the guidelines would allow it if it did not have any function at all because it would be like a church spire. Given the additional height, it would be a swell place for someone to get a view of the Savannah River and the City.

Mr. Steffen stated there were two separate motions.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the demolition as presented. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and passed unanimously.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the continuation of this petition. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of H. O. Price LLC
Richard Guerard
H-07-3785-2
342 Drayton Street
New Construction – Condominiums**

The Preservation Officer recommends a **continuance**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Richard Guerard.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass for a four-story condominium.

FINDINGS:

1. No model was submitted and the site plan does not show the stoop encroachment. An encroachment permit from City Council will be required.
2. The applicant is requesting a lot area variance from the Board of Appeals.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone. The R-I-P-A zone allows a maximum 75 percent building coverage.	A five-foot setback is proposed on the east side. The applicant is requesting a 17percent lot area variance for a proposed lot coverage of 92 percent.	The previous structure occupied 80 percent of the lot. Based on the petitioner's submittal the lot is 100 feet by 121 feet or 12,100 square feet, and the proposed building is 100 feet by 114 feet or 11,400 square feet. This would equal a 19 percent lot area variance. The site plan as submitted appears to indicate open space of only 5 feet by 10 feet on the east side, which would suggest a 24.6 percent lot area variance. The applicant needs to clarify the accurate lot

		<p>coverage requested.</p> <p>In addition, there is a stoop encroachment on Charlton Street which is not shown on the site plan.</p>
<p>Dwelling Unit Type: A variety of dwelling types may exist within any given Tything Block in the Historic District. As long as the rules for height, setback, lot coverage and street elevation are met, any of the historic building dwelling types within that block may be used.</p>	<p>An apartment dwelling type is proposed.</p>	<p>Apartment dwelling types are not found in the same block as the proposed development, but within the ward there are a number of examples on Charlton and Abercorn Streets. The existing apartment buildings located on the east-west streets in this ward are not as wide as the proposed development, and are broken up more than the proposed structure.</p>
<p>Street Elevation Type: The proposed 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. Where the aforementioned conditions cannot be met, the proposed building shall meet the visual compatibility factors.</p>	<p>A high stoop street elevation type is proposed for a large apartment building spanning 114 feet along Charlton Street.</p>	<p>While some structures in the ward have higher entrances they usually do not exceed 60 feet in width. The use of a high stoop might be more successful if the length of the building were broken into two entries. (See Sisters of Mercy Convent).</p>
<p>Entrances: A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.</p>	<p>The entrance is proposed on Charlton Street.</p>	<p>This standard is met, however, Staff recommends incorporating multiple entrances along Charlton Street to correspond to the tradition building pattern in this ward.</p>
<p>Building Height: The building is located in a four-story height zone. A basement that is entirely underground; a crawl space or partial basement that is four feet or less above grade...shall not count as a story.</p> <p>For residential buildings the</p>	<p>The partial basement ground floor on Charlton Street is noted as 7'-8" on the Drayton Street end and 8'-1 1/2" + 1'-6 3/4" at the east end. The proposed structure is four stories.</p> <p>The ground floor is proposed at 9'-8 1/4"; the second floor is</p>	<p>The proposed structure meets height map standards, however, the design does not appear to account for a two-foot change in grade. The same corner as shown on the north elevation and the west elevation have different heights. The applicant needs to provide</p>

<p>exterior expression of the height of raised basements shall not be less than 6'-6" and not higher than 9'-6". The exterior expression of the second story shall not be less than 11 feet and the exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet.</p>	<p>12'-2" at the Drayton Street end and 12'-6 ¾ inches at the east end. The third floor is 12'-6 ¾" and the fourth floor is 11'. The total height of the east end of the building 45'-4" and the total height for the west end of the building is 47'-4".</p>	<p>accurate drawings showing how the grade change is to be handled.</p> <p>The entire ground floor is parking.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development: Development whose ground floor footprint is equal to or greater than 9,000 square feet is subject to the Large Scale Development standards. These are Large scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width. Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street.</p>	<p>A central entrance is proposed. The center line of the entrance is approximately 57 feet from either end of the structure.</p>	<p>This standard is met. See further comments on entrances above. There are no varying heights.</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Facade</p>	<p>The front façade is 114 feet wide by 45 +/- high. The other buildings of comparable length of façade are the Sisters of Mercy Convent (150') an institutional building located on Liberty Street, a boulevard, and the EMC office building on Charlton and Drayton Streets at 100' +/-.</p>	<p>The uninterrupted length of this structure suggests an institutional form rather than a residential form. Staff recommends that the applicant revisit the design and break it into two entries similar to the way the mass of the convent is broken up, and that the scale of the openings be residentially proportioned.</p>
<p>Proportion of Openings</p>	<p>Triple and double Semicircular arched headed windows and flat-headed windows are proposed on three elevations. No dimensions given. An arched recessed portico is proposed. Segmental open ventilation windows are proposed for the first floor into the garage.</p>	<p>Applicant should address the type of ventilation and reduce the number of openings into the garage area.</p> <p>The openings are greater in proportion than any other residential structure except the Lafayette apartments, which is on a larger single Trust lot and is a bigger building.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids to Voids</p>	<p>The facades are divided into bays by piers.</p>	<p>There is very little modulation to the solid walls of the proposed structure.</p>

		Many of the buildings in Lafayette ward are characterized by smooth uninterrupted facades interspersed with shuttered or open porches, which add depth and airiness to the façade or as in the Sisters of Mercy convent use greater depths of plane changes.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The applicant is proposing a structure which covers almost 100 percent of the lot on an east-west street.	The unbroken length of this façade is not typical of this ward. The widest apartment buildings are 80-90 feet long at most, with more entrances. The proposed lot coverage does not allow for the breaking up of the façade into more compatible pieces. A lower lot coverage would enable the façade to be articulated to distinctly break up the mass.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	Recessed porches are proposed.	The dimensions of the porches are not legible. While they help break up the facades, the placement of two porches together on the sides of the building is not typical of this ward and creates an unusually large “void”.
Walls of Continuity	A front façade 114 feet long with one stoop is proposed.	The existing historic residential structures in Lafayette Ward, whether detached or attached, create a streetscape of multiple stoops.
Scale	The applicant has subdivided the building horizontally into two equal horizontal parts.	The division of the building almost in half horizontally creates a scale that is not in harmony with the other buildings in Lafayette Ward. The applicant appears to be trying to apply tall building characteristics to a four-story building. The brick should be carried down to the first floor. The strong horizontal lines increase the perception of width along Charlton Street.

RECOMMENDATION:

Continuance for the following:

- Restudy the massing of the building, taking into consideration Staff, Board, and public comments.
- Provide the model and a site plan showing the stoop and any other encroachments per the submission requirements. The HVAC and garbage pick-up should also be addressed.
- Provide drawings clearly showing how the grade changes are to be handled.
- Reconsider a ventilation system that does not require so many openings into the ground floor garage.
- Clarify the lot coverage. Staff does not support the large lot coverage variance.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated they do not have a site plan of the building, and it did not show the sidewalks or the street edges. The stairs on the south goes to the roof, which meant there would be a stair tower not visible on the elevation. The parking was two to two- and one-half feet below grade, which meant it would have to ramp down to a below grade parking area, and it was not shown on the Charlton Street side. If it was a ramp, it would alter what was shown to the Board because there would be a down ramp. Parking space one and twenty wouldn't be accessible because of the ramp. He wanted to add those points to the continuance of elements the Board would like to see on the next presentation.

Ms. Seiler stated she wanted to see a model on a project like this. Especially with the residential area and a historic building across the street. She said Staff's point was well made regarding any changes discussed today that could go into the building model for the next meeting.

Mr. Neely stated the solution for the ventilation for the façade was possibly going down lower with the parking about four to six feet, and having smaller grates, so the parlor level would be lower to the street level.

Ms. Reiter stated it was one approach. She said in a residential neighborhood when walking by the building you were looking into parking and it was like the Chamber of Commerce building on Oglethorpe.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Richard Guerard stated the building was offset because it ramps down one and one-half feet into the open area, then it picks up another one-half-foot.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if they were going to have a six-foot ramp going down two feet.

Mr. Guerard stated the building was six feet deep. He said there was two feet at the corner building, and it was something they would address but they had accounted for some.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the numbers did not indicate that.

Mr. Guerard stated there was not two feet; there was a one-foot elevation difference. He said if you look at the topography it says 40.4 and goes to 39.4. The difference in the topography sloping back was not a two-foot difference in the slope, but a one-foot difference in slope in the overall topography of the site. He said they accounted for it but would address it more clearly.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the site plan would help.

Mr. Guerard stated that the site plan covered everything except for the porch sticking out the front. He said he would clarify it before they came back in.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he did not have a site plan and that a model was required.

Mr. Steffen stated in keeping with the statement made on the last petition, one of the jobs as Chairman was to make sure the rules were followed, and as long as there were policies and procedures he was going to make sure they were followed. One of the policies and procedures was that there should be a mass model. Before the petition could be decided on, the Board would need the model. He was not going to keep people from commenting on this today because it would be a waste of their time, but the Board needed the model before the next decision.

Mr. Guerard stated it was not a blatant disregard because it was planned to go on the original petition that was done six months ago. At that time they had planned to continue as if they had changed the model or structure like they had done in the past. He said the main goal today was to figure out if 95 percent of lot coverage was or was not going to be acceptable. The importance was to get the number of units in the building. The building could be long and fat or tall and skinny. They could drop the garage down six feet as suggested because they were only four feet above grade and it wouldn't count as a story. They could go four stories above to increase the height of the building approximately ten or twelve feet. They were trying to create a shorter building for the area. He said the Lafayette was a very large building; they weren't too much higher than the building next door and EMC Engineering. The possibility of dropping the garage down a couple more feet to eliminate the openings on Drayton Street was not a problem. It would put it closer to the same height as the two buildings next door. To get the amount of square footage they needed, they would have to drop it down a few feet more to go six feet into the ground and go up four stories, or drop it down four more feet and stay at three stories. It would technically be a three-story building by the ordinance.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Review Board had asked for a height ordinance. They formed a committee and received a height ordinance that tells them that in certain zones they could go up so many feet and stories. He did not think the Board could make any comments if a variance was granted by another agency that would accept it. He said there was an ordinance that fully explained the height in certain areas.

Mr. Steffen stated he did not think the petitioner was asking for a height variance.

Mr. Guerard stated he was not violating the height ordinance.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the height issue was brought up.

Mr. Guerard stated he was trying to build it lower, he was not trying to go to the maximum height, and that he was not asking for a variance of height. He said he was asking for a surface coverage area variance to stay ten to twelve feet below the maximum height, and that he was trying to make the building short.

Mr. Gay stated if they don't get the 95 percent coverage, then he would go up.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated then it would be a height difference.

Mr. Johnson stated he would go down four feet.

Mr. Guerard stated no scenarios require a height variance. He was trying to keep the building lower than what was a maximum. If he can go out he will have to go up, and he did not need a variance to go up; he did not want to go up.

Mr. Steffen stated he was giving a reason for why he was asking for extra lot coverage, which was not in the Board's purview except where it related to Height and Mass. If the petitioner asked for more lot coverage than what the ordinance dictated, they would have to get approval from someone else to do it.

Mr. Guerard stated he had applied for it, and said he was asking for the Board's opinion with the mass of a 114-foot building.

Mr. Steffen stated the opinion the Board could render would be in Height and Mass as in other instances. He said he did not want to give the impression that he was discouraging people to get approvals before they came to the Board. If they had the approval, it made the Board's job easier.

Mr. Guerard stated the petition was obviously going to be continued, there would be comments they would address, and he was trying to cut down on the time so they won't be discussing it in June. What he was trying to figure out from the Height and Mass was the 114-foot of mass on Charlton Street; if they could put in three entrances instead of two and break it up some. He went for approval to the variance Board, but the sign stated he wanted RIP-C zoning. He did not want RIP-C zoning because it was for the property on Oglethorpe and Habersham and the sign was wrong. This petition was for surface coverage area. He wanted to know if the 114 feet of mass was an acceptable mass, or if the Board did not like the 114 feet and would rather it be 90 feet, which is the maximum length. Staff recommended not approving the overage, and he was asking the Board if they agreed. If so, he would come back with a new design of four stories instead of three stories.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the drawings do not show any break-up of the massing on Charlton and Drayton Streets other than the main entrance. Columns were shown in the elevations, but weren't projected in the plans. The columns were in line with the full mass of both elevations.

Mr. Guerard stated they were supposed to step out, but it was an oversight on the floor plan.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it would be six inches.

Mr. Guerard answered four inches.

Dr. Johnson wanted to see a site plan on the resubmittal because they only have the survey's drawing. He wanted to see the slope of the ramp for the garage and how it would affect the parking.

Mr. Guerard stated on the site plan it showed the building, the curb and gutter, and asked what else the Board needed to see other than the porch projecting out.

Dr. Johnson stated the outline of the houses on the other side of the street.

Ms. Reiter stated the dimensioned site plan showing all sides in relation to immediately adjacent buildings to scale, including parking areas, any roof or ground-mounted equipment and fence locations. Locate HVAC equipment, trash enclosures, and utility boxes. She said the site plan must include the public right-of-way including sidewalks, it must indicate the location, canopy spread, trunk diameter, and species of all existing trees in the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Bill Steube (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated the property was in a residential district in the Historic Landmark District, and any new construction should be visually compatible with the character of the neighborhood. They strongly recommended that the 75 percent lot coverage be adhered to, which would create a more residential character than 100 percent lot coverage. The height limitations needed to be taken into consideration, and the project should be made to adhere to the regulations.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the ARC would like to reiterate Staff's comments, especially the ones supporting varying the rhythms of solids to voids in the structure. They suggested looking at examples of deep recesses like the Sisters of Mercy on 37th Street.

Mr. Walter Hartridge (representing Mrs. Hartridge of 119 East Charlton Street, and Mr. Claude Dryden of 108 and 110 East Jones Street) stated he understood that since there was not a model, the Board did not expect to recommend Height and Mass.

Mr. Steffen said no. He said there would be a motion for a continuance and he would estimate it would be granted. Because people were present at the meeting, the Board was entertaining comments for the record.

Mr. Hartridge stated the Board of Zoning Appeals would meet on March 27, and on the notices that were sent out, the request was for 96 percent coverage and the other was 95 percent, and the RIP-A coverage is 75 percent. He said they were dealing with a Historic District; Lafayette Square was residential lots and, a streetscape across Abercorn to the east on Charlton were high-stoop houses. The Bergen Law Office was reconstructed with new buildings. His wife's property at 119 East Charlton Street was rated exceptional on the original historic Savannah survey. Historic Savannah Foundation holds a historic easement on the property, and both his wife and the Foundation have standing at any point, and were not just members of the public. The property had been maintained over the years, and it would be their position that the proposed development was not consistent with the streetscape. The proposed project would drastically alter the streetscape in Lafayette Ward and change the character of the Historic District. There had been a lot of discussion about big box hotels and condominiums. They felt the Board of Zoning Appeals should not permit a variance to the lot coverage because it could change everything. There would be a better use of this site in the Historic District if three or four townhouses were constructed that were consistent with Lafayette Ward, the streetscape, and the City plan of Savannah. He asked since there was not a model and the Board wasn't going to make a recommendation that it not go to the Board of Zoning Appeals with a recommendation on Height and Mass.

Mr. Steffen stated that was correct. He said even if the Board had made a decision, it might not have gone.

Mr. Guerard stated there was one residence on the street in either direction. He said Bergen's office on the end was a brick building on an asphalt parking lot that was a business, and EMC Engineering was on the other side of Bergen. There was a rehabilitation building, a condominium, a hotel, and a church, and the only residence was the Hartridge's.

Ms. Seiler asked Mr. Guerard if it faced the Andrew Low house.

Mr. Guerard stated on the lot coverage area he could go to four stories because he was going to try and keep it down. He thought it was a reasonable alternative.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated on the east end the wall was still standing. He asked if they planned to retain it or if they planned to start a new footing and come back up.

Mr. Guerard stated he would rather not comment on that issue. The difference as far as row homes, townhomes, condominiums, or hotels was the zonings were RIP-A, and was zoned for 20 condominiums, which was the plan they were sticking with.

Mr. Hartridge stated he asked Mr. Guerard not to tear down the wall. He said it was opposition because it was a party wall and they did not want to get into a legal debate, but it was married to another wall they own and to the carriage house. He said Mr. Guerard did not want to comment because it was a legal issue, his lawyers were not present, and the wall was there to protect the integrity and privacy to the extent they could to 119 East Charlton to Mr. Guerard's credit.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the continuance of this item. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Carol A. Barrett
H-07-3771(S)-2
514 Barnard Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Brian Packer
H-07-3773(S)-2
145 Habersham Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Sweet Pea Properties
Jay Maupin
H-07-3775(S)-2
509 ½ - 515 Blair Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
4. Petition of Lott + Barber Architects
James G. Briglia
H-07-3779(S)-2
14 East State Street
Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
5. Petition of Mega Ltd.
Marie Booker
H-07-3787(S)-2
541. 543 & 543½ East Congress Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: MINUTES

Approval of Minutes – February 14, 2007

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

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

1. Carl Vinson Institute Board Training - June 8, 2007

Ms. Reiter stated the City of Savannah and the MPC were going to sponsor the Carl Vinson Institute Board Training for all of the Boards that were within the building. She said it would be a fabulous opportunity for a workshop and she would like for everyone to attend.

2. MPC Planning Academy – April 10 - June 12, 2007

Ms. Reiter stated for six weeks on every Tuesday night the MPC will be holding a Planning Academy. It will be about planning in Savannah, the MPC, the different department, and should be very informative with different people every week. She added that someone needed to attend the St. Mary's Historic Preservation Commission training, April 27 and 28, 2007.

Mr. Steffen stated there had not been anything he had attended in a long time that was more worthwhile. The issues that had been discussed would be the things that should be interpreted.

RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

RE: INFORMATION ITEMS

RE: ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp