

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET**

**ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM**

**August 13, 2008**

**2:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**HDRB Members Present:**

**Dr. Malik Watkins, Chairman  
Brian Judson, Vice-Chairman  
Ned Gay  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Gene Hutchinson  
Sidney J. Johnson  
Linda Ramsay  
Swann Seiler  
Joseph Steffen**

**HDRB Members Not Present:**

**Richard Law, Sr.  
Eric Meyerhoff**

**HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:**

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

**City of Savannah Members Present:**

**Mr. Randolph Scott, Zoning Administrator**

**RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

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

**RE: REFLECTION**

**RE: SIGN POSTING**

**Ms. Ramsay, Ms. Seiler, Mr. Steffen, and Mr. Gay** stated that they did not see the signs at Ruth's Crisp Steakhouse.

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition of H-08-4018-2 due to the sign not being posted. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: CONTINUED AGENDA**

**Petition of J. T. Turner Construction Co., Inc.  
Bryan J. Robinson  
H-08-4008-2  
321 East Congress Street  
PIN No. 2-0004-41-010  
Alteration/Relocation of an Existing Fence**

**Continue to September 10, 2008, at the petitioner's request.**

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects  
Patrick Phelps  
H-08-4013-2  
412 Williamson Street  
PIN No. 2-0003-08-001  
New Construction/Design Details - Part II - Five-Story  
Hotel**

**Continue to September 10, 2008, at the petitioner's request.**

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture  
Keith Howington  
H-08-4015-2  
205 Papy Street  
(Corner of Fahm & West Hull Streets)  
PIN No. 2-0016-33-004  
New Construction/Design Detail – Part II - Five-Story  
Parking Garage**

**Continue to September 10, 2008, at the petitioner's request.**

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

**RE: CONSENT AGENDA**

**RE: Amended Petition of Lynch Associates Design, Inc.  
Rebecca Lynch  
H-08-4016-2  
233 Abercorn Street  
PIN No. 2-0015-30-003  
Rehabilitation/Alteration/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Coastal Heritage Society  
Becki Harkness  
H-08-4017-2  
500 Block of West Charlton (536 West Jones Street)  
PIN No. 2-0001-24-006  
Relocation of a Building – Part II/Rehabilitation**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Bacha Koslosky Design Works, LLC  
H-08-4025-2  
414 Price Street  
PIN No. 2-0033-01-036A  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Larry Hess  
H-08-4033-2  
549 East Macon Street  
Windows**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**. (Pending ruling from the Department of Inspections)

**HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Continued Agenda items as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. The petition of Mr. Larry Hess, H-08-4033-2 at 549 East Macon Street was withdrawn at the petitioner's request.**

**RE: REGULAR AGENDA**

**RE: Amended Petition of Daniel E. Snyder  
H-07-3830-2  
4 West Taylor Street  
PIN No. 2-0032-16-007  
Privacy Garden Wall**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Thagne.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to amend a previously approved decision to include the removal of the basket weave brick fence on the south end of the east side garden and replace it with a new cnc-milled (computer numerical control), water-jet cut one-half-inch steel plate fence, with a perforation pattern to match the pattern of the new porch guardrail system. This pattern will reflect the oak leaf canopy pattern in Monterey Square and will reflect the intricacy of the period ironwork on the building in a modern medium. The previous approval remanded the final approval of the exact pattern to Staff.

The applicant is also requesting approval to install a water feature consisting of a water source at the top of a slit in the new fence that will flow into a concrete basin, and, thence through a narrow canal along the east wall of the house to a rear pool. The canal and pool will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

**FINDINGS:**

The fence will be black powder-coated perforated steel plate. It will be set into a concrete coping. The height of the fence will match the height of the existing historic masonry wall along the eastern property line.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval as submitted with final perforated design to come to Staff for final approval.**

**Mr. Gay** stated that the original wall was erected because of the dogs and that putting a wall back up after taking one down was redundant.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that she believed the wall was there because of the dog and that the new wall was for the privacy of the pool.

**Mr. Gay** stated that any fence would look strange because there was already a fence in the front.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the low fence in the front was not very high and could be seen through and she thought that it would work because there was a garden in the front and it separated the public garden from the private space. She said the new fence would also match the new balcony.

**Mr. Gay** asked if there was something like a pool in front of the metal item other than just the garden.

**Ms. Reiter** stated there would be a water feature that was part of the wall.

**Mr. Gay** asked if the water would come down the wall.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the water would come down part of it.

**Mr. Judson** asked about the height of the stucco wall on the Bull Street, and if the new metal wall would match the stucco wall height.

Ms. Reiter stated that was her understanding, but she did not know the exact height.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

Mr. Algar Thagne (Representing Mr. Dan Snyder) stated that the height of the existing wall was 5 feet 10-inches and was shown on one of the drawings.

Mr. Gay asked about the height of the brick wall.

Mr. Thagne stated it was similar in height.

Mr. Gay stated that he did not understand the water feature.

Mr. Thagne stated that it was a cast stone masonry water feature that had a gap in it, and water flowed through the gap into a trough in line with the building. He said the water would pour out of a scupper at the top and flow down in a solid curtain. The pool was not far back in the yard from the existing brick lattice fence, and the new wall would be in line with the front of the building and existing corner of the east brick wall.

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

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Trace Tarel  
H-08-3976-2  
720 – 722 Habersham Street  
PIN No. 2-0044-08-020  
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

Present for the petition was Ms. Trace Tarel.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for rehabilitation, addition, and exterior alterations to the building at 720-722 Habersham Street as follows:

- 1) Remove the corner entrance and install a side entry on Habersham Street.
- 2) Reinstall neon banding along the length of the existing metal cornice that existed when the former Leopold’s Ice Cream shop occupied the building.
- 3) Replace existing storefront with high efficiency clear insulated glazing in aluminum frames. Ripple glass storefront will be installed in the upper transom lights. The existing black tile base will be preserved and restored.

- 4) Replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof, Pac-Clad by Peterson Aluminum. The roof has a minimum of 16" flat panels with 1 3/4" tall ridges and trim.
- 5) Demolish the one-story shed roof portion behind the brick wall on Gwinnett Street and steel fire escape as indicated on plans. The applicant is proposing to rebuild the rooms and the roof, adding a roof terrace above.
- 6) A new second-story addition is proposed at the rear of the property adjacent to Gwinnett Street. It will be the same height, material, and roof profile as the existing two-story structure beyond.
- 7) Windows and doors on the rear/side addition on Gwinnett Street are to be casement, single-light fixed and double-hung sash windows and doors by Marvin. They have single lights with no muntins manufactured by Marvin, Clad Magnum Series. Street level windows and pedestrian doors will be covered with a decorative metal grille as shown on the plans. A metal canopy on a wood frame is proposed over the entrance.
- 8) Replace the existing garage door facing Gwinnett Street with a "shiplap wood siding" overhead garage door. The finish is to match the restored doors.
- 9) Install lighting. Projecting fixtures and flush mounted up/down lighting are indicated on the elevations. Figures are to be black. The up/down lighting will be turned off when the neon is on.

### **BACKGROUND:**

The building at 720-722 Habersham was built ca. 1888 as a residential duplex. In 1911, the downstairs of 722 was converted into a commercial use. This confectionary operated until 1920, when George and Basil Leopold opened a fruit store in the building with a dwelling upstairs. Between 1931 and 1934, the building was remodeled to reflect its present appearance. The windows were replaced and a brick veneer, Colonial Revival style storefront with pressed metal cornice, wood frame plate glass display windows, and Carrerra glass bulkheads were added along Habersham and Gwinnett Streets. 1932 was the first year the City Directory listed Leopold's as offering "fruits and confections" marking the expansion of the business into the ice cream/soda shop business. By 1934, the soda shop business is the sole business on the premises. This continued until the 1970's when it closed and other businesses occupied the space.

The building was listed on the Historic Building Map in October 2007 because, "it is 119 years old and served as a popular soda and ice cream shop for generations of Savannahians. It is an excellent example of a corner store/residence and retains many of the original features."

### **FINDINGS:**

The property is zoned B-N (Neighborhood-Business) in the location of the existing building and the portion of the parcel to the north is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). The lot extends approximately 131 feet along Habersham Street and 73 feet on Gwinnett Street (9,563 SF). The applicant is proposing to reestablish the commercial use for Leopold's Ice Cream on the ground floor

with an undetermined use on the upper floors. **Residential use is not allowed in the B-N zoning district. In addition, parking and curb cuts for the redevelopment must be provided and indicated on the site plan.**

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

**(k)(1) Preservation of historic structures within the historic district.** An historic structure...visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs, shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto... In considering proposals for the exterior alterations of historic structures in the historic district and in applying the development standards, the documented original design of the structure may be considered.

*Staff recommends approval of the neon banding and removal of the corner store entry. Photo documentation from the time of Leopold's occupation of the building (beginning in 1932) indicates that the corner entrance was not original to the commercial ground floor. At that time, the building featured side entrances on both Gwinnett and Habersham Streets within the storefront. The original neon sign was approved for reinstallation by the Board in April 2008.*

**(l)(10) Roofs.** Roof decks and pergolas shall only be visible from the rear elevation. Roofs visible from a street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile, or asphalt shingles.

*Staff recommends approval of the roof replacement with clarification. Plans show walls beyond the cornice on the second floor but not in elevation. Please clarify if these will rise above the cornice or not; if so provide material and elevation. The pitch of the roof is low and thus the proposed roofing material will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.*

**(l)(9) Windows.** Residential windows facing a street shall be double- or triple-hung, casement or Palladian. Double-glazed windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction... All windows facing a street...shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.

*Provide verification of the three inch recess within the masonry walls. The Marvin Clad Magnum Series window appears to meet the standards as they are wood clad and have no muntins. The windows facing the street do not have a 5:3 ratio but are designed to be gable accent windows.*

**(l)(12) Additions.** Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure. Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building.

*The standard is met. The addition is on the rear and does not compromise the integrity of the historic structure.*

**(I)(14) Lanes and carriage houses.** Overhead garage doors shall not be used on street fronts, adjacent to sidewalk, unless they are detailed to resemble gates.

*The standard is met. The overhead garage door is located on a more contemporary façade and as such the proposed shiplap wood overhead door is appropriate and similar to the existing (original) garage door.*

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

*Plans indicate rooftop equipment but it is unclear if this will be screened. Clarify location of electric/gas/water meters and refuse storage.*

**Colors:**

Roofing: Sandstone  
Siding: White Swan  
Fascia/Trim: King’s Canyon Grey  
Windows: Burmese Beige  
Storefront: Black  
Doors: Reuse existing historic doors. Historic photos show double-hinged doors on Gwinnett Street and a single wider door on Habersham Street. Both have a high level of transparency.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with the condition that the up/down lighting be eliminated in view of the proposed projecting light fixtures, neon sign, and neon banding and the following details to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval:**

- 1) Revised site plan showing the required parking spaces, trash enclosure, and electrical meters. (1 per 200 sq. ft. of leasable commercial space.)**
- 2) Provide information on canopy frame material on Gwinnett Street facade.**

**Mr. Steffen** asked about the information regarding the canopy frame material on the Gwinnett Street façade.

**Ms. Ward** stated that it was noted on the drawings but was misnumbered.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the only concern was the site plan and the parking.



**Ms. Ward** stated that Staff felt comfortable that it could be brought back to them.

**Dr. Henry** asked about the parking.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the Review Board would not look at parking. She said they would look at screened parking, putting in a fence, and making sure that the plan was consistent with what was required in the development standards. They didn't look at the paving or the surface.

**Dr. Henry** asked who would review the parking.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the City of Savannah would in the Site Plan Review process. She said they look at stormwater, park and tree requirements, etc., and that it would be reviewed, but was not within the Review Board's purview.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Trace Tarel (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay)** stated that the proposed drawing on Page A8 had a line that continued out because the parapet line was starting to lean and they wanted to shore it up to give it more stability. She said the equipment would be behind the wall and could not be seen from the street. They showed the details of the windows and said that they would meet the historic criteria.

**Dr. Nichols** asked about their plans for parking.

**Ms. Tarel** stated that it would need to be worked out when the owner figures out what the second floor use would be. She said the reason for going forward with the permit was to get the building structure repaired. The existing condition was that the entire back of the building behind the parapet had collapsed. There are three roofs that had all collapsed and there was additional structure that was moving. There was a huge parking lot at Kroger's and she did not know if they needed parking.

**Mr. Scott** stated that they would be able to work out the parking by grandfathering it in with the pre-existing use. However, the lot was not included with the building and any parking with the building would have to be developed. He said if the parking was developed then they would have to go to Site Plan Review for the surface material that would be allowed. It could be done at a later date, but when the customers come and they decide to start parking on their own on the lot, then it would be an issue. From a zoning enforcement standpoint they would have to develop the lot.

**Dr. Nichols** asked what the applicant was planning to do with the parking situation because it had not been used as parking in the past.

**Mr. Stratton Leopold (Owner)** stated that the use of the building would be primarily for ice cream manufacturing. He said the retail portion would not be what they have downtown, but a tiny place to pick up a quart of ice cream with no soda fountains, tables, etc., and it would hopefully mitigate the parking. Over 30 plus years ago he received permission from the Board to put up the vinyl siding which has been there for years. He wanted to insulate behind it and asked if he could take it down and put vinyl back up.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she believed it was in the fire district and vinyl siding was not allowed in a fire district.

**Mr. Leopold** stated that the petition was made 32 years ago and the Saseen building on Habersham and Oglethorpe Streets had vinyl. He discovered that there were a number of buildings that had it, based his petition with that Board, and it was approved then. He said he did not know if it had changed in 32 years.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she knew that vinyl siding was not allowed in a fire district and was not sure of the extent of the boundaries of the fire district.

**Ms. Ward** stated that they could keep what existed, but that once it was taken down and changes were made then normally it wouldn't be approved. Particularly if they planned to go through the tax credit process with the State Historic Preservation Office.

**Mr. Leopold** stated that it was not eligible. He said when Mr. Bob Ciucevich went through the building they had to leave certain elements in to keep the building from falling down. They put in about seven or eight beams to jack it up and a lot of what Mr. Ciucevich suggested they leave to qualify was no longer there. It was a function of saving the building.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the condition that a revised parking plan be reviewed by Staff. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects  
Eugene M. Maria  
H-08-4012-2  
210 Whitaker Street  
PIN No. 2-0015-13-010  
New Construction/Design Details - Part II**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Paul Hansen.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part II Design Details of a three- and one-half story Sunday School Building for the Independent Presbyterian Church. The property is located at the southeast corner of Whitaker Street and Oglethorpe Lane with the primary façade fronting Whitaker.

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed building received approval for Part I, Height and Mass on July 9, 2008, with the condition that a more substantial entrance be provided on Whitaker Street, the size of the window openings be increased to meeting the 5:3 ratio, and that the amount of solid wall be reduced to keep the building in scale with neighboring historic structures.

Changes from the previous submittal include increasing the size of the ground floor windows and the arched windows in the gable. The windows have also been placed further apart. The ground floor base has been reduced by two feet with the entry extending over the height of the ground floor. The gabled dormers feature wood siding with a traditional gabled pediment and trim. The overall height and footprint are consistent with the Part I approval.

Comments from Site Plan Review were submitted by the city infrastructure departments and no changes were requested. The property is zoned B-C-1 (Central Business).

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Windows and Doors:</b> Double-glazed windows are permitted on new construction provided: the muntin is no wider than 7/8”; the profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash be wider than the meeting and top rails; and extrusions shall be covered with molding. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement, and top-story windows shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3; provided, however, nothing in this section precludes an arched window being used. The distance between windows shall not be less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a</p>	<p>Kolbe and Kolbe, Heritage Series, solid wood traditional double-hung windows with six-over-six simulated divided lights with 5/8” putty glazed (shaped) muntins and a spacer bar between the glass. Windows are recessed 4” from the façade.</p> <p>Windows are 6’ by 2’-8” [elevations indicate 6 by 3].</p>	<p>Clarify the dimensions of the window opening. Must have a minimum vertical to horizontal ratio of 5:3 to meet the Board’s Part I approval and to meet the standards.</p> <p>Approval of the Kolbe and Kolbe window. They have been previously approved in the district and have proven to be compatible.</p>

<p>vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.</p>		
<p><b>Roof:</b> Hip roofs in excess of 8:12 pitch are permitted only where similar historic building roof pitch exists within the same block front. Roofs visible from a street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile, or asphalt shingles. The Board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.</p>	<p>Rubber shingles to simulate slate to correspond to existing slate roofs of the church. Exposed flashing will be copper. A stucco cap is proposed at the apex of the hip roof to screen the mechanical equipment.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p><b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:</b></p>	<p>The entrances have been changed from the previous submittal to a recessed arch opening on the lane and a recessed opening with an attached arched pediment on the Whitaker Street elevation. They both feature sidelights and a transom. A fanlight transom is proposed on the arched lane entry.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p><b>Materials and Texture:</b></p>	<p>Exterior Walls: Portland Cement Stucco, sand finish, on the exterior walls. The ground floor and the quoins are to be cast stone. Cast stone is also proposed for the arched pediment entry and the window lintels and sills. Dormers: Wood Siding. Trim: Painted PVC.</p>	<p>Staff recommends that the stucco have a smooth finish.</p>

<p><b>Color:</b></p>	<p>Roof: Charcoal to match existing IPC roof colors.                  Windows: Benjamin Moore Dove White.                  Stucco and Cast Stone: Colors are to be custom to match the existing IPC buildings.</p>	<p>Samples of stucco and cast stone colors are to be submitted to Staff for final approval.</p>
<p><b>Utilities and Refuse:</b>                  Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view. HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way. Refuse storage areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.</p>	<p>The HVAC mechanical equipment is proposed to be placed on the roof and screened with a low stucco coping.</p>	<p>Provide information on location of electric/gas meters and refuse storage area.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval upon clarification of the window size, location of the refuse storage area, and electrical equipment. Custom colors for the stucco and cast stone are to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Paul Hansen (Hansen Architects)** stated that the windows as designed would meet the criteria at a ratio of 3:5. He said the church had an existing enclosed trash location on the west side of the property in an existing parking lot and the trash would be taken there for disposal. There would not be an on-site need for a trash receptacle. The electric meter would be located in the lane and they would try to make it discrete. It would probably be all electric so they would not need gas service.

**Mr. Judson** asked about the texture of the exterior.

**Mr. Hansen** stated that before they would do any final work on the building they would bring the final samples of the stucco and paint colors to Staff for final approval.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Michael DeCook** asked where the heating and air would go behind the wall.

**Ms. Ward** showed Mr. DeCook where it would be located on the plans.

Mr. Hansen stated that there was a noise ordinance for downtown Savannah and they would meet the ordinance.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

Ms. Seiler stated that this project has been ongoing for a long time, that this was her third term on the Board, and they have done a very nice job on it. She said the Board was glad to see it finally come to fruition, the materials looked excellent, it would be a nice addition to the neighborhood, and the Board appreciated their patience with working with everyone.

Ms. Ramsay complimented the applicant on the redesign of the dormers.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler 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.

**RE: Petition of CNG Signs  
H-08-4018-2  
111 West Bay Street  
2-0004-13-001  
Sign**

This petition was continued due to the sign not being properly posted.

**RE: Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose Gonzalez  
H-08-4024-2  
13 East York Street  
PIN No. 2-0015-08-004  
Storefront Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Jose Gonzalez.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is replacing the existing solid front with a recessed angled glass storefront with ATM. Also the upper windows will be replaced with butt-jointed clear glass.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The existing building was built ca. 1955 by Helfrich Grantham and Helfrich.

2. The spirit of the style is being retained by keeping the cantilevered concrete slab canopy.
3. All glass will be butt-jointed (no vertical metal mullions) clear glass in brushed aluminum top, bottom, and side frames.
4. The floor of the recessed entry will be white Carrerra marble.
5. At the ATM and night deposit box butt-jointed white frosted glass will be used. This installation will be located at the far right of the façade.
6. The brick will be painted Mocha.
7. The handicap ramp is considered a sloped 1'-20' sidewalk and does not require a railing.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval**

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Judson** asked if the current glass wall was recessed three feet from the current wall.

**Mr. Gonzalez** answered yes. He pointed out the existing wall.

**Mr. Gay** stated that there was not a glass wall and that it would be weird.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that it spanned the current wall and there was no structural element because it spanned from side-to-side on the property.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he did not dislike the angled entry.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that the bank loved the angle but it was a function of getting one additional office space in the front section and nothing to do with the aesthetics.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that was her question also. She said that she liked the angled wall and hated to see it be lost.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that the bank hated to lose it as well. He said it was a function of program at the end.

**Mr. Steffen** asked where the bank was headquartered.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that they were out of Charleston.

Mr. Judson stated that either angled or straight it improved the space and it was much more inviting. He said that he walked down the block and thought it would be a much more inviting presence on the street.

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

**RE: Petition of William Bridges  
H-08-4028-2  
521 East Gaston Street  
PIN No. 2-0033-04-006  
Roof Repair/Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. William Bridges

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for rehabilitation and exterior alterations to the building at 521 East Gaston Street as follows:

- 1) Replace roof with new 30-year architectural shingles;
- 2) Reframe rear addition to tie into existing historic roof for a “salt-box” appearance; the corner board of the original building will be retained;
- 3) Repair windows;
- 4) Restore porch and remove iron columns and railings. Replace with wood chamfered columns and 2 by 2 square inch balusters. Retain foundation and resurface with brick veneer. Replace front stairs with wood stairs.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic residence at 521 East Gaston Street was constructed in 1891 and is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. The building has suffered from a lack of maintenance and is in need of repair. The rear addition has a sloped pitch that begins at the slope of the main body of the building and, as such, the request to tie into the existing would be similar to what is visible now from the west elevation. The east and south elevations are minimally visible from the right-of-way if at all. Colors and brick material are to be resubmitted to Staff for approval when they are determined by the owner.



**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval**

**Mr. Steffen** asked what was meant by the salt box appearance.

**Ms. Ward** stated that it was when you add an addition that continued off the main slope of the building. She said that with a lot of the additions that Staff asks for them to be placed under the existing roofline to further show it subordinate to the building and retain the corner board. Staff was recommending approval of the salt box appearance because it was almost like that already and it would be hard to tell.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with brick and colors to go back to Staff for approval. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-08-4030-2  
Northwest Corner of Barnard and Bryan Streets  
PIN No. 2-0016-01-004  
New Construction/Height and Mass Part I - Six-Story  
Office Building**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass of a six-story office building with ground floor commercial space on the northwest corner of Barnard and Bryan Streets fronting Ellis Square.

**FINDINGS:**

The property is zoned B-C-1 (Central-Business) and is currently vacant. A portion of the neighboring parking garage will be demolished and the property used for the current development, portions of which will contain a four-story structure and part of the six-story commercial – office building. New plans and elevations showing the east elevation and the entry for the parking garage must be submitted with the Part II, Design Details. A recombination subdivision plat will need to be submitted and approved prior to issuance of a building permit.

Comments from Site Plan Review (SPR) were submitted by the City’s infrastructure departments. All departments have accepted the General Development plan with the two revisions needed below. These revisions should be shown on the final plans submitted for HDRB approval:

- 1) Traffic Engineering, Cindy Coddington: Handi-cap ramps for Bay Lane, Barnard Street, and Bryan Street will need to be shown on the Specific Development Plan.
- 2) Streets Maintenance, Carey Purvis: 1) Show ADA ramp locations; 2) Improvements on north side of Bay Lane are on a separate parcel. Is this going to be on a separate plan?

Staff’s comments on the proposed project and the standards are provided in full in the table below. In summary, Staff is recommending that the applicant eliminate the recesses within the façade as they are atypical of adjacent contributing buildings and commercial buildings in the Historic District. Staff also recommends that the applicant integrate the projecting arcaded bay into the overall mass and design of the four-story portion of the building and allow the 30-foot plane to be continuous and parallel to the street.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p><b>Development Standards:</b> No setbacks, maximum lot coverage or parking are required in B-C-1 zone.</p>	<p>The building extends to the property line on both Barnard and Bryan Street with recesses (4’ by 2’, 20’ by 4’, and 30’ by 13’) and a curved recesses corner entrance fronting the square.</p>	<p>The standards are met.</p>
<p><b>Street Elevation Type:</b> A proposed building on an east-west connecting street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front or on an immediately adjacent tithing or trust block.</p>	<p>Six-story office building with commercial space on the ground floor.</p>	<p>There are no historic buildings within the block front. Immediately adjacent trust and tithing blocks feature historic buildings that are built to the property line for the full height of the building, typically divided by storefronts and fenestration into 60’ and 30’ increments. The historic portion of the Inn at Ellis Square across Bay Lane is a tall four-story building that occupies the entire lot for the full height of the building with slight (inches) recesses in the center portions of the building which are continuous for 60+ feet to accentuate the corners of the building.</p>

<p><b>Entrances:</b> A building on an east-west connecting street fronting a square shall have entrances at intervals not to exceed 50’.</p>	<p>A corner entrance and side entrances on Bryan and Barnard Streets are proposed at approximately 50’ intervals.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Building Height:</b> Six-story height zone. Minimum commercial floor-to-floor heights: 14’-6” on the ground floor; 12’ on the second floor; 10 feet on the floors above.</p>	<p>Six-stories with a four-story portion on the west side with an overall height of +/- 75 feet. Floor-to-floor heights are 16’ for the ground floor, 12’ for floors two through six with a 3’-8” parapet.</p>	<p>The standards are met. The previous approval for a building on this site was for a six story building with 12’ floor-to-floor heights.</p>
<p><b>Tall Building Principles:</b> The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60’ in width with each section taller than it is wide. Buildings greater than four stories in height shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15’ nor more than 20’ in width. Buildings greater than 60’ in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances.</p> <p><b>Large-Scale Development:</b> Large-scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plan exceeds 60 feet in width.</p>	<p>The building has numerous recesses and setbacks along the sidewalk edge with no wall plane exceeding 20 feet in width.</p> <p>The building features a base middle and top defined by materials, band coursing and a cornice below the top floor.</p>	<p>Eliminate the two 4’ recesses adjacent to the corner entrance and extend the glass corner element for the full 30’ section. Eliminate the 20’ wide recesses within the two 60’ sections on the Barnard and Bryan Street facades to be more consistent with historic building forms in the ward. Eliminate the 5’ wide 17’ deep recesses on the four-story section on Bryan Street. The multiple recesses within the facade are incongruous with the historic building pattern in the Historic District – especially within the intense commercial districts surrounding Ellis Square. The building should meet the sidewalk and define the edge of the property on all sides. Historically lots were 60’ wide and were then subdivided into sections, usually within the same plane. This is a commercial building; recessed balconies are typically not found as a major design component of office buildings within the district. Balconies on the old Savannah Hotel are recessed; however, the building plane is not. This is also similar to the Federal Post Office building on which balconies project forward of the building plane.</p>

<p><b>Commercial Design Standards:</b> The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront. The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature...The height of the first story shall be not less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single-story above the first. The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story. Retail storefront glazing shall be not less than 55 percent...storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18"-24" base of contrasting material, to the lintel. Storefront glazing in subdivided sashes shall be inset a minimum of 4" from the face of the building provided, however, that continuously glazed storefronts may be flush with the face of the building. Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, and Carrerra glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system; bronze glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront.</p>	<p>The ground floor is for an "urban market" or commercial use. Palladian window groupings comprise the storefront on Barnard Street, Bryan Street, and Bay Lane. Double-door entrances and side lights are proposed on the Barnard and Bryan Streets facades. A full glass storefront is at the northeast corner entrance and on the four-story portion to the west. The storefront on the western portion consists of a projecting two-story arcade that is 20' wide and 17' deep with side brick columns extending further back from the plane of the building wall.</p>	<p>The proposed Palladian storefront is not typical of the historic district and is not appropriate on a commercial ground floor in this urban setting. Extend the corner storefront the full 30' of the portion of the building at Barnard and Bryan Streets eliminating the 8' section and 4' recess on each side. The single double-hung window is out of place with the commercial ground floor. Eliminate the projecting arcade portion on the western end and allow the 30' plane to be continuous and parallel to the street (i.e., flush). As in the corner portion, more glass could be incorporated, instead of independent window openings, to distinguish this portion from the rest of the building. The arcade is in keeping with the functionality of the building but it should be integrated into the overall mass and design of the building and exist on the same plane parallel to the street and not appear as an appendage.</p>
<p><b>Exterior Walls:</b> On lots less than 60 feet in width the front façade shall be constructed so as to form a continuous plane parallel to the street. Bays and porches attached to such elevation may project streetward of the plane.</p>	<p>The building is sited on a 90' by 120' lot. It is divided into 30' and 60' wide sections. Each of those sections has recesses within the building plane.</p>	<p>Although the building is sited on a lot that extends more than 60' in width, this standard should apply to the sections of the building that are broken into 60' wide or less divisions to form a wall of continuity at the street.</p>

<p><b>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:</b> 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 visually related.</p>	<p>The building can be divided into two sections: the main six-story portion of the building at the corner; and the four-story portion to the west. The four-story portion is approximately 56' tall and 30' wide with a 20' wide central bay and 5' wide solid walls on either side. The six-story portion is 79'-8" tall divided into 60' wide sections with a 30' wide corner portion divided into 4', 8', and 18' wide bays.</p>	<p>Eliminate the recesses and projections from the four-story section and make the 30' wide section of the building flush, reinforcing the Oglethorpe Plan. Eliminate the 4' wide recess and 8' wide window portion near the corner entrance to allow the 30' wide storefront portion of the building to meet the street and define the sidewalk edge while eliminating a large solid recess within the wall and extending the glass storefront area.</p>
<p><b>Proportion of Openings:</b> 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 the structure is visually related. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3; provided, however, nothing in this section precludes an arched window being used.</p>	<p>Independent window openings are both 8' tall by 3' wide and 6' tall by 3' wide. Corner window openings are used on the projecting bay to the west.</p>	<p>The standard is met for the six-story portion of the building. The sixth floor openings could be reduced in height to further distinguish the upper floor from the lower levels.</p> <p>Eliminate the recess on the four-story section on the south facade. Reduce the flanking brick columns and reconfigure the four window openings on each floor to relieve the compact spacing of the windows.</p>
<p><b>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</b> The relationship of solids to voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>There are a high number of voids-to-solids within the street fronting facades. There are no openings within the 17' recess where the six-story section meets the four-story section on Bryan Street. A number of different shaped and sized storefront, balcony window, corner window, and French door openings are proposed.</p>	<p>Provide more consistency in window configuration, pattern and storefront. Eliminate the 17' recess on Bryan Street; if the Board determines that the recess is compatible, window openings should be introduced on the wall perpendicular to the street.</p>

<p><b>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</b> 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 visually related.</p>	<p>There is no open space between the proposed building and the neighboring parking garage.</p>	<p>The standard is met. Historic structures within the ward are built adjacent to one another with no open space.</p>
<p><b>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, and Balconies:</b> The relationship of entrances, porch projections, and walkways to structures shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are visually related.</p>	<p>The projecting arcade on the four-story portion of the building is 20' wide 17' deep. 5' wide 4' deep recesses are on either side of the façade beyond the arcade. Recessed balconies on the Bryan and Barnard Streets facades are proposed and at the corner portion on the second, third, and sixth floors. The sixth floor balcony projects from the building plane approximately 2'.</p>	<p>See above discussion on balconies in the Commercial Design Standards. Allow the 30' wide portion to the west to read as such. 30' is a typical building division within the district although usually not set back 17' +/- from the lot line, especially within the commercial districts.</p>
<p><b>Roof Shape:</b> The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>The roof appears to be a flat roof behind a parapet wall. Gabled pediments over the sixth story balconies/porches are located on the 60' wide central section of the Barnard and Bryan Streets facades.</p>	<p>Simplify the parapet walls by eliminating the ornamental railing and the Greek Revival style pediment and entablature. Parapets in the ward are typically continuous in height and material for the duration of the building with the Inn at Ellis Square having gabled and hipped corner elements, which are more subdued than the proposed pediments. Continue the modern approach evident in the curved corner section throughout the building eliminating the Federal style and Greek Revival style elements that conflict.</p>
<p><b>Scale:</b></p>	<p>The scale of the building is six-stories with a four-story portion to the west. A large amount of void within the masonry façade mitigates the scale of the building.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

**Mr. Gay** asked if they were supposed to be considering the Height and Mass because Staff was going through the entire design.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the roof shape and openings were part of Height and Mass. She said that the mass included all of the window openings, the recess, the balconies, porch projections, and the roof.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the number and size of the window openings were part of Height and Mass.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of **Part I, Height and Mass** with the following condition:

**Eliminate the two 4' wide recesses adjacent to the corner entrance, and extend the glass corner element for the full 30' section. Eliminate the 20' wide recesses within the two 60' sections with balconies to be more consistent with historic building forms in the ward and reinforce the 60' lot rhythm along Bryan and Barnard Streets. Balconies should be integrated into the façade without recessing the building plane. Integrate the projecting arcaded bay into the overall mass and design of the four-story portion of the building and allow the 30' plane to be continuous and parallel to the street (i.e., flush). If the board approves the 17' recess, window openings should be incorporated on the west façade of the six-story section where the exterior wall is perpendicular to Bryan Street.**

Staff recommends that other comments be taken into consideration for **Part II, Design Details:**

- 1. Replace the Palladian storefront with more glazing.**
- 2. Provide more consistency in window configuration, pattern, and storefront.**
- 3. Simplify the parapet walls by eliminating the pediment and the ornamental railing.**
- 4. Reduce the amount of brick on the four-story portion and reconfigure the fenestration; perhaps use more glass to reinforce the 30' rhythm.**
- 5. Submit plans and elevations for the affected area of the parking garage with Part II, Design Details.**
- 6. Address comments from Site Plan Review in the revised site plan for Part II.**

**Mr. Gay** stated that he presumed that taking away the parking in the garage, while it was not under the Board's purview, has been looked into and that it was okay.

**Ms. Ward** stated that it was not received as a comment at the Site Plan Review.

**Dr. Henry** stated that he was not sure about Staff's recommendation.

**Ms. Ward** stated that they were recommending the western portion of the building not be recessed 17 feet, but rather be brought up to the street. She said if the Board found that it was compatible to have the

recesses then Staff would recommend that they have windows in the wall perpendicular to the street to be consistent with Downtown Master Plan recommendations to provide transparency at the street.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay)** stated that the corner no longer had the Daybreak Restaurant because it was demolished to facilitate two previously approved designs for the corner. He said that the owner decided not to move forward with those uses and it was brought back and approved as a condominium project. It covered one 60-foot-wide lot. A portion of the existing parking garage would be demolished to give enough footprint to make an office. Part of the reason why the previous project proved economically unfeasible was by the time you subtracted two fire stair towers, two elevators, and some of the other mechanicals with a 60 by 90-foot lot, there was not enough left to carry the load. By going to two lots there was enough. The only difference between the two previously approved designs, one as a condominium and another luxury hotel, was that the floor-to-floor height for the luxury condominiums needed to have higher ceilings.

The entire project was in a B-C-1 zone and there was no parking requirement. The owner intended to replace some of the parking on another piece of property that was adjacent to the parking deck site. They have also discussed with the City of Savannah about having access to some of the parking garage space because hotel customers generally park in those spaces at night, and office and retail customers park during the day. The part of the parking deck that could be seen when coming out of City Market after turning left would be demolished, and the new building would start and go all the way to the side. There was an expansion joint in the existing building that moved about three-quarters of an inch during the construction of the Ellis Square parking garage, badly damaging the structure enough to have to remove that portion of the building.

He displayed the pedestrian level of the project with existing City Market streetscapes, Ellis Square that would have sidewalks, and the area where the elevators and public restrooms would be and said that they would be connections at street level. Someone coming out of City Market and heading into Ellis Square looking to the left would see the building rather than the end of the parking garage. Part of the concept was to resolve an anomaly, which was that the entrance to the hotel was on the lane. There was no opportunity on Bay Street to have the entrance on street level without backing up traffic. It worked well for the hotel but the first experience for people coming out of the hotel would be the lane. They would like to extend the experience through the subject property connecting with Ellis Square and City Market. The connection would be glazed and at night the corridor would be closed off around midnight and not part of the public realm.

When they did the massing it needed to be tall and as solid as possible to stand in direct contrast to the big void of Ellis square, and needed to be something that was highly articulated with a lot of architecture; not something that was a box with franchise detailing. He pointed out the entrances for pedestrians at street level and said that it would be a very permeable building with a lot of glass and something seen from that square that would hopefully invite people in. The galleria space was a two-story corridor space that went from one side of the block to the other, and the massing steps down from the six stories at an allowed ordinance height to four stories to mitigate the transition down to what would remain of the existing parking garage. It would also mitigate the difference between the sections of the two- and three-story portions of the existing buildings in City Market.



He said that being next to Ellis Square, the building would become the premium outdoor space in the downtown area and they would like to incorporate landscape into the architecture but did not have a lot of site to give up. They would like to have a rooftop garden on top of the fourth floor, street trees, and for the projecting element to have a trellis over top of the glass covered with Wisteria so there would be beautiful flora in the Spring, Summer, and Fall; and in the Winter all the leaves would fall off and allow for sunlight to penetrate. The areas above the arches they would like to have trained with ivy to draw the green into the concept of the design.

The materials for the building were all masonry; cast stone and brick on all four sides of the building with no stucco. He said that one of the primary objectives of the new revised guidelines was that more noble materials be used and the owner was willing to use durable masonry materials on the entire building. When the round corner is looked at in elevation with 30 feet of glass it seems to make sense, but when looked at from the corner it was no longer a solid building with a glass corner but a glass building with some facades of brick. It would not have been obvious by the elevations and the reason why they decided to do a three dimensional view. They thought that it read as a solid building with very animated and interesting voids incorporated into the design.

**Mr. Gay** stated that Ms. Ward was talking the bottom floor having glass.

**Mr. Shay** stated that there was a lot of discussion about the setbacks and glazing at the street, and if they were talking about still allowing the level of articulation and some of the detailing used to break up the mass on the upper floors, it was something more palpable from an architectural standpoint. What that means is that at street level only the doors would be pushed forward and the element that was mostly brick with a window in it would be mostly glass. They also looked at pushing the glazed part forward to be in line with what the recessed entrance was before. He hesitated to give up some areas because they would like to include some water and have green plants grow out of the water to envelope the projecting arcade. If they brought the wall of the building forward all the way, then it would all be interior space and not as interesting. Having the mass tucked back a little and the entrance projected forward it reads more clearly as an entrance, but if it was the opinion of the Board that they needed to have the glazing pushed forward then they would like to set it back from the columns. He said that they did a calculation and the existing ground floor was about 64.2 percent glass if measured by width, it counted against it to have the area up there, and they were probably below the standards now. By the time they added glass then they would meet the standards.

He said that on the upper floors it was alright for the building to move in and out to break up the articulation because the standard states that buildings 60 feet wide or less should be in one plane. This building was not 60 feet wide or less but a large-scale building and they tried to figure out how to give up floor area to make an articulated building with an articulated floor plan on the upper level. They had no problem adding windows or restudying the window pattern, but they strongly believed that stepping the mass down from six to four, stepping the upper floors back, and projecting the entrance forward was what they wanted to do to make it read clearly from the square at the entrance turning left coming out of City Market.

Regarding the porch projections, the earlier designs were presented the way Staff preferred with a continuous railing so that the façade plane was continued across the area and the windows were punched back more like the Federal Courthouse building. He did not have a problem with it but the massing read

more vertical and the mass was wider than it was taller. They liked having the vertical elements that added shadow lines dividing the massing into three segments; 60 feet wide in the center and 30 feet on each end. If it was a deal breaker and the Board wanted to see the balconies continue to create a horizontal line that contradicted the vertical they were interested in setting, they had already done it and it would give an idea that there would be four instead of one.

The pediment in the parapet was a deal breaker because they had been before the Board twice, projects were approved, and it had not come up before. He said that Staff started by showing a building of a tavern on the corner with a round Victorian element from 1947 that had a pediment in the middle of the block in the roofline. The only building that the standards referred to in the ward was the Guggenheimer building which did not just have the element in the cornice of the high part but it was also in the middle, there was a pediment, and flag poles. They thought the building needed to have a very distinctive top; a place where the person who rented it would feel heroic and it was an appropriate expression for that area. It was more of a detail than a Height and Mass issue, but if they were to draw a line in the sand, then he wanted to step across the line whether it was given to him today or if he had to come back and fight for it again.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he thought the project was interesting and really well thought out. He stated that he understood after having seen the drawings, the night view, and the purpose for it. The gallery or the atrium space being created made sense as a recessed area now that he understood that it was for people to walk through, to be used as a passageway, and a focus of the building. At the same time, he agreed with Staff that they should create more glass for the windows that were above the space so that it tied in with the element on the other side. It looked small and odd the way it was now and with that change it would make sense. He felt the same about the vertical recesses now that the purpose had been explained and they made more sense. He agreed with Staff that recessing the balconies made more sense especially with the night view, and it would be an important change. He hated to hear the phrase “deal breaker”, he did not have an objection to the pediment itself, and agreed that whoever rented the top floor should have a distinctiveness to it, but was not convinced that the Greek Revival theme made sense in this location. To him it did not internally agree with the glass structures being created, especially at night, but he would like to see a different type of design. He might be the only one thinking it but it didn't seem to go with the area and the square.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked why the cast stone veneer did not extend all the way around the bottom floor. She said that typically if there was a different material like that it would horizontally go all the way around the first floor. In classical tradition it would not be done showing the entire face with the same material.

**Mr. Shay** stated that what he wanted to do was accent the 60-foot-wide center mass. He said that for Design Details he did not object to using cast stone throughout the base, it was shown on the lane elevation, and they were willing to study it on a detail level, but wasn't sure that it was a Height and Mass issue.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she agreed with Mr. Steffen regarding the pediment, especially with the Palladian window elements that she had a problem with on the ground floor. She asked if the doors on the arcade entrance were 15 feet high and if they slide.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they telescoped so that in the daytime they were flat and the whole space would be opened. He said at nighttime they would fold to a flat glass.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked about the window types of 2/2, 1/1, and one light fixed, and said that on the rounded element there were storefront windows. She asked why several different types were used.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they wanted to add a variety and follow the spirit of the guidelines by making as many distinctions as possible. He said there was no problem with using fewer types of windows. He was enamored at the size of the windows in the centerpiece, they were very large windows and would have lights incorporated into them. He pointed out a human-scale window, an oversized window, and a space inside of the window that was intended to be a light shelf to allow the southern light to reflect into the office. If they didn't want so many different types he would like to have something less on one end so that it would read as a classic void between two solids.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that it appeared as three different buildings and she was trying to make it seem like one building with articulation. She said that the destruction of the Oglethorpe plan bothered her because the tithing lot had a tremendous building and the trust lot buildings all around were two- and three-story and then there was this six-story building on a tithing lot. She said that she had gone through this before on the First African Baptist Church.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it was six stories on the height map.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she would have liked to have seen the fourth story on the end so that there was some recognition of it being a tithing lot rather than seeming less important than the trust lot.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the Oglethorpe plan was the plan of the streets and the Chadbourne plan was the plan that came from Cambridge. He said the corner was something that needed to be addressed with a monumental solid building, and that there was an allowance of a six-story building on the opposite side of the corner. They stepped back and the corner was now a porch with a roof and would have a lit cornice, but that was not going to happen.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that if he came with a six-story building on a trust lot then she would be happy because there was a balance of trust and tithing lots.

**Mr. Judson** stated that Mr. Shay did a good job of illustrating what they were trying to do with the building, he understood the atrium pass through element to the far left along Bryan Street, but with all respect to Staff he agreed that it should be recessed to make it more inviting. He said he was intrigued to see what kind of water and foliage treatment would go in there. He agreed with Staff about the tall four-foot recesses and understood the intention to use them for streetscape. He asked if the consideration about the corner glass being extended on the floor level was not an issue.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he did not have a problem with taking the small window coming down to the base and making it larger to read as a storefront. He said he did not want it to be pure glass like a curtain wall but it could be a different and larger window type.

**Mr. Judson** stated that he agreed with the other five stories changing the feeling of the building considerably. He said that he was wondering if something with a semi-circle form as the pediment might be more in keeping with the design elements.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that was his exact thought. He said especially when it would be seen at night with the curved corner element, that if it could be captured in the pediment with glass or metal that it would tie the building together and not create internal confusion.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they would be willing to restudy it.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that they agreed with Staff comments, especially the recommendation to simplify the parapet wall and minimize the recesses. The Architectural Review Committee (ARC) felt that the Greek Revival elements were out of character with the modern cylindrical tower, and that it could be simplified with the elimination of some of the recesses. HSF has consistently voiced concern over the Greek Revival pediment on all three of the submittals.

**Ms. Trace Tarel (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay)** stated that as an architectural study there was a pattern that forms in every element that was ever designed. She said that two parallel lines were just two lines that gave direction. Two circles would give two points. One of the highest ways to get a good architectural design was to give lines and circles because it created two things that weren't the same speaking to one another and was a very basic rule of thumb in proportions that architects look for. Even the people who had the building long ago were thinking of it because there was an arch which was a circular form with a line, and in this case there was an arch with a line. The corner where material was being removed from had a line and a curve and that was what this was about; a line and a circle.

**HDRB ACTION:** **Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the following five conditions to go back to Staff for further review:**

- 1. Increase the glass on the four-story portion of the building;**
- 2. Extend the glass elements on the ground floor at the corner and on the Palladian storefronts;**
- 3. Punch the balconies into the façade as opposed to being extended;**
- 4. Provide further articulation to the galleria entry walls where the six-story portion meets the four-story portion; and**
- 5. Restudy the design of the pediment at the roof.**

**Mr. Judson seconded the motion. Ms. Ramsay was opposed. The motion passed 6 to 1.**

**Mr. Shay** stated that they were willing to restudy it, but he was not promising anything. He said that he had to make a piece of architecture out of it at the end.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that if the elements would go back to Staff there could be a resolution.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he needed to make a decision with the client tonight whether they would be back in a month or two months. He asked Mr. Steffen to repeat number four.

**Mr. Steffen** stated to provide further articulation to the galleria entry walls. He said that what he was referring to was a serious comment that if they left the opening to the four-story element recess that it was indicated that the window opening should be incorporated on the west façade of the six-story section and he agreed with it.

**Dr. Watkins** asked if that would address the last component that Staff was discussing regarding the 17-foot recess.

**Mr. Steffen** answered yes and said it was the fourth condition.

**RE: Petition of Marchese Construction  
Joe Marchese  
H-08-4031-2  
322 East Broughton Street  
PIN No. 2-0004-41-003  
Exploratory Demolition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Joe Marchese.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for exploratory demolition/excavation of non-historic elements of the interior and exterior of the Berrien House at 322 East Broughton Street as provided in the attached scope. The request focuses on the removal of non-historic intrusions that obscure historic and structural elements. Small sections of exterior plaster will be removed to determine the location and condition of historic siding beneath. All chimneys, structural walls, wood lathe, interior historical features (wainscoating, plaster moldings, base boards), doors, windows, casings, wood flooring, and stairs are to remain.

**BACKGROUND:**

The historic building at 322 East Broughton Street was originally constructed c. 1795 and is one of the oldest surviving buildings in Savannah. It is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District and has been through several modifications that have gained historical significance in their own period (1850 and 1917). The building has suffered from lack of maintenance and neglect for a number of years, and is in urgent need of repair and stabilization due to the significance of the property and the level of deterioration.

The building was originally constructed c. 1795 for Major John Berrien in the Federal style possibly designed by Adrian Boucher. It was a three and one-half story wood frame residence atop a masonry garden level with a high stoop entrance. The earliest detailing of the building's history can be found in the interior moldings, wainscoting, doors, casings, and original beaded clapboard which are still evident on the rear wall where the original porch was later enclosed. The building was modified ca. 1850, and evidence of this is mostly found on the second floor or the original parlor level. At this time Greek Revival elements were added and the single residence was divided into two, with two separate entries at the parlor level. By 1900 the ground floor was being used for commercial services. Around 1919 the ground floor was raised to feature 13-foot +/- ceilings with a formal storefront on Broughton Street. At some point the upper floor entrances were converted into windows the wood clapboard was covered with stucco and the internal chimneys and fireplaces were removed.

MPC Staff, along with Lise Sundrla, Executive Director of the Savannah Development Renewal Authority (SDRA), and Cassie Dolecki, Preservation Information Specialist at Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) toured the building with the applicant, Joe Marchese, on July 30, 2008. Many alterations to the interior appear to have been undertaken in the 1950s, possibly when the shoe repair shop remodeled the ground floor and installed wood paneling, drop ceilings, partitions, carpeting, and new subflooring. It is most likely that at this time the historic plaster in the upper floors was either removed or covered with a 3/8-inch plywood board and batten.

In 2007, some minor stabilization work was done, the roof repaired, sheathing put on the west elevation, and the openings boarded.

### **FINDINGS:**

The proposed exploratory work is Phase I of a larger project to restore the building for the new owner, Queensborough National Bank to make it their office headquarters. Due to the number of modifications made over the years, it is necessary to remove some of the non-historic building material to ascertain the condition and the location of historic fabric that remains. Staff intends to work closely with the applicant on any discoveries or stabilization efforts that need to be documented or undertaken during this period. Once this phase is complete, plans for the rehabilitation will be submitted to the Board for review.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

#### **Approval**

**Mr. Gay** asked what they were going to do with the first floor.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the Queensborough National Bank bought it and they plan to occupy the building as their headquarters. She said they may lease out some of the spaces and not use the whole building.

**Mr. Gay** stated that on the Habersham Street side there was a massive brick façade on the first floor that was ugly. He wondered if they would be on that side of the building.

**Ms. Ward** stated that it would all come back to the Board if they decided to punch in openings or even when they remove the stucco, and then the siding that was there could be seen as well as what they would replace. She said that it would all come back, but this was the first step to see what they had and how they need to move forward.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Joe Marchese (Marchese Construction)** stated that they were hired by the Queensborough National Bank who had taken the building in foreclosure. He said they were anticipating placing offices on the first floor, but that there was significant structural damage to the building because it had been struck by a car on the Habersham Street side. The other area of major concern was adjacent to the adjoining building where the stucco was bowed and precariously attached. They wanted to remove a three-foot-wide strip of stucco to temporarily board it with a four-foot sheet of plywood, then they would flash it on the way back up. The building was opened to the elements for approximately 20 years, and Historic Savannah Foundation placed temporary walls in the middle of the existing space to stabilize the roof so it wouldn’t cave in. They were seeking permission to do exploratory demolition to remove all of the intrusions into the building that had obscured the structure. The building had been terribly abused and it was delaminating in places. He displayed photographs of the interior and the deterioration that had taken place.

He said that they had two structural engineering firms inspect it and they couldn’t give any recommendations until some of the things obscuring the view were removed. The building was a layer cake with the first layer being from 1917 when the building was raised, the second layer was from the 1850’s, and the third was the attic layer from 1796. The major areas of concern were the back corner and the Habersham Street side where one of the structural columns was damaged.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the stucco had been removed on the east side of the building toward the top and you could see the wood exterior. He said that they might be able to get an idea of what was there from looking at that.

**Mr. Marchese** answered yes and said that they replaced the Tyvek on that area to keep the water from intruding because there was water damage.

**Mr. Gay** stated that since it was a bank he assumed the high stoop was not coming back.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that at this point he could not answer the question. He said that they were the general contracting firm that was doing selective exploratory demolition to make a recommendation so that they could bring in an architect and a structural engineer.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if there were other historic buildings they had done exploratory demolition to in Savannah.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that they had done nothing in Savannah. He said that he was from Boston, Massachusetts, and had worked on two older houses from the 1800’s. He worked for a general contracting firm who mostly did new construction and interior office renovations. This would be the first structure of this type.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if they have removed stucco from wood siding.

**Mr. Marchese** answered no. He said that he had never seen a building where the stucco had been there as long as this had. From the inside they could determine that some of the clad boards were existing but it was hard to see. Originally, the house had no stucco because it was all hand-hewn wide boards with wallpaper. They had been in contact with Mr. Jim and HSF but they just wanted to make structural repairs because the building was in dire need of being strengthened. The repairs HSF performed were temporary because they did not address any of the problems, but the repairs kept it from collapsing further.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that one of the things Ms. Ward pointed out was that George Washington actually stayed at Mr. Berrien's father's house and there was a strong possibility that George Washington came to Savannah and visited this house.

**Mr. Marchese** stated yes that it was a possibility. He said that he was a third generation licensed general contractor in Massachusetts before relocating to Savannah and that his father was a general contractor and builder, his grandfather was a brick mason and plasterer, that he had grown up in the trades, and he was familiar with wood lathe. He stated that he would like to see a picture of the chimney from 2000 because there was no evidence of the entire chimney. There were two chimneys on the east and west side of the house that were encased in the building.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she understood the mantels were in existence out on the Isle of Hope on a map.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that the reeding, rope molding, and some items on the third level were phenomenal, they understood the significance of the project, and were careful in what they do.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the Board had comfort in the fact that they would try to get historic credits and could not stray too far from what was there from the beginning.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that there should be a color package of 60 photos to show what was going on in all of the rooms. He said that the blue color was a pressed cardboard product with wooden strips over them.

**Ms. Seiler** asked how much excavation they planned on doing around the property.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that the first floor had literally turned into mulch because it was laid on dirt and that over the years the moisture had turned the wood into mulch. He said they had put in temporary lighting and that the Board of Directors did a tour because it was a significant project. The bank had been around since the 1840's and changed their name in 1996 which was why people were unfamiliar with the name.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked about the headquarters.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that it in (inaudible), and that the third generation owner of the bank was the Chairman of the Board. He said there were some 1930's post offices they remodeled as two of the branches and they seemed to be aware of the process. They did have some tax credits on one of the



projects. An area on the first floor had no historical value, the ceilings were falling in, and that they needed to be removed to keep from falling on the workers. If you stepped on certain parts of the floor you would fall through to the dirt.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if that was where the odor came from.

**Mr. Marchese** answered yes. He said that it was musty, but there was no significant termite activity. When they remove the column line of the original back wall of the house he felt that they would find evidence of footings and footprints of the chimneys.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if they had any historical assistance for the excavation.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that they were just going to remove the rotten floor boards and not excavate. He said his understanding was that they needed to put structural steel in the first floor because in 1917 when the building was raised it had shifted considerably. The other wood timbered sections of the building were in good shape and if they could underpin where they were at then it would stabilize the first level. First, they needed to find out what was under the dirt to see if the footings were of a consistent size.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if they were going to go in and stabilize it.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that they were not going to stabilize it at this point, but remove non-historic and rotting materials to see what was there.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that they should move stuff with caution.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that all of the blue boards were pressed cardboard and that batten was used to cover the exposed lathe. He said what they could not see was what was behind it and they didn't know what the floor joists and exterior corner of the building looked like. They did know that it had dipped six inches in the center.

**Dr. Watkins** stated that it had gotten to the point that Staff had placed in the report what was being done and he gathered from the Board that there was support.

**Mr. Judson** stated that the Board had unfortunately seen a history of demolition projects through renewal in the city and that it was obvious with their coordination with HSF and SCAD that the intention was to preserve the building. He asked that time be taken to explain the preservation to every worker on the crew so that everyone understood the intention so that mistakes won't be made.

**Mr. Marchese** stated that was one of their major concerns; that they do no harm to what was there.

**Dr. Watkins** thanked Mr. Marchese on his level of preparation and information that was presented.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that HSF holds a façade easement on the Berrien house and was in favor of the petitioner's request for the exploratory demolition. She said that

they had been working with the owners and other interested parties, including individuals from the State Historic Preservation office, to come up with a plan for rehabilitation of the structure. She would answer any questions about HSF's role in this process now or later depending on what the Board wanted to do.

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

**RE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS**

**RE: STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of Sign Concepts, Inc.  
Cheri Johns  
H-08-4021(S)-2  
219 – 221 West Broughton Street  
PIN No. 2-0016-25-006  
Sign  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Congregation Mickve Israel  
Alan S. Gaynor  
H-08-4022(S)-2  
440 Lincoln Street  
PIN No. 2-0032-47-015  
Stucco Repointing/Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Lewis E. Wilson, Sr.  
H-08-4023(S)-2  
621 – 623 Jefferson Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of Robert Cheney  
H-08-4026(S)-2  
137 Bull Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
5. Petition of Spine and Sport  
H-08-4027(S)-2  
22 West Oglethorpe Avenue  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products  
Jennifer Wall  
H-08-4029(S)-2  
121 West River Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

7. Petition of Larry Hess  
H-08-4033-2  
549 East Macon Street  
Door  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

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

**Ms. Reiter** stated that she testified in court last Monday on the Hall and Habersham Street project. She said that they have filed a petition and would be at the September meeting, and the results of that meeting would be reported back to the judge on the following Monday.

**RE: NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND  
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

**a. Unfinished Business**

**b. New Business**

- HDRB Board Retreat

**Ms. Ward** stated that there were no applications submitted and that they would have to readvertise.

**Mr. Judson** stated that he had a candidate ask him and he sent word back to him.

**Ms. Ward** stated that they would have to submit during the dates and if people wanted to submit applications, that Staff would walk them over so that they could know whether people had applied.

**Dr. Watkins** asked about the deadline.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the City had not readvertised yet.

**RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS  
MEETING – June 11, 2008**

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

**RE: ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

**BR/jnp**