



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
May 12, 2010 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

MAY 12, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Brian Judson, Chair
Ned Gay
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Richard Law, Sr.
James Overton
Linda Ramsay
Gene Hutchinson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Sidney Johnson, Vice -Chair
Ebony Simpson

MPC Staff Present: Thomas Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Christina Shealy, Intern

City of Savannah Staff Present: Mike Rose, City Building Inspector
Tiras Petrea, City Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Chairman Judson called the meeting to order at 2:10 pm.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [April 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [04-14-10 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the April 14, 2010 meeting minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

III. ITEM(S) REQUESTED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL AGENDA

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

3. [Petition of Daniel E. Snyder, AIA - H-10-4233-2 - 41 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. - New Construction, Part I Height and Mass - Continue to June 9, 2010 at the petitioner's request.](#)

Board Action:

Continue to June 9, 2010 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

| | |
|----------------|-------|
| Linda Ramsay | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

4. [Amended Petition of Patrick Shay - H-091223-4200-2 - 28 Abercorn Street - Alteration to Canopy Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the alteration to the rear canopy addition as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

5. [Petition of Charlie Angel - H-100420-4240-2 - 337 Tattnell Street - Gate](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the sliding gate and piers as proposed. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

| | |
|-----------------|-------|
| W James Overton | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

6. [Petition of Crystal Beer Parlor, LLC - H-100422-4244-2 - 301 W. Jones Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the principal use facia sign as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

7. [Continued Petition of Richard O. Mitchell - H-09-4196-2 - 625 Tattnall Street - Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Richard Mitchell was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval to install a wooden privacy fence along the side-yard of the property at 625 Tattnall Street as follows:

Location: The southern end of the property reusing an existing wooden fence along Tattnall. The existing masonry piers at the rear along Jefferson Street will be removed and the wooden fence installed.

Size: The proposed fence is 6' tall. The existing fence along Tattnall will be reduced in height to 6' to match. A finish cap will be installed on top of the fence with a routed trim piece between the fence and the cap. A wooden gate to match will be installed on

Color: the Hall Street side (south) and the metal door will be removed. Painted to match the main color of the building at 625 Tattnell. Vegetation will be planted in front of the fence to grow over the structure.

The Board continued this item at the January 13, 2010 meeting for the applicant to verify that an encroachment agreement was obtained. The fence does encroach into the public right-of-way and the property owner has provided the encroachment agreement that was obtained to erect the fence in this location.

The design of the fence has not been changed. Board comments at the prior meeting included the wall of continuity at the street and that the span of the fence was too long without some vertical break.

The residence at 625 Tattnell Street is not historic. The main residence is stucco over wood frame. The existing wooden fence and gate was approved by the Historic District Board of Review on April 12, 2006 but construction was never completed. The petitioner intends to finish the plans that were approved with modifications to lower the height of the fence and install a gate.

Staff recommends after-the-fact approval of the fence and wooden gate.

Ms. Ward reported that she received a called from Lynn O. Brophy and Bob Johnson at 312 West Hall Street asking her to voice their opposition to this petition.

Ms. Ramsay stated that a part of the original approval was that vegetation be placed in front of the fence with the location of the fence being right on the sidewalk. She asked if the applicant intends to meet this condition.

Ms. Ward answered that the applicant has told her that he intends to meet this condition. This condition can be specified in the decision today. As they can see the fence is not right up on the sidewalk and the petitioner has told her that there is enough space for him to plant the vegetation.

Dr. Henry wanted to know what was the basis of the neighbors' objection.

Ms. Ward said the neighbors just stated that they felt the fence was not in keeping with the design of the house. They just wanted it conveyed that they opposed the fence.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Mitchell stated that he has been all over the City looking at fences and he found one at 321 Barnard Street. They have planted vegetation along their fence. It is the same design of the fence that he wishes to put up. He will plant vegetation in the foot of space he has between the sidewalk and the fence. Mr. Mitchell said at 321 Barnard, a board is on top of the fence and ivy is growing on top of it. This looks good; it is really the best looking fence he saw doing his search of fences in the area. Mr. Mitchell stated that at the last time the Board heard his petition, they said his fence was too long, but the fence at 321 Barnard Street is 62 feet long and one side is 60 feet long. His fence will only be 57 feet long. He is aware that property owners now are responsible for cutting grass beyond the sidewalk

abutting the street. Therefore, he is hoping that he will be able to plant vegetation in this area also to make it look better.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Mitchell how tall is the fence fronting Barnard Street

Mr. Mitchell answered that it is six feet.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Bill Stuebe of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that the revised ordinance, Article 12, Section 8.3030 says that, "fences, trellises and walls shall comply with the following: fences, trellises and walls shall not extend beyond the facade of the front elevation except in the following cases: 2. A building setback on east/west streets with a front gardening. He believes the buildings west of this location have basically front gardenings and are not built to the sidewalk. Mr. Stuebe believes this works and the benefit of keeping it with the sidewalk keeps it neat and clean. If it is setback, the wall of continuity is not maintained.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams wanted to know if the Board could specify that vegetation should or should not cover the fence.

Ms. Ward answered that technically vegetation is not within the Board's purview. She believes, however, that the Board could condition that the fence be covered with vegetation.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the original application did specify vegetation. The Board can specify that the fence be screened by vegetation.

Mr. Engle said the wall continuity issue bothers him. He could think about two or three times in the last four months, including a planter, that they discussed to some extent and required that it be pulled back to meet the wall of continuity of the adjacent building. This fence sticks out three or three feet beyond the line. This wall of continuity was discussed also during their discussion of the Ships of the Sea. If they look at the photo, they will see that this fence is sticking out beyond the face of the other porches down the block.

Dr. Henry asked if this concern was not made moot by the original permission.

Ms. Ward did not believe it was moot, but believes the Board needs to proceed with caution that this was approved by the previous Board and they are seen as a continuum of that Board. Unless there is a greivous change in the condition, design or the ordinance, there should be no reason that this Board's decision would not be consistent with the previous Board.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Engle if he was talking about continuity with the southernmost wall of the western buildings in this block.

Mr. Engle answered that he was talking about the buildings down the block.

Dr. Williams said the difference on Tattnall Street and the rear side of 321 Barnard Street

is that the 6 feet fence (Barnard Street) is in line with the street wall of the adjacent properties whereas Tattall Street projects beyond the base of the properties in the next block by approximately four or five feet. He said as a point of comparison, the petitioner used the long wall as an example - same material and essentially the same height, but the one difference is precisely the issue of alignment.

Mr. Engle said where the gate is located is a break and if the fence was to drop back beyond the gate, that point of continuity would allow both things to be done. They would only be asking that a part of the fence be moved over. A few shrubberies could be put in front of it also.

Ms. Ramsay believes this would be a solution.

Dr. Henry believes this would be a nice balance between this Board's concerns and the past Board's actions.

Mr. Engle stated that the past Board's actions are moot because it has expired. They are under a new law. He only made mention of that Board because it appeared to him that they, too, were concerned about screening the fence.

Dr. Williams asked if the gate is in the middle of fence.

Mr. Mitchell answered yes.

Dr. Williams said the good news is that one of pre-existing piers would not be impacted. There is no pre-existing pier that would impede this proposal. He asked if the piers are from a pre-existing fence.

Mr. Mitchell answered yes.

Board Action:

Approval of the wooden privacy fence and wooden gate with the condition that west of the gate, the fence be setback from the sidewalk to align with the historic buildings to the west to form a wall of- PASS continuity along the street and vegetation installed in front of the fence.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

| | |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Second: Linda Ramsay | |
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Gene Hutchinson | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Not Present |
| Brian Judson | - Abstain |
| Richard Law, Sr | - Aye |
| W James Overton | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

8. [Petition of Steve Day - H-100401-4236-2 - 405 E. Charlton Street - Rear Porch Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for the following exterior alterations and additions to the rear and west side of the building at 405 E. Charlton Street:

1. Construct a three-story elevator addition on the rear to match the stucco of the main building under an engaged hip roof surfaced in asphalt shingles to match the primary building.
2. Remove rear balconies and construct two-story rear porch. New columns to be Duracast and a hip roof surfaced in standing seam metal is proposed. Doors to be Anderson Architectural Rectangle hinged.
3. Install two new window openings on the west exterior wall. New windows to be Kolbe and Kolbe Magnum double-hung sash, single glazed, true divided light, wood frame windows.
4. Install new Plantation style shutters by Atlantic, Authentic Series PVC.
5. Proposed colors:
 - a. Window, columns, trim – Benjamin Moore, Navajo White
 - b. Shutters, iron railing, stair – Benjamin Moore, Wrought Iron Black
 - c. Metal roof – medium bronze
 - d. Porch ceiling – Stained red mahogany
 - e. Stucco – match existing stucco color on building

The residence at 405 E. Charlton Street is part of a historic row house constructed in 1882. The building is a rated structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District.

The proposed window openings on the west elevation are located on a property line and are not permitted under the International Building Code according to the City's Development Services Department. Fire rated windows could be installed but would need to be reviewed for compliance with the Historic District ordinance (Section 8-3030).

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Further differentiate the new addition from the original building by removing the proposed corbels, changing the lite pattern in the windows, and lowering the height if possible to be subordinate and not obscure character defining features.
2. Eliminate the new openings on the west property line or resubmit new windows that meet the building code and the Historic District ordinance (Section 8-3030).

Mr. Engle wanted to know if there was not a problem with windows in an elevator shaft according to the fire code.

Ms. Ward answered that she was not aware of a problem. If the building code does not allow it, even if the Board approves it, they will have to be eliminated. If it changes the design, it would have to come back to the Board. Therefore, staff tries to identify these conflicts before they are brought to the Board so the petitioner would not have to resubmit.

Ms. Ramsay stated that on an exterior wall it is okay, but on the interior wall it has to be separated.

Mr. Engle asked if the shutters need to be one-half the width of the window.

Ms. Ward answered yes or they could be bifold depending on the size of the window.

Mr. Engle asked if the second floor railing according to the guidelines has to be 36 inches.

Ms. Ward that 36 inches is the furthest that you can extend. She asked Mr. Engle if he was referring to the height.

Mr. Engle answered yes.

Ms. Ward said they can go more than three feet.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes the code says the railings have to be 36 inches.

Ms. Ward said there is no landing here that one can stand on. But Mike Rose, Building Inspector, is telling her that it has to be 36 inches.

Dr. Williams asked if a building is next door to the west where the windows will be.

Ms. Ward replied that a building is next door, but there is a small amount of space between this building and the adjacent building. They are not touching each other.

Mr. Gay stated that the buildings are taller than the building on the corner. Therefore, they will be able to get more lighting with the slips window.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Day clarified that they have put windows in elevators. He said that the Board approved this on a house they did on Oglethorpe Avenue. It has gone through the building inspection process and there was no problem. Mr. Day said regarding the shutters, they recognize that

they must be functional and operational. If there is a situation where they cannot get a full shutter here, they will put up a bifold shutter. They also recognize that the shutters must cover the entire window.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Day to discuss the question the Board had about the dimensions of the two proposed windows.

Mr. Day explained that their client is proposing 18" x 36" and the reason they want to do this is primarily to get light into the bedroom. They want to keep the windows above the roof line of the house next door. There is approximately five feet between the houses. They have talked with staff about this. He said that they recognize the fact that the International Building Code does not allow them to put in a non-fire rated window or some kind of fire device on the property line. Therefore, they will try to come back with a fire rated window for staff to approve. Mr. Day said at the very least what they will do is put a fire rated shutter on each window.

Mr. Judson asked where would one be to see the two windows.

Mr. Day answered that the windows could not be seen from the street nor the lane. They would have to stand directly below and look up.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the windows cannot be the size they are; they would have to meet the height to width ratio.

Ms. Ward stated that the ordinance requires windows that face the street to maintain the five to three ratio. They must be taller than they are wide. But, she did not believe that the windows here would apply to the ratio. She thinks these windows are accent windows which are permitted. Ms. Ward explained that the question regarding the railings, the ordinance says that for one and two family dwellings the height of the railing shall not exceed 36 inches. Therefore, they are within the guidelines. But, they may not meet the building code.

Dr. Williams said a question arose about the elevator shaft. He asked that since it is a shaft could it be lowered.

Mr. Day answered that they do not know at this time. He said Ms. Ward mentioned this and they have seen this situation before. He said it depends upon the elevator that their client selects. It is either a seven foot or eight foot elevator. They agree with Ms. Ward that if they can bring it down, they would be happy to bring it down below the existing roof height so that it can be subordinate to the main building. They just have to maintain the safety level in the top of the elevator shaft.

Dr. Williams asked what would happen to the current exterior wall in the building where the elevator is located.

Mr. Day answered that the current exterior wall of the building either be left stucco as is or they would put in a fire rated drywall material on the inside.

Dr. Williams said since the Board's purview is with exterior design, but once the elevator is added it becomes an interior building. He wanted to know if the Board could stipulate that the original exterior wall be preserved.

Mr. Day stated that the elevator shaft has to be attached to the structure of the building. Therefore, they will have to penetrate into the stucco. The stucco will not be removed. The only thing they will do is put some type of framing material over the top and then put fire rated drywall over the top of this. He said what they want to be able to do is to have a fire rated shaft from top to bottom.

Dr. Williams said particularly if the shaft is lowered, they could potentially just leave the soffit and bracketing.

Mr. Day replied if they can lower it, they will.

Dr. Williams stated he believes that the Board in their decision need to say how the elevator shaft should interact with the historic building.

Mr. Engle stated that he saw a parallel to the elevator shaft they went through with SCAD a few months ago. The initial presentation was for a hip roof and stucco to match the existing. However, what they ended up with was a much simplified design where they added a flat roof and the stucco did not match the original building. He asked Mr. Day if there was a reason he could not simplify this not just with the brackets, but also the scored stucco. They would not be able to differentiate from what was original and what was added later. This could be simplified by using stucco, but not score it or score it differently so that it is not an exact replica of the original. Mr. Engle said this is the Secretary's Standards. It should be contemporary, but compatible. But, what is here now is an exact copy of what is already there. It is not simplified and ten years from now, they would not be able to tell that it is not the original. He asked Mr. Day if this could be simplified.

Mr. Day stated that if they don't want it scored, they can do where it is not scored as long as their client agrees to this. He will talk with their client about this and meet with the staff. If there is a problem, then it could come back to the Board. But, he believes that if the Board wants to put this in their recommendation, it is fine. He said he understood the need for differentiation. As far as the look of the stucco, they are going to have stucco that has been there for a number of years and there will be new stucco. They can match it as close as possible. Over time, however, they will not be able to tell the difference whether they score it or not.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) asked whether the two small windows (upper story windows) will be in the addition or in the existing section.

Mr. Day explained that the two windows will be in a bedroom; a fire place is between them and they will be placed exactly in the middle of the wall spaces on each side of the fire place.

Mr. Judson stated the two windows are not a part of the addition; they are a part of the existing house.

Mr. Carey stated as always HSF has a concern with putting holes in historic buildings. He said regarding the elevator shaft and the windows (he agrees with Mr. Engle), he believes

that Pepe Hall was able to achieve a height below the eve line and the Espy House as well which also included a stairwell, if not an elevator. Closed shutters or fixed shutters, rather than having a window in the elevator shaft, was probably a better treatment. It appears to him to make better sense rather than try to fool the public in some way that it's a room, why not just fix closed shutters into the window spaces that are planned for the elevator shaft.

Mr. Day stated that the windows in the elevator are not just for appearance nor trying to make someone believe that this is a room. They will put glass doors in the elevator shaft going into the house. This allows light to come through the elevator shaft into the room on the third floor and through the elevator shaft into the room on the second floor. This provides more light into the room.

Dr. Williams said according to the elevation, it appears that the second floor, main living level is 11.5 feet. He said assuming that the drawing is to scale, it looks like the upper living story is of a comfortable height. This suggests that with a 11.5 feet clearance, they are talking about a seven or eight feet tall elevator, appears that the chances of lowering the shaft are good.

Mr. Day agreed and said when he talked with Ms. Ward about this he did not have a problem in saying that if it was possible, they would do so.

Mr. Engle looking at page 8 stated that he was somewhat confused because Mr. Day said the reason for the glass windows in the elevator shaft is because there will be glass doors in the house. However, this does not show on either plan.

Mr. Day stated that this would not show on these plans.

Mr. Engle responded that Dr. Williams has requested that most of the walls be kept, but this is impossible because the petitioner will be punching holes in the walls for doors on both floors. The doors that are shown are going onto the decks, not into the house.

Mr. Day said this is correct.

Dr. Williams stated that here, no windows or appurture on the house. He asked Mr. Day if he was referencing the middle plan.

Mr. Day answered correct.

Dr. Williams stated that there is no appurture to allow light in from the elevator shaft.

Mr. Day said the bottom window would provide a balance and continuity.

Mr. Gay stated that the parlor floor window is not there to allow light to come in. The next floor window will allow the light to enter. He asked Mr. Day if this opens into a room and not into the hallway.

Mr. Day said this is correct.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Day to identify the floors on the plans. He believes the far right floor is the top floor.

Mr. Day apologized and stated that the floor plan drawings are incorrect.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes the floor plans are useful to help the Board see the location of windows and doors on the exterior. However, the Board's decision should be based on the exterior arrangement.

Mr. Stuebe stated that the other houses on this row are only two rooms deep. Perhaps, this house was only two rooms deep to begin with. Therefore, the back facade was a later addition.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams pointed out that page 5 shows what Mr. Stuebe was saying.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff report shows that the addition appears on the 1898 Sanborn map. She believes as stated in the staff report, this has been modified many times. Obviously, the fenestration pattern is not original and does not contribute to the integrity of the building.

Mr. Gay stated that every other house built at the time this house was built, the back part where the roof line is a little different were back porches. They typically had shutters and in the afternoon a breeze would be able to come through from front to back as all the windows in the front and back are lined up. In all likelihood this was not a part of the interior part of the house.

Dr. Williams asked if the neighboring house to the left does not align with this row. In other words, he believes it is setback about one dozen feet.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it is setback.

Dr. Williams stated that the two new windows if they are flanking the rear chimney, the neighboring house would not screen the windows as much as he originally thought. But, technically the windows would be facing the neighboring house. The ordinance suggests that they don't have to conform to that specific proportions of the visible facade.

Mr. Gay stated that he believes the windows are a great idea from the standpoint that light get in.

This is also visible in the Owens-Thomas house.

Dr. Williams stated that the windows are not so great a concern for him; he is more concern about the height of the elevator and the articulation of its design. He realizes that the petitioner is trying to match the size of the windows to the scale and proportion of the size of the existing western windows on the top and middle floors. But because of the narrowness, the scale and windows appear to be out of proportion with regards to the elevator shaft. Dr. Williams said the petitioner stated that he has done this before. He recommended that the windows be scaled down.

Mr. Day explained that on the other elevator shaft they physically took the windows out of the house and simply moved them into the elevator shaft. Proportionally, they were much

like what they are talking about here. When you stand back in the lane from the house, it doesn't draw your eyes to the elevator shaft being a window that is different in size than the other windows in the house. What they have done was to try to create continuity between the windows on the back so that it does not draw it from one side to the other. This is the reason they are trying to keep the windows exactly the same. It worked very well before.

Board Action:

Approval of the addition with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval: 1. The stucco is to have a smooth sand finish with no scoring; 2. Eliminate the brackets; 3. Reduce the height of the elevator to have a flat roof to be below the soffit of the main house; 4. Windows on the property line and balconette railing - PASS must meet the requirements of the International Building Code and the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030); 5. Shutters must be sized to fit the window openings when closed; and 6. Any brackets that must be removed for the addition should be preserved on site.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Linda Ramsay
Reed Engle
Ned Gay
Nicholas Henry
Gene Hutchinson
Sidney J. Johnson
Brian Judson
Richard Law, Sr
W James Overton
Linda Ramsay
Robin Williams

- Aye
- Aye
- Aye
- Aye
- Not Present
- Abstain
- Aye
- Aye
- Aye
- Aye

9. [Petition of William Coggins - H-100407-4237-2 - 313 Berrien Street - New Construction, Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition were **Mr. Jonathan Leonard, Mr. Carl Holiday, Mr. Cole.**

Chairman Judson explained that this petition, the Board will be considering Part I, Height

and Mass. He said for clarification on large projects, the Board generally has a two-part approval procedure. Today, they will be discussing the footprint and mass of the building. The Board will discuss the design details in a second petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction Part I, Height and Mass, of a 2½ story single-family residence on the property at 313 Berrien Street. The property is zoned RIP-B (residential, medium density). A Specific Development Plan was approved in 2008. The proposed plan appears to be slightly different and a recombination subdivision plat must be filed and recorded prior to issuance of a building permit. Parking should be shown on the plan or a variance from the requirement should be obtained.

This block of Berrien Ward contains only two historic buildings and the rest is almost fully built-out with new construction.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions: 1. Eliminate the solid party wall on the east elevation; 2. Revise to remove openings on property line per building code; and 3. Restudy window size and location on the second floor.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward that regarding the second floor windows if she was saying that the petitioner either lower the height of the second floor or enlarge the windows by making them taller.

Ms. Ward answered that the window openings on the ground floor are three feet wide and six feet tall.

Dr. Williams stated keep the windows three-by-five and keep the height of the wall as stated simply just as the neighboring house windows start at the higher point, he would say as a third option raise the windows; don't change their size and don't change the size of building, just move the windows up.

Ms. Ward said the staff would support this suggestion and in the rhythm of solid voids, staff suggested repositioning the upper story windows.

Dr. Williams stated that he advocates keeping the windows smaller because of the hierarchy issue.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if she was saying to remove the party wall because it is too close to the property line to allow windows in the wall. Therefore, it will be a solid wall of siding.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams said the west wall should also be solid unless the windows are fire rated.

Mr. Engle asked why is the Board reviewing a single-family housing on a large scale project - height and mass.

Ms. Ward stated that there is a two-part submittal for new construction. Only part I was submitted to staff and there was not enough details to review it for Part II.

Mr. Engle said he was somewhat confused because if the shrink wrap this, they are talking about a lot of details that are not going to show.

Mr. Judson explained that the shrink wrap metaphor is something that they all have adapted that isn't necessarily a part of the review process. It is a way of wrapping their minds (per se) around it. The requirements for a Part I, height and mass submittal is link to projects of a certain size, but it does not exclude other projects from being submitted in two parts.

Ms. Ward stated that for any new construction, there are Parts I and II, to the submittal. Many times such as with carriages, the petitioner will go ahead and submit everything they need for a full review. However, this petitioner did not; he only submitted enough material for the Part I.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Jonathan Leonard stated that to answer a couple of questions that came up, the overall intent from a land use is that this is a continuation on the existing development from Applegate Industries and all the amenities will still be allowed to be used by the owner. He said in terms of the party wall on the left, they will be happy to remove it. They were putting the party wall here for code reasons. They don't see a problem with raising up the head height for second floor windows to keep them in line with the house on the left and right. Mr. Leonard said they, too, want to keep them six on the lower floor and five on the upper floor in order to keep the rhythm throughout. He said with regards to the removal of the windows on the west elevation, they don't have an issue with removing them either. They were trying to get some light and since they had the space and this is an unusable piece of property since it is the right-of-way (private drive-way), they felt they should be able to at least put some light here, but they do not have an issue with removing it. Mr. Leonard said in terms of the submittals, they have enough information to proceed with a final submittal but were just following the procedure with height and mass and did not want to over step their bounds. He asked the Board to clarify the meaning of the shrink wrapping.

Mr. Judson explained that "shrink wrapping" is a term that was developed on the Board to help them visualize why window openings are a part of height and mass consideration. A simple explanation would be that it is the dimensions, footprint of the building and height, and really isn't the case when they talk of the fenestration and openings in the buildings, they then become a part of the height and mass consideration. He said this is why the Board talks about placement, number of windows and so forth as part of a Part I submittal height and mass; whereas specific design details, materials, etc. become a part of Part II.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Leonard if he would be willing to specify fire proof windows. He believes it would be extremely unfortunate to have two big blank side walls of just siding. They both are visible and he does not see this being compatible with anything in the neighborhood.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Leonard if he would be willing to keep the windows, but conform to the fire rated standard for the windows that are in his design on the west elevation.

Mr. Carl Holiday of Applegate Industry stated that the way the property is set up presently where the block wall is shown is a parking space for this house. It is not to be shared with the other property, except for the driveway that comes in. Therefore, he was wondering why it would be required to be fire rated.

Ms. Ramsay stated that according to the site map, it is on the property line. They run the risk of fire rated openings and they are not pretty. If the entire assembly has to be fire rated, she was not aware that any has been done successfully in the district.

Mr. Holiday asked if they could go back and look at deeding a part of the parking space to that lot. This will allow them to keep the window open.

Mr. Judson stated that there is some ambiguity about the property usage and how this is as it has been referred to as being a part of the other development. Yet, the Board is viewing it as a stand-alone project. All of these questions fall into the purview of zoning and building and is not a part of Board's purview or decision process.

Dr. Williams stated that perhaps the petitioner might want to bring this back to the Board with a clarification.

Mr. Gay said he believes they could go forward, but just don't put in the windows until they are approved.

Mr. Holiday stated that they will look at deeding the eight feet of parking space to the property.

Mr. Engle said on the east elevation there is always the dummy windows with the shut shutters that could be used. Two and one-half stories of blank siding is too much. The petitioner can put in recessed dummy windows with shut shutters that will at least give it some character and breaks it up.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation believes he heard that the proposed building is 36 feet high. However, the building looks taller. This could be because it is so narrow. He is more inclined to try to resolve the second story fenestration issue. Rather than lift the windows as Dr. Williams has suggested, he believes that the overall height needs to be brought down a little. It appears that this would make it work better on this block.

Mr. Cole of Applegate Industry stated the reason that the building is shown as such is because this is an exact replica of the buildings that they have built on the right. They just split them off, changed the facade, put porches on them to try to tie it in with the existing historic property. They are presently at nine and one-half feet ceilings downstairs. They have 12 inch trusses on the buildings which are causing them trouble; therefore, they want to go to a 16 inch truss to run their heating and air. Mr. Cole said they have nine foot ceilings on the next floor and a nine foot peak on the inside of the bonus room on the top story. Therefore, bringing it down would shrink the head room inside the building.

Dr. Williams stated that the width of the building is 20 feet. He asked if the other buildings are also 20 feet.

Mr. Cole confirmed that the building are exactly the same.

Mr. Gay said the buildings do not stand alone and, therefore, they don't look like it.

Mr. Cole stated that the building does look skinnier and taller, but they are exactly the same.

Dr. Williams said that the drawings show that the building is slightly higher. He said it is a matter of inches but sheet five shows it a little higher.

Mr. Cole stated that the buildings are the same height and dimensions.

Mr. Judson asked if the windows on the second story are the same height as the lower story. Are they all six foot windows?

Mr. Cole believes that the windows are five feet.

Board Action:

Approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions to be resubmitted at Part II, Design Details: 1. Eliminate the solid party wall on the east elevation; 2. Restudy location of parcel lines to allow for window openings on the west elevation; and 3. Reposition the windows on the second floor of the front facade to reduce the amount of solid above the windows or lower the height of the second floor. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Gene Hutchinson

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Gene Hutchinson | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Not Present |
| Brian Judson | - Abstain |
| Richard Law, Sr | - Aye |
| W James Overton | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

10. [Petition of Kathleen Dupuis - H-100422-4245-2 - 217 E. Gaston Street - After-the-fact approval for rear addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was **Ms. Kathleen Dupuis**.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval to construct a one-story rear addition on the building at 217 East Gaston Street as follows:

Location: Rear of the building beneath the ground floor of the rear porch.

Size: The addition encloses the ground floor of the porch area and extends an additional 6' into the rear yard. It is 14'-4" wide.

Materials: Exterior walls are concrete block to be surfaced in stucco with a 6' wide opening for a double French door. The low slope shed roof is surfaced with a rubber mermbrane.

The historic building at 217 East Gaston Street was constructed in 1877 as part of row and is a rated building with the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density) and is currently occupied by the Old Savannah Inn. The addition was constructed to provide another guest room for the Inn, according to the owner.

Ms. Ward reported that the colors need to be verified as it needs to match the existing trim and body of the main building. The staff recommends after-the-fact approval for the rear addition.

Dr. Henry stated that he noticed another item was on the agenda for the Old Savannah Inn. Ms. Ward clarified that there is another property on the same block on the agenda for a different Inn.

Ms. Ramsay asked how did this come to the staff's attention.

Ms. Ward stated that the Development Services Department's building unit was notified. They went out and conducted a site investigation and met with the petitioner on site. At that time, the building inspector was told that a garden wall was being constructed. Ms. Ward said at the request of the building inspector, she went there also. Because a wooden fence is there, she could not see it from the lane. She said, however, she received another call a week later. At this point, a roof and door was put on the structure. This was obviously more than a wall and she could clearly see it from standing in the lane. She worked with the Development Services Department to visit the petitioner and gave her an application and informed her that she needed to appear before the Board and then get a permit.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Dupuis stated that the original space was the garden. She said that Mr. Fred Gleason, prior owner, made a room downstairs for his daughter. When she bought the property, she

turned the room into a spa in 2005. Therefore, the spa was already in existence. Her paint person referred the contractor to her and she did not know that Rhino Construction was working without a permit. She apologized to the Board and her neighbor, Sam, as they were working out of his property which was shocking to her. Ms. Dupuis stated that she sees her neighbor that is in the back of her present at today's meeting. She said she does not understand how this would interfere with their property. She explained that the space is very small. The space was overpowering for the spa; therefore they extended it into the garden. Since she has been in Savannah, she has put nothing but money into this property. She has put in approximately \$1.3 million. Ms. Dupuis said she came from Boston, MA; she said she pleases with the Board that this is approved as she has put much into this property. They have had several people from the City of Savannah visiting the property and they know how much money she has put into this property. She said this is probably the most prestigious property in this section.

Mr. Judson interrupted Ms. Dupuis and explained to her that the Board has to be consistent as with previous meetings and previous discussions, the Board cannot entertain any discussions about economic hardship, investment viability, business or anything else. The Board's purview is limited to the design details.

Dr. Henry stated that he was not sure he understood the evolution of this issue. He said he understood Ms. Dupuis to say that it began with a spa that was enclosed.

Ms. Dupuis answered yes. The room was already there. The only part of the addition that was not there is where the french doors were removed and brought them out more. She said she does not have the dimensions, but the part where the french doors were located is the enclosure for the spa room. The addition she is requesting for is probably 5' x 8'.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Dupuis where is the addition that was added.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Dupuis if she has a drawing that will show the Board where the building was initially and where it is now.

Ms. Dupuis explained that basically the space was the under hang of the porch. She said in order to get more space, she closed-in the under part of the porch.

Dr. Williams asked her that the porch was already there, but not a room.

Ms. Dupuis answered yes. She just added three cement walls to close-in the porch so she would be able to put a bed there.

Mr. Judson explained that he believes in the Board's submittal packet the difference between pictures 5 and 6 might help with the illustration.

Mr. Engle stated that picture 9 shows the concrete extending quite a bit from the porch. He said if you look at picture 9, it is totally outside the porch.

Ms. Dupuis stated that it is even with the porch.

Mr. Engle stated that it is perpendicular to the porch.

Ms. Dupuis stated that it is right under the porch.

Mr. Gay said a room was not under the porch initially, but now a room is there.

Dr. Henry said he was on page 9 and asked Ms. Dupuis what was the gentleman building.

Ms. Dupuis said the gentleman is building the wall.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Dupuis what was he building the wall for.

Ms. Dupuis answered to close this in.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Dupuis if the original porch is the white beam with the two columns underneath.

Ms. Dupuis answered yes.

Dr. Williams said obviously the house is behind that; therefore, the wall that the gentleman is building in the photo is not under the porch, but in front of the porch.

Ms. Dupuis answered correct.

Dr. Williams stated, therefore, Ms. Dupuis is not enclosing the porch, but she is extending a room beyond the northern boundary of the porch.

Mr. Judson explained staff members of the City's Development Services Department were present and they might be able to assist with this.

Mr. Mike Rose explained the walls that are being built go about six feet passed the porch and a roof is on top of this.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward if she stated that the petitioner is within the 75% lot coverage.

Mr. Gay stated yes because there is nothing in the back where the parking is located.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Dupuis to repeat why she did not initially come before the Board.

Ms. Dupuis stated that she was under the assumption that Rhino Construction, who did the framing, already had the permit. She believed he went to the City and got the permit. But, unknown to her, Rhino was working without a permit.

Mr. Gay stated that the Board does not have anything to do with the permit.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Dupuis if the contractor held her to believe that he had the Board's approval, but had no approvals from anyone.

Ms. Dupuis answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Sylvia Udinsky stated that she and Mr. Bert Udinsky reside directly behind this bed and breakfast. She stated that she believes that the Board realizes that there is no parking on Gaston Street which is the front of the Inn. They share the lane and Inn's guests park off the lane; actually the lane is sort of used as the main entrance to the Inn. The parking at present is inadequate and if this is going to be an additional guest room, she does not see where they will be able to put another car. There has been occasions where the Inn's guests have had to come in their driveway to back into this small entrance. Ms. Udinsky said recently the gates were partially opened because one of the cars was sticking out into the lane.

Mr. Judson interrupted Ms. Udinsky and stated that he certainly understood that adjacent neighbors have every right to be heard on the construction and design element, encroachment on the space or changes to the building, but the Board cannot get into discussions about parking or use of the lane. He was not unsympathetic to the issues that Ms. Udinsky was raising, but wanted to let her know that this was not the purview of the Board.

Mr. Udinsky stated that he hates that to forgive is easier than getting permission. This is entirely wrong. He said that Ms. Dupuis knew that she did not have permission to the work, but now is asking for permission; this is wrong. If this trend continues, everybody will be doing this. If someone wants to install an elevator they will go ahead and do so and then say I did not know I was not suppose to do so.

Mr. Judson explained that this is something that has come before the Board many times. He said they feel frustrated because there is a sense on the Board that they would frankly like to take a punitive stand on things that are done without permission. He said the reality is that the Board has to consider each petition on its merit as though it was submitted in a timely fashion. The only leverage that the Board has is through the building department to stop the progress of it, step back and take a look to see if it is appropriate. Mr. Judson said he understood what Mr. Udinsky was saying and he fully agrees in a certain sense, but the reality is that the Board cannot disapprove a project solely because it proceed without the proper process.

Mr. Udinsky said it was his understanding earlier on that Ms. Dupuis told the City representative that it was not going to be an addition, but would be a part of a continuation for her garden work.

Mr. Sam Connor stated that he owns the property at the bottom as shown on the map. His principle concern is a violation of the property line. He said for the last 30, 40 or 50 years, it has been a constant whiddling away of the rights of the adjoining property owners. The lumber for this addition is being stored on his property. He wants to be sure that the fence is not removed as a part of this project. The area is already crowded without the encroachment on the property line.

Ms. Dupuis stated that she had no intentions of removing the fence. When she originally renovated the Inn in 2005, they specifically planted the oleanders to reach the height of the fence so that they could enhance the property. Ms. Dupuis said they momentarily had their gate slightly opened until her guest came home and they moved their car further in.

Mr. Judson stated that the Board is looking at pictures and are being told what has been done. Typically, as the Board reviews projects whether they are after-the-fact or if the

procedure is followed, they look at a set of plans that has dimensions and structural details. He asked Ms. Dupuis if she had the plans available for this project.

Ms. Dupuis stated that she believes that Vincent, her surveyor, gave Ms. Ward a set of plans.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if she received a set of plans in the submittal package.

Ms. Ward explained that pages 2 and 3 contains the information that was provided to her. She felt that with the submittal of the site plan that it was okay to waive the requirement for the floor plan especially since it is already built.

Mr. Judson stated that on page 2 the addition is described as filling in the space on the porch. He asked Ms. Ward, however, if this extends six feet beyond the porch line.

Mr. Engle stated that the engineering plan states that it is a new 14 x 14.35 addition. This makes it six feet by eight feet.

Mr. Gay said that photo 5 shows a large space in the back presumably for parking with nothing here and then photo 7 shows a fountain is there. He said parking is not the Board's concern, but he was wondering where is the parking.

Dr. Williams stated that the fountain is in photo 5; it is buried behind the bush.

Mr. Engle said the Board does not know the elevation of this addition and this is what bothers him. There is no picture that shows the roof in relation to the porch above it; there is no floor elevation picture. He can not make a judgment as to whether the Board would have approved this initially. There is no adequate documentation now to help them make this judgment. Mr. Engle stated that he is not prepared after-the-fact to say that this is okay. He wants to see better documentation.

Ms. Ramsay agreed with Mr. Engle. She said what they have is entirely inadequate. She would like to see a section that shows the roof and rafters over the porch could be accommodated in a seven inch width. It looks like you step up eight inches to get into the space; the door is drawn incorrectly. They see the picture of how it is, but if the Board was to approve this, they would have had correct drawings prior to their approval.

Mr. Judson informed Ms. Dupuis that he believes what she is hearing from the Board is regardless of where they are in the timeline of this already existing, as she has seen in the other submittals, the Board gets rather detailed about construction and architectural designs. This is why they have architects on the Board and is why they require in the submittal package some substantial information regarding the project. He agreed with the other Board members that the feels this is lacking rather they make a judgment about new construction or existing construction as in this case.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Thomson if there is a way to stop the syndrome of persons apologizing for during a project before getting it approved.

Mr. Thomson explained that he believes the only way to stop this for the City to pass some penalty for doing this. In this case, a building permit was not obtained or did the petitioner

come to the Board in advance to ask for permission. The staff has attempted in the past to raise the awareness to both the City staff and the community in general to know that they have to get approval. But, the simple answer is that there is not a lot that they can do and he does not believe that the City really wants to create a penalty for this. Consequently, will have to be the watchful eyes of the next door neighbors who will call and advise the City or staff that something is going on. There is an added permit fee if this not requested prior to starting the project.

Dr. Henry asked how much is the added permit fee. Is it only \$25.00?

Mr. Thomson believes it could be, but he was not sure of how much the added permit is.

Ms. Dupuis stated that she filed a civil suit against the contractor on Friday. The contractor walked off the job. She gave him a substantial amount of money to finish the job. She was aware that the Board did not want to hear about finances, but she has put a tremendous amount of money into this project. Ms. Dupuis said she feels that if the Board approves this, it will really benefit the City of Savannah.

Mr. Judson explained that they have discussed a lot of things that may or may not be the Board's purview whether they be relationships with neighbors, parking, or Ms. Dupuis' relationship with the contractor. As regular attendees of this meeting are aware, the Board can do one of two things. They can either approve or disapprove the request. Only the petitioner has the right to request a continuance. He believes that they have heard from a substantial number of people that there is a real concern that the Board at this time is not clear on what they will be approving. Mr. Judson stated that obviously Ms. Dupuis' relationship with her contractor may be at an issue, but he was trying to suggest to her that perhaps if she moved for a continuance and come back with some more detailed plans so that they have some better things to consider, might be in her interest. Mr. Judson asked the staff to explain what happens if the Board denies this petition.

Mr. Tiras Petra, Zoning Inspector of the City of Savannah, explained that if the Board decides to deny the petition, the petitioner would have the opportunity to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) to possibly overturn the Board's decision. He explained that this case is already in court. Therefore, they will proceed as necessary. If this is denied by the Board and if a variance request or an appeal of the Board's decision is upheld by the ZBA, they will have to go to court for approval to remove the addition.

Mr. Gay stated that a request for continuance will not stop where Ms. Dupuis is because she does not have a contractor at this point. Certainly, she is not doing anything and a continuance would not hurt her.

Ms. Dupuis stated again that she has put a substantial amount of money into this room.

Mr. Gay informed her that the Board is presently not asking her to remove the room.

Ms. Dupuis replied that she is aware of this, but the longer the room is held up, the longer she loses money and she borrowed money.

Mr. Thomson explained to Ms. Dupuis that if the Board makes a motion to deny her change, she has a long road in front of her to go through the courts and all the things that the City

will probably do to ask her to tear it down. This has happened before. He told her that it may be in her best interest to ask for a continuance and the Board then would be very specific about what you are looking for and will be able to make a decision in terms of plans, pictures and so forth. Mr. Thomson said it would be a lot less delay for Ms. Dupuis to get an architect to produce the plans and pictures what else the Board is asking for than for her to end up in court and have a judge tell her to tear it down.

Dr. Williams asked the staff if there is a minimum internal height for ground floor.

Ms. Ward answered that there is not a minimum height for ground floor through the ordinance, but the building code would have the minimum floor height.

Dr. Williams stated that it is not clear whether this meets the requirement. Therefore, this is another reason for having measured drawings to make sure that this conforms.

Ms. Ward explained that this is something that would be considered before the building permit is issued. The City would look at this.

Mr. Engle stated that the staff has a checklist of what is required for submission. He said that this submission does not come close to meeting the checklist. He believes that a continuance is needed. Then the checklist could be followed for the next meeting of what is required. Mr. Engle said he could not vote for this without seeing what is required.

Ms. Dupuis said the ceiling for this small addition is the same height as the ceiling that was in the spa.

Dr. Williams stated that documentation is needed to substantiate this.

Ms. Dupuis asked for a continuance.

Mr. Judson explained to the petitioner that the staff will be able to guide her in terms of what the Board is looking for. Nevertheless, the Board is looking for measured drawings.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of June 9, 2010 at
petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Reed Engle
Reed Engle - Aye

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Gene Hutchinson | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Not Present |
| Brian Judson | - Abstain |
| Richard Law, Sr | - Aye |
| W James Overton | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

11. [Petition of Cogdell & Mendrala Architects, P.C. - H-100422-4246-2 - 16 Price Street - Rear addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. John Mendrala was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for a two-story rear addition on the building at 16 Price Street (northeast corner of Price and East Bryan) as follows:

Location: The majority of the two-story addition is on the northern half of the rear of the property. A second story is also proposed over a portion of the existing one-story rear porch.

Size: Two-story addition that is 23'-4" deep by 14'-4" wide and a 55 SF bathroom addition over the existing one-story porch.

Materials: The bulk of the addition is clad in brick to distinguish it from the main residence and to be compatible with the neighboring historic brick structure. The bathroom addition is clad in Hardi-plank siding. A bay window will feature a copper standing seam roof with copper flashing.

Colors: Siding to match the main house.
Trim to match the main house trim in brick and Hardi-plank additions.
Brick will match the brick on the neighboring property at 14 Price Street.

The building at 16 Price Street (aka 18 Price Street) is listed as a rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. There appears to be some ambiguity to its authenticity as a historic structure.

Although it is listed as historic, Mary Morrison's *Historic Savannah* states that it was built before 1809 for William Williams and the replica was built in 1968. The Georgia Historic Resources survey card indicates that it was moved to this site from the Civic Center location at the time of its construction (1969-1972). The Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps depict a Victorian-type apartment building on the site in 1916 (Figure 1). A photograph of this building is provided on Sheet HRB2.7 in the submittal packet. The existing structure appears in the 1973 update (Figure 2).

As such, there is a strong indication that this building does not possess any historic fabric as

indicated Mary Morrison and verified by the property owner and applicant. As such, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards do not apply.

The property is zoned RIP-A. The addition will not be visible from the front façade (Price Street) but will be visible from East Bryan Street. An existing seven foot tall wooden privacy fence is located along the property line at Bryan Street. There is no lane at the rear of the property. The addition is on the rear of the building and subordinate in height to the peak of the roof of the gable building. The height of the addition is level with the adjacent brick building to the immediate north.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the addition with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Reduce the span of the brick parapet wall on the south elevation to end at the point where it intersects with primary elevation of the main building;
2. Restudy the bay window to incorporate brackets, extend to the ground upon relocation of the stair, or use punched openings; and
3. Verify louver or panel shutters.

Mr. Engle asked if the brick addition is extending beyond the property line.

Ms. Ward stated that this could be asked of the petitioner.

Mr. Engle asked if the same person owns both properties.

Ms. Ward answered no.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Mendrala said the building was actually designed by John LeBey in 1967. He was told that it is a replica of something, but obviously it was not a replica of what was originally there with the Victorian structure. The building was designed for Mills B. Lane who owned both this property and the brick structure next door. He set up the easement at the back of the property which accesses parking for 16 Price on the lane on the other side of the lot. Mr. Mendrala said they have some concerns about the property lines. He said that both 14 and 16 Price Street actually go over each other's property line. This is being worked out by attorneys between the two property owners, either by easements, deeds or however they want to do so. The existing building, John LeBey building was built right up against the existing brick building which actually puts this building slightly over the property line. Therefore, they will share a common wall. The owner of 14 Price Street did an addition where they are doing their addition. It is actually an extension of the brick building that is actually done in stucco in the back portion of the lot. Mr. Mendrala said the individual is having water problems with the addition. Therefore, they asked them to build their addition up against their wall so that they can flash the parapet wall together to eliminate problems in the future. Based on what they show in the site plan, the attorneys will work out the final agreements between the owners and create a new property line.

Mr. Judson stated that the staff made comments about the south elevation, reducing the extension of the brick over the existing roof.

Mr. Mendrala stated that he has done a drawing of this and believes that from the roof standpoint, they don't have a problem with this as it seems to work out. When he extended the bay, the two stories proportion looked a little awkward. Therefore, he wants to consider the brackets on the second floor rather than bringing it all the way down.

Mr. Judson stated that he believes he heard Mr. Mendrala say lane, but it was his understanding that the staff said there is not a lane behind these buildings.

Mr. Mendrala stated that a lane is not behind the buildings; there is a lane between Bryan and Bay Streets. The easement, which is a walkway, goes to the lane where there are some parking areas off the lane. He said that 16 Price Street has one of those parking areas.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Mendrala if he said that the back of the neighbor's house at 14 Price Street is stucco.

Mr. Mendrala answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked what is the rationale for building this addition in brick.

Mr. Mendrala said it is being done to match what is happening along Price Street. The brick structure adjacent to wood siding structure, they thought was a more handsome addition.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Mendrala if their addition would completely cover the stucco extension.

Dr. Williams guessed for him the issue is compability and differentiating the initial from the historic structure. He stated it is almost as if the addition is disregarding the building to which it is attached. He said in looking at the east elevation, he knew that Mr. Mendrala was trying to create essentially the way the two relate to one another on Price Street and they are trying to emulate that relationship on the rear. Dr. Williams believes this gives a misimpression that when you see it from the rear or looking at it from Bryan Street, that one might infer as it will be visible from Bryan Street that the brick house sort of wraps around. He stated that maybe this is Mr. Mendrala's intention that the brick building is actually an "L" wrapping around the yellow LeBey house. This raises for him whether it is beneficial for this to be brick and identify with a neighboring structure whose brick you cannot see on the side that is being proposed to be brick. He said if the brick went all the way back and had brick on the east facade and Mr. Mendrala was putting brick beside it would be one thing, but it doesn't have brick as it is stucco. Therefore, there will be stucco, brick and wood. Dr. Williams asked if consideration was ever given to making the addition out of wood.

Mr. Mendrala answered that he believes originally the idea was to make it blend with the existing LeBey. There were some issues of how you tie those kinds of roof forms into the addition adjacent to it which has a flat parapet on it and how you handle water between the two. This why it was sort of created in a box rather than an addition to the LeBey gable. He believes that the brick really sets off the Lebey house. This seems to fit the garden quality that the owner was looking for in the back area.

Dr. Williams said it doesn't feel as if it belongs to the house. It really looks like an addition to the neighboring house and just landed on this owner's yard as opposed to

something that has been knitted as an addition to the LeBey house at 16 Price Street. He does not think that using wood would necessitate a pitch through such as a gable, hip and so forth. Dr. Williams said in looking at the Italianate wood buildings that are shown in the photo are wooden boxes with a slight pitch to the roof behind the top parapet. They are basically flat roof houses. In some respect the buildings on Bryan Street to him would be something that would evoke the spirit of that entire frontage on Bryan Street as they are a series of wooden buildings.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Mendrala if he gave thought to using stucco instead of brick.

Mr. Mendrala stated that the drawings came from Beehive. There was a real concern with Beehive that the character was compromised by using stucco before. Therefore, they never really considered stucco as a material. However, may be they should have thought about this.

Mr. Gay said that actually in looking at this from the front or just walking by, you sort of get the impression that the brick house is somehow connected and a part of the Victorian wooden house next to it, the LeBey house. He did not have a problem with this and believes that it is interesting to have a brick addition in the back.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Bill Stuebe of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that the architectural review committee is concerned about this addition. Mr. Stuebe said the addition is much grander and much larger in scale proportion than the rest of the house. He believes the intent of the Historic District Ordinance is to have additions be subservant to the primary structure. This is larger and more massive. The window openings are much larger than in the main structure. Mr. Stuebe said the oriel window is totally out of scale and proportion of the main house. He believes that the entire addition needs to be shrunken down and made subservant. Mr. Stuebe believes that another bedroom is being added. He said if the owner wants a three bedroom house, then buy a three bedroom house and leave this house as is.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Ramsay wanted to know if the petitioner had a drawing that shows the parapet.

Dr. Williams stated that it appears that the second floor is taller than the first floor.

Mr. Mendrala said they are matching the parapet height of the adjacent building next door.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Mendrala if they could go lower while still abutting the adjacent building. Lower the wall so that it actually meets the height of the rear soffit. In other words take their design cues from the building which is attached as opposed from the neighboring brick building. He asked how wide is the addition.

Mr. Mendrala answered approximately 12 feet.

Dr. Williams said from the sidewalk one would not be able to see the 18 inches. He was suggesting to drop it 18 inches so that the second floor gets scaled down. He concurred with Mr. Stuebe that the bay looks out of scale and out of proportion. He likes it better

where they have left more rear wall and believes it is a good solution, but in some respect they might want to drop it down to the height of the cornice.

Mr. Mendrala asked, "drop it to the brick row?"

Dr. Williams stated yes, just a little under the brick course and scale down the bay. Just the shortening of the wall is better and he believes the more it is scaled down, the less he would have a problem with the material. It sounds as if other members of the Board are not so concerned about material, but he agrees with Mr. Stuebe that scale is a big issue.

Dr. Henry that he finds himself in agreement with Dr. Williams. He believes it looks odd. He also believes it should be the same material and should be more proportionate in the fenestration.

Mr. Engle believes it is too massive and too heavy. The brick and massive windows are doing this. The ordinance is specific that the addition should be subservant to the main building, but this is not. This will end up being the dominant structure in that elevation.

Dr. Williams said that it looks as if the second floor is a couple of feet taller than the second floor on the main house. The lower string course is actually a foot below. He asked if the dotted line represents the floor level in the existing house.

Mr. Mendrala stated that is correct.

Dr. Williams stated that the string course makes the eye think that this is the ceiling of the first floor. He asked, "Is it?"

Mr. Mendrala answered no. The dimension line is the floor level on the second floor.

Dr. Williams stated that on the exterior, a misimpression is being created. He said historically string courses mark floor divisions. This has been dropped about a foot below the bay; presumably to accommodate the bay. If the bay is scaled down, the string course could be raised so it corresponds with the head height on the first floor ceiling. Dr. Williams said anytime you have something taller above something shorter, it will look top heavy. In some ways if the proportions were reversed; raise the first floor, drop the second floor and reduce the scale of the bay, would meet many of Board's concerns.

Mr. Mendrala said they are fooling the eye a little bit to let it read proportionally different.

Mr. Engle asked what are the proportions of the windows. They are not five to three. The first floor windows read as sidelights. There is not a bay on the first floor, it is a flat surface.

Mr. Mendrala said the lower windows are drawn incorrectly.

Dr. Henry looking at page 8 stated that for him to understand what is going on, asked the petitioner if bricks were being used to relay it to the upper picture of the building on the immediate left of the building in question. He asked if this would be going on the back of the house. He does not see how this relates.

Mr. Mendrala said he likes the contrast between the wood siding and the brick on the front elevation. He thought this would be a handsome choice. He is not trying to relate one to the other. Mr. Mendrala said what they saw when doing it in brick was to pick up some of the brick detailing that is on the Price Street elevation and use it as some of the detail.

Dr. Williams told Mr. Mendrala that in the spirit of doing this, if he looks at the Price Street elevation of the brick building, he will notice that the second floor windows are about 25% shorter and the second floor is shorter than the first floor. If the goal is to evoke the spirit of the brick building, he would say that certain proportional modifications that they are talking about would be a little more respectful to the building would seem to be in order. Dr. Williams said either Mr. Mendrala take his cue from it or do not. But since they are going to use brick it appears that they are taking their cue from it.

Mr. Mendrala said from their stand point, it is are they going to mimic the historic building or take the brick as the material and do something else with the windows. In looking at a garden facing south, do they want to open up the rooms to the garden and get rid of as much brick. Therefore, you somewhat go back and forth with these things.

Mr. Judson said he is less concern about the material than the scale. He said picture six shows huge grand windows that are overpowering what is here. With the standards for an addition to be distinguishable, but compatible he believes they are missing the second point.

Mr. Gay believes that one reason they used the bay, though, in the three windows was to not have as much brick that you could see, but he agrees that the windows are out of scale. Maybe they can tone these down a little, the brick would not be that offensive.

Dr. Williams stated that his point about relating to the Price Street elevations, design principles historically have been very successful. Taller/lower stories and short/upper stories are not just in this situation. He told Mr. Mendrala in recognizing this strategy will help him immensely in terms of toning down the scale. Dr. Williams stated that he could not approve this in its present form.

Dr. Henry stated that perhaps a continuance would be in order.

Mr. Engle believes that there are so many issues - the fenestration, the materials, and the parapet.

Dr. Williams believes the Board's opinion is more towards scale than material. He said Mr. Mendrala might want to talk with the owner and inform of the brick option and wood option. If this is not the route that the owner, he or the Board wishes to pursue than he might want to focus his energy on the scale issues. He said Mr. Mendrala and the owner might want to explore this with wood, not stucco, to see how it works with the bay.

Mr. Judson said he was sensing among the Board that an approval in the present stage is not likely. He asked Mr. Mendrala if he was willing to ask for a continuance and come back with some design changes that might also include more than one alternative in terms of the material. He believes that the Board has some grave concerns about the scale and compatibility of the addition.

Mr. Mendrala asked for a continuance.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of June 9, 2010 at petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

12. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects - H-100422-4247-2 - 17 W. Gordon Street - Alterations and Addition to Rear](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was **Ms. Rebecca Lynch**

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for a rooftop covered porch on the existing rear addition and modifications to an existing two-story rear addition as follows:

Roof-top porch addition:

1. Remove the existing roof on the two-story addition to add a porch above and lower the height to allow room to expose the historic brick band course below the bracketed cornice.
2. Supported by 8' tall 8" square wood columns. An iron railing and balustrade are proposed to correspond to the ironwork on the primary residence. A wood handrail and decking are proposed.
3. A masonry parapet wall will be built on the property line above the neighboring addition for separation. It will be stucco with a sand finish to differentiate it from the main brick building. Three openings are located within the wall to reduce the overall mass.
4. Porch roof will be a flat two-ply membrane roof which will not be visible.

5. The chimneys will be extended up one-story to provide fireplaces within the porch addition. The new chimneys will match the original in size, design, and material.
6. Existing window to the far west of the third floor of the primary structure will be removed and the opening enlarged to install a custom wood French door to provide access to the proposed porch. The brick arched window header will be retained.
7. Existing window in the center of the third floor of the primary structure will be partially enclosed with brick infill where intersected by the porch beam. The brick arched window header will remain intact and the opening detectable so it can be reversed in a future restoration.

Existing addition modification:

1. Remove the southern end of the addition and extend over the courtyard.
2. Replace the existing wood door and window with a pair of 1'-6" by 9' custom inswing French doors.
3. Remove the existing landing and stairs and install a new balcony projecting 3' from the façade to match the width of the existing balcony on the second floor above.
4. Install a new railing at the roof to match the railing on the new porch.
5. A new awning will be installed over the opening to match the existing awning on the current addition.

Colors:

1. Charleston Green to match existing trim: columns, trim and fascia.
2. Black: metal railings and balustrade.
3. Stained: handrails and decking at the balconies and porch.

The historic building at 17 West Gordon Street is part of a double-house constructed in 1881 and is a rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. A three-story rear addition is located to the south of both sides of the double house. The addition is historic and appears on the 1898 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (Figure 1). The fenestration pattern on the addition has been modified from its original configuration to accommodate the residential use by adding a balcony, door and stair. This was most likely done when the rear two-story additions (illustrated in the 1973 updated Sanborn Fire Insurance Map) were removed. The smaller two-story addition to the east is not historic and was constructed sometime after 1973.

The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density). The following Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SOS) and Guidelines for Rehabilitation apply for additions:

Recommended: "placing a new addition on a non-character defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building," and "designing a rooftop addition when required for the new use, that is set back from the wall plane and as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street."

Not recommended: "attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed," or "designing and constructing new additions that result in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the resource," or "designing a new addition that obscured, damages, or destroys character-defining features," or "constructing a rooftop addition so that the historic

appearance of the building is radically changed.”

Staff recommends approval for the porch addition and modifications to the existing addition upon verification of the door inset to meet the standard.

Dr. Williams asked what are the shapes of the header. He asked if they are awnings.

Ms. Lynch stated that the existing header is flat.

Ms. Ward stated the petitioner could answer this question when they make their comments. She saw that the rest of the openings are arched, but she assumed that they were flat headers as the existing as Ms. Lynch just mentioned.

Dr. Williams asked if this is a later addition.

Ms. Ward answered yes. It is not historic and was not on the 1973 Sanborn. She looked in the records as the Review Board was here in 1973 and she was sure that an approval was given for a permit, but she could not find a decision on it.

Dr. Williams they call them later additions, but he believes the two stories bump heads on the rear are original to the building. They were there in 1888. He said he thought Ms. Ward referred to these as later additions even though they are 19th Century.

Mr. Gay said Ms. Ward stated in her report that the buildings were built in 1881 and in 1898 the additions showed up.

Ms. Ward said they could have been originally, she did not know. But if they were not original they were built shortly after the original date.

Dr. Williams stated that his speculation is that they are original. It is not uncommon to have kitchen wings sticking out the back of buildings like this. Therefore, for them to know what they are talking about they are probably original fabric; not even an early addition, but probably an original.

Ms. Ward reported that one thing that was evident for her on the additions as she thought the same thing that they were kitchenelles. Everything else is very symmetrical and balanced, but the configuration of the chimneys have been modified. This house has two central chimneys, but they actually not mirrored on the other side as you would expect. They are different and she thought this was interesting.

Dr. Williams stated that the one on the house in question has been bothered with a lot. The second floor window on the left half bump is obviously not an original window.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Rebecca Lynch said to address a few of the things that the Board was discussing, one other differentiation between the two wings in the back rather they are original, they are not. The wing at 17 West Gordon extends a full foot beyond the neighboring house. She does not know if this was original or if it was modified over time. But, it does show that the two sides are not completely alike. She wanted to reiterate that in terms of the roof top addition,

they made every effort to make the roof additions subordinate to the height mass and details of the four story historic part of the residence, most importantly, beneath the eve corbels and even the brick bands. It is their intent to make compatible, but differentiate, all the additions from the historic brick structure and the materials. Ms. Lynch said everything new will be stucco, even if it is masonry. They want it to be clear that the addition is different from the existing. In modification of all their existing openings, will be maintaining the existing headers and details so that they be reversible as Ms. Ward pointed out. She said all new doors will be recessed the required minimum three inches as requested by staff.

Dr. Williams wanted to know if both would have square headers.

Ms. Lynch answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Lynch if she knows when the existing french doors were added.

Ms. Lynch answered no.

Dr. Williams asked if the french doors would be remain.

Ms. Lynch answered yes. They are not a part of the petition. She said on the first floor there is a door, window, a small balcony and a stair down to the courtyard. They are proposing to bring both of the openings down to the floor level and install a pair of french doors within the masonry openings to make the two openings match.

Dr. Williams stated that on sheet seven, the first floor rear door is an arch. He was wondering if the egress from the house would be retained or eliminated.

Ms. Lynch said it would be a part of the interior of the house.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Lynch if the arch door feature could be brought to the new addition.

Ms. Lynch said they could so this. It is mostly obscured by the existing structure addition; you can hardly see them in the back. It would be great to reuse them by bringing them to the new addition.

Dr. Williams stated that this would be a wonderful interplay of segmentally arched openings. He said there would be one existing square header that will not change and encouraged Ms. Lynch to continue the interplay. Dr. Williams stated that since the petitioner has the materials, maybe they could be brought back. Therefore, they will actually be retaining a part of the historic structure and rather than throwing it away, move it to the new rear addition of the south elevation.

Ms. Lynch asked Dr. Williams if he was recommending actually making this a part of the addition break as well as he mentioned materials.

Dr. Williams said that sheet 7 shows a door and an arch. He asked what is happening to the fabric, the door and the transom window header.

Ms. Lynch stated that they will reuse the header. They welcome Dr. Williams's suggestion.

Mr. Engle stated that he has two concerns. He said all the massive amount of new wrought iron is supposed to match existing, but if you look at drawing seven, there is no wrought iron of that pattern on the existing elevation. What are you matching?

Ms. Lynch explained that they would be matching the existing railing.

Mr. Engle said the standards say that it is suppose to be contemporary, but compatible. He said actually when you look at drawing seven, it does not show wrought iron, just straight baluster iron.

Ms. Lynch stated that the first page shows the existing wrought iron detail. It does have the vertical pickets; she apologized that she has not put in all the wrought iron work.

Mr. Judson asked her if this is what she is proposing to match.

Ms. Lynch answered yes. They are doing so because they thought it would look more cohesive rather than having two different patterns. Otherwise they could change everything.

Dr. Williams stated this looks like 1880's iron work. He asked if this is the original or is it a pattern that is evoking 1880's iron work, but is modern.

Ms. Lynch answered that she does not know the history of when the iron work was installed. She knows that there have been some modifications to the kitchen wing over the years. It is existing on both of the two balconcies, but they do not match each exactly. One is approximately five feet deep while the other is about four feet deep. Therefore, chances are this is not the original to the house. There is a wrought iron fence in the front of the house along the sidewalk and it has a different pattern.

Mr. Gay said it looks a little light to be 1880.

Ms. Lynch guessed that it is not original.

Mr. Engle stated again that standards say it should be contemporary to compatible, but there should be a differentiation between new and old construction. He said the petitioner is going to copy exactly the iron work and, therefore, no one would be able to differentiate what is original iron and what is later.

Mr. Gay stated that probably the iron work is not very old.

Mr. Engle stated that they are making an assumption that it is.

Ms. Lynch asked the Board if they would prefer to have a simplified iron on what is being proposed. If so, this is something else that they can entertain.

Dr. Williams stated he believes it should read as visual compatible which means that it should have the kind of visual weight, but probably a different pattern.

Ms. Lynch said they were of the opinion that if they just went with the straight iron pickets

would not be as attractive. They could do a different pattern that could be differentiated from one to another, but be visual compatible. They will be happy to submit this to staff.

Mr. Engle stated that chimneys are being raised, but then they are copying the original chimney part design. He has a problem with this as it is new and he believes that it should be differentiated.

Ms. Lynch said addressing this as an architect, it was a question that they are the original chimneys and are approximately five feet taller. Do you make them completely different on the top just to show that they are different from the main ones or do you just show that they were actually the original chimneys?

Mr. Engle said if they copy the original, no one will know the difference.

Ms. Lynch stated that they can do different chimney parts.

Dr. Williams asked if the chimneys are presently there on the kitchen addition.

Ms. Lynch answered yes. They will just be raised up so that they will be above the roof.

Dr. Williams asked if the chimneys currently have the tops on them.

Ms. Lynch answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Lynch that what she is proposing is basically keeping the top, inserting a piece and then put the tops back on.

Mr. Engle asked if the arches are brick.

Ms. Lynch answered yes.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes the standard would be applicable if these were wholly new chimneys, but these are existing chimneys that stop at the top of the second floor. The petitioner is proposing to raise them up to the top of the third floor and will use the original fabric. He said he would prefer to see the original chimneys retained and just jacked up, put new brick thereon and lower the original tops back onto the chimneys. Dr. Williams said the goal is to preserve as much as they can.

Mr. Engle stated that there is no way they will be able to lift off the brick and put it back on.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the addition and modifications with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval: 1. Retain rear arched door and transom and install in new rear entrance on the two-story addition; 2. New ironwork must be distinct from but compatible with the existing ironwork; and 3. Retain and reuse the existing chimney caps if possible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Reed Engle | - Aye |
| Ned Gay | - Aye |
| Nicholas Henry | - Aye |
| Gene Hutchinson | - Aye |
| Sidney J. Johnson | - Not Present |
| Brian Judson | - Abstain |
| Richard Law, Sr | - Aye |
| W James Overton | - Aye |
| Linda Ramsay | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

13. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects - H-100422-4248-2 - 211 E. Gaston Street - Chimney addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Rebecca Lynch was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to add a chimney on the rear elevation of the building at 211 East Gaston Street. The chimney is to allow for a new kitchen exhaust system to vent above the roof as required by the building code, per the applicant. The chimney is 2'-2" deep by 3' wide. It will be covered in cement stucco with the finish and color to match the existing building.

The building at 211 East Gaston Street was constructed as a double house in 1876 and is a rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The property is occupied by the Dresser-Palmer Inn and the kitchen modifications are to serve the Inn.

The following Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation apply:

Recommended: *Installing a completely new mechanical system if required*

for the new use so that it causes the least alteration possible to the building's floor plan, the exterior elevations, and the least damage to the historic material.

Not Recommended: *duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in a new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building.*

The chimney is designed as an appendage on the rear of the building and is reversible.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval with the condition that the cap be simplified so the chimney does not appear to be a part of the historic building.

PETITIONER COMMENT

Ms. Lynch said that they concur with the staff's suggestion to simplify the chimney cap detail. She said presently it matches the existing chimneys and they think it is more appropriate to simplify it so that it could be differentiated from the historic fabric.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

Board Action:

Approval with the condition that the cap be simplified so the chimney does not appear to be part of the historic building. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

14. [Petition of Kurt and Julie Urban - H-10-4250-2 - 204 East Hall Street - Window alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Kurt Urban was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to alter the window openings on the rear second floor (parlor level) of the building at 204 Hall Street. The property is located on the south east corner of Hall and Abercorn Streets and the north façade fronts onto the lane. The applicant requests to enlarge the opening to the far east and decrease the size of the opening in the center to match the dimensions of the other openings on the façade. The window frames and sashes will be swapped out and reused in the alternate openings.

The building at 204 East Hall Street was constructed in 1871 and is a rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The alterations are proposed to accommodate the new kitchen on the interior. The following Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation apply:

Recommended: Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other non-character defining elevations if required by the new use. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.

Not Recommended: Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.

The standards and guidelines are met.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the window alteration as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Urban stated that he did not have anything to add to the staff's report.

For clarity, **Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Urban if they were going to keep the existing windows but just flip their location.

Mr. Urban said that everything existing is staying. They are just switching the position of the windows.

Mr. Engle stated that he visited the site and looked at this carefully. They are the only two openings in the building with a row lock course beneath the sills. This tends to suggest that both of these windows were originally larger windows. He said that page 3 shows the only place where vertical header row lock is on these two windows. Mr. Engle stated that he believes originally that four large windows were across the back and not just one large window on each end.

Mr. Urban stated that he was not sure; but the second window from the left, you can obviously see the brick work that looks like it was infilled.

Dr. Williams stated that the windows on the right appear to be altered, but not the window on the left.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Urban why is he changing the windows.

Mr. Urban stated that this will take the placement of their kitchen.

Dr. Williams stated that if Mr. Engle's theory is correct, the building has been altered. He said the bricks that are there now under the two sills do not appear to be anywhere else suggest that there might have been a modification.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the window alteration as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Nay

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

15. [Petition of Roy Ogletree - H-08-4059-2 - 507 East Hall Lane - Extension for New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Sarah Ward made the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for a 12-month extension of a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new two-story single family residence at 507 East Hall Lane.

The original Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction was granted on October 8, 2008 and expired the following year, 2009. The request for a 12-month extension would only be valid until October 8, 2010. Although the Historic District ordinance (Section 8-

3030) was amended in December 2009, none of the amendments would apply to this application.

The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density) and the Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for a 12-month extension from the previous expiration date of October 8, 2009.

Mr. Judson asked the staff to clarify how long an extension can be granted.

Ms. Ward answered 12 months. The original approval is good for 12 months. After this time, the Board may grant a twelve month one-time extension. To clarify on this project, the original approval was granted on October 8, 2008. It expired on October 8, 2009. Mr. Ogletree is now requesting a 12-month extension. If the approval is granted today, it will expire on October 8, 2010.

Mr. Judson asked the staff if it matters if the request is being asked for after the actual expiration date.

Ms. Ward said technically the Board has done it this way in the past, but this is why she included a full submittal packet to the Board. The application was posted properly on the site. Therefore, public notice was given and all the requirements have been met.

Mr. Engle asked staff if there is anything in the new ordinance that would impact this.

Ms. Ward explained that this is for a single family residence. None of the changes in the new ordinance impact this decision. Nothing has been changed from the original submittal.

Board Action:

Approval for a 12-month extension for New Construction from the previous expiration date of October 8, 2009. New extension expires October 8, 2010. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Ned Gay
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Gene Hutchinson - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present
Brian Judson - Abstain
Richard Law, Sr - Aye
W James Overton - Aye

| | |
|----------------|-------|
| Linda Ramsay | - Aye |
| Robin Williams | - Aye |

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

16. [Petition of John Clegg of Barnard Architects H-10-4238\(S\)-2 429 Barnard Street - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4238\(S\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

17. [Petition of Security Finance - H-10-4239\(S\)-2 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4239\(S\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4239\(S0-2\).pdf](#)

18. [Petition of Samuel Group Architects -H 10-4241\(S\)-2 - 33 Bull Street -Stucco Repairing/Repointing](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4241\(S\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

19. [Petition of Bloomquist Construction-H-10-4242\(S\)- 2 - 612 Howard Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4242\(S\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4242\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

20. [Petition of Big Foot Electric & Signs -H-10 - 4243\(S\)-2 - 136 Bull Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4243\(S\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

21. [Petition of Coastal Canvas -H-10-4249\(S\) - 2 - 12 East Bay Street - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4249\(S\).pdf](#)

22. [Petition of Coastal Canvas -H-10-4251\(S\) - 2 - 42 Drayton Street - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision and Submittal Packet 4251\(S\).pdf](#)

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements

23. [Acknowledgements](#)

Mr. Judson reported that he received a "thank you" note from Ms. Beth

Reiter. Ms. Reiter appreciates all the acknowledgements and plaque that the Board gave her. She extended best wishes to the Board in all its endeavors.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

24. [Petition of Stratton and Mary Leopold - H-10-4212-2 - 720-722 Habersham Street - Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward reported that she was contacted by a couple of the members of the Board after the last meeting who were interested in how the Leopolds were planning to move forward with the restoration of their building at 720-722 Habersham Street. She said immediately after the meeting the Leopolds sent her an email containing the proper course of action. Subsequently, she met with Mr. Leopold and he wanted to know what options he could pursue as opposed to just keeping the vinyl. Ms. Ward said Mr. Leopold also had concerns that the structural members under the building had so much moisture damage that he actually needs to get in there and remove some of the vinyl.

The suggestion that they talked about was one that she heard at the meeting and thought would be palatable, but just need to discuss how they can move forward. It is as follows:

1. Remove all of the vinyl siding from the building and conserve as much of it as possible.
2. Remove all of the clapboard and conserve as much as viable. The exterior of the
will be taken down to the studs, insulated, and proper sheathing and sealing
will take
place.
3. Use as much of the conserved clapboard on the north side of the building.
This area will
be covered with the conserved vinyl siding. Every effort will be made to
complete that
side of the building thusly.
4. On all other exterior of the building, the Mr. Leopold proposes to use Hardi-plank.

Ms. Ward stated Mr. Leopold said that on the side that wood would be put back on, he would probably be able to do most if not all of the north facing facade, which is the two story facade of wood siding that does not have the brick veneer on the bottom. He still wants to retain the vinyl siding and put this over it which she feels is within Mr. Leopold's right to do because this is an existing condition.

Ms. Ward stated that Mr. Leopold did not bring this approach to her in time to meet the advertisement requirement to get him back on today's agenda. But, she feels that she should be allowed to let him go ahead and start moving on the repairs, salvaging the vinyl and siding and not hold him up. Then hopefully by the time of the next Board's meeting, he could bring the photos of what he could salvage and then request the Hardi plank. She wanted to make the Board aware of this so if they had any questions or concerns about this. If there are concerns, she will tell Mr. Leopold not to proceed.

Mr. Judson stated that Ms. Ward answered his concern which is that he plans to come before the Board with a petition based on the information of the discovery process.

Ms. Ward stated that Mr. Leopold was apologetic that he was unable to attend the last HBR's meeting. She said if Mr. Leopold was present at that meeting, she feels that a solution could have been reached. The Leopolds were called out of town on a medical emergency.

Mr. Engle stated that he does not have a problem taking the vinyl off. But, he has spent 30 years supervising removal siding and it can be done correctly or you can deliberately go in as a contractor and trash it all. He thinks that the Board has the right to see the condition of the wood siding before it is pulled off. Mr. Engle said the problem with the sheathing is they are adding 3/4 of an inch to the outside of the studs. Then when you put something else on that, you have an extra three quarters of an inch which means that none of your original trim works anymore. It has to be spaced and this changes the entire configuration of the trim.

Mr. Judson stated that he believes what the Board is saying that Ms. Ward be instructed to allow Mr. Leopold to remove the vinyl and then stop.

Mr. Engle said as the Board as stated that the late two-story addition that has nothing on it at all, there is no reason that Mr. Leopold cannot proceed with this. This two-story section has no siding and vinyl at all. He said cover this up so it can be protected.

Ms. Ward said she believes that Mr. Leopold has a concern with removing the siding and if the pause is too long before he does any action that it will be open.

Dr. Williams said that he is somewhat confused because Mr. Leopold wants to conserve the wood and then he wants to conserve the vinyl. He will use as much of the conserved materials on the north side of the building, but then he says that he will cover it with vinyl. Therefore, there is an exercise in salvaging wood, consolidating it one place as Ms. Ward mentioned, but then what is the point if the vinyl will be put back on. Dr. Williams said why not leave it exposed as wood. He thought the Board's discussion was that they don't want vinyl, but as much of the original wood exposed as possible that is in good condition. Then Mr. Leopold talks about Hardi plank. If he is saving the vinyl, where will the

Hardi plank be placed. He said he finds this to be a very confusing document.

Mr. Judson stated that he believes that Dr. Williams' understanding of what the Board discussed at the last meeting is clear. If he reads it correctly, the introduction of the Hardi-plank has to do with the small addition to the east side.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes initially Mr. Leopold wanted to Hardi-plank the entire building.

Ms. Ward stated that Mr. Leopold is looking at this from a maintenance point-of-view.

Mr. Judson said he believes that the staff may let Mr. Leopold remove the vinyl, give the staff a report and then the Board will make a decision based on that.

Mr. Engle suggested that maybe the Board will have a field trip to this site. He said that once the vinyl is removed, the Board members who want to go to the site could do so and then discuss this.

Mr. Judson told Ms. Ward that the Board's consensus is for her in guiding Mr. Leopold is that they are fine with him removing the vinyl for further inspection, but do not go any further at this point. Hopefully everything will move forward quick enough for him to come to a resolution on the building. But, anything beyond this puts them at risk both damaging the wood and allowing Mr. Leopold to move in a direction that is not compatible with the Board's feeling.

25. [Petition of Shannon Lancaster - H-10-4220-2 - 322 East Harris Street - Demolition and New Construction of a carriage house](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward stated that last month the Board heard the application to demolish an existing carriage house and then rebuild it with the same materials just as a reconstruction. There was a decision to approve the petition for new construction and then there were several conditions. She said one condition was to install a new window opening over the pedestrian door to match the historic carriage house that is being demolished. At the time did not come to her attention and the petitioner was trying to be agreeable and did not say anything, but there is actually no window above what is going to become the pedestrian entry door into the building. The decision of the Board was to make it match the historic and if it didn't actually match the historic that it was okay that it could be noted on the plans.

Ms. Ward stated that she just wanted to bring this to the Board's attention so that when the carriage house gets rebuilt and the window isn't there, they would be aware of the reason for it not going back in.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

26. Adjournment

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Stuebe to take a matter from him to the Historic Savannah Foundation as he is at a lost for trying to be proactive in addressing the concern of people proceeding without knowing that there are guidelines in the Historic District. He has drafted a letter to several of the prominent realty firms in town trying to help them put a positive spin on ensuring this. He asked Mr. Stuebe that at their upcoming meeting ask if anyone in the Historic Savannah Foundation has any ideas on how he as chair or the Board might move forward with making it more of a public awareness campaign so that they don't end up in these situations. Mr. Judson said as always they welcome the input of the Historic Savannah Foundation and this is an area that he feels they can use the HSF's help.

Mr. Stuebe said the person cannot get a building permit without the Board's approval. Mr. Judson explain that this is two-fold. They are trying to make the persons aware that they must have a building permits and that there is a Review Board. In his letter to the realty firms he said they could put a spin on it.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 6:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah Ward
Preservation Officer

SPW:mem

The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.