

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET  
ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

AUGUST 11, 2004

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

Dr. Gerald Caplan, Chairman  
Dian Brownfield  
John Deering  
Ned Gay  
Dr. Lester Johnson, Jr.  
Eric Meyerhoff  
John Neely  
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring

Members Absent:

W. John Mitchell, (Excused)  
Swann Seiler, (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer  
Lee Webb, Preservation Specialist  
Christy Adams, Secretary

RE: Call to Order

Dr. Caplan called the August 11, 2004 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

All signs were properly posted.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Dawson & Wissmach  
Architects, for The Parker Company  
HBR 03-3067-2  
15 Bull Street  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Rudd M. Long  
HBR 04-3234-2  
349 West Bryan Street  
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Hyatt Regency  
Michael Goldsmith  
HBR 04-3235-2  
2 West Bay Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs  
Donna Swanson  
HBR 04-3236-2  
117 East River Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Sign  
Donna Swanson  
HBR 04-3237-2  
13 – 17 West Bay Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Albert Faragalli, For  
Marty & Rosemary Hill  
HBR 04-3239-2  
107 East Jones Street  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Naomi Williams, dba  
Daily Bread Café & Bakery  
HBR 04-3241-2  
610 West Oglethorpe Avenue  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Go Fish Clothing & Jewelry  
HBR 04-3243-2  
106 West Broughton Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 04-3248-2  
420 West Bay Lane  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 04-3249-4  
225 West River Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 04-3251-2  
411 West Bay Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison  
HBR 04-3255-2  
536 – 538 East Charlton Lane  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Regular Agenda**

**RE: Amended Petition of Ciphers Design  
Gary Sanders  
HBR 03-3071-2  
558 East Jones Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Gary Sanders.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report:

The applicant is requesting approval to amend a previously approved petition for a new single family townhouse by removing four feet from the width of the structure and revising the rear side porch from two stories to one story.

**FINDINGS**

The width would be reduced from 25' wide to 21' wide. The height, depth and design details to remain the same except for the side porch which becomes one story.

Please check revised front elevation for drafting error. Siding on front elevation does not appear to extend over to edge of porch floor.

Smaller scale structures are appropriate in the Beach Institute neighborhood. The change does not appear to substantially change the visual compatibility of the previously approved design.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose Gonzalez  
HBR 04-3193-2  
21 West Bay Street  
Alterations**

**Mrs. Reiter** asked if the petitioner was present.

There was no one present for the petition.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that the Board would move the aforementioned petition to the end of the agenda.

**RE: Continued Petition of Francis Hayes, For  
David Therrien  
HBR 04-3222-2  
224 A & B and 226 West Charlton Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Francis Hayes.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. Height and Mass for a new elevator addition, 4<sup>th</sup> story addition and egress stair. Elevator to be at rear of alley between the applicant's property and adjacent property to the north and will only be marginally visible from a public right-of-way, if visible at all. The material will be masonry block with Portland Cement stucco. Fourth floor addition. The fourth floor addition is set back on the Charlton Street side to allow for a deck. This has a parapet with iron insets. The top story addition and parapet have a dryvit system on masonry block. On eastern side of 4<sup>th</sup> story addition there is

- access to a roof garden. The roof garden and access will be obscured by a parapet similar to that at the third floor.
2. Uncover corner post at corner commercial entrance. Corner entrance to be natural wood, stripped, sealed and varnished.
  3. Remove infill from garage entrance and add folding iron gates.
  4. Add cedar louvered shutters, sized to fit the windows and hung on hardware by Cobblestone or equivalent. Paint black-green.
  5. Reconfigure existing balcony.
  6. Reopen infilled doors at second and third stories on the Charlton Street side and install custom door and transom. Paint windows ivory.
  7. Add false windows on Jefferson Street side at Ground floor and new 4<sup>th</sup> floor.

## **FINDINGS**

The following Standards apply:

- This is a four story zone on the Height Map.
- Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.
- Snap-in or between-the-glass muntins shall not be used.
- The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.
- All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.
- Window sashes shall be not less than 3 inches from the façade of a masonry building.
- Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening.
- Pitched roofs parallel to the street with less than 4:12 pitch shall be screened from the street by a parapet wall.
- Roof decks and pergolas shall only be visible from the rear elevation.
- Residential balconies shall not extend more than three feet in depth from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets or other type of architectural support.

## **DISCUSSION**

Substantive changes from previous submittal in response to Board discussion.

Charlton Street Elevation

1. On Charlton Street elevation the existing pedestrian entry to the upper floors will remain as is. The corner entry gates will be removed and reused elsewhere on the project. The corner post will be uncovered.
2. The existing iron balcony will be cut and reused at the second and third floors as shown on the elevation.
3. The iron insets in the parapet will copy those in Photo # 4.
4. A cornice detailed as in Photo # 3 will be added below the parapet.
5. The roof pergola will not be visible from Charlton Street (See sight lines on Jefferson Street elevation)

## Jefferson Street elevation

1. The top floor balconies have been eliminated on the Jefferson Street side and decorative iron safety grates will be added in the door openings.
2. The cornice described above will wrap around the Jefferson Street side between the third and new fourth floor.
3. Expansion joints appear to have been eliminated.
4. The ironwork from the corner entrance will be reused at the auto-courtyard entrance.
5. An existing iron arch and twisted iron gate will be reused in pedestrian entryway on Jefferson Street.
6. Roof pergola stepped back to be not visible (see sight lines on Charlton Street elevation) Rear elevation

1. The circular windows have been eliminated and replaced with 2/2.
2. The metal fire stair has been expanded per drawing and will be screened by a wire mesh screen.
3. The new elevator shaft has two windows on the north elevation. Masonry Block with Portland Cement Stucco.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDED**

1. Section, materials and dimensions of new cornice.
2. Dimensioned detail of metal inset
3. It is not clear what the decorative ironwork is that is to be reused as window guards – is this on the building now somewhere?
4. Detail of how the pedestrian gate will look when combined and finished.
5. More information on how the stair will be supported. It is recommended that consideration be given to eliminating the wire mesh screen and use plain railings instead with a solid wall at ground level.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval pending receipt of details described above and further discussion on stair.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF was still concern about the way the building was being enlarged. He said they approve of the changes that were made, however, the new floor in appearance was almost equal to two of the other floors although not exactly that height. This was contrary to the Savannah building tradition, which would have the upper floor being shorter than the other floors. Until you get to very tall buildings then sometimes it took a leap. But HSF was concerned that if this project is approved in this manner that similar enlargement in a more sensitive part of town would be much harder for the Board to deny even though they were aware that no precedent is set.

**Mr. Hayes** stated to the left of his project across from Pulaski Square there were two buildings that were similar to what he proposed. Originally, the building was built as a hotel, so its actual interior dimensions of the first floor was built as a store. Therefore the first floor was much higher in terms of retail. The second and third floors had the wide corridors indicative of its being a transient facility, so the original construction was a late 19<sup>th</sup> century hotel/motel. The bridge use to be visible from inside, but it has been lost due to the new parking garage. The

only thing that one would see in looking out of the window is other buildings. He said if it was a matter of inches than that was fine. But the top floor on the building already was the higher floor. So, in terms of the building itself, looking at the interior dimensions the first floor was high. The second floor is low and the third floor was the highest in the building. He said that was continuing a height that was already indicated in the present structure. He also stated that all of the surrounding and influences were taken into account over some period of time.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he was going to abstain from voting because he was not present last month when the project originally came before the Board. He said in the guidelines on Page 8, it specifically showed in the diagram buildings that were stepped back from a front façade as being not permitted. He said that seemed to not have been discussed and he wanted to point it out.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he felt the building met the height requirements in the area. He said reconstitution of the cornice at the third floor which was not in the original presentation made all the difference in the project because it established visually what the original building was. He said there were many examples of top floors being higher than intermediate floors. He said he felt the changes as made was a big improvement over the original presentation.

**Mr. Deering** stated there was a house on Charlton Street in the next block that was constructed in the early 1980's that that particular guideline was written in response to because the front plane went up two stories and it stepped back on the third floor. And yet the Board seemed to be allowing an addition to a building that was very much the same thing.

**Dr. Caplan** stated one thing that needed to be pointed out was this was not brought up at the last time when they had a continuation and the Board did not specifically mention that, therefore, he felt that that particular situation is if only for 1 month grandfathered in.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was passed. Mr. Deering abstained.**

**RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose Gonzalez  
HBR 04-3193-2  
21 West Bay Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Jose Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to add a one story full width covered wood portico with 12" diameter wood columns on 20" square bases. The capital will be the Ionic order. Above the portico will be a balustrade with 16" square posts with picture moulding applied to the front and back faces and a chamfered wood cap. The balusters will be 2" square. The total projection of the portico is 7'-4½".

Install Marvin wood Magnum Historical double hung 6/6 wood windows with authentic divided lights to replace 4 bricked in openings.

Install new operable bi-fold shutters on upper floor windows.

### **FINDINGS**

The applicable Standards are:

Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards (1) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District. An historic structure and any out buildings, or any appurtenance related thereto visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purpose of this section, exterior architectural features shall include, but not be limited to the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors and signs. In considering proposals for the exterior alterations of historic structures in the Historic District and in applying the development standards, the documented original design of the structure may be considered.

The applicable Guidelines are:

Section 9-3030 (k) Development Standards (6) Visual Compatibility Factors

- (f) Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection. The relationship of entrances and porch projections to sidewalks of a structure shall be visually compatible with the structures, squares and places to which it is visually related.
- (j) Scale of a building. The size of a structure, the mass of a structure in relation to open spaces, the windows, door openings, porches and balconies shall be visually compatible with the structures, squares and places to which it is visually related.

Construction on a City right-of-way requires approval of the Mayor and Council.

### **Discussion:**

1. 21 West Bay, originally known as the City Hotel, is attributed to William Jay, architect. Only one historic image is known of the building and that is the 1837 watercolor of Savannah by Firmin Cerveau. This indicates that there was a one story ground supported porch across the entire front of the building with a railing. The view shows 8 columns, evenly spaced except there is a wider space centered on the entrance between columns 4 and 5. This is reflected in the railing above. The existing building has undergone several changes including the ground floor windows have been replaced with storefront windows. The second story door opening appears to have been enlarged. The upper windows appear to have been changed from 9/9 to 6/6.

Given the architectural importance of this building, its attribution to William Jay, and the existence of the Cerveau view of the portico it is critical that the construction of the portico be as close as possible to the original. A close look at the Cerveau, as well as Jay's other work would suggest that the order of the columns on the portico is probably



Tuscan or Doric rather than Ionic. The American Vignola by William R. Ware is a good source to get the correct proportions for the column. The detail and proportion of the entablature is as important as the detail, proportion and order of the column. The above reference can give the correct entablature details for each order.

Regarding the railing. As proposed the newels appear too large and the applied detail is inappropriate. The 2x4 railings and 2x2 pickets are too vernacular for the lower part of the portico. It is possible that the original railing was iron between the posts.

2. Verify that the proposed windows are single glazed.

Provide more detail on the design and material of the proposed bi-fold shutters. Do these meet hurricane standards. Why can't regular shutters be used?

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval in concept for a one story portico, with a continuance to refine the details per the discussion.

### **Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Jose' Gonzalez** stated the shutters appeared to be much narrower. He said they did a study with a full shutter on the window based on the width of the windows as they exists and the shutters touched. It appeared that either there were some artist in the original rendering or there was some variation of a bifold shutter or something along the likes. And that was why they have scaled these this way. He said a full shutter would destroy the façade.

He said regarding the railing of the period they were widely spaced pickets, but they could not do a widely spaced picket today because of the code, which is the 4" spacing that is required. He said it might be appropriate if they all agree that in principle to maybe use iron as a way to achieve a lighter look in the railing as opposed to the heaviness that comes from having wood pickets so closely together, which they would be agreeable to. He said they could go with a narrower picket, but the problem with narrow pickets was that they tended to warp over time. So, they would suggest either allow the 4" spacing dictated by code or changing possibly to a metal rail as a way to achieve a lighter look on the balcony railing.

He further stated regarding the column capitals it was difficult to tell. He said they looked at several variations of this. It looked more ornate than a Doric, so that was why they thought it might have an Ionic bent, although it may be rare but it was not something that did not occur. He said if the Board felt they should go with a simpler Greek style using a Doric treatment that would also be fine with them.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** asked if he was proposing to use aluminum shutters?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated no, they would be wood shutters.

**Mr. Deering** asked if he addressed Staff's entablature point?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated yes.

**Mr. Deering** stated he looked at the section (beam over the top of columns) and he felt that it was rather simply detailed. He said he felt it would be more elegant on a William Jay building to be more correct in following as Staff suggested the American Vignola or something like that.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that was fine and they could provide that detail to match.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt if he went with a narrower picket and kept it wood it would be more in keeping. He said he felt with the iron he would end up with a 3/4 " picket and that might be too narrow.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated he agreed.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated reduction of the intermediate post in width might take away some of the heaviness of that porch.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that would be fine. He said in the rendering they were rather significant, but they could make them smaller.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he felt 4" off of them would be better.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they would agree to that. He said for clarification they are talking about using either a narrower picket or an essence to achieve a lighter look in the wood picket (railing), reduce the actual pilaster supports in width so that they don't appear to be as massive, to change the style and simplify the style in terms of the entablature. He said regarding the shutters he was not sure how the Board felt, but they have suggested their opinion as to what they felt would be a solution. Regarding the hurricane protection component, under historic structures you technically did not have to comply and the City will not require them to comply with the impact resisting glass. But they could design a shutter to withstand some wind loading, but a traditional wood shutter in no way could comply with the hurricane loading. He said he would suggest that they try to achieve a historic look and a lighter shutter would be more appropriate.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked since the shutters were an ornament at this point if the building would look better without them?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they would be bifold shutters.

**Mr. Deering** asked if there was a way for him to beef up their bottom rail on the balustrade design and also the top rails?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated yes, and he will detail that in a very large scale and could submit it to Staff, as well as provide some historical evidence of a typical historic rail and match the profiles.

**Mrs. Brownfield** asked if he said he would simplify the columns?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated yes, and he preferred the Doric because he felt it was a better treatment.

**Mr. Neely** asked if he needed the shutters?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they could leave them off if the Board wanted them to.

Mr. Deering stated he would not do the shutters rather than doing bifold shutters. He said he felt that these were not accurate when you look at the research on other Jay buildings.

Mr. Gonzalez stated okay.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the following conditions: (1) Eliminate the use of bi-fold shutters, (2) Reduce the balustrade newels at least 4” in width, (3) Revise the pickets and top and bottom railing, (4) Revise the column and entablature to the Doric order, and (5) Resubmit revisions to Staff. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose’ Gonzalez  
HBR 04-3226-2  
210 – 212 Gwinnett Street  
New Construction**

Present for the petition was Jose Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design for a six unit row of brick two-story townhouses.

### **FINDINGS**

The following standards apply:

1. Section 8-3030 (I) Design Standards
  - (1) Height Map. This is in a four story zone. The exterior expression of the height of the first story shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each subsequent story shall not be less than 10 feet.
  - (2) Street Elevation Type: a. A proposed building on an East-West connecting Street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front or on an immediately adjacent tithing or trust block.
  - (3) Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setback except on tithing blocks where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.
  - (4) Entrances: A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the East-West street.
  - (5) Residential Windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.

Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8”; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding; Snap-in or between-the-glass muntins shall not be used; the centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically; all windows facing a street, exclusive of

storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3, provided however, nothing precludes an arched window being used. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building. The distance between windows shall not be less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. Windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.

- (1) Roofs: Pitched roofs parallel to the street with less than a 4:12 pitch shall have an overhang and be bracketed or otherwise projecting eave detail, or be screened from the street by a parapet wall.

Parapets shall have a string course of not less than 6 inches in depth and extending at least 4 inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and one-and-a half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two inch overhang.

- (2) Stoops: Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate.

Section 8-3030 (k) (5) Non-rated structures. The construction of a new structure...shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, structure, material, texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with other nearby structures designated as historic...

The Following Guidelines apply Section 8-3030 (k) (6) Visual Compatibility Factors

- a. Height
- b. Proportion of structure's front façade
- c. Proportion of openings
- d. Rhythm of solids to voids in front façade
- e. Rhythm of structures on the street
- f. Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection
- g. Materials, texture and color
- h. Roof shape
- i. Walls of continuity
- j. Scale
- k. Directional expression

### **FINDINGS:**

1. The drawings still do not appear to scale accurately. The graph does not scale at 3/16" – 1'.
2. Height: The proposed construction is two stories within a four story permitted zone. There is a one foot elevation above grade although the water table is slightly higher than the threshold of the door. The first floor appearance on the exterior is 11 feet from grade. The second floor is eight feet with a parapet above. The same heights appear to prevail for the carriage house without a parapet. The height standard of 10 feet for the

second floor has not been met. The carriage house is the same height as the main house and does not appear secondary to the main structure.

1. Street elevation type: The adjacent and nearby street elevation types are raised crawl space, or full raised basement with ground floor elevations significantly higher than that proposed. While there are individual low rise masonry structures on the west side, they are not in the immediate proximity of this lot.
2. Setbacks: A four foot setback is proposed with the stoop even with the lot line.
3. Entrances: The primary entrance fronts the East-West street.
4. Windows: The proposed windows are approximately 1:2 in proportion with a cast stone surround. The brochure from Castello windows included no specifications. All the windows in the vicinity of the proposed site are taller than they are wide. All the historic masonry dwellings in the vicinity of the proposed site have punched openings in the walls with sills and/or lintels. No dimensions, depths, muntin profiles were given. While cast stone detail appears on the Queen Anne style buildings nearer Forsyth park, it is not used as a surround for windows.
5. Roofs: A brick parapet is proposed with a flush rowlock band below. A segmental arched raised parapet is proposed at the center of each unit and at the center of the side.
6. Stoops: The stoop material is cast stone. There are no railings. There is cantilevered roof over the door. Typical stoops in the area range from supported covered stoops to full porches. The one stoop without posts on West Hall Street has a bracketed hood.  
  
There is a raised ground supported rear deck with a bridge to the carriage house. No materials or dimensions were given.
7. Rhythm of solids to voids: A three bay rhythm is predominant in this neighborhood. The proposed project has a two bay rhythm. The precedent cited by the petitioner for a two bay rhythm is a modern house on Tattall Street.
8. Rhythm of structures on the street: 15' wide brick townhouse rows are not typical of this neighborhood.
9. Materials: Although this is primarily a wood frame neighborhood, there are a few brick buildings (most of the masonry structures are stuccoed) within several blocks of the site. A reddish brown brick with beige brick accents is proposed. The window and door trim is a cream Arriscraft stone.
10. Walls of Continuity: The main structure is connected to the carriage house on the Tattall Street end by a wall that appears to be almost a story in height.
11. Carriage House:

The following standards apply:

- New carriage houses may provide up to a four foot setback to allow a turning radius in to the garage on a narrow lane.
- Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.
- Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet or flat or shed hidden by a parapet.
- Carriage houses were traditionally accessory to a main house in mass and scale. They were secondary to the main structure.

**Discussion:**

The proposed carriage houses are the same height as the main house except for the parapet. They are not secondary to the main house in scale.

While the plan of Savannah can tolerate a diversity of styles and anomalies of rhythm, scale, material etc., this project varies in almost every aspect. The proposed houses do not achieve an appropriate sense of verticality due to the actual height of the second story and the interruption of a sense of verticality caused by the rowlock band between the first and second stories. The elimination of the uncharacteristic side stone pieces from the windows might help the verticality.

The street elevation type is more typically found on the n-s streets such as Tattnall, not in this block or neighboring e-w streets and the two bay rhythm is atypical of this neighborhood. The height and width results in a diminutive row in a much larger context.

There is not enough information to evaluate the rear of the structures or the deck/bridges.

Staff did meet with the petitioner and discuss these issues prior to this submittal. Complete material details and dimensions have not been provided as requested.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Denial based on incompatibility of height, rhythm of openings, relationship of width to height, street elevation type, height of carriage house in relation to main house, proportion of windows, design of stoop, walls.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Neely** asked Staff in order to get more verticality if she felt the solution was a third story or a higher crawlspace?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated she felt it could be done with a higher crawlspace elevating the main building to have more bulk. And she felt they could eliminate a unit to get a three bay rhythm.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated the site is zoned four stories with a density that will allow 21 units. The goal was not to build 21 units on the site, but build a number of units on the site that would work in terms of transition because in that neighborhood you had taller buildings then you transitioned to smaller residential. And the goal was to design a project and even though it alluded in detail to other structures that it also be a contemporary structure. The idea was to reduce the number

of units on the site from what would be allowed. He said they could go up to four stories on this site, but it was not the intent to build a four story 21 unit project. The intent was to build something smaller in scale. In doing something smaller in scale it was about trying to make the numbers work. He said they took an approach of trying to design a unit that they felt could be handsome inside by doing some unique things in the interior and at the same time create a nice new rhythm on the street. He said he agreed with Staff if they were trying to build something in a zoning that was similar to what was across the street or on the other corners. But on this site, which is zoned for larger density the goal was to scale down the project. With that said, they tried to deal with the concerns that Staff brought to them.

He stated he felt reducing to 5 units would be more problematic and may require them to revert back to a much denser site to make it work. He said he would ask if there is a way for the Board to consider an alternative scale for the site as a transition to residential.

**Mr. Gay** stated on page 3 of his photographs (203 West Gwinnett Street) it has two stories and was probably wider, but it was a nice building. He asked why couldn't he do something like that?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that was one unit on that site versus the width of the proposed site. He said it was also half the size of the proposed site with a different zoning.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt there were better scaled examples for this site over at the corner of Tattall Street and Huntingdon Street. He said there was a small row of four or five houses that was stucco that had bay windows that were about 18 or 19 feet wide. He said they were raised a little higher off the ground, but they had a street presence that would suit this site better than the six proposed houses. Also, there was a row of wooden houses on Barnard Street between Gwinnett and Waldburg Streets that were also about 18 or 20 feet wide that suited the neighborhood and would also suit this street a lot better. He said he felt as proposed that they looked like worker houses from the Pullman district of Chicago and they did not suit the street.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the area virtually had all wooden houses with the exception of Tattall Street, which was partial brick with a wood side porch. He said what he saw on Gwinnett and Tattall Streets and the lane was a two story brick wall. There was no architectural articulation on this building with the exception of the downspout. There was no indentation and no rhythm at all. He said because of that he felt that it became a 90 foot long building along Gwinnett Street and even longer along Tattall Street. By connecting them with a high wall and having no articulation on the Tattall Street side it looked almost like a prison wall. He said he felt architectural articulation of getting into the rhythm with the compatible buildings in the neighborhood. He said he felt that it lacked that on all three elevations.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he felt Mr. Meyerhoff hit on it. He said he felt as proposed the petitioner had lost all verticality and the downspout was not enough. He said maybe some sort of vertical differentiation between units may help.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated this was a significant departure from massing and scale on this site than the way it is zoned and the way it has been approached before. He said it was important for them to get a sense from the Board to establish to what ends they could aim the design bearing in mind the goal is to achieve something that everyone could feel comfortable with. He said there were two approaches – (1) is to go to much more detached situation such as this, which basically eliminated the ability to create a sense of a single family entity. Forcing the site to become more multifamily in its solution ie either four stories or as many units as they could work

and whatever scale issues they could deal with. He said the goal with a tight sight that has density issues is to deal with this single family kind of feel with something that went to a larger scale and then come to the middle with something that is sort of a transitional scale. He said he knew that this did not deal with any of issues that Mr. Meyerhoff mentioned, but he was concerned with that their concept was a significant deviation from the zoning in transitioning here and whether the Board would be agreeable to this solution programmatically. He said to just reduce to five or four units was not a solution that was viable for them in terms of trying to approach it. He said they would have to go to the other direction.

**Mr. Deering** stated he understood that the zoning and the ordinance allowed for four stories, but there would have to be contacts around the building for the Board to allow four stories on the proposed site. He said he had to meet not just zoning, but the ordinance and approval from the Board because all these come together. He said he was going to have to find on his own a way to make that work. He said it was not up to the Board to say that this density is right because the Board was not here about density.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated he understood that density was not the purview of this Board. He said what he was talking about was if he duplicated the older type structures that was on this site and put the number of units that the zoning allowed that would meet the scale issues and so forth. It did not necessarily meet any contemporary or need basis for the type of housing that they were trying to provide, which was market driven. He said they were trying to fill a market and at the same time be sensitive to the fact that that market does not lend itself to the more traditional four story apartment building and it went more to residential.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he was not talking about separating the units. He said he was talking about architectural articulation. He said he had the room between the carriage house and the building to where the two end units could be setback or set forward. He said he has the opportunity on Tattnell Street to do any number of things particularly between the wall, between the carriage house and the main building not in the same plane.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated he agreed with that. He said if he articulated this in a handsome appropriate architectural way he was suggesting that he may not have a problem with it. But he was trying to get from the Board and Staff whether that would be an appropriate solution.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated it was a visual thing. He said to get a rhythm in here as Staff mentioned a three unit or two unit rhythm is easily accomplished, but right now there was no rhythm at all. The only rhythm was on the downspouts, which he felt looked sort of warehousy and did not fit.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if the Board could narrow it down for the petitioner.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated she felt it seemed simple enough that Staff has denied the petition based on incompatibility of height, rhythm of openings, relationship with the width and the height and so forth. She said she was very specific in her findings of what he probably should look for. She said she would suggest that he go back and look at the specific findings that Staff pointed out.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated those comments were based on the original submission. And the drawings that were before the Board has met those.

Staff stated it has met some of them.



**Mr. Gonzalez** stated it did not meet the whole issue of scale, which was his main concern. He said he would suggest that the petition be tabled.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if he was asking for a continuance?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated yes.

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until next month. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of T. Heyward Gignilliat  
HBR 04-3240-2  
124 East McDonough Street  
Gate/Fence**

Present for the petition was Heyward Gignilliat.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting to insert a bi-fold auto entry gate into an existing historic brick, brownstone and iron fence.

### **FINDINGS**

1. The space to become a 2 car parking area is the courtyard for 124 East McDonough, built in 1861. There is currently no off-street parking for this house.
2. The Savannah Grey brick fence with its brownstone cap and Wickersham wire iron fence is one of the few authentic “old Savannah” details left in the Historic District. If altering this original fabric is necessary to accommodate off-street parking, then the alteration should be kept to the bare minimum. A 16’ opening is proposed. The Historic District Ordinance limits garage door openings to no greater than 12 feet. It would appear that the petitioner is trying to provide two off-street parking spaces in the courtyard. Staff recommends an opening no greater than 10 feet. There is a concern with the root structure of the existing trees on the street and the paving material proposed for the courtyard. Brick is preferable to concrete. The site plan is not specific to the existing conditions of Floyd Street. It would be useful to know what the City’s plans are for this street regarding paving, planting and parking. Alternatives may be able to be worked out with the City for off-street parking such as having sidewalk only on the west side of the street and pull off spaces on the east side dedicated to the house.
3. The write-up states that the existing fence railing will be reused to match the existing gate facing McDonough, however the proposed drawing does not exactly do this. The existing gate design with single horizontal bar is good and should be the prototype, rather than three horizontal bars in the middle and no screen or other opaque material should be used in the bottom half as suggested in the photograph.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Explore on-street alternatives with City.

2. If off-street parking is the only alternative, then provide detailed site plan showing paving materials, reduced opening, and redesigned gate.
3. Provide letter from City Traffic Engineer and Park and Tree that this vehicular access is approved by these departments.

### **Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. T. Heyward Gignilliat** stated that he grew up in the building next door which was his grandfather's house. The building is an Owens House and built by Heyward, a former Mayor of the City of Savannah. Dr. Owens whose relatives own the Owens Thomas House is the owner of this building. The property has been through about five different ownerships before he was able to purchase the building.

The house in question has eight units. When he was growing up it had seven units with eight in the main building and a doctor's office along with a single carriage house above. There were two parking spaces underneath the carriage house. This was destroyed by one of the subsequent owners to make another apartment. The eight unit apartment has no parking provided. When Parkers was built next door to the property he had to negotiate with the City off and on. There was dumpster put right in the front door which he finally had moved. There were three dedicated spaces for tractor trailers. They were pulling in behind the property and destroying the sidewalks. He went to negotiate for the final parking space to be removed. They have lost five parking spaces for truck delivery on the street behind the house.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated that there have been two attempts to pave the street, Floyd Street. He stated that he had some of the City Council members to go out and see that they were about to lose two of the most majestic Magnolia Trees in Savannah if they were to pave the street along with two Crepe Myrtles. One of the reasons this was pushed was to gain three more parking meters in downtown Savannah to the cost of five trees. He stated that everyone argued that they could pave around the Magnolia Trees. He further stated that you can pave around a Live Oak, but you can not pave around a Magnolia. He stated that he told the City Preservation Officer that there will be additional attempts to pave the street and to secure the additional parking spaces. What the proposal will do, as seen in the building next door which is the Catholic church building, where they put in three parking garages. They lost the trees across the street and the area was paved. He stated that he is attempting to give the building some parking. His 89-year old mother-in-law lives on the ground floor. They know that they will soon need someone to live with her and would like to have some parking for the building. If they cut it to ten feet, they would not be able to get two parking spaces in the narrow area. He stated that he loves the idea of using the existing fencing and using a mesh on the bottom which he could paint Charleston Green. This would allow them to save the two majestic Magnolia Trees and stop any thought of the city paving Floyd Street. Mr. Gignilliat stated that he would take any suggestion as to how to maintain the fence.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that if the gate is started at the northernmost tree and complied with the 12' gate and angle park along the McDonough Street wall the same thing could be accomplished. He stated that it seems to him that this would work.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated that he and Mrs. Reiter had a fight with Greg Parker about angle parking. He stated that this is not consistent with downtown parking. They would lose the beautiful tree.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that there is no tree in the yard. He stated they could move the gate next to 220 Floyd Street and then angle park against the McDonough Street wall.

**Mr. Deering** stated in the garden.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated coming in between the trees is going to be difficult.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that you would come in straight and then turn once you get inside the gate.

**Board Comments:**

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that it is clear that they don't allow garage openings greater than 12' period.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it is not a garage.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated, but he wants to create a garage door opening. She further stated that the Board has had similar requests come before them many many times.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated that the proposed doors will be bi-fold. He stated that they will not come out into the street.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that no matter what the proposal called for the Board has always denied openings 16' wide.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated that it would be more attractive if he puts two openings there with a brick . If you look at the building next door there are three garage doors next door to each other. He stated that this is not very attractive. The proposal will keep the integrity of the fence which will be much more attractive than two entrances.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that the width of garage openings come up month after month and the guidelines are pretty specific on the matter. They don't allow 16' garage door openings.

**Mr. Gignilliat** asked if he puts a petition in between and did two separate openings would that be allowed.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he could have whatever opening he wanted as long as it did not exceed 12'.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they would be losing more of the fence.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated that the integrity of the beautiful yard would be lost.

**Mr. Gay** stated then you would have the trees to worry about. You would have to cut down all of the trees just to get there.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated that to save the City of Savannah from paving the street and losing five trees he is asking for a variance to this situation. This would allow him to keep the integrity and doing an expensive bi-fold gate.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated that if you have a ten foot opening and park two vehicles in a "V" shape why would this not work.

**Mr. Deering** stated that then you would have cars parking in the yard the way it was in the 1930's.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that the Historic District isn't made to accommodate cars.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he agrees with the Staff Report in principle and he understands the Gignilliat's desire for off-street parking. He stated that he believes that the existing garden would be the best possible solution to work out a situation with the City for them to be able to park on the street. He stated that he doesn't think they should do a bigger opening or two openings because it destroys more of the historic fence which is pretty rare. He stated with all due respect to Mr. Meyerhoff, he does not think having cars laid out in "V" formation in someone's downtown garden is a solution. It would look like the 1930's where they simply parked cars anywhere they wanted to. Mr. Deering further stated that he does not have a clear solution, but he does agree with Staff's recommendation for the wall to remain and that there should be some other solution worked out. He stated that the property is beautiful and they all know that it is beautiful.

**Mrs. Brownfield** asked if the mother-in-law were in need of a caretaker would the city not somehow offer an off-street parking space with regard to handicapped. She stated that there could be a need base for two off-street parking spaces on the street.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated that he has blocked the city from paving the street because there is a big move in the City of Savannah to get as much parking with parking meters as possible. The biggest push is to have parking meters. If he were to get the requested parking they city wouldn't be able to ask for parking meters in the space. He stated that this will continue to come up every three years.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if there was any further discussion or a motion?

**Mr. Gignilliat** requested a continuance on his petition.

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until next month. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

\*Mr. Gay left the meeting approximately 3:40 p.m.

**RE: Petition of Tom Hoffman & Gretchen Ernest  
HBR 04-3242-2  
520 East Gaston Street  
New Construction (Part I & II)**

Present for the petition was Gretchen Ernest.

The petitioners are requesting approval to construct a single-story carriage house on the rear portion of 520 East Gaston Street.

### **FINDINGS**

The following standards apply:

## 1. Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards

- (1) Height: a. Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.
- (2) Street Elevation Type: a. A proposed building on an East-West connecting Street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front or on an immediately adjacent titling or trust block.
- (9) Windows: Residential Windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.

Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding; Snap-in or between-the-glass muntins shall not be used; the centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically; all windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3, provided however, nothing precludes an arched window being used. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building. The distance between windows shall not be less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. Windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.

- (13) Lanes and carriage houses. Lanes and carriage houses shall comply with the following:
  - c. New carriage houses may provide up to a four-foot setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.
  - d. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.
  - e. Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.

The Following Guidelines apply:

## Section 8-3030 (k) (6) Visual Compatibility Factors

- a. Height
- b. Proportion of structure's front façade
- c. Proportion of openings
- d. Rhythm of solids to voids in front façade
- e. Rhythm of structures on the street
- f. Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection
- g. Materials, texture and color
- h. Roof shape
- i. Walls of continuity
- j. Scale
- k. Directional expression

**Discussion**

1. An existing concrete parking pad with a masonry retaining wall is located off of East Gordon Lane. The proposed carriage house will be constructed on the existing pad and foundation.
2. Site Plan: The lot at 520 East Gaston Street is 90' deep and 31' wide. The maximum building coverage is 60% for this zoning district, RIP-A. The total area is 2,790 square feet. The existing semi-detached residence is 880 square feet. The area of the proposed carriage house is 440 square feet. The total proposed building coverage is 1,320 square feet or 47% building coverage.
3. Height: In the Beach Institute neighborhood of the Landmark District, one-story dwellings rather than two-story carriage house are located along the lanes. The petitioners' proposed carriage house will be single-story and have a gable running parallel to the lane, which resemble an existing row of seven, single-story dwellings on East Gordon Lane.
4. Exterior siding: The exterior façade of the carriage house will be 5" lapped wood siding, with wood trim and soffit, to match the main house.
5. Garage doors: The side garage doors of the carriage house will be 8' wide, with two overhead sectionalized garage doors, painted hunter green to match the main house window trim color.
6. Windows: One window will be located on the east gable. The west side of the carriage house will have no windows because this is a fire separation wall, in the event the adjacent property owner pursues building a carriage house at a later time. The south side of the carriage house, facing the main house will have a center door with windows on either side. This façade should not be visible from the lane or East Gaston Street. All windows will be manufactured by Marvin, in the Ultimate Clad model, and will be double-hung, one-over-ones. This model of window has been approved for new construction by the Review Board.
7. Roof: The roof will be gabled, with the gable running parallel to the lane. An asphalt shingle by Timber Line, in "weather wood", will be used to cover the roof.
8. Colors: The colors will match the existing house, including: main body-Benjamin Moore 306,"lion Heart;" window sashes- Benjamin Moore 2041-10 "Hunter green;"; and trim and stucco foundation-Benjamin Moore HC-30 "Philadelphia Cream."

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval. The Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards appear to be met.

**HDBR Action: Mrs. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I and II as submitted. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects  
Anne Smith  
HBR 04-3244-2  
225 West President Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Ellen Harris.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting alterations as follows:

Remove old stucco and restucco the north, east (Main) and south façade with new stucco, custom formulated to match the make-up of the stucco found and tested on the west pediment. The original sample appears to be scored in 24.5" high by 55.25 inch wide blocks (See photo). An additive will be put in the stucco to prolong its life. More information on this additive will be provided. The new stucco will be scored to match the pattern found on the west side of the building. Structural scoring will occur periodically along the scoring. It has been determined that patching the existing stucco would not be successful.

The sandstone will be patched and repaired as needed with a mineral based mortar formulated for sandstone in a custom color to match the existing color.

The wood capitals will be repaired and sealed.

### **FINDINGS**

The applicant has consulted the National Park Service Preservation brief series and has had the stucco tested and custom formulated to match that on the protected west façade.

Please further describe what is meant by "structural scoring" and how this will look on the building. What color and texture will the stucco be? Further describe the latex additive. Will this give the finished surface a shiny look as when an elastomeric coating is used?

Is there any evidence that the sandstone was originally exposed and stuccoed because it was delaminating?

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval in concept pending discussion of items raised above.

### **Petitioner's Comments:**

**Ms. Harris** stated the term structural scoring was a misnomer. She said what she meant was that controlled joints would be added in the scoring. And also expansion joints would be periodically added. With the expansion joints there will be scoring in the stucco that will go all the way through to the brick to allow for the natural expansion of the stucco and then the brick will be sealed. The expansion joints will be no more than ¼" thick and sealed with a caulk so that the brick beneath will not be exposed. She said the color will match what they believed to be the original color of the stucco. And the texture will be a sandy finish. She also stated that it appears that no additive will be necessary, therefore it won't be shiny or have a wet appearance. She said that they also could not find photographs to determine if the sandstone was originally exposed, therefore they were not recommending that it be exposed.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** asked if the expansion joints would occur at the sides of the pilaster or some unobtrusive place?

**Ms. Harris** stated it would be as unobtrusive as possible. She said when they remove the stucco it will be easier to determine because there would probably be some cracking in the joints of the bricks, probably above the windows it might be necessary to add some.

**Mr. Deering** asked if they will follow the scoring?

**Ms. Harris** stated yes.

**Mrs. Brownfield** asked the petitioner if she anticipated the look being similar to the Scardino House at 20 West Gaston Street that faced Forsyth Park?

**Ms. Harris** stated without having a photograph of it she was not sure.

**Mr. Deering** stated what Mrs. Brownfield was alluding to was that was a poor restucco job. He said he was sure that they would not want to see that and it was hard to find a craftsman that could execute the stucco work as they used to. He said they just wanted her to be conscious of that.

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mrs. Brownfield seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of T. Heyward Gignilliat  
HBR 04-3246-2  
116 East McDonough Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Patti Gignilliat.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to install screens, as façade elements, to hide condensers, satellite dishes, and a future elevator access landing, on the third floor of 116 East McDonough Street.

### **FINDINGS**

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

- (1) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District: An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenances related thereto visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include, but not limited to the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors, and signs.



- (6) Visual compatibility factors: New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the Historic District which are moved, reconstructed, materially altered, repaired, or changed in color shall be visually compatible with structures, squares, and places to which they are visually related.

### **DISCUSSION**

1. The petitioner is proposing two treatments for screening condensers, satellite dishes and a future elevator access.
2. On the front façade, the alteration would use 9" thick Savannah Grey brick screen wall, with the reuse of an existing window and shutters. The sill and lintel would be brown sandstone. The drawing is unclear, but it appears that the screen wall extends 12 feet. What happens in the 6'-5" section is unclear because it appears that a cornice comes across at the front and yet it is currently an alleyway. A section is required and more information on how the 12' portion of the cornice will be detailed and interface with the existing cornice. It should be a simplified version so as to not be confused with original fabric.
3. On the rear elevation, the second screen would use 4"x 6" thick timber frames, with 11.5" thick louvered shutters. The framed shutters would be 6'11" tall and span 18'5". The shutters would be in Charleston Green and the timber frame and siding would be in Ivory. A photo is included of a similar screen wall on a house at Gaston and Drayton Street. Staff agrees that this detail would be appropriate, however the proposed drawing does not indicate this level of design detail. The apparent use of siding appears inappropriate for this house.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval in concept of the use of a brick screen wall on the front and a louvered screen wall on the rear, however a continuance for more detailed drawings indicating exactly what is proposed with sections. If an elevator shaft is a part of this proposal with a connector across the roof to the house then it needs to be indicated on plan and elevation to understand whether any of it will be visible above the screen wall.

### **Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mrs. Gignilliat** stated she felt it would enhance the beauty of the house to screen all of the satellite AC condensers, etc. She said they have proposed the brick (Savannah Grey) to fill in the front of the house. And in the back the screens expanding the entire interval between the two buildings were similar to the Brasswell house on Drayton and Gaston Streets. She said she felt it would enhance the visual from the back, cutting out some of the other buildings in the distance.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** asked the petitioner if they thought of a different screening material for the front rather than just bricking in the void?

**Mrs. Gignilliat** stated yes, and it was discussed with Staff and the brick appeared to be more consistent for the appropriateness of the Historic District.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF was concerned with the nature of the petition because they were not sure what was fully going on. He said his primary concern was with the front of the house and the way they chose to screen it. He said he felt it created a very odd situation on such a vintage house where the roof comes down to where the chimney was located, but the front of the building now seemed to keep going. And not knowing any better if that was a fake window sitting in a wall, which he did not feel was appropriate. He said HSF also agreed with Staff on the siding on the rear screen. But felt that what appeared on the front was much more important and hoped the petitioner would take another look at that and come with a different solution.

**Additional Comments:**

**Mrs. Gignilliat** stated one of the reasons for the screen was because of the potential elevator that will be hidden by the screens. And at the moment they were looking at sundry elevator designs, etc and they did not know what the materials would be. She said they were talking about putting in a 21<sup>st</sup> invention and wanting to screen it with 19<sup>th</sup> Century screens. She said that was the major reason for the screens.

**Mr. Deering** stated this was really important in the shape of their house and felt that was what HSF was bringing up. He said perhaps the solution where it looked like a wood porch that was infilled with windows might be a more successful solution and maintain the integrity of the shape of their house. And from that point over maybe do screens like the back of the Andrew Lowe house where they had the louvers within the porch. He said he felt something like that might be more successful than just putting in a false window and bricking all the way across to the next building. It would maintain the original brick fabric of their house, but it would have to be done carefully. He said maybe HSF and Mr. Hardison could give them some assistance with that.

**Mrs. Gignilliat** stated it appeared that way on the drawings, but it stopped at the line.

**Mr. Deering** stated he still felt they needed to maintain the shape of the house.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated if they went with the brick he felt they needed to set it back a couple of inches to show where the original house line was.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated they thought it would be consistent to go across since they could get the window out of the side where the elevator was going. He said it would be the same window and he had a matching shutter that could go over that. He said he will use original bricks because he had a stockpile of them.

**Mr. Neely** stated he was looking at two photographs, but he felt the darker one that looked like shutters because it met the concern about maintaining the shape of the house. He said he felt it blended in well with the shutters.

**Mrs. Brownfield** asked Staff if she had any comments regarding the revised drawings?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated her comment was that they had to have a much more detailed drawing to know what the screen was going to look like. The other was she was confused because if the future elevator was here, and there was a covered connector and it was setback, why did it have to be screened at all?

**Mrs. Gignilliat** stated there was a lot of stuff that showed. She said she felt it would be consistent with the front of the house being more attractive and they did not know what the elevator was going to look like. But it certainly hid all of the necessary equipment that was on the roof in the back. She said but not knowing the nature of what the elevator was going to look like she could not answer that.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated she would agree with the shutters from the back.

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated they could agree to the shutters.

**Mr. Deering** asked the petitioner if they could bring more detailed drawings of how the shutters were going to go together back to Staff?

**Mr. Gignilliat** stated yes. He requested a continuance on his petition.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Neely** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until next month. **Mrs. Fortson-Waring** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Kern Coleman & Co.  
Tom Olson  
HBR 04-3247-2  
11 East Perry Street  
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Tom Olson.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design approval to construct a carriage house on the same footprint as an existing carriage house behind 11 East Perry Street and approval of a color change on the main house as follows: Siding, windows, porch trim: Benjamin Moore Navajo White; shutters, door, porch floor: Benjamin Moore Essex Green; Roof Charcoal GAF shingles; copper gutter.

### **FINDINGS**

The following Standards apply:

Section 8-3029 (6) (l) Design Standards (1) Height a. Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.

(13) Lanes and Carriage Houses:

New carriage houses may provide up to a 4 foot setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.

Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.

Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by a parapet.

The following Guidelines apply:

Carriage houses were traditionally accessory to a main house in mass and scale. They were secondary to the main structure.

Multiple narrow garage openings should be used in lieu of large openings to preserve the scale of the lane.

**Discussion:**

1. The size of the carriage house is 20' x 35'-11" by 19'-6" to the plate with a 5:12 gable roof. The building to the west is taller and the building to the east is one story.
2. The gable roof has asphalt shingles.
3. The material is sand finish stucco over concrete block scored on the ground level and expansion joints on the second floor. Three, eight foot garage door openings are proposed with flat panel flush metal overhead doors, painted Essex Green. A flat flush metal pedestrian door is proposed.
4. The windows are wood, double hung, true divided light. The shutters are operable wood panel shutters painted Essex Green.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval, subject to building coverage variance approval from Board of Appeals.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked has he gone to the Board of Appeals for building coverage?

**Mr. Olson** stated they have made application, and the meeting is scheduled for later this month.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was a very fine example of a federal house. He said he felt the façade they presented for the alley did not suit the house in front of it. He said he felt if they went back with a clapboard solution on the back or a brick really simple without lentils and funny carriage lamps that it would be much more successful project. He said he felt that this looked more like it belonged behind a later period townhouse. It seemed that he was trying to make it traditional in nature. And if he was then he felt that he should find simpler examples that were behind 1820's houses that would be good models for this project rather than this particular solution.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he concurred with Mr. Deering.

**Mr. Olson** stated they ended up with stucco because the owner had a strong preference to do it in stucco. He said there first recommendation to the owner was to do it in clapboard. He said every building along Perry Street sort of had its own character. And next to the Byck building it was sort of dwarfed. And then next to the next building it did not have much character. But he felt the owner was looking at the stucco as being something and maybe it was a reaction to the fact that the old garage carriage house was in bad disrepair. And with stucco it would be a less maintenance type of material. He said if the Board had a strong preference he could approach the owner and go with clapboard with simple trim.

**Discussion:**

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated she would also have to agree with the clapboard and would like for the owners to consider that.

**Mr. Deering** also stated that if the owners wanted less maintenance they could also use brick because there were several examples of brick carriage houses behind federal period wooden townhouses. And if the owners absolutely have to have stucco then maybe simplify the details where the casings around the garage doors would not be there. And the fancy lentils above the windows on the second floor would not be there or something like that if they have to have the stucco. He asked the petitioner if they would be interested in continuing the petition until next month?

**Mr. Olson** stated he hoped they could get it approved with conditions.

**Mr. Deering** stated the Board may be able to grant approval for Part I – Height/mass and they could proceed with their drawings and come back with exterior materials and details.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Deering made a motion that that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I – Height/mass with exterior materials and details to come back before the Board. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE:   Petition of Dirk Hardison, For  
      James & Debbie Smith  
      HBR 04-3250-2  
      202 East Gwinnett Street  
      New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a one-story carriage house and 7' high brick fence along the lane and Abercorn Street for 202 East Gwinnett Street.

**FINDINGS**

The following standards apply:

1.     Section 8-3030 (I) Design Standards
  - (1)    Height: a. Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.
  - (2)    Street Elevation Type: a. A proposed building on an East-West connecting Street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front or on an immediately adjacent titling or trust block.

- (12) Fences and garden walls: Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building, provided, however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.
- (13) Lanes and carriage houses. Lanes and carriage houses shall comply with the following:
  - c. New carriage houses may provide up to a four-foot setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.
  - d. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.
  - e. Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.

The Following Guidelines apply:

#### Section 8-3030 (k) (6) Visual Compatibility Factors

- a. Height
- b. Proportion of structure's front façade
- c. Proportion of openings
- d. Rhythm of solids to voids in front façade
- e. Rhythm of structures on the street
- f. Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection
- g. Materials, texture and color
- h. Roof shape
- i. Walls of continuity
- j. Scale
- k. Directional expression

#### **DISCUSSION**

1. The proposed one-story carriage house will be constructed on top of an existing concrete parking pad off of East Hall Lane. A wood porch will extend from the carriage house on the west elevation.
2. The proposed carriage house will have a depth of 30'10" and a width of 24' along the lane.
3. Height: The proposed carriage house will be one-story. One story carriage houses with gabled roofs, are found along East Hall Lane.
4. Exterior materials: The carriage house will be constructed of brick, with wood trim and a wood vent. A typical wall section was provided by the petitioner. Petitioner needs to clarify color of wood trim and exposed rafter tails.
5. Roof: The carriage house will have a front facing gable roof, covered with composition shingles. Rafter tails will be exposed.
6. Garage doors: The garage door openings appear to be approximately 10' wide. The doors will be roll-up doors with carriage house trim. Petitioner needs to clarify color of garage doors.
7. Wall: A new brick wall is proposed to replace an existing, non historic wall along the lane and Abercorn Street. The solid brick wall will be 7' tall with evenly spaced, 6x6 brick piers, with caps. A section of the proposed wall was provided by the petitioner. A 6' wide wood gate will be installed between the new carriage house and the wall. Other wood gates will be located to the east of the carriage house and on the Abercorn Street elevation at the main house. Petitioner needs to clarify color of wood gates.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with clarification of colors for wood trim, garage doors, and wood gates. The Visual Compatibility Factors and the Design Standards appear to be met.

**Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the owner has asked for the Board's opinion on a last minute change due to some security issues that have recently come up. He said what they were hoped to do was eliminate one more point of access. They had asked for a double gate so that they could move wider objects in/off the property without going through pedestrian gates. And then the new point of access onto the property would be from a garage door on the opposite side that faced the house. He said although it was back behind the house it would be visible at a distance from Gwinnett Street. And also three 2 foot X 2 foot wood windows for light. He said he explained to the owners that it was a little late to be making these changes.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Webb** asked how wide was the garage door?

**Mr. Hardison** stated it was the exact same size as on the lane side.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if he could put up the elevation that was originally submitted side by side with that?

**Mr. Deering** stated some of the older carriage houses did have doors where you drove straight thru.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if he could put up the other elevation?

**Mr. Deering** stated there was just the gate.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked the petitioner if they would consider lowering the ominous 7 foot high wall with an 8 foot high pilaster. He said it was a long yard and was on an interesting corner with a lot of interesting houses.

**Mr. Hardison** stated it was a high wall because the hotel was going up across the street on the corner. And the current non-historic Savannah Grey wall was crumbling.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated it did not add more protection or change the sight of the hotel across the street.

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended and presented today. Mrs. Brownfield seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Request for Extensions**

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Amended Petition of Gregory Gill, AIA  
HBR 04-3174-2  
201 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.  
Alteration  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
2. Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects  
HBR 04-3229(S)-2  
110 Barnard Street, Unit 212  
Windows  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
3. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
HBR 04-3231(S)-2  
27 Montgomery Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
4. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
HBR 04-3232(S)-2  
210 West Bay Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
5. Petition of The House Doctor  
Charlie Angell  
HBR 04-3233(S)-2  
522 East Gordon Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
6. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Glenn Wood  
HBR 04-3251(S)-2  
309 East Gaston Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
7. Petition of Ray Johnson, Inc.  
HBR 04-3253(S)-2  
513 East York Street  
Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
8. Petition of Keith Howington  
HBR 04-3254(S)-2  
427 Montgomery Street  
Window Alteration  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**



**RE: Work Performed Without Certificate  
Of Appropriateness**

**RE: Report on Items Deferred to Staff**

**RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements**

\*Dr. Johnson left the meeting approximately 4:55 p.m.

**RE: Other Business**

**Dr. Caplan** stated the Board has been trying to meet with the Mayor. He said they have had several responses and correspondence back and forth. He said the Mayor has asked that they have a workshop, which they were currently working on. He said they have not heard from them about dates.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** asked what kind of workshop?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated ...(inaudible)

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated the Board has had their Retreat workshop in which the Mayor did not attend.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated she felt the handout was excellent that was included in the Board's packets.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that was interesting because they had already embarked on that project. He said they have worked up some very interesting statistics, but they have not presented them because they were making some revisions. The Board's approval rate is about 97%. One of the most interesting items was that in years past there were many continuances that went 2, 3, and 4 times. Now with the Board's new agenda having a continuance and stating what it was for and limiting the conversation to that they have not had one continuance go beyond the initial continuance. He said he thought that was a remarkable statistic and felt the Board needed to be commended for doing that. He said he felt that would be one of the items that the Mayor and City Council would be interested in. He said Staff has really been working hard on this and they have met a couple of times to discuss this.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated that she felt that what Staff has done with regard to putting what was in the guidelines, etc they have defined it so clearly for the petitioner as well as the Board. She said she felt that was something that also needed to be pointed out to the Mayor and City Council.

**Dr. Caplan** stated there has been a lot of things that have been done, which he felt was real improvements. He said they will point those out, but he was sure they would hear a lot of things particularly as it related to past Board's that were not going to be favorable. He said he felt the they could address that because they have addressed those problems.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated that in here when they talk about the Preservation Commission doing an Annual Report, she felt defining all that in a paper like an annual report and presented it was the way to go.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that in the past Staff has done quarterly reports with similar information.

**Mrs. Brownfield** asked to whom did they present the quarterly reports?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated to the Mayor and Alderman and the Board.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated that she felt how the Board or Staff spot things that are in error and people have to be asked to take things down that were inappropriate or correct it also needed to be included in the reports. She said the Board and Staff were the eyes for the community in a lot of ways.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he felt that there should be a fine or some sort of penalty for people who came before the Board seeking forgiveness after they have done something.

**Dr. Caplan** stated for the workshop if the Board has any suggestions for Staff about statistics or other things to communicate them to Staff. He said he would like to talk to the Mayor and City Council about things that they would like to see them improve on, like fines and meter boxes.

**Dr. Caplan** asked Staff has she heard anything on a new Board member?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated no.

**Mrs. Brownfield** asked would it be appropriate to talk about the other seven or eight Historic Districts that are in Savannah.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated no, because that was going through another process.

**Dr. Caplan** stated one thing they will try to do is to address the changes that have been recommended and they have never met on those.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** asked if they were finish with that process because she noticed they have not had any meetings?

**Mr. Webb** stated that they have not had any public meetings.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated the City Manager wanted to have a workshop ...(inaudible)

**Mr. Deering** stated they did not want to have a public meeting until they were informed about what the changes were.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he felt that was a good suggestion to do that, but he did not want to do it at the expense of the other things that the Board was trying to accomplish.

**RE: Minutes**

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – July 14, 2004

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated the Board did not have a quorum and because they did not start the discussion before Dr. Johnson left they would not be able to vote on the minutes.

Dr. Caplan stated the Board will vote on the above-mentioned minutes at the next meeting.

**RE: Adjournment**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR:ca