

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

October 10, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Gene Hutchinson
Sidney J. Johnson
Brian Judson
Richard Law, Sr.
Linda Ramsay
Dr. Malik Watkins

HDRB Members Not Present:

Dr. Charles Elmore
Ned Gay
Eric Meyerhoff

SDRA Staff Present:

Kristin Hyser

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

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

RE: CALL TO ORDER

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

RE: REFLECTION

Mr. Steffen acknowledged Mr. Bob Allen's Preservation class from Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD).

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Continue to November 14, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

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

Continue to November 14, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

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

Continue to November 14, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Continued Agenda items as presented. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Derek Brown
Dolphin Magic Tours
H-07-3892-2
PIN No. 2-0004-06-002
312 East River Street
Sign (Parking Lot)

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

RE: Petition of City of Savannah
Building Electrical & Maintenance
H-07-3897-2
PIN No. 2-0015-16-002
201 Habersham Street
Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

RE: Petition of Specialty Building Product Corp.
H-07-3902-2
PIN No. 2-0016-24-011
109 Jefferson Street
Color Change/Existing Windows,
Doors/Rehabilitation/Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

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

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Mr. Shay read the following letter:

Pat Shay as representative for Mr. Bennett, while preserving Mr. Bennett's rights as to his claim for denial of procedural due process by the Historic Review Board's passing on its own motion at the last hearing his petition without obtaining consent of the petitioner, and the Historic Review Board's failure to schedule a special meeting to hear his petition as required under the ordinance, Mr. Bennett's position will remain that both of those actions were in effect a procedural due process, wrongful denial of his petition. However, Mr. Bennett will honor and abide by the Superior Courts request without entry of a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction to permit the Historic Review Board to reschedule today's agenda matter as to Mr. Bennett, to its next meeting. This allowance to place the matter on the next agenda is to honor the direction of the Superior Court, and does not constitute a waiver of any of his denied due process claim concerning the Board's action.

Thank you, we look forward to the next agenda.

Mr. Steffen stated that the petitioner was requesting their item be continued to the next meeting. He said that when a petitioner asked for a continuance, it was the Board's procedure to grant it and they were preserving their right to object to the Board not taking it up at the last meeting. The court still had control over the petition and asked the parties in attendance to have no action taken by the Board until the court has dealt with the issue. He asked Ms. Chisholm if that was correct.

Ms. Chisholm answered that was correct.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Blackburn if he wanted to address the issue.

Mr. Blackburn stated that they were aware of what was going on and there was general consent to continue it. He said the parties were reserving their rights and that it was completely in order.

Mr. Steffen asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak against the proposed continuance.

There were none.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the November 14, 2007, meeting. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends denial of height variance and continuance for redesign.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, of a seven- and eight-story hotel building at the southwest corner of Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard and West Bay Street. There are 219 rooms shown with three meeting rooms and one restaurant/bar and an eighth floor penthouse. Demolition of the two non-historic structures on the site was approved March 14, 2007.

FINDINGS:

Site Plan Review:

- Traffic Engineering has requested a one-way entry off Bay onto Ann Street with a cul-de-sac turn around off Bryan Street on Ann Street.
- The site is located in a six-story height zone. One- and two-story height variances are required. A Finding-of-Fact is necessary regarding the proposed variances.
- The Bay Street drop off is subject to DOT approval.
- 70 off-street parking spaces are provided in one floor of underground parking. There is an on-site parking deficiency.

Changes from March 14, 2007 submission:

- Condominiums are no longer proposed for the building.
- The cylinder portion of the building has more regularized zones of brick and glass.

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 a Crispy Chik 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 concerns.

- **Height:** Staff is concerned about the height variance request. The proposed height is 86'-6" and the tower portion is even taller. It is located in a six-story zone on the height map. The applicant has submitted pictures of historic tall buildings in Savannah. Staff notes that most of the tall buildings built in downtown Savannah occupied 60 to 120 feet frontage, not 303 feet. The DeSoto, which was submitted as a precedent, was an anomaly in Downtown Savannah. The building forms for the proposed site do not relate to any tall historic building in downtown Savannah.

- **Tall Building and Large-Scale Development:** The nearest historic buildings are a block away, including the Landmark Scarborough House, First African, and First Bryan Baptists churches. Even if there are no immediately adjacent historic structures, the historic land pattern is critical to maintaining the character of downtown Savannah. The 1888 and 1898 Sanborn maps indicate that this site was occupied by as many as 14 separate structures. This fine-grained lot subdivision, while not a part of Oglethorpe's Tything lot and squares plan was, none-the-less, a character-defining feature of this part of the downtown. The mass of the proposed building, even though it is broken into three parts, does not reflect any traditional siting pattern in the District.

- **Entrances:** The proposed structure is 303 feet long, with one entrance on Bay Street to the hotel and a corner entrance to the restaurant at MLK and Bay Street. Bay Street is a heavily traveled thoroughfare. The narrowness of the sidewalk, together with few pedestrian entrances extends the pedestrian-unfriendly zone along Bay Street further to the West. It is recommended to consider reducing the size of the structure to provide more sidewalk.

- **Solids-to-Voids:** The structure stands at a prominent entry point into the Landmark District. The forms do not relate to past or present building forms in the Landmark District, nor do the three forms relate to each other. There are large expanses of glass curtain wall directly adjacent to plain punched openings and arched openings. The deeply recessed reveals have no openings at all. The amount of void to solid in the punched opening sections is less than in traditional Savannah buildings. While curtain walls can be a good tool to define mass, it appears visually incompatible here. It is not possible to discern what clear glass is and what is opaque spandrel glass, and whether the curtain walls and windows will have PTAC grills. The large void at the corner is visually incompatible.

There appear to be too many different building forms. The DeSoto was an anomaly with its multiple building forms, but the forms on the DeSoto were tied together by similar materials, intricate detail and recessed porches etc.

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 86'-6"+; the center portion of the building along Bay Street is seven stories; the</p> | <p>The standard is not met. The six-story height zone, stepping down to five across the former Olive Street, is an appropriate transition to the</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | western portion of the building is seven stories tall. | historic structures to the south. |
| <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 78'-2" 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 303 feet long and is broken into three distinct sections.</p> <p>The first section is 83 feet wide at ground level on Bay and 78 feet wide on MLK. The corner entry leaves a 30;-7" void on both MLK and Bay Street. A two-story rectangular form appears to wrap a cylindrical interior form that rises five stories above the base, with two progressively smaller diameter roof additions.</p> <p>The middle section is 105 feet wide +/- and is comprised of a curved wall divided into three bays; a 50' + wide curtain wall in the center and two 27 inch bays on either side. The western section is 66 feet+/- wide and divided into two bays with approximately by a central recessed balcony bay.</p> <p>Two 25'+/- "bays for recessed "hyphens" between the three sections of the building.</p> | <p>The standard it not met.</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 unrelated building forms. Each has its own distinct architecture, material, and form.</p> | <p>There is no continuity between the various forms.</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</p> | <p>The building contains large amounts of glass curtain wall as well as punched openings with storefront type windows. There are no contributing</p> | <p>Although there are no contributing structures directly adjacent to this proposed building the Scarbrough House, a</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p> | <p>buildings directly related to this structure.</p> | <p>National Landmark, the First African Baptist Church, the First Bryan Baptist Church, the administration building for the Yamacraw Village, and other historic commercial buildings are within one block of this structure. The pictorial references of the Old DeSoto Hotel submitted by the applicant show deeply set windows and porch recesses. The elevations are broken into interesting and finely detailed compositions by the fenestration. The proposed fenestration in the three sections do not relate to each other as a whole and there is no fenestration on the deeply inset portions of the building.</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 and central section on Bay Street. The ground floor features storefront glass in two of the three building sections.</p> | <p>On the MLK section of the building, the lower fenestration is not visually related to the cylinder fenestration. The strong vertical expression created by the contrasting bands of brick and glass are not visually compatible with any building in the District, and add to the visual perception of the increased height. It is not clear whether the curtain wall windows have PTAC systems, nor, where spandrel glass will be used. The commercial window type is flat, and together with the spacing of the windows and lack of detail the openings seem stark.</p> |
| <p>Entrances:</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 entrance for the ground floor restaurant is within a recessed corner at Bay Street and MLK.</p> | <p>The two proposed entrances do not provide adequate street interaction. The 303-foot-long block essentially has only three public entrances.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | The western Bay Street façade features a vehicular drive through the center of the ground floor. | |
| Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, and 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. | A recessed corner entrance is provided at MLK and Bay. 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. | There is no discernable rhythm to the balconies and entrances, etc. The sections of the building do not relate. |
| Setbacks/Lot Coverage: No setbacks are required in B-C zone. Lot coverage can be 100 percent. | 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 Street for an entrance to a restaurant. | While there are no setbacks required and lot coverage can be 100 percent, it is recommended that the building set back from Bay Street to allow for a wider sidewalk. |
| 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. | The width and height of the structure create a very massive building. | The proposed subdivision of the structure into three segments does not mitigate the mass and height of the building. |
| 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. | Historically, there were multiple buildings with multiple addressable entries on this block and throughout the neighborhood. The proposed building takes up the entire city block, with one entry in the middle of the block and a corner entrance to a restaurant on MLK. | The proposed structure does not provide for multiple entrances. The proposed segmentation does not mitigate the mass of the structure. |
| 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. | The mass of the structure is very large for the Historic District, consuming an entire city block. There is very little fine-grained detail on the building to mitigate the mass. | The use of large areas of curtain wall, walls without openings, lack of surface detail emphasize the massive scale of this building. |
| Parking: | 70 off-street parking spaces are provided. | The off-street parking is deficient. |

RECOMMENDATION:

(March Recommendation): 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, 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.

(October Recommendation): Denial of a height variance and continuance for Part I Height and Mass to reconsider form including the deletion of the cylindrical form, reconsideration of the scale of materials, restudy of solids-to-voids, and division of structure into parts that have more entrances. Consider setting building back from Bay Street to allow for a wider sidewalk.

Mr. Steffen asked if the petitioner accepted Staff's recommendation for a continuance, would the Board need to deny the Height and Mass.

Ms. Reiter answered no and said that it would be continued. She was recommending denial of a variance for it being higher than six stories.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects) stated that after the review in March that everything was generally acceptable. He said they received a detailed land survey of the area and found that the Ann Street right-of-way was offset into the middle of the street, and the drive lane was on private property. It was a dilemma because the client owned the property and the City Engineer looked at it to make sure they were doing what was right. The City researched it and discovered that although the section of the road was paved, that there was no transfer of the land. The historic width of that section was 25 feet wide, and when the other strip of land was acquired from the owner, they did not get a conveyance for the separate strip of land. He said that after having meetings with various engineers it was decided that this was a good thing because the Traffic Engineer did not want two-lane traffic in the area due to traffic volume. That meant many people would be making right- and left-hand turns onto Bay Street, and the current building blocked the view of seeing around the corner. They agreed that there would be an in-only entrance from Ann Street, an arrival court for automobiles, or they could come down Bryan Street, turn, and go up Ann Street to enter but there would not be an outlet. As a result, the City Engineer said they would need to create a cul-de-sac for turn-around for those who did not want to go to the hotel. There was more detail about the signage and it took time to work out the details. They did not want to get approval from the Board for the building without working out these details.

Mr. Saad Al Jassar (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects) stated that parking was a zoning issue that was not relevant to the Board. However, the one floor parking with 70 cars shown was actually double floors. He said they were using a system where cars could be stacked vertically for approximately 144-parked cars.

The two existing buildings had been demolished, which showed that the owner was eager to move quickly on the site.

There were three reasons why they used seven stories instead of six. One was for the demand of the franchise that would occupy the hotel with approximately 200 rooms. They provided 219 rooms, set back the building away from the boundary, and said that the void that was six stories high was approximately over 19,000 square feet. They compensated for that in the seventh floor with approximately 19,000 square feet of rooms. Second, the eighth floor was the round cylinder with approximately 2,000 square feet on top of the roof. The building was 76 ½ feet high and not 86 because the seventh floor makes it 76 ½. Only the round cylinder was one floor to 86' 6", which is the penthouse. Third, Bay Street sloped down to the west and the difference in height was about four feet between the seven- and the six-story height between the DoubleTree on Bay Street. He said he visually surveyed Bay Street and most of the buildings were not set back from the setback, and they compared their building to those buildings. All of the existing buildings along Bay are right up to the property line.

He said they showed a photograph of the old DeSoto Hotel that was the inspiration for the building but they did not intend to copy it. There were buildings in the district with round towers and round edges such as the roundhouse, and they did not feel that it was an alien shape. **(Remainder is inaudible.)**

He said that the previous report suggested that the proposed design was successful in breaking up the mass of the façade along Bay Street into three buildings. They felt that they had achieved although the report stated that the three parts were not relating to each other. They have added...**(inaudible)**. You can see how much area was given on the ground floor back to the public and what was additional to the sidewalk. It was approximately 4,000 square feet and the five-story height was approximately 20,000 square feet of volume.

They agreed that they could add more entrances but the front desk would like to control the entrances, otherwise the safety and security would become a liability. They would be willing to add two entrances to the restaurant. They kept the cylindrical shape of the tower from the top to the ground floor. On the second floor they needed 7,000 to 8,000 square feet of meeting rooms and kept the rectangular shape. Although they added a seventh floor, the area was the same as the volume they gave up and they recessed back a couple of other areas.

On the elevation, they brought the cylinder to the ground because it strengthens not weakens the shape. For the fenestration, they added windows to all of the returns and added fenestrations to another side. He said Staff's report states that the site had no compatible or historic context and no contributing structures directly adjacently to the proposed building, and that the standing could not be measured because the building did not visually relate to any contributing structures and very little historic context was present, which provided opportunities for more modern infill and possibly greater height. They were encouraged by these comments.

Mr. Steffen asked if they were addressing Staff's recommendation for a wider sidewalk.

Mr. Jassar stated that the existing sidewalk was 3,122 square feet of additional paved area, which was within the property; 4,400 square feet. They doubled the size of the existing sidewalk, and the paved area was considered the sidewalk. They felt that in order to get to the parking they did not want to cut through the building from Bay Street and did not have sufficient length to come from MLK. The most logical way was Ann Street and it would be a one-way street to be able to enter and go directly to parking, or drop off, go out, and exit. He asked for the Board's comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation Director) stated that the Architectural Review Committee agreed with Staff that the building was inappropriate in scale and height, too large for the neighborhood, and the forms were unfamiliar. He said there were rounded edges in the Landmark District but they were buildings of a certain period that had intricate and beautiful architectural detail. The building was simply another large, corporate hotel that was threatening the significance of the entire city. He asked the Board to continue the petition with instructions to design a building that met the design ordinance and the spirit.

Mr. Bill Steube (Downtown Neighborhood Association) said that the ordinance stated that the economic viability of the design was not to be considered with regard to height variances. He said the fact that 200 rooms were needed was not appropriate justification for additional height of the building.

Mr. Steffen stated that the petitioner had asked for Board feedback and assumed that it was with the intention that the Board would listen and decide if they wanted to agree to Staff's recommendation for a continuance, or for the Board to vote. He said the Board received very specific instructions from the City Attorney that the ordinance was clear in stating the Board did not have the power on its own motion to continue a matter. The Board could only continue matters at the petitioner's request, and if the petitioner chose to have the Board rule on an issue, then the Board must rule on it. He asked for comments from the Board for the benefit of the petitioner.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Judson stated that if the goal was to get 219 rooms that related to square footage, then the cylinder was objectionable. He said that without asking for a height variance they could get the same square footage to accommodate the number of rooms if it were not a cylinder.

Ms. Ramsay stated that there were inconsistencies with the drawings and that she agreed with Staff's recommendations.

Ms. Seiler stated that during the March meeting she said the shape reminded her of the former Holiday Inn hotel that used to be on the entrance of the Atlanta highway, and that she did not want that to happen here. She said she appreciated the petitioner doing some redesign but did not think the shape was appropriate or that it could be compared to the old DeSoto. She would like them to go back and look at it.

Dr. Watkins stated that when there were discussions about the height variance that most were tied to the economic value of the buyer or the owner. He said if they were to go in that direction that it needed to go beyond an arbitrary statement of a buyer or a specific statement about height. He asked how asking for a height variance would contribute to the historic value of this community, particularly as a gateway lot coming from the west side. If they want to go beyond the variance he wanted to see something that contributed to the community versus a corporate organization needing 200 rooms, and it was specifically disrespectful to the community.

Mr. Steffen stated that they had heard from half of the Board members and asked the petitioners if they wanted the Board to vote on the matter as it was, or did they want to ask for a continuance.

Mr. Shay stated that he wanted to discuss some of the comments and said there was a program for the building that was related to the economics, but more importantly, in order to break up the building into distinctive separate pieces they agreed to give up much of the developable volume of the building. He said by doing that, they had lost square footage that could be developed like the hotels in the area in order to create the geometric shapes. He did not want them to think it was economic but also architectural in the sense of getting three different forms, well articulated and different shapes, they had to give up the developable volume of the building.

He said the Board was different and the Staff report was different than it was in March, and they would be willing to seek a continuance to come back and make another presentation.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Shay wanted it to continue until November or leave it open-ended at this point.

Mr. Shay stated that they wanted it open-ended because they had to have discussions with the client and the corporate franchiser to make sure they could do that, and that it was two weeks until the cut-off for the November meeting. He said they wanted to come back in November and would try to do that.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass to November 14, 2007, meeting in order to restudy the height and form. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3838-2
PIN No. 2-0015-34-001
15 East Liberty Street
Sign/Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of fascia signs; denial of freestanding directional sign.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting approval to update signage on the Desoto Hilton Building. The following are the proposed signage and sites:

1. Top floors on north and south of building—Letters 96" tall; halo illuminated letters—total of 15' 3/4" span on each façade. Existing lettering to be removed and spot painting in area where letters are removed. Labeled A/B on application.
2. Canopy at north porte cochere -- Halo illuminated letters to be mounted on the western side of the canopy. Labeled C on application.
3. South entrance canopy—Blue letters 18" tall; non-illuminated reverse channel letters; total of 19' 5 3/8" span. Existing lettering to be removed and spot painting in area where letters are removed. Labeled D1 and D2 on application.

4. Canopy on north side of building--Halo illuminated cartouche sign—30” high Labeled E on application.
5. At north entrance—non-illuminated freestanding directional sign—2’3” by 2’3” sign; blue with white letters; 4’ overall height. Labeled F on application. Located on the public right-of-way at curb.

FINDINGS:

1. The structure is a non-rated structure in the Landmark Historic District.
2. Non-illuminated freestanding signs are permitted in tree lawns with the written approval of the City Traffic Engineer and Director of the Park and Tree Commission. There is a tree well, but no tree lawn at this location. The sign does not meet the two-foot setback requirement from the curb.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the directional sign be removed. Non-illuminated signs less than three square feet in size may be mounted at the appropriate location on the building denoting “Lobby” and “Parking” without further Review Board approval.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay) stated that he had no authorship over the signage and did not have objections to the Staff’s report. He said he would be happy to report to whoever designed the signs the changes to be made.

Mr. Steffen asked if he was willing to make the changes that Staff suggested.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Judson** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the directional sign that is in non-compliance with the ordinance be removed. Non-illuminated signs less than three square feet may be mounted at the appropriate location on the building denoting “Lobby” and “Parking” without further Review Board approval. **Ms. Seiler** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen introduced Councilmember Van Johnson from the First District who was present at the meeting.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Part II Design Detail approval. Part I approval was granted August 22, 2007, with the condition that the ground floor canopies be separated. This has been reflected on the drawings.

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

| Standard | Proposed | Comments |
|--|--|---|
| Windows and Doors: | First floor and glass wall windows: Aluminum storefront First floor Kynar Coated Factory applied white. Aluminum storefront wall to be mill finished brushed aluminum. Upper windows to be Peerless Kynar coated factory applied white. The windows have AC architectural louvers below. The Oglethorpe Avenue blades are proposed to be smaller than the lane elevation. | Many of the products are listed by brand "or equal". Any change in approved products requires Staff approval at a minimum. Discuss the PTAC louvers more thoroughly. No color given. Staff is concerned about the utilitarian appearance of the louvers. Please clarify where the spandrel glass is to be used. |
| Roof Shape: | Flat with parapet. | This standard is met. |
| Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches: | NA | |
| Fences: | NA | |
| Materials: | Hanson Brick modular size veneer "Cottonwood"; Rockcast, Crystal White, smooth finish stone base by Arriscraft. | |
| Textures: | Sand finish true stucco stone color. Master Wall stucco No. 420 White. | Sample is for color only. |
| Color: | See materials | |
| Awnings and aluminum cornice: | Mill finished Brushed aluminum. | |

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval pending clarifications requested.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Hutchinson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that clarifications be made to Staff. Ms. Seiler Seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends a **continuance**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

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

FINDINGS:

1. Staff met with the applicant, property owner, and representative of the hotel developer on Monday, July 30, 2007. A second meeting was held with the architect on September 19, 2007. A third meeting was held on September 26, 2007, with Michael Brown, Lise Sundrla, Rochelle Small-Toney, and Reverend Tillman of First African Baptist Church and Ms. Gould, their consultant. A fourth meeting was held with the architect and representative of the hotel developer, Lise Sundrla, and Rochelle Small-Toney on September 27.

The issues discussed at these meetings included:

- The urgency of repairing First African Baptist Church. The money from the land lease to the hotel will pay for this renovation.
 - Reducing the height of the proposed hotel. Building in the air rights over the main Economic Opportunity Authority building (EOA) was suggested but may not be a viable option. However, building over the EOA annex may be an option. The developer does not want to lower the height because it will mean fewer rooms. The Homewood Suites brand also has specific interior requirements to be met. The Homewood Suites brand does have buildings with fewer rooms, however, the developer states that fewer rooms will not work on this site.
 - Additional windows or glass in the stair tower was discussed. The architect recommended not adding further fenestration to the rear six-story portion. In his opinion, less detail will make it less noticeable.
2. The site is located within a four-story height zone; therefore, the applicant is seeking a two-story height variance. A Finding-of-Fact is necessary.
 3. The two historic structures were built in the early 20th century. The westernmost structure does not extend to the lane. The adjacent use occupied by EOA extends behind this building.

4. Substantive changes since the August 22 Review Board meeting.
 - a. The square footage of the two ground floor retail spaces along Montgomery Street has been reduced from just under 4500 square feet to two spaces totaling approximately 667 square feet each.
 - b. There have been changes in the window arrangements on the Bryan Street side to align the windows. However, the level of detail in the drawings is insufficient to understand what is being proposed.
 - c. The storefronts appear to have been changed, but again the level of detail in the drawings is insufficient.
 - d. Related to Part II Design Details, the material of the East end portion of the building has been changed from stucco and metal panels to terra cotta panels with stucco canopies.
 - e. No rear elevation was submitted.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

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

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | the historic structures and the six-story portion. | on the square, no building should be higher than the louvers on the steeple of the First African Baptist Church. This was adopted in 1997 and did not change in 2003 when the height map was amended. |
| Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development: The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width, with each section taller than it is wide. Buildings greater than four stories shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet, nor, more than 20 feet in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched, the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature. | The new four-story section is approximately 60 feet, and the corner building is approximately 60 feet. The rear six-story portion extends across the original lot divisions and does not align with them. | The building mass would be improved if it better aligned with the divisions of the original Oglethorpe plan such as 60-foot or 30-foot divisions. As designed along Bryan Street the divisions are 26'-4", 23'-8", 25', 38'-10", 7'-2". The two historic structures are 30'-6". There is no detail to understand the profile or dimensions of the various cornices. |
| Proportion of Structure's Front Façade: | | |
| Proportion of Openings: | The revised drawings lack specific detail regarding the window openings. | Rectangular windows are typical in this ward. The windows on the eastern portion appear to be storefront with transom and spandrel panels? There is no indication whether PTAC systems will be used in the windows. |
| Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids: | Punched openings are typical of Savannah. | The depth of the windows in the new construction is not shown, but it appears to be shallow giving little shadow relief. There will be greater depth in the portion with the terra cotta cladding. |
| Rhythm of Structure on Street: | The Bryan Street elevation has been subdivided by varying height and material. | There is a step down from six stories on the corner to five stories, to four stories. The six-story portion runs behind all this for the total length of the site. The step down from six stories to five |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | is only a few feet deep. Further study needs to be given to the traditional lot divisions of the Oglethorpe Plan. |
| Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies: | <p>A number of pedestrian entrances are proposed along both Bryan and Montgomery Streets.</p> <p>There is a projection on the corner building that appears to be a canopy, and projections at each floor above at the corner.</p> | <p>The use of pedestrian entrances along both streets is desirable and in keeping with the recommendations being developed for the Downtown Master Plan.</p> <p>Please explain the purpose of the corner projections.</p> |
| Walls of Continuity: | <p>On Bryan Street, the proposed structure has several setbacks that do not reinforce the wall of continuity along the street. These occur in the five-story portion and between the four-story portion and existing two-story building.</p> | <p>Buildings in this ward typically abut each other in the same plane.</p> |
| Scale: | | <p>Six stories at the corner are too massive for this square and overshadows the church. The terra cotta panels help with the scale of the materials.</p> |

There are many features of the proposed development that follow the principles being discussed in the Downtown Master Plan process, including multiple entrances and pedestrian activity along the street. The designer has made a number of accommodations in design details such as materials and in trying to vary the height. However, both Franklin and Decker wards were traditionally primarily commercial wards with attached ranges, which were used for 19th century produce, feed and seed, hardware, and similar types of sales. The church served as a focal point in Franklin Ward. Thus, the Chadbourne report’s recommendation for not going above the louvers of the church steeple. This equates to a five-story structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Continue discussions with the developer to explore options that will enable the church to make its renovations, the hotel to achieve its room count, and to achieve a new building that does not violate the Historic District ordinance regarding height. The six-story building height is not in conformance with the height map. The southeast corner of the site is critical because it faces the square. The City is analyzing an option that could possibly reduce the square facing end of the building to five stories, which is equivalent to the Chadbourne height recommendation in relation to the church. This can be accomplished by relocating these rooms to the northwest corner of the project over the one-story building addition of the EOA center. If this proves feasible, the six-story proposal on the rear portion of the site is justified in order to support the restoration of the church and its historic steeple.

Continue making a Finding-of-Fact until the above option has been proposed and discussed.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects) stated that he had worked with the client over the last two years and participated with some negotiations with EOA in the past that had not proven fruitful. He did not want the Board to think that they had not fully explored other options.

The hotel had been reduced from 120 to 109 rooms. The developer felt that 120 rooms was the minimum in order to justify the expense that had been negotiated with the church. What was being presented today reduced the rooms to 107. He said the church steeple would be restored if the project was successful and the new height would be much taller. He did not want the desire to save significant parts of the historic buildings to become lost in the discussion because it was critical. The reason behind stepping down in the facades was to locate the historic buildings in the middle of the block and everything else would defer to it. There had been discussions and concessions about increasing and showing retail on the ground floor. They went to a presentation of the first draft of the Downtown Master Plan and heard that it was better if there were addresses and not just doors that opened up into meetings rooms. That desire was addressed successfully in the design that was proposed.

He passed around a brochure for the exterior material that was chosen for the body of the building. He said they were large-scale terra cotta panels. The remainder of the building was designed to recede from view, and the elevation did not show it like a perspective. He displayed a perspective view of a more realistic idea of the volumes of the two comparative buildings. He said if you were standing in Franklin Square adjacent to the Haitian monument, the trees would obscure the view. They wanted to show the relative masses of the building, and how the design concept of the building with articulated and recessed masses, did not detract from the silhouette of the existing church. The receding portion was not invisible but the idea was not to dominant the element of the design composition. The other element of the drawing was that if the change happened the church would no longer look the same. Today, it was in a state that was in desperate need of restoration. They did not show what it would look like if the steeple was restored but wanted the Board to see in perspective. It would be approximately five stories high and when looked at in three dimensions, it was not as disconcerting as the elevation showed. They lost two more rooms since the meeting with Staff and SDR by stepping back a portion of the building so that it would recede.

He said that Staff pointed out that the level of detail in the drawings was insufficient to understand what was proposed and he felt there was enough detail to understand the Height and Mass, although they had not drawn out all of the cornice and fine details. He felt there was enough information to understand and grasp the design concept. There was not a rear elevation submitted because it was the same as what was originally submitted. The curved roof over the stair tower was eliminated. Staff questioned whether there would be PTAC systems used. He said it was a suites hotel and each room would have two separate areas within it. A PTAC would not be the right air conditioning system. They committed that the window reveals would meet the standard of being three inches deep.

There were questions in the Staff report that asked what the projections on the corner were. One of the comments received at the last meeting was that the design needed to respond in a direct way to being on Franklin Square, and they agreed. That was why one section of the building had a storefront-type glass corner similar to the storefronts on the street level, and because it faces south and east, it needed to have an eyebrow over top or the people inside of the rooms would be too hot. The idea related to the contemporary hotel in the area, the corner

was wrapped, and it was deliberately a modern building so that it did not compete with the authentic older buildings in the ward. They worked hard to introduce a strong horizontal and vertical expression to the element and rather than compete with the existing steeple or the increased steeple that would happen, the main and dominant vertical element in the ward would be the church. Some areas may be as high as the steeple now, but will not be as high as the steeple in the future because there were horizontal expressions that mitigated the verticality to some extent. He said they stepped a portion of the façade on Bryan Street, which was the only portion of the façade on that street other than the minor recesses at the entrance, to break up the mass into three parts. It made sense to move it back out to the property line at street level, but was desirous of breaking up the mass on the upper stories so that it did not become too much of a wall. The building where the entrance to the hotel was located was a brick façade that mediated halfway between the contemporary building and the historic buildings. They changed the exterior expression to make it something that was not deliberately historic, but not deliberately modern. He said they split the difference and succeeded in some extent by placing a building there that did what they wanted in stepping down and being different compared to the historic buildings in the middle of the block. At the same time, mediated between the more obviously contemporary portions of the building.

The front of the building was much deeper and away, and when you stand in the square or stand out on the edge of Bryan Street you see the silhouette of the steeple. Whether it was the low or the high steeple it was preserved and remained the star. The way that buildings meet the sky was more important visually in terms of the massing than how they meet the sidewalk.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Bryan Street elevation was brick.

Mr. Shay answered that it was brick. He pointed out the real historic buildings and said there was a bit of a groove in the mass to make it deferential, and pointed out the more contemporary brick.

Ms. Ramsay stated she knew they considered having the height and be deferential to the historic buildings in the middle of the block, but the real building that was different was the First African Baptist Church. She said if it was not so tall on the southeast corner it would not be as objectionable, and you would still have the number of rooms. She asked if that had been considered.

Mr. Shay stated they had tried different ways to figure out how to get 109 or 107 rooms without having to go to six stories for a significant part of the building, but had not been able to get there yet. He said they had talked about moving rooms down to the ground floor but then you lose the retail and the ability for it to read architecturally and functionally, and for the retail to be meaningful on the ground floor. He had participated in discussions for several years with EOA but they did not seem to be interested.

Dr. Watkins stated he agreed with exploring the corner piece and the extra floor being moved over so it would be more amenable. He said from a particular angle it seem to take attention away from the centerpiece of the church, and if it was moved over, he would be more open.

Mr. Shay asked that if it started at six and broke down to five, would it be stepped down across the building enough to defer to the church at that level.

Dr. Watkins stated he would have to think about it.

Ms. Ramsay agreed and stated that it was important to her that the church be the centerpiece.

Mr. Steffen stated there was a question asked by Staff about the depth of the windows and asked if it had been addressed.

Mr. Shay stated that he addressed it in his presentation. He said that they would be at least three inches deep and with the terra cotta, they might be much deeper.

Mr. Law stated that the steeple needed work done on it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Kristin Hyser (Savannah Development Renewal Authority Senior Manager – SDRA) stated that SDRA had been tasked by the City Manager to work along with MPC Staff and developers to ensure that the design of large-scale development was in keeping with the spirit of the Downtown Master Plan, and that the proposed designs presented quality and compatible design within the Historic District. She said that Staff mentioned that SDRA and MPC Staff met on several occasions with the applicant, and she asked that the Board support the recommended continuance so that Staff could continue the discussions and work toward a resolution for all parties.

Pastor Thurman Tillman (First African Baptist Church) stated he was grateful for the time and discussions that had gone into what could happen but that the congregation had been looking to do restoration and renovation for years. He said they looked at making sure they could remove the stucco and cement that was currently on the building to restore the original Savannah Grey brick, and to replace the steeple that was blown off by a hurricane in the 1890's. They had tried various ways to get it done like fundraisers, the congregation had given, and that they were not an extremely large congregation but had done a lot in trying their best to preserve what they had. There were many tourists that came to see First African Baptist Church and the church would like to see it get back to the glory that it had years ago, however, they did not have the funds but they had the energy to get it done. They had talked with different individuals and other people had repeatedly promised to work with them to get things done, including Historic Savannah Foundation, but they had not been able to get anything done. He was grateful that they did not come today begging and asking for people to give them money, but for an opportunity to help their community. It was not only the hotel, but it was on land that First African Baptist Church owned and it meant they would get a chance to share in it now and 99 years from now, although they will not be here, but the structure and improvements would belong to First African Baptist Church. He said what belonged to First African Baptist Church belonged to the community because it was a place that all kinds of people come to. When they looked at the Chadbourne study and the height of the steeple, from the very beginning it was their intent to build the steeple back. They tried to collaborate with others, including EOA, but it did not work and they were now trying to do what they could because it was time. He said the congregation had to raise approximately \$30,000 because of leakage and the water could be detrimental to the building. They were trying to repair the steeple to keep water out but it was getting worse. They needed the Board's support and approval so they could move further and discussions with EOA could continue, but they needed to commence with what needed to happen at First African Baptist church. An approval today would help to put it in place. He hoped that they would not take out any more retail space. In speaking with the owner of the hotel, it was clear that they would like to see more African-American retail space downtown because there was not enough presently. They knew the owner would make an effort to make it happen, and said that it was not exclusively for African-Americans. They also had an agreement regarding employment and being able to employ through Savannah Tech with those who receive certificates. The certificate holders would be able to be employed at many hotels downtown. The owner said if the hotels were full, he would relocate them to Atlanta to work at hotels there. This was an opportunity for the community now, was a good opportunity, and a good project.

Mr. James Ryals (First African Baptist Church) stated that in reference to the Chadbourne Guidelines and how the height would compromise the integrity of First African Baptist Church and the trust lot, he observed the height of the buildings on Johnson Square and Christ Church was overpowered by ten-story buildings. He said when you look at downtown Savannah from MLK to Drayton Street and between Bay and Congress Streets, you would see a skyline for downtown Savannah, which were the highest buildings in the city. First African Baptist Church and Franklin Square happen to sit in that district, which was a business and commercial district. When Chadbourne came up with the guideline, in his opinion, Chadbourne was focusing more on the squares in the residential and Victorian District. In keeping with what was there, you would not want to come up with buildings that were much higher than what was already in the area. He thought that Franklin Square was unique because it was in the commercial and business district, and there were three other hotels in the area that were also six stories high. He said what they were asking for was not out of line because there were buildings in the area that were as high as what they were proposing. The Chadbourne Guidelines were just that, guidelines, and it was focused more on residential and Victorian districts.

The project that the church was embarking on was one that was not self-serviced, but geared toward the restoration of the church, two other dilapidated buildings that had been sitting for some time, and a project that would allow them to continue serving the community and the city. He said he was on the board of the SDRA and was Chairman of the Martin Luther King/Montgomery Street Committee, which focused on revitalization and redevelopment of Montgomery Street and MLK. One of their goals was to revitalize the area and create economic opportunities. They had a project that was faith-based and working with churches in the community to help them redevelop their properties. The First African Baptist Church project fell within those goals and objectives to redevelop property and create economic opportunities for this community. It was imperative that the church be able to move forward with their project and be on board with the other redevelopment and revitalization efforts within the community. He asked the Board to support their efforts.

Pastor Samuel Williams (President of the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance) stated that he was appalled about the ongoing discussion on whether a black church that was 200 years old and purchased by slaves with no money, where some worked for 10 or 25 cents an hour, and he had talked to some of those people who have a chance to build a hotel. He said it was absurd, diabolical, evil, and against the will of God that people could help themselves and change an image of a house of worship, and use their land. He said they were being robbed of their own rights and had a right to build a hotel, say what went into it, to be able to use it, and have hundreds people to go there. There were people coming from all over the continental United States and abroad to see the First African Baptist Church. He said that Staff was more concerned about preserving the little buildings on the side where they used to whip slaves than they were about where people worship. He could hear them crying now and saying Lord, how long. He asked why the Board could not say yes, put the building up, let them have their property to use for good sources, and remodel it for \$3,000,000. They did not have the money before. He said that the best architect in town was dealing with it and the Board should let them build it instead of discussing if it fit in proper. Right behind it was the housing project where the people should be able to see a new steeple that showed them the hope of their forefathers, and not an old piece of tin. The Board should vote for the city to be the kind of city that people could come to and see the best that people had instead of the worse. This could bring more of the best and asked if the Board wanted the church to stay as it was when they had people who had tried to get money. He asked if they wanted it for the city and said he wished they would have a string of humanity wrapped around the whole city with tie cards and boards that would say what the Board had done if they denied the people the right to use their land to build a hotel. He hoped that it would be on CNN, 60 Minutes, Oprah, and everything because it was unjust, ungodly, diabolical, and absurd to keep pampering and playing with the congregation for something that would make the city better and encourage people walking by. He could go to

the hotel when it was built, have his birthday, live in one of the rooms, and think about the people who died and gave their lives, took 25 cents and did work for an hour to be able to live in something that would provide rooms, a hotel, a place for people to work, and a good image. With all of the people that came to Savannah to eat at the pizza place across the square, they did not need to look at the old church but the proposed church. The buildings and the church were decaying further. There was a 1992 Chadbourne study and this was 2007. He said they should go ahead and do what needed to be done for the people and the spirit of the people who were crying out now, along with our spirits and the hope for our children. It would be for the people and the future and it could not be said anywhere in Georgia that there was a Black church with a hotel. He asked why they could not have a hotel in Savannah and asked why Savannah was so unique that they would not want to preserve the best of history where people bled, died, suffered, and were still poor. They now have a chance to be better off and no one wanted them to become better.

Mr. Steffen stated that he wanted to caution everyone. He said that he had spent some time in Baptist churches and it was hard to resist the temptation, but it was out of order to have any kind of demonstration in support or against the speaker. He asked everyone to withhold any applause just as he would ask people to withhold any negative comments in reaction to what was being said by any speaker. He asked everyone to please do it out of respect to the fact that there was an issue to decide that had people on both sides.

Pastor Michael Lewis (Second Saint John Missionary Baptist Church and President of the National Action Network of Savannah Chapter) stated that he attended seminary at Morehouse School of Religion along with Reverend Tillman and Dr. Benny Mitchell, and they took a course called the History of the Black Church. He said that the First African Baptist Church was the oldest Black church in America, it was an icon, something young seminarians and Black ministers looked forward to, and it was prevalent in their history. He had seen a project similar to this in Atlanta with Ebenezer Baptist Church and Big Bethel Baptist Church. Big Bethel was restored and Ebenezer built a new church. He gave facts with what could happen if the petition was approved. The partnership between First African Baptist Church and North Point Hospitality Group would create a solid, faith-based, private partnership creating jobs and business development opportunities. There was Yamacraw Village with impoverished people that they were trying to reach out to and create jobs. The project, as designed, would preserve two historic buildings facades in the middle of Bryan Street and allow First African Baptist Church to restore and preserve the current and historic structure. The capital investment of the hotel is in excess of \$18,000,000, but the capital investment of the restoration project required over \$3,000,000. He said he concurred with his colleagues that it was absurd that they had to come to talk about a continuance, because it did not make sense that construction was taking place everywhere and they wanted to restore the church, while North Point Hospitality would help. The preservation of the facilities was essential in providing an important and valuable education about Afro-Americans, which he thought people did not get enough education about. He had gone to school, went to law school, went to college, graduate school, and theology school, but there was not enough Afro-American history. As an integral part of Savannah, Georgia, and American history, Savannah was a tourist town and people bring in money and go to the hotels. He asked why they would not do something about this historic site. It was the oldest Black Baptist church in America. This opportunity provided education, culture, and economic benefit to the community. The systematic redevelopment of the hotel and properties surrounding the church as a venue had caused a land lock, restricting the use of the property for redevelopment purposes. It did not make sense that there was a chance and that people were reaching out to help with drug addicts and the homeless because they were being run off the street anyway. He asked the Board not to recycle them in the prisons. He stated that he was in the prison every other day visiting inmates and this was a chance to do something now. This partnership resulting from the development would create one of the first ever faith-based partnerships of its kind in the United States of America, while

preserving the historic value of the church and advancing in education. If no one on the Board wanted that to happen, then he thought that they should turn in their resignation today.

Ms. Carol Gould (Representing First African Baptist Church) stated that they had continued to meet with Staff and Mr. McDonald, and they made suggestions about things they could possibly do to get the church restored. She said one of them involved placing a cellular tower inside of the church, and that was extremely offensive to the members of the church because it was a holy place of worship. It was not like EOA, which was a non-profit organization. They had an opportunity to meet with the City Manager in looking at certain concessions related to EOA, and he pointed out the legal contingencies. There had been three-year discussions and the building had use restrictions for homeless people that were housed in the building. That meant that someone had to come up with the \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 or greater to move EOA or get subsequent permission. What goes with the use restriction was the fact that the church served a homeless population. In that regard, translated by HUD, the church had to have an equal to or better than site, and that was another two to three years of decay in a building that was deteriorating and had obsolescence not only in the steeple, but also in the building from sharing it with the tourists. She said that they were very willing to discuss the EOA option, but there were ultimate restrictions with what could happen with that building. The pastor and Board had said that if they were continuing for the sake of just continuing, then there was no need to continue. If they were continuing to make forward progress that represented everyone in Savannah, then it made sense. With respect to EOA was the price tag that had been discussed with the City Manager. They were talking about \$7,000,000, and she asked where the money was and who was going to pay it. In the meantime, the people who suffer were the members of the First African Baptist Church and the community who wanted to see the history preserved. She felt that the Board would be fair and concerned about historic preservation, and as a student of history, that the reason they had historic preservation was to preserve history. She said that it was an important part of history and was the churches property, that the hotel would belong to the church, and it was important to African-American people and people of all walks of life that the hotel happened. This was history being made and when it happened, it would be on the Board's watch that they would empower the first faith-based hotel. The integrity of the design did not have to be compromised to get it done. As the Board was deliberating, she was hopeful that there was something that would come out of it that said forward progress today, and was hoping that as the Board looked at it and say that there were other options, that there were other possible things to consider that were contingent upon approval. If that opportunity did not exist, then they would just continue to continue the case.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation Director) stated that the First African Baptist Church was among the most important sites in the city and that there was not a more important site because it was in the upper tier of all of the sites. He said with all due respect to the previous speakers, that it was the Board's duty to look at the historic sites and apply the laws of the City of Savannah and the Historic Preservation Ordinance. The height map that was adopted in 2003 by City Council was not a guideline, but the law. The height map was drawn very carefully and updated in 2003. It stated that the site was a four-story zone and was in no way a violation of property owner's rights to apply the law equally. He asked the Board to do what the SDRA and Preservation Officer had recommended and continue or deny the petition if necessary, so that design professionals in the community could work together to build a building that they would not be sorry for a few years from now. The building overwhelmed hallowed ground and was a very shortsighted effort because there were other ways to accomplish the goals of the First African Baptist Church. He said they supported them, that the church took many years to build, and that they should not be in a hurry to compromise it.

Mr. Steffen stated that many people had come in since the beginning of the meeting, and one of the things he requested was for people to put their cell phones on silent or vibrate because he did not want the speakers to be interrupted by phones going off.

Mr. Joe Saseen stated that he disagreed with Historic Savannah on this situation. He said that Mr. McDonald referred to the church as hallowed ground and said that Christ Church was hallowed ground with a 15-story building on one corner and a 12-story building on another corner, and that it had not taken anything away from Christ Church. He said that there were skyscrapers next to the Christ Church and he asked why they could not have a six-story hotel next to another church that had hallowed ground. The proposed hotel was smaller than the buildings that surrounded Christ Church and it would be a wonderful opportunity for the church. With the high cost of construction, Savannah would have to lighten up on the height restrictions to give the developers a return on their investment and that was a fact. The Board goes around and around with this and spend hours month after month dealing with the height matter. He thought it was a wonderful project that was wonderful for the church and for Savannah. He said that Mr. Shay should have put up a rendering of how it would look when finished because the church would tower over the hotel.

Mr. Ryals stated that he echoed Mr. Saseen and asked the Board to keep in mind the location of Franklin Square. He said they were looking at a commercial business district with hotels that were already surrounding the church. He hoped that it was not a matter of personal gains, losses, or even racially motivated. The church had gone to an agency in town and had sought their help. While talking with the executive director of the agency it was said to them that the church was their church but the city was their city and that there were certain things that would not happen in their city. They told the church members that they should look at their architect because he was the problem. Instead of getting help from the individual, they were pointing fingers at the problem in terms of the architect and this being their city and that the building was the church members. He found it appalling and it defeated the purpose of receiving help.

Pastor Ben Mitchell (Connor's Temple Baptist Church) stated that he started out on MLK and refurbished the church with \$900,000, and ended up with \$3.5 million. He said you make laws but that the laws could be changed. They did not want the same attitude that was happening in Savannah to go to Atlanta or anywhere else where they would tell you that Savannah was a good, hard place to live. It was good if you were not Black and hard if you were Black. It seemed that any time Black people tried to do something for themselves that the reputation in Savannah was that the city would stop them from doing anything. It was time for us to change and he said that the church was not asking anyone for anything, they had made a way to get money, and that the city should help them because of what they stood for. The city should change and make a difference because every day that they wait, it cost more, the church was rotting, and it was going to get worse. For what the building stood for and what it would do, he thought the Board should vote for it to be done and it would send a message that the city was open to help anybody become somebody and do something within their city.

Mr. Steffen stated that when the issue came up last month that the Chair did not vote unless there was a tie or an order to make or break a tie. He said the Board was asked to make a Finding-of-Fact that an increase in height over the Height Ordinance was historically compatible. What Mr. McDonald said about it being a law was that it was a law that the Board of Zoning Appeals enforced. The Historic Review Board did not enforce the law but made recommendations on whether something was historically compatible or not. If the Board approved the petition today, it would still have to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals and be heard by them. There might be some members of the Board that would be curious about the meeting that would take place in a few days that could talk further about the project. The people who were bringing the petition would still have to meet because it would still go to the Board of Zoning Appeals, even if the Review Board voted in favor of the project today. He said Ms.

Gould made a very important point to keep in mind on this and other projects that the Board would deal with. The Board was the Historic Review Board and he said that one of the first things he read at the start of every meeting was that the purpose of the Board was to promote the educational, cultural, economic, and general welfare of the City of Savannah. He said that all of the issues with properties, including First African Baptist Church, were within the Board's trust. They were to follow ordinance and guidelines but not in a vacuum. He said the Board did so with the understanding that they were not charged with protecting a particular building, guideline, or a way a window was supposed to look, but their overall charge was to protect the historic integrity of the community for the educational, cultural, economic, and general welfare of the city. If some were wondering why the discussion was allowed on issues that went beyond the normal perimeters, specifically when they were dealing with a structure like Christ Church that was a treasure, and probably one of the most important things they could possibly think about protecting, it was relevant. He said the Chair cannot make a motion and that he was not suggesting anyone make a particular motion. He was just reminding the Board of their charge and putting their role in a proper perspective. If the Board voted in favor of the petition the Board was, as part of the vote, making a recommendation for the height to be six stories in a four-story zone. The Board of Appeals would make the legal decision whether it would or would not be appropriate.

Ms. Seiler stated that she wanted to follow the recommendation of Staff and request a continuance so that conversations could continue with the study in an ongoing manner.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board had been instructed that they could not make a motion for a continuance. They could make a motion for approval.

Ms. Seiler stated what Staff had recommended.

Mr. Steffen stated that Staff's recommendation was for a continuance, but the Board could only vote on a continuance if the petitioner said they wanted it to be continued. He said from what he had heard today that the petitioner did not want a continuance.

Ms. Seiler asked if the petitioner was Mr. Shay and if he could come forward.

Mr. Steffen said yes.

Ms. Seiler stated that she was asking because she did not hear it come from Mr. Shay but from the members of the congregation. She asked Mr. Shay if he was willing to go forward on Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Shay stated that he had not been empowered to ask for a continuance.

Ms. Seiler asked if Mr. Shay was representing the congregation or the realtor.

Mr. Shay stated that he was representing the hotel developer and the church was his client. He said he had been instructed not to ask for a continuance unless he had the full concurrence of First African Baptist Church.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was a joint venture between the hotel developer and the church. He asked if they were both his clients.

Mr. Shay stated that they were.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board had tried to give themselves the ability to continue matters when they felt it was appropriate, but that they did not have the authority. He said it was not just

him suggesting whether the Board should or should not in this particular case, but their only authority was to approve the petition, approve the petition and amend the petition, or deny the petition. Those were the only three choices when the petitioner did not wish to have a continuance. The finding in this case that was the most controversial was the question on whether the Board would allow six stories was not the Board's final decision to make. The only decision they could make was that they believed that in the context of the entire project and the setting it was in to be historically compatible. If they made the finding, the Board of Zoning Appeals would still have to rule on it in order for the petitioner to proceed.

Mr. Law stated if the Board voted on it and if another petitioner came, the Board would need to be open for it.

Mr. Steffen stated that if what Mr. Law was asking was if it took precedence, it did not. He said they were not bound by precedence on this Board. They were only making a ruling on one particular site and when the Board makes that ruling, it applied to that site and that site alone. That did not mean that people would not come and give examples of things, because they did, but the Board was ultimately charged with their opinion to a particular site in its entire context. This was a very unusual site because it was in a context that was an extremely important historical context.

Ms. Seiler asked if the petitioner had received any ruling.

Mr. Shay stated that they did not want to seek a continuance.

Ms. Seiler stated that she wanted to change the motion and said that the Board had to uphold the guidelines. She said that it was in fairness and was upheld equally toward any petition that was heard. She felt that it was in the best interest of the congregation and the property to look at working it out further, that she had no other choice than to ask for a denial, and hope that they would continue to work forward on it.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the petition as submitted. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. Ms. Ramsay, Ms. Seiler, and Dr. Watkins were in favor of denial. Mr. Steffen, Mr. Law, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Judson were opposed. The motion failed 5 to 3.

Dr. Watkins stated that he respected what Reverend Tillman and the group was doing in the community, but thought there was a further issue in terms of the ethics on how the petition was presented. He said you have to be careful when you start bringing racial discussions and historical issues into context, especially when the Board was not considering everyone's wishes and viewpoints. Historic preservation dealt with that area but there was a broader issue. If the issue was just the church, then just as the developer hired an architect he did not see the renderings for the church. He thought much of it was being shifted in different directions and what he saw was the developer using someone else to do his dirty work. Just because a developer puts a design on the board and whether he goes for it or not was not a statement of how someone felt about their particular community. The church was not the issue but the height was the issue along with the compatibility. It was an unethical issue in terms of putting someone else up and hiring someone else, because they had not spent that much time developing the drawings that were presented. He said he did not see any drawings or a proposal for First African Baptist Church. He respected Reverend Tillman and what he was doing, but he took issue with the underlying assumption or connotation that there were other motivations in place.

Ms. Reiter stated that a previous Board had approved the renovation designs for First African.

Dr. Watkins stated that was not his issue and whether it was or was not approved. That was not what he was looking at. He said they were talking about Height and Mass and design issues of that nature and to him, that should be the primary issue that the Board should focus on.

Mr. Steffen stated that he was prepared to go forward with the petition today because he believed there would be another day and hearing before the Zoning Board of Appeals, and it could be another meeting or two prior to that time, By the time it got to the Zoning Boards of Appeal, it would be right. He could not see delaying it any further because the church was in peril and they needed to get moving. That would be his vote if the vote came back tied or if it broke the tie, but it may not be the case.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review make a Finding-of-Fact that the six-story height is compatible, and approves Part I Height and Mass as submitted. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. Mr. Judson, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Law, and Mr. Steffen were in favor of the motion. Ms. Seiler and Ms. Ramsay were opposed. Dr. Watkins abstained. The motion passed 5 to 2.

Mr. Steffen stated that there could not be any demonstrations, cheers, or boos. He said it had been an emotional issue and the matter would have to go before the Zoning District Board of Review because the Historic Review Board only made recommendations on issues of historic compatibility. If the Zoning Boards of Appeal did not approve it, it would come back to the Historic Review Board for further review.

**RE: Continued Petition of Toly Siamos
H-07-3877-2
PIN No. 2-0004-47-004
216 East State Street, Apt. 9
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Toly Siamos.

Ms. gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for replacing an original wood banister divider with a wood partition that has been constructed. The partition is 6' 2" tall and 9' 2" long. The partition is currently an unpainted, board and batten style wall.

FINDINGS:

1. Staff met with the applicant. The applicant has offered to paint the partition white.
2. The partition is located on the third floor south façade of a rated structure within the National Landmark Historic District. It is visible from the public right-of-way.
3. Section 8-3030 6 states that, "New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the Historic District which are constructed shall be visually compatible with structures to which they are visually related." Even if painted, the

partition is not visually compatible with the architectural design of the building to which it is attached.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the partition be denied and that it be removed and the original banisters be replaced.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Toly Siamos stated that he attempted to discuss the matter with Ms. Reiter but she was not open to discussing the matter. He said it was not that they did not reach an agreement. There was a banister separating the common use side from the private side and there were ongoing problems on the west side of the balcony that were resolved with the partition. He showed a photograph of the balcony and said that it was not an imposition and that it did not impact the façade of the building. He believed the partition visually and historically related to the building, said it was constructed of cedar, had been painted, and had alleviated the issues. He showed a photo shopped picture of what the partition would look like if they went in two feet and up 32 inches with a diagonal cut. He said it did not make it visible from the public right-of-way. It could be cut in like cubes and stepped up.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she was not clear about what had changed from the last meeting when the Board unanimously denied the petition.

Mr. Siamos stated he thought that he received a continuance to discuss it with Staff.

Ms. Ramsay stated that Mr. Siamos had come forward with the same thing he had last time, along with plan “b” and “c”.

Mr. Siamos stated that the partition was up and to tear it down would have been an undue hardship. He said he was willing to discuss plans “b” and “c” with Ms. Reiter, and he thought they could come to a compromise.

Mr. Steffen asked if he had met with Ms. Reiter.

Mr. Siamos stated that he did and they spoke. He said he asked if they could compromise with a design that would be more pleasing, visually related, or historically related to Staff, and she said no.

Ms. Seiler stated that according to the minutes from last month that the petitioner would go to Staff and they would suggest an alternate design so the petitioner would have a continuance.

Mr. Steffen stated that was what the minutes suggested and that was what his recollection was also.

Ms. Seiler asked if Mr. Siamos had received Staff’s recommendation.

Mr. Siamos stated that he thought by going to Ms. Reiter that he was going to Staff.

Ms. Seiler asked if Mr. Siamos took recommended designs to Staff.

Mr. Siamos stated that Ms. Reiter was not willing to discuss it.

Ms. Reiter stated that she had recommended denial and that the original architecture should remain.

Mr. Judson stated that he did not have a visual of how the banister was, how easily it could be reinstalled, and asked if it would meet the purposes of protecting the privacy.

Mr. Siamos stated that the banister would go across approximately two-feet high and would be lower than the railing that goes around the outer edge of the balcony. He said it was not a solid banister but had a criss-cross design that could be removed easily. When he came back from out of town he found that the banister had been removed and people had been using his balcony. When the carpenter built the partition, he made it so that it would go back in.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that the petitioner claimed it would be an undue hardship to remove something he had no permission or building permit to erect. He said the petitioner was asking to be rewarded for breaking the law, and the Board would not have accepted the petition if they wanted to put up a six-foot wall and remove historic fabric from a building. The petitioner had come after breaking the law, had thrown it in the whole Historic District's face, and wanted the Board to approve it after he had done so. He felt that the Board would do a disservice to the 90 percent of the people who abide by the law and come before the Board. He asked the Board to deny the petition and asked them to remove the partition.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. McDonald had an opinion on plan "c".

Mr. McDonald stated that he thought plan "c" was acceptable but the proper procedure would be to remove it and come back with a plan.

Mr. Bill Gillespie (Neighbor) stated that he told Mr. Siamos to do the photo shop and he displayed a photo shop picture. He said he spoke with some of the Board members at the last meeting and they did not understand that the balcony was 23 feet in the air, on the third floor, and that Mr. Siamos was the property owner of a private balcony with a common area next door. He calls the police every week because he lives next to three out-of-control, large-density condominiums, and there was not a proper condominium association along with absentee landlords. Mr. Siamos was on the condominium board and the president approved the design. They did not think it would be intrusive enough to have to come to the MPC. He said that good fences make good neighbors and the form followed the function. The Board could go outside and walk 20 feet across the street to make a judgment themselves because the picture did not speak for the reality. He and his wife were furious with the out-of-control condominiums, tourism, and ghost tours.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Neighbor) stated that he would ask the Board to deny the partition and remove it. He said he was an owner and understood that there had been noise problems on the third floor and the police had been called. He spoke with Mr. Chris Comerford, the homeowner's president, and Mr. Comerford could not recall approving the design. At the last meeting there was a continuance, a design plan was not submitted or approved, and a plan was not presented to him as a homeowner in the building. It was not consistent with the historic style of downtown and was a drab, monotonous, fence that belonged in a 1980 suburb. He displayed a postcard of the Owens-Thomas house that was directly across the street and said that the large fence could be seen in the same view. He was concerned about people being able to build whatever they wanted whenever they wanted for any reason without coming to the Board or the members of the building first. He hoped that it would be removed and a new plan submitted to the homeowner's association, approved, then submitted to the Board.

Mr. Steffen stated that issues within homeowner's associations and tenants were not within the Board's purview and that they were things to be solved outside of the hearing room. He said it was the purview of the Board to approve anything that was in the public view from a street, a lane, or the neighbors. It did not matter how high up it was. All that the Board dealt with was private property unless a public entity came forward. The Board was a compromise between private property rights and the rights of the collective Savannah interest. The Board was there to entrust the historic preservation of the community and the properties within it and, therefore, there were certain private property rights restrictions.

Mr. Siamos showed a photograph of the view from the Owens-Thomas house and said that the members of the Owens-Thomas house staff commented that it was a welcome addition. Especially since it had curbed the number of beer cans and bottles that they would have to pick up.

Mr. Steffen stated that Mr. Siamos presented to the Board what he described as plan "c", which was taking the partition down to waist level, and asked if Staff considered it or had an opinion.

Ms. Reiter stated that she did not see how it would solve the problem...*(inaudible)*..

Mr. Siamos stated that the railing was not the same height...*(inaudible)*.

Mr. Steffen stated that he would give Mr. Siamos the option of asking for a continuance based on a plan being presented to Staff that involved taking the partition down to the level as described in plan "c". He said he was not guaranteeing that the Board would approve it. He was suggesting that it was possible that it might meet people's objections.

Ms. Reiter stated that the Board should vote that they were in favor and have the drawing brought back to the file.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board could do that if they wished but did not know if he would get a motion on it.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the partition as submitted and order its removal and the reinstallation of the original railing. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Siamos if he understood and explained that the Board had decided to deny the petition and asked him to remove and replace the original banister. He said that Ms. Seiler indicated that Mr. Siamos had the right to file a new petition, request Staff to look at the new petition, and that it should include something that did not reach the level of height he currently had but something at the level on plan "c". No one was saying that it would necessarily pass, but it was the best path for getting the problem solved.

Mr. Siamos asked how many days.

Ms. Seiler stated the wall had to come down immediately.

**RE: Continued Petition of Bates Lovett for
Nina Cooper et al
H-07-3882-2
PIN No. 2-0031-24-006
342 Purse Street
536 West Jones Street
Demolition**

A meeting to discuss saving the buildings is scheduled for October 8, 2007.

Mr. Reiter stated that the petition was continued from the last meeting because there was discussion regarding working out a solution to save both structures in Frogtown. She said that she had received a number of phone calls with statements of opposition to Staff's recommendation that the demolition was approvable. There was a lot of interest in saving the buildings and she understood that a solution had been submitted to the petitioner to reach a compromise to move the buildings. In view of the ongoing negotiations to save the structures, the petition should be continued until it was affected. She said it was Staff's duty to preserve buildings if there was an interest to preserve them and that Staff should not stand in the way.

Ms. Seiler asked if it had been discussed with the families and all parties involved.

Ms. Reiter stated that she received the letter at 5:00 p.m. and did not know where the negotiation stood.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Bates Lovett stated that the proposal had been discussed and the petitioner turned it down. He said the proposal was to leave the yellow house on Lot 8 and move the white house from Lot 6 to Lot 9, and for the petitioner's to donate Lots 8, 9, and both houses to the Coastal Heritage Society (CHS). This was one-third of the lot that they were talking about and the purchase price of the 10,000-square-foot lot was \$700,000. CHS wanted the land given to them that was worth \$233,000, which was not acceptable to the Cooper's. He said they were asking the Board to make a judgment on the merits of the petition for demolition and that they were not going to request a continuance again. He regretted they had come to this point, had tried to work through it, and would consent to a 90-day stay from demolition. They would continue to try to work it out, but it was in the best position of the Cooper family and Battlefield Park Partners to try to work it out because it would not be the last time they would appear before the Board. They were trying in good faith to save the homes but Staff recommended demolition, and it was not a petition that Staff recommended be denied. They asked that the Board rule on that motion. He said it was an economic hardship for the Cooper family and that they had an opportunity to sell property that had remained on the market for more than a year at a good price. If the petition did not go forward the contract would cease. There were environmental considerations that needed to be taken into account. This was an opportunity to grant the petition and it would not be the final stopping point on this decision. Mr. McDonald stated in a letter that they would take it as far as they could to fight it. The Board's approval of the petition would keep the ball rolling and they would continue negotiating in good faith. He did not want to give Mr. McDonald the opportunity to say that Mr. Lovett did not negotiate in good faith. Simply giving two pieces of property that essentially totaled \$233,000 was not economically viable at this point, the Cooper's could not afford it, and that was where they were.

Mr. Steffen asked if the motion that Mr. Lovett was asking for was for the Board to allow the demolition but stay it for 90 days.

Mr. Lovett answered yes.

Mr. Steffen asked if they were aware that any demolition motion the Board passed could be appealed at the Savannah City Council.

Mr. Lovett stated that he fully expected that it would occur if the Board granted the petition.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Becky Harkness (Coastal Heritage Society) stated that they were contracted with the City of Savannah to manage and operate the Roundhouse Railroad Museum and the Georgia State Railroad Museum. She wanted to emphasize the importance of the two buildings and showed a photograph from 1950 with the houses at 342 Purse Street and 536 West Jones Street. The structures were not high-styled structures and they have had many alterations; however, she felt they were extremely important in historic context to the site. Along with 535 West Charlton, which is Frogtown Cottage, these were the only three surviving properties in the area and the residential context that surrounded the site was no longer there. She showed an 1888 view of the Sanborn Map that showed the surrounding residential areas known as Railroad Ward that once had more structures, and compared it with a SAGIS image that showed the three existing properties along with commercial buildings and an elementary school. She said the importance of the Coastal Heritage Society's mission and the site they were managing was that they could use the properties, even if they were moved to other locations, or keep the yellow house where it was. As long as they were in the area adjacent to the roundhouse they were useful to the society for interpretative potential because they could point them out. They had done research on it and found that it had been a workers village, and some Central of Georgia employees lived in both properties at certain points. It was the only 19th century residential context that they had to show people and could explain how many of the workers lived near the site. She felt it was important to the MLK corridor because they were the only historic houses that existed up to Gwinnett Street. Since the 1890's the entire area was a vibrant, residential area and part of the West Broad Street/MLK corridor, and without the three structures, they had nothing left. She said the Coastal Heritage Society employed a very large preservation team that was comprised of architectural design professionals, preservationists, construction, and crafts people, and that they were very capable of preserving both properties. That was what they wanted to see happen. They wanted an opportunity to move the houses and restore them and even though the houses have had alterations, they had enough information and could do research to restore them to their appearance in the 1890's.

Mr. Steward Dorman (Coastal Heritage Society) stated that they felt strongly about the importance of the buildings and were concerned about the deal between the Cooper's and Xavier ? because they wanted it to go forward. He said they wanted to see it happen for the Cooper's and part of the negotiations had been to try and help it go forward without a demolition of the buildings. They felt strongly that there was a compromise to maximize the dollars of the seller to save the buildings that were an important part of the city's history. In August when they made the offer to the developer they thought they were close to an agreement. On yesterday they sweetened the pot with a \$50,000 cash offering to move the white house that the developer had previously offered to move, and would leave the yellow house where it was. It did not make sense to require two moves for the developer, plus, it was a \$100,000 savings on the developer's part. They were willing to continue talking and felt like there was a way to do both with the biggest benefit going to the Battlefield Park, LLC who was gaining the full block. They owned the property that was formerly Savannah Hardscapes, and the lot where the white house was. If they could have that contiguous property it would be a benefit. They did not discount the value of the two smaller lots because it was of some value to the developer as well. They had hoped that there was a compromise out there and they hoped to help with it.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that both parties had been negotiating in good faith and he attended a meeting on Monday and thought they were further along than they were today. He would ask that the petitioner not ask for a continuance and for the Board to deny the application because denial of the application was the only thing keeping the developer at the bargaining table. He said that under the old ordinance, you could only delay demolition for one year and the policy was to try to give twelve months to work out situations like this. It took time and they had only been working on it for a couple of months.

The new ordinance allowed the Board to deny demolition in perpetuity, but with an appeal. He thought they could work it out because Historic Savannah Foundation was willing, and he was willing to recommend to their board that they provide financial assistance to Coastal Heritage Society to come up with more money and make the deal work. It was not as if Coastal Heritage Society was not offering any value, they were offering value and looking at it long-term. If they took the properties, they would have to move them. If they move them, they would have to invest money and they were not prepared for this. They needed more time, and if the Board granted demolition today, it could result in a lack of incentive on the developer's part to negotiate in good faith to move it forward. It was a shame that the Cooper family was caught in the negotiation between the developer and the Coastal Heritage Society. He asked the Board to delay or deny the petition if the petitioner was not willing to accept a continuance.

Pastor Brown (First Union Missionary Baptist Church) stated that he knew Mrs. Cooper because she lived around the corner from his church, and that the yellow and white houses were the last of the original Frogtown community. He said the Cooper's had reiterated to him that they were willing, able, and ready to get rid of the house because of financial difficulties, but needed legal representation for themselves because the developer and all other interested parties did not have the Cooper's concern at heart. Since it was still the Cooper's property and the contract had not gone through, although there was a recommendation to sweeten the pot and give more money to the other concerned party, there were rental fees and other monthly items. He was torn about it because the houses were of value and that the church and the houses were the last property standing in the Frogtown community. He would hate to see them go, but at the same time he would hate to have the Cooper's locked and tied up financially and did not know if there could be something worked out where they could be compensated for their losses and save the properties as well. He believed if the contract was valid that the Cooper's should be paid and get out of the whole process, and the negotiations should be between the developer and whoever else was concerned about keeping the property. He wanted to speak on their behalf in whatever would be the fair and equitable thing for the Cooper's financially, as well as historically for the city if something could be worked out in the process.

Ms. Kathy Ledvina (Coastal Heritage Society, King-Tisdell Cottage Foundation Board Member, Historic Savannah Foundation Member, and Downtown Resident) stated that she agreed with everyone but the Coastal Heritage Society. She said that Savannah's Central of Georgia Railroad National Historic Landmark District was the oldest and most complete manufacture and repair facility in the United States. In order to enhance the site, long-term plans were underway to recreate an interpretative workers housing. The concept for the component was to move or reconstruct period housing to demonstrate the regional domestic life and living condition of the common workers family, regardless of ethnic group or status. The African-American heritage was an interpretation that was not currently available in Savannah. She said that African-Americans overcame many restrictions of economic opportunities, and took both skilled and unskilled jobs as blue-collar workers. Mostly in the building and transportation trades, which became profitable businesses and enabled affluence in the Black community. It resulted in Blacks getting a measure of economic autonomy. It allowed them to build their own houses, some in the Frogtown village, using their skills to build the houses. Demolition was an extreme and irreversible action that should not be taken lightly. She said there were only four houses remaining in the entire Frogtown community, and demolition should be considered only after all other alternatives, such as relocation, have been exhausted. Unlike the previously approved demolition of the Drayton Street garage, there was no threat of any hazardous condition because the buildings were not going to fall down on anybody. They were structurally sound and there was no immediacy to the demolition. She hoped they could continue negotiations and that a resolution could be determined that would save the African-American vernacular structures.

Mr. Noble Boykin stated that he owned property on Purse Street and had looked at the houses. He thought it was odd that the two-story house was sitting on Savannah Gray piers and that he could tell it was old because the railroad houses that were redone appeared to be duplicates of the other small houses. There was an 1860 sign on the front and he thought they were Civil War era houses and wondered why the houses would be town down. He said when he bought the property, he thought it was nice that the small context of those houses on the side street were the last vestiges of the old Frogtown, because the rest had been knocked down. They had lost Yamacraw, which were vernacular houses on the west side of MLK, and then you see the three houses that were the only ones remaining. He spoke with Ms. Reiter and she said it was a hardship on the family. It was an issue for the developer who was coming in to buy this and could factor it into the cost of doing business in the Historic District. It was Battlefield Park, LLC who was trading on history, and to come in and say they wanted to knock down the last two remaining vernacular houses to put up something overlooking the Battlefield Park, struck him as ironic. It was unfortunate that the developer drew the contract so they could hold it over the head of the family and have the family talk about economic hardship, but it was a hardship when the key was being held by the developer. The developer could say that he would step forward and take the chance of it not being done, and then he would close because he had a contract. Then, the only question would be the economic hardship on the developer. It was valuable because it was in the Historic District, and if the houses were in downtown Vidalia he doubted that Battlefield Park, LLC would be worried about buying them. As a neighbor, he would submit that if they were given the permit and negotiated for 90 days there would not be much negotiation, and he would hate to see the houses lost as a neighborhood property. He said he felt for the Cooper's and the developer should do the right thing.

Mr. Steffen stated that because it was a demolition request that any action the Board took, whether denial or approval of the demolition, it could be appealed to City Council. Whether it was the thing that would move it further, encourage, or discourage negotiations, it depended on what side you were on if that would happen. He said this was an area where the Board would serve in an advisory capacity.

Ms. Seiler stated she appreciated the Cooper's being willing to wait and entering into negotiations because it was generous. She apologized that the Board could not come up with a better financial situation for them. She said when Staff recommended the demolition of the building that it was said that little was left of the remaining historical significance of the two buildings. Mr. Lovett made a good point that if the Board recommended demolition it would get the ball rolling and something would happen, but she was concerned about the family and hoped that it would bring the other parties interested in the buildings to make something happen faster.

Mr. Law stated that he was concerned when he heard Pastor Brown suggest the Cooper's needed an attorney.

Mr. Steffen stated that he felt Pastor Brown was saying that the Cooper's needed an attorney to represent their interest in the deal because they were like pawns being shifted back and forth between the two organizations. He agreed with them but it was not within the Board's purview.

Mr. Lovett stated that he had a dual representation before the Board for Battlefield Park Partners, LLC and the Cooper family. He said if anyone had questions about how he was not representing the Cooper family or what he could be doing differently, that he would be more than happy to answer the questions without violating any confidence he had already engaged with the Cooper family. There were things he could not tell the Board that he had discussed with the Cooper family and would not inform the Board about them. He said that he was the petitioner for the Cooper family as well as Battlefield Park Properties and was doing his best to represent their interest.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board was not going to ask any questions because they respected the relationship. He said Pastor Brown's comments was that there could come a time when their interests start to diverge from the partners and that Mr. Lovett would do the right thing if that happened, and it may not be the case. It was not within the Board's purview to know that either.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with a 90-day stay of demolition in order for interested parties to seek an alternative to demolition. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. Mr. Hutchinson, Ms. Seiler, Mr. Judson, and Mr. Law were in favor. Ms. Ramsay, Dr. Watkins, and Mr. Johnson were opposed. The motion passed 4 to 3.

Mr. Steffen stated that he was yielding the Chair for approximately ten minutes and that Ms. Seiler would Chair the meeting.

**RE: Continued Petition of Greenline Architecture
Keith Howington
H-07-3884-2
PIN No. 2-0005-15-008
535 East Congress Street
New Construction, Part I and Part II**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for demolition of an existing structure, and Parts I and II for new construction of the replacement structure. The replacement structure is a mixed-use structure consisting of one floor of offices and two floors with two condominiums each.

SITE PLAN REVIEW:

The site plan review took place on September 6.

- An encroachment permit will be required for the balconies, stoops, and steel door in the sidewalk.

FINDINGS:

Changes from September 12 meeting:

- Overall height has been reduced by three feet.
- A brick wall has been added to screen the parking.
- Lane elevation porches are to be constructed of steel framing with iron railings.
- The reduction in height and change in rear building cornice has helped the scale of the rear building.
- A drawing has been provided showing comparative heights with adjacent structures.

Demolition

1. The structure is a 1966 one-story masonry structure. The building is a non-rated structure within the National Landmark Historic District. The applicant states that the building is in fair to poor condition. The demolition includes removal of existing false tabby sidewalk and replacement with brick sidewalk to match similar sidewalks. All existing trees within the right-of-way are to remain. The rear stucco and masonry fence to be removed.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

| Standard | Proposed | Comment |
|--|--|--|
| Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone; meets 75 percent lot coverage required. | No setbacks on north, east, and west sides; consistent with surrounding setbacks. South--setback to allow for existing parking spaces. | This standard is met. |
| Dwelling Unit Type: | Mixed Use structure using low stoop attached townhouse form. | |
| Street Elevation Type: 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 titling or trust block. | Two low stoops are proposed on Congress Street with a low stoop side entry on Houston Street. | Low stoops are found on other historic structures on this block. |
| Entrances: A building on an east-west connecting street fronting a square shall have entrances at intervals not to exceed 50 feet. A building on a titling block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street. | Two recessed office entries are proposed to face Congress Street. A recessed condominium entry is proposed on the Houston Street side. | This standard is met. |
| Building Height: | Three stories plus roof elevator shaft/stairwell. 37'-8" overall roof height (to top of parapet). Roof unit approximately 6' over parapet height. Floor-to-floor height-first floor 11' high; second and third stories 11'-6" high. | Adjacent and surrounding structures are one, two, and three stories. This is a corner lot on a square. The amended height is compatible. |
| Proportion of Structure's Front Façade: | Approx. 58' wide by 37'8" high. | It is proposed to make the structure appear as two semi-detached townhouses. |
| Proportion of Openings: Individual sashes shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 3:5. | Double- and triple-hung windows are proposed. 6/6, 6/6/6, and 2/2 windows on the rear Houston Street portion of the structure. French doors with transoms are proposed for the south elevation. | This standard is met |
| Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids: The distance between windows shall not be less than for | On Congress St. façade, each townhouse has a three-bay rhythm with windows and doors | The solid-to-void ratio is compatible. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. | aligning vertically. The northern portion of the Houston Street façade has five bays, and the southern portion has single and paired windows in delineated bays. | |
| Rhythm of Structure on Street: | The proposed structure has been designed to look like attached townhouses, with a separate attached building facing Houston Street. | The rhythm along the street is compatible. |
| Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies: Residential balconies shall not extend more than three feet in depth from the face of a building, and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support. | On the Congress Street elevation, metal balconies by King Architectural metals with IPE decking are proposed across all the windows at the second floor level, and on each of the middle two windows on the third story. Balconies will project three feet. On the Houston Street side, metal balconies are proposed for the two northernmost windows at the second and third floors. The parlor floor balcony wraps the corner facing the square. On the lane elevation, a two-story metal porch supported by metal brackets is proposed. | This standard is met. |
| Walls of Continuity: | A brick wall is proposed to screen the parking area. | This standard is met. |
| Scale: | Existing scale of surrounding area established by one, two, and occasionally three-story low stoop dwelling units. | There is an 8” reveal between “Building 1” and Building 2”. The ensemble has been designed to appear as a paired dwelling with attached single building. |

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

| Standard | Proposed | Comments |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| Windows and Doors: | 3/3/3 triple hung and 6/6 double-hung on Congress Street Façade; Houston St. 2/2 double-hung with blind windows with flat arches on first floor. Windows are Kolbe and Kolbe Aluminum Clad true divided light. Shutters: Hinged, operable, composite material, Painted. | This standard is met. |
| Roof Shape: | Flat with parapet | The applicant has provided a sight line drawing. The applicant indicates that the main view of the roof structures will be from the rear (lane) side. |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Materials, Colors: | “Building 1” Old Carolina Brick Company, Savannah Grey, oversized; Mortar Ivory Buff. “Building 2”, Triangle Brick Company, Windsor, Mortar Laforge Red. | The materials and colors are compatible. |
| Utilities: | Screened in southwest corner in rear with wood board gate. | This standard is met. |

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval.

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

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.
Donna Swanson
H-07-3898-2
PIN No. 2-0031-20-007
320 Montgomery Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Doug Bean.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting approval to install two projecting signs advertising “Country Inn and Suites Historic Savannah By Carlson.” The signs, 42.5 square feet, are constructed of high-density foam. They will be mounted on a scroll bracket and be placed on the Harris Street and Montgomery Street faces of the hotel. The sign on the Harris Street side will be located between the garage and the main entry. The sign on the Montgomery Street side will be located on the tower element. The sign cannot be located on the Harris Street tower element because of a flagpole. They will be lighted with three gooseneck sconces. Colors: black ironwork, green background, red trim, and white copy.

FINDINGS:

The signs meet the Historic District Sign Ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Kari Schuler (314 West Charlton) stated that she lived directly beside the property, had been a graphic designer for 25 years, and said that it was relevant to the discussion. She was asking the Board to approve the Harris Street sign but deny the proposed sign on Montgomery

Street. She also asked the Board to approve the wall plaque signage on the first floor façade on both the Montgomery and Charlton Streets. The Board was not given a full sign proposal because nothing was shown on the Charlton Street side. She said that it would be coming back before the Board and that it was wasting everyone's time. She felt that they were testing the waters with the signage issue, and said that there were other doors that did not have signage that would have to have signage of some kind. They were using the same signage in close proximity to each other, and Traffic Engineering asked that they move the main entrance from Montgomery Street to Harris Street. She showed a picture of Montgomery and Harris Streets and said that the visual main entrance slipped by that was clearly on Montgomery Street. She said there were many issues related to the I-16 down ramp, and that Traffic Engineering dealt with pedestrian and vehicular safety egress issues. The only thing that should be allowed on the Montgomery or Charlton Street side would be an understated wall plaque to prevent accidents. There were people coming down the I-16 ramp and crossing over the low cement median, and she showed a photograph of the damage. Signage on the building was important, Traffic Engineering had stipulated that the entrance had slipped by the Board once, and it was imperative that the Board deal with the signage issue. She asked that the Board deny the petition or partially approve it with the Harris Street sign.

Mr. Patrick Shay stated that he was familiar with the building and said that the original design showed a valet parking entrance on Montgomery Street, and the issue of traffic coming off the ramp was discussed. He said the final approved design had the valet entrances on the Harris Street side with a very wide sidewalk curb. The exterior of the building that was approved at that time had indications of the entrance on the building, but not as the main entrance of the building but a secondary entrance. As you come down the ramp or up Montgomery Street it was important to note that the drawings did not show the tree that was saved and blocked the building from view. He did not think it was a situation where someone would mistake the side entrance, and there would be signs further down the street to direct people to the valet entrance of the hotel.

Ms. Seiler asked if Mr. Shay adequately answered Ms. Schuler's questions.

Mr. Doug Bean answered no. He said that those were the only two signs he was contracted to do. The suggestion that it was testing the waters was not the case as far as his firm was concerned.

Ms. Seiler stated that the Board could only rule on what had come before them today.

Mr. Bean stated that the conjecture was made and he wanted to make sure it was understood. He said Ms. Reiter indicated that the client was allowed by the ordinance to have a sign on Harris, Montgomery, and Charlton Streets. Mr. Shay pointed out that there was heavy tree cover and said that the client wanted the Montgomery Street sign for pedestrian traffic on Liberty Street. The signs would serve more in general than just identifying entranceways. The sign on Montgomery Street identified a business, and it was practical and reasonable that the client would want to identify the business to Montgomery Street and the traffic on Liberty.

Ms. Schuler stated that a curb cut did not constitute the moving of a main entrance. She said she showed the picture and it was clear that the visual was still Montgomery street, which was a construction site, and when the walkway was removed the building would be much more visible.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen returned to the dias as Chairman.

**RE: Petition of McBrier M. Maloney
Michael F. P. Maloney
H-07-3899-2
PIN No. 2-0032-45-013
102 East Gaston Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Ms. McBrier M. Maloney

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of an addition as follows:

1. On the north garden elevation of the main house remove existing windows, door, and stoop, and extend two bay windows into the courtyard approximately 4'-6". Standing seam copper roof. National wood true divided light windows, double-hung, 6/6 with 3/16" muntins; seven light two panel French doors to new stoop, reusing existing iron railing.
2. On the east wing facing the courtyard, add two sets of triple windows and a pair of wood and glass doors flanked by sidelights in existing wall.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval as submitted.

Ms. Ramsay asked if there was a section submitted with the petition.

Ms. Reiter stated that there was not a section and felt that the extension of a bay window was clear from the side view. She said she was not sure what the section would give them.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she did not have the information about the materials.

Ms. Reiter stated that Ms. Keller wrote the Staff report and called the petitioner for the information. She said the information had been placed on Ms. Keller's drawing, but she did not transfer the information to the Board's drawing and apologized for the oversight.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it might have showed the recess of the windows.

Mr. Steffen asked for the petitioner. The petitioner was not present. He said that when the petitioner was not present the Board would continue the item.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was a straightforward petition.

Mr. Steffen stated that they could approve it without the petitioner, the Board had the authority to continue an item if the petitioner was not present, and the third option would be to refer it to Staff for final approval. He thought it would be the best situation.

Ms. Seiler stated that since there was no one to speak for or against the petition that it should be approved if Staff was willing to approve it.

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

RE: Petition of Sign Mart, Inc.
Parker's
H-07-3900-2
PIN No. 2-0031-18-001
325 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Sign

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Bill Norton.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting approval to remove an existing BP freestanding sign and replace it with a monument sign advertising Parker's.

FINDINGS:

Summary of Findings: The sign width exceeds the maximum allowed by 1'-8". The reader board has an illuminated white background. Reverse silhouette is recommended for the Historic District. This property is located next to the Battlefield Park. It is recommended that the design be revised to make use of a darker background on the reader board.

1. The property is zoned BC.
2. The Historic District Sign Ordinance states that a freestanding principal use sign in a non-residential zoning district may have a maximum square footage of 30' plus a bonus of 1' for every 2' over 75 feet of building frontage. The building (from the architect's drawing) has 105' frontage on MLK; therefore, the property is entitled to a 45 square foot maximum sign. The Principal use sign area is 43.6 square feet.
3. The maximum height for a freestanding sign in a BC zone is 20 feet and maximum width is 6 feet. The proposed sign is 10'-1 3/4" high and 7'-8" wide.
4. On an arterial, a 30 square foot reader board sign is allowed in a BC zone. The graphic area of the reader board is 17.25 square feet.
5. Internally illuminated signs are permitted within a BC zone, however the use of reverse silhouette letters is encouraged (i.e., the background is opaque and only the letters, logo and numbers are illuminated). The sign is internally illuminated.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the sign width is brought into compliance with the Historic District sign ordinance and that the reader board background be changed to a reverse silhouette appearance.

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

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Patrick L. Phelps
H-07-3901-2
PIN No. 2-0005-04-004
518 East Bryan Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends continuance.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick L. Phelps.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct rear addition to the residence at 518 East Bryan Street. The request includes a two-story rear addition with a two-story elevator and a partial one-story garage.

FINDINGS:

The building at 518 East Bryan Street was constructed in 2004, and is not a contributing structure to the Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density).

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

| Standard | Proposed | Comment |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Lot Coverage: Maximum 75 percent in RIP-A zone. | The lot area is 2,814 square feet and the proposed lot coverage is 2,102 square feet, for a total of 75 percent. | The standard is met. |
| Setback: No setbacks are required in RIP-A. New carriage houses may provide up to a four-foot setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane. | The addition aligns with the existing ell at the rear on the west and extends to the existing garden wall on the east. The garage does not extend the full width of the parcel, as a telephone pole is located at the rear of the property. | The standard is met. |
| Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure of the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly as appendage, and distinguishable from the existing main structure. | The addition is located at the rear of the property and is sited as an addition, connected to the main house by an ell. | The standard is met. |
| Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure. | The addition is equal in height and mass to the existing rear portion of the building, which also appears as an addition. Both are subordinate in height | The standard is met. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | and mass to the main structure. The elevator and partial garage is both subordinate to the additions and main structure. | |
| Forms: | A brick one-story partial garage is attached to a two-story brick addition, and a two-story wood frame addition is proposed to the east. The second floor above the garage is setback to allow clearance from existing power lines. | The setback above the garage is not typical of buildings along the lane within the district. The wood addition does not tie into the proposed addition creating a sense of four additions on the back of the building, three of which are being proposed at one time. |
| Garage Openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width. | The proposed garage opening is 10 feet wide. A wood overhead garage door designed to simulate carriage doors is proposed (Overhead Door, Ranch House Collection, Series #145) | The standard is met. |
| Materials: | The two-story addition and one-story garage extension are clad in brick; A two-story storage/closet space is clad in wood siding above a brick veneer base. The former rear porch will be enclosed with painted fixed wood louvered shutters. | Staff recommends restudy of the false brick foundation. It is not typical of historic buildings within the district to have a foundation that extends beyond the wood exterior. The door opening within the false foundation is awkward as it is now. |
| Windows: Double-glazed windows are permitted on new construction provided, that the windows meet the following standards; the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the top and meeting rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3" from the façade of a masonry building...windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad. | A four-over-four lite double-hung window is proposed on the two-story brick addition. It is aluminum clad by Weathershield with 7/8" simulated divided lites with a spacer bare in the "Colonial Style". No openings are proposed on the wood addition. | Staff recommends the putty style window be used to meet the standard. Staff recommends restudy of the two-story wood addition as it appears too large and out of place, with no openings and not architecturally tied to the proposed addition. Redefining the roof and door opening may help reduce the massive wall |

| | | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| <p>Roof:</p> | <p>The addition features a hip roof, surfaced in asphalt shingle to match the existing building, which ties into the existing rear appendage on the structure. The wood frame addition and one-story garage portion feature standing seam metal roofing.</p> | <p>Staff recommends approval. The standing seam should be residential grade with approx. 1.5” turned ridges 10” apart.</p> |
| <p>Color:</p> | <p>Brick and Mortar: To match the existing building. Wood Body: Painted to match the existing trim. Standing Seam Roof: Cadet Grey Trim: to match the existing (off-white)</p> | <p>Staff approval</p> |

RECOMMENDATION:

Continuance to restudy the building form along the lane and the wood appendage to the east to be more compatible with building forms in the Historic District. The proposed foundation on the wood frame portion should correspond to traditional building practices in the district, and be reduced in height to correspond to the door opening. The window should utilize muntins that simulate traditional putty glazing to meet the ordinance.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Phelps (Hansen Architects) stated they went back and restudied the issues that were discussed with Staff. He said there was a power line that ran across the property and that on the site plan you could see the power pole. He displayed photographs that showed how much of an encroachment it was on the property. The power pole was set back approximately two and one-half to three feet into the property. They investigated relocating the power pole, but the financial feasibility was almost zero, and that was the reason for the setback. They created a one-story garage entrance that was in the Historic District that fronted the lane. He showed a photograph of two houses that fronted Price and Houston Streets and said that the lane had fences and no structures except for the one they were extending.

The materials used on the addition would match the existing house, and they hoped that the color change with the cut line and brick would be seen as a congruous building and not an addition onto an addition. After restudy of Staff’s comments, they were willing to remove the water table. It was carried over from the existing building, they carried the siding down to the ground as a more historic treatment, and they put fenestration on the storage building. They changed the roof form into a hip to better address the existing structure, which set back from the addition approximately four feet.

They had looked at other studies and wanted the Board to see why they broke the building down into additions. He said they were trying to create a better scale of the buildings, a better conjectural value, and a better use of materials. If they were to create a large mass it would look like an appendage onto a historic typology of the carriage house.

They were willing to use the putty simulated windows and concurred with Staff that they would use a more residential standing seam roof spacing to have minimal percentages, and determine the turned ridges dimension upon construction. He encouraged the Board to approve the petition with a further conference with Staff or for a continuance.

Mr. Steffen stated that with the changes that had been presented he had asked Staff if they would feel comfortable with the remainder coming back for review.

Ms. Ward stated that if the Board felt it was compatible.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it was shown with brick all of the way across and asked if they had considered using the same wood element in brick.

Mr. Phelps stated that they would get the same imagery of it being one total brick mass and that it did not break down the volumes as they were trying to do. He said there would be a shadow line and a mass of brick material. The guidelines encouraged the break down of masses to make it look like additions over time rather than one big mass.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as amended with final details to be submitted to Staff. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Gonzalez Architects
H-07-3903-2
PIN No. 2-0004-18-007
304 East Bryan Street
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of amended renovation; continuance for reconsideration of fence design.**

Present for the petition was Ms. Toni Parker.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to amend a previously approved petition (November 8, 2006) as follows: Delete all new construction and install a parking lot screened by a stucco fence. The approved plans for the renovation of the historic structure are amended since two additional elevations will be exposed.

FINDINGS:

1. The 5'-11" wall is a continuous flat surface with no structural piers expressed, or base to give the wall definition. The cap is minimal. Staff recommends a redesign to break up the planar surface into segments and more finely detailed cap and base.
2. The east elevation of the existing non-historic building forms the garden wall of two adjacent historic homes. Staff recommends that consideration be given to allow this wall to remain to shield the homes from the parking and tie the new wall into the existing east wall.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the revised elevations for the rehabilitated building and continuance for the wall's design to be reconsidered. A strong recommendation is made to preserve the east wall of the existing non-historic structure to shield the view from the adjacent historic homes and to tie the new wall into it.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Toni Parker (Gonzalez Architects) stated that she wanted to get the Board's feedback for the design.

Ms. Ramsay stated that her thought on the parking garage screening walls was that it was better to see through them.

Ms. Parker stated that someone told them to mask the cars because they did not want them to be seen from the street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Doug Bean stated that the courtyard was his and that he was gratified that the petitioner was willing to save the wall and could understand cutting back the vegetation. He said it was not historically significant but he desired to have some piers and it gave more personality to the walls. He asked the Board to approve the petition.

HDRB ACTION: **Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3904-2
PIN No. 2-0004-10-001
115 East River Street
Awning/Roof/Rehabilitation**

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting approval to enclose the existing outdoor dining area/deck on the second floor at Huey's Restaurant overlooking River Street. The proposed enclosure consists of a system of retractable glass panels, extending approximately 10 feet from the building, and extending 72' 4" down the length of the building. The proposed wall is a folding glass system that is attached at the sides. The application indicates that the project includes installation of retractable glass walls and replacing the existing metal roof and wood deck.

FINDINGS:

1. In 1994, at which time the applicant was requesting three retractable awnings, the Board expressed that the project was having a negative visual affect on the building, in that it was being obscured by a hodge-podge.
2. Approval for a retractable awning was approved by the Board in July 2001, with the motion stating that, “the awning not become enclosed or supported such that it becomes a roof structure.”
3. To quote the previous (2001) staff report, “This enclosed dining area has been expanding since 1994, when the bar area was constructed. Following this, subsequent changes were approved: construction of a permanent entry bay; permanent enclosure of the bar area (with the upper deck and awning above expanding as well); addition of a scallop shaped awning to the first floor dining room windows; installation of the awning above the entry (projecting five feet toward the street.)”
4. Approval of the proposed installed folding window system would reverse the Board’s decision of 2001, granting approval of enclosure such that it becomes a roof structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the visual incompatibility of an additional enclosure and the Board’s previous decision, staff recommends denial of the proposed enclosure of the deck.

Ms. Seiler stated that the Board tried to avoid letting people putting up awnings because they eventually become a closed-in structure.

Ms. Reiter stated they would later add that it needed to be air-conditioned and then it needed to keep the rain out.

Ms. Seiler said right and stated that they put in the plastic enclosures and air condition it. Before the Board knows it, there were side items. She asked if that was what they were doing in this situation because they proposed that the awning with the roof become a closed in structure and an addition to the building.

Ms. Reiter answered that was right.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she was on the Review Board when the awning was done and the Board was told no, that they would never want to enclose it because they just wanted an awning and an eating space. It was ironic to be present and to be asked for something they were told would never happen.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board was not bound by precedent either, but another petition came to mind that would probably come before them again at some point. He said the Board went down that path at their own risk.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects) stated that the people who own the building had asked Ansley Williams and his partners to upgrade the restaurant from Tubby’s Tank House. In order to do that, they needed to add something that was a little bit more elegant. He said that if it were allowed to happen, then the restaurant would evolve from beer and burgers into something closer to fine dining. He made Mr. Williams promise that if the petition was successful he would take down all of the Bud Light signs and neon.

Ms. Seiler stated that the awning was such a precedent and the guidelines talked about River Street being so important that it was a dangerous thing. She said the awnings needed to be watched.

Mr. Judson stated that he saw the photograph of the beer signs, the awnings, umbrellas, and what not and realized he was not present when the other motions were made. He understood that it was dangerous to set a precedent, but he personally thought it was cleaner and better looking than the row of umbrellas.

Ms. Seiler stated that it was not in the guidelines.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition as submitted. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Kathy Ledvina
H-07-3905-2
PIN No.2-0016-14-016
202 West Broughton Street
Sign and Awnings**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Ms. Kathy Ledvina.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a principal use sign and two awnings on the building at 202 West Broughton Street on the corner of Barnard and Broughton as follows:

Principal Use Projecting Sign:

1. Sign projects 6' from the face of the building at the corner.
2. The sign has a 10' clearance over the sidewalk.
3. Materials – clear cast acrylic sign supported by aluminum “arms”.
4. Size – 4' wide, projecting 6' from the face of the building. Clarify Height. Applicant states that it is less than 8 square feet total.
5. The projecting sign will be illuminated by 110-volt exterior floodlights mounted on either side of the sign.
6. The oval sign has a double outline with the text “nour-ish” in the center. Colors were not provided or indicated.

Awnings:

1. Location – over the south and east doors mounted on the piers adjacent to entrances.
2. Material – aluminum aircraft grade welded to base plate and bolted to structure.
3. Dimensions – project 28” from building with a 3' arc. They are 7'- 2” and 7'-6” wide and align with the top of the existing door openings, approximately 9.5' above the sidewalk.

4. Attached by brackets and 9 1/8" stainless cables.
5. Signage – 6" by 18" (.75 square feet) oval acrylic sign, 3/4" thick, in center with text for nour-ish.

FINDINGS:

The historic building at 202 West Broughton Street was constructed in 1903 as 202-206 West Broughton Street. The building is a rated structured within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District and is zoned B-C-1 (Central-Business). The building maintains approximately 28 linear feet along Broughton Street and 35 linear feet along Barnard Street. The standards for the Broughton Street Sign District have been met; however, clarification is needed on the colors for the sign and awnings and the flood lights.

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

(2)(c) Principal Use Sign.

1. One principal use sign shall be permitted for each business establishment. One such sign may be mounted or erected...as a projecting sign. Where a business establishment fronts on more than one street or pedestrian walkway providing public access, one principal use sign for each frontage shall be permitted; provided, that only the maximum sign area computed for a given street frontage shall face that street.

The standard is met.

2.(i) Projecting Signs.

- 1) For all principal uses occupying 125 or less linear feet of street frontage, projecting signs shall be permitted one square foot of display area per sign face per linear foot of frontage occupied by each principal use; provided that a maximum of 45 SF shall be permitted per sign face...
- 2) The outer edge of a projecting sign shall not extend more than 6' from the building to which it is attached.
- 3) The height of a projecting sign shall not extend above the parapet wall of the building, and the lowest point of the projecting sign shall not be less than 10' above the established grade.

The standards for projecting signs are met.

(ii) 4) Awning Sign.

In addition to the permitted principal use sign, one awning sign shall be permitted for each entrance providing public access. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than one square foot of sign face per linear foot of awning or a maximum of 20 square feet, whichever is lesser; provided, however, that the aggregate total principal use sign area for the subject use is not exceeded along that street frontage. Individual letters or symbols not to exceed six inches indicating use...shall be exempt from this provision.

The standard is met.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that details on the colors and specifications for the lighting fixtures be provided to Staff for final approval.

Ms. Ramsay asked about the awning on the front and in the oval part containing the word nourish remaining on Broughton Street.

Ms. Ledvina stated that they would both say 202. She said they identify the building as a script.

Ms. Ramsay asked about the material with the lines in it.

Ms. Ledvina stated that the material was a one-eighth-inch cable that was open. There would not be any enclosed glass or anything.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it would not offer protection from the weather.

Ms. Ledvina stated that it would highlight the door.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with final details on the colors and lighting to be submitted to Staff. Mr. Law seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Hansen Architects
Sean Selfe
H-07-3768(S)-2
217 & 221 West Broughton Street
Rehabilitation/Alterations
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of Jonathan Hall
H-07-3891(S)-2
211 West Gordon Street
Existing Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of KSN Partners, LLP
H-07-3893(S)-2
5 Bull Street
Roof Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
4. Petition of Cryselle Stewart
H-07-3894(S)-2
412 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Existing Windows, Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products
Daufuskie Island Resort and Breathe Spa
Jim Morehouse
H-07-3895(S)-2
23 East River Street
Color Change/Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Re: Think Design Studio
Joel Snayd
H-07-3896-2
1 East Broughton Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

G. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes – September 12, 2007

Ms. Reiter stated that she had found a few typing errors that needed to be corrected.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the minutes as submitted with corrections made to typographical errors. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

H. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Steffen stated that he wanted to ask Ms. Ramsay, Dr. Watkins, and Dr. Elmore to be on the committee to meet and nominate someone to be the Chairman and Vice-Chairman. He said that he was not eligible to continue as Chairman but could continue as Vice-Chairman, suggested that since the Board would not have an attorney as Chairman that the Parliamentary position could be recreated. He asked them to report at the next meeting who they would like to select for Chairman and Vice-Chairman. He said that Ms. Seiler, Mr. Gay, and Mr. Meyerhoff were coming off the Board and were not eligible to serve in those positions. He added that everyone else was staying on.

Ms. Seiler stated that people could be reappointed that have served out the year.

Mr. Steffen stated that was right. He said if someone had served as Chairman previously and was off, they could come back.

I. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

J. INFORMATION ITEMS

- Diversity of Coastal Georgia Archaeology Program -Thursday, October 18, 2007, in Midway, Georgia - Free Event!

Ms. Ward stated that the Coastal RDC was helping to sponsor the free workshop on October 18, 2007, in Midway, Georgia. She said that Ellen Harris went last year and that it was a really good event where she learned a lot. While dealing with Historic Preservation it was not always the built environment but what was under the ground. It was not within the purview of the Board but was important to the history and encouraged anyone to go if they could.

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp