

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET  
ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

DECEMBER 8, 2004

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

W. John Mitchell, Vice-Chairman  
Dian Brownfield  
John Deering  
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring  
Ned Gay  
Dr. Lester B. Johnson, Jr.  
Eric Meyerhoff  
John Neely  
Swann Seiler

Members Absent:

Dr. Gerald Caplan, Chairman (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Mitchell called the December 8, 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: Regular Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Buck Lindsay  
HBR 04-3174-2  
201 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.  
Alterations

Present for the petition was Winford Lindsay.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting amendments to a previously approved petition as follows:

1. Oglethorpe Avenue elevation: (Staff note: In order to locate the proposed changes staff has numbered each bay along Oglethorpe between MLK and Papy Street. There are nine bays for this purpose.)

The change in elevation along Oglethorpe Avenue between MLK and Papy street was not taken into account on the previous submittal. There is about a four foot change in elevation.

- In Bay # 2 the fire exit door has been eliminated and a window has been replaced by a French door, stained.
- In Bay # 9 at the West end the portico and door have been omitted.
- In Bays # 3 and 7 the stucco at the first floor has been changed to brick.
- Signage has been moved from the west end of the elevation to the east end.
- Control joints have been added to all stucco portions.
- Projecting arms to support building accent lighting have been added to the second floor level.
- All windows have been changed from a pair of 6/6 to a pair of 4/4.

Discussion: The following standards apply:

- (1) The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide.
- (2) Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street.
- (3) Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on an east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances.

In addition, the July 14<sup>th</sup> approval contained the condition that the stucco on Bays 3 and 7 be brought down to the ground in an effort to break-up the massive length of the brick elevation. This was reflected on subsequent drawings given to staff. The proposed changes leave a 281 foot long elevation with no pedestrian ingress. The portico on the Oglethorpe Avenue side appears to have no active use.

The July 14<sup>th</sup> approval also asked for a window sample once the manufacturer had been determined. This has not been received.

The location and design of the projecting accent lighting is not shown on the drawings.

1. Martin Luther King, Jr. Elevation:

- The large multipane windows have had a 10" sill added. Please verify that this sill was also added under the two similar windows on the Oglethorpe Avenue side. Please provide enlarged scale drawing of typical large window.
- Replace the two windows over the entry at second floor with large multipane windows.
- Add three flagpoles at second floor level.
- Utilize green opaque glass in the two left arched windows and leftmost window at second floor level.

2. South elevation (courtyard elevation)

- Change roof tile to Monier Lifetile “S” profile; Color - Buttercup Blend.
  - Remove six windows in Bay 2 and add six windows in Bay 6.
  - Add a step and railing at western end.
3. All stucco to be painted with an elastomeric coating in previously approved color “Believable Buff”.

### **FINDINGS**

Staff has concerns with the following issues:

1. The Oglethorpe Avenue elevation is the longest and most prominent and yet it is “dead” as far as communication with the street. The proposed revisions remove what doors there were on this elevation. Other recent hotel plans have placed prominent entrances along the primary street elevations. The proposed hotel essentially turns its back to the public street.
2. The proposed changes showing the “blacking” out of several prominent windows on the entrance façade does not enhance the pedestrian experience along this street.
3. The Board conditioned their previous approval on bringing the stucco down to the ground on the two bays along Oglethorpe Avenue to help break up the strong horizontal base.
4. The size of the drawings submitted make it very difficult to discern detail clearly. It was requested that the applicant provide detailed information on all the various proposed windows, including manufacturer and dimensions and profiles of muntins etc. at a scale that can be easily understood. This has not been received. Staff had also requested that the areas of change be “bubbled” so that the Board could easily see where the change was occurring. Information was also requested on the width and depth of the expansion joints and exterior lighting.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Continuation until application is complete and staff concerns addressed.

### **Petitioner’s Comments:**

**Mr. Lindsay** stated he inherited this project post HRB approval. He said they were charged with preparing the construction documents for the project. In the process they encountered a couple of realities that had not been considered during the original design work. One was that the site sloped about 4 feet from M.L.K. to Papy Street. Another was that a lot of the implementation details had not been thought through. He said what they have requested were minor changes, which he wanted to address in hope of leaving with conclusions today. However, if necessary they were prepared to revert to the design that was originally approved.

He stated that on the Oglethorpe elevation bay 2 fire exit door no longer functioned as an exterior exit door. The stairs had been reoriented and was a monumental stair inside the building that the bottom of which faced inward rather than outward.

In bay 9 at the west end, the entrance door and portico feature had been eliminated due to 3 feet drop.

He stated in bays 3 and 7 the stucco that was shown at the first floor has been deleted in favor of brick. He said they were concerned that the stucco would easily be damaged and discolored at the pedestrian level. However, if the Board was adamant about the desire to have that as stucco they were prepared to make it stucco. He said he would also like to suggest that if the elements remained as stucco that they use rustication to express the fact that the base of the building was different from the top of the building.

Also, the signage has been moved. He said control joints had been added. Projecting arms to support building accent lights had been added to the second floor level. He said they would be arms projecting exactly like what was on the Courtyard Hotel. It would be the same type of light fixture painted to match the rest of the building trim. He stated that all windows had been changed from 6/6 to 4/4.

**Mr. Lindsay** further stated on the M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. elevation under the large multi windows a 10 inch high brick sill had been added. The same window treatment also continued on the large windows that were on the Oglethorpe frontage closest to M.L.K. He said they replaced the two small windows on the front center façade with larger windows. He said they have also added three flag poles cantilevered at a 45 degree angle off the face of the building. Also, there was an area where they would like to use opaque glass. He said if they were not allowed to use opaque glass, they would like to use curtains.

He stated on the south elevation there was a note saying change the roof top from what was previously approved to another type of tile. He said he would like to withdraw that request. He said they also changed some window locations which were previously pointed out. It was mainly because the floor plan even as originally presented to the Board could not have windows in those locations. However, they added windows in some other locations where they were shown on the floor plan, but not on the elevation. He said because of the way roofs intersect with the building those windows could not be positioned where they were shown. He said they added a step and a railing as pointed out to accommodate the 4 foot grade change from M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. to Papy Street. Also, they requested that the stucco be painted with a colored paint same as what was previously approved.

He stated with regard to failure to present bubbled plans he apologized, but it was asked. However, he talked with Staff and on the second resubmittal turned in plans which showed both the original presentation approved façade and the proposed façade so that the issues could be easily compared. With regard to the stucco control joint samples he believed they were ubiquitous in Savannah and it would be a simple 3/8 inch "W" shaped control joint put into the face of the stucco. He said concerning the window sample submittals they still did not have a contractor, but felt within about a week or two they would be able to identify the window manufacturer and present samples.

#### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated on the Oglethorpe elevation when it was originally presented it was presented similar to what was now shown in that the base extended the entire length of the building. He said they talked about it at that meeting and the architect changed it to take some verticality down to the sidewalk. He said even when there were groups of buildings there was very strong vertical accentuation. He said he felt they lose that in the proposed revision. He said there was a very strong base and he felt they needed to consider breaking up the block-long, one material situation.

**Mr. Lindsay** stated they could do that. He said they would modify their plans accordingly, and that was something the Board had already approved in its original presentation. He said he would like for the Board to consider the idea of the rustication on the stucco or they could also create the rustication in the brick if it was the desire of the Board.

**Mr. Deering** stated if it was not done on both he would not suggest that it be done on just one.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated also on M.L.K. side where they had the three arched windows they were asking the Board to approve the dark glass because behind two of them there was a kitchen. He asked why did they have windows there at all?

**Mr. Lindsay** stated the three arched elements had a sense of importance just as three arches. He said if the Board did not care for the opaque glass they could curtain the inside of the windows with an opaque curtain.

**Mr. Neely** stated maybe they could bring down at least two or three of the stucco features on the Oglethorpe façade. He said he felt now that it was slanted it was even a larger block of straight brick with no features. He said he was wondering if there was some feature they could put in there, whether it be four windows, to break the far right hand side of the base even further.

**Mr. Lindsay** stated as you went around the corner and looked at the Papy Street end of the building you had a large array of windows on that façade. So, when you looked at the corner in elevation, it was a longer stretch of no windows, but if you looked at it as a practical pedestrian you were seeing windows all over the building.

**Ms. Brownfield** stated she did not have a problem with the sign change as far as going from one end of the building to the other. She said she liked the three arched windows and would prefer that they use curtains there as opposed to the glass. She said she also agreed with the Board about the stucco.

**Mr. Lindsay** stated they would be glad to run the two elements of stucco down as presented. He said there was also the third element in the middle which projected that they could make all three of the projecting elements similar. He said he also did not see a problem with rustivating the brick.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF echoed the concerns that Staff had with regard to this project. He said in the original drawing there was an elaborate fence and in these plans it has disappeared. He said there were also some decorative elements that were across the top of the building, but they did not appear here.

**Mr. Lindsay** stated the leaving out of the decorative squares above the fifth floor was accidental. He also said the fence should be presented as it was originally designed. He said that was not intended to be changed.

**Mr. Deering** stated regarding the 4/4 windows he felt the proportions were better than what was presented and approved last time. The large windows over the entrance portico were better and helped unite the entrance element much better than the other two windows did.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the following conditions: (1) The stucco on the Oglethorpe Avenue bays to extend to the ground as previously approved and in addition, the stucco of the middle bay to also extend to the ground. The ground floor stucco to be rusticated, (2) The window manufacturer and detail of the components of the windows such as profiles and dimensions of muntins to be brought to staff, and (3) A curtain design to be used rather than the opaque green glass on the MLK. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Sam Tompkins  
dba Sorry Charlies  
HBR 04-3210(S)-2  
116 West Congress Street  
Fans/TV**

No one present for the petition.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting “after-the-fact” approval of ceiling fans placed under the existing previously approved awning and 13” t.v.s attached to the pilasters of the building.

### **FINDINGS**

Exterior televisions mounted to contributing architectural features of a structure are incompatible appurtenances. The ceiling fans are attached to the awning.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of the ceiling fans and denial of the t.v.s.

**Ms. Seiler** stated the Board approved signage on the Congress Street side, but she noticed that there was also a sign on St. Julian.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated she would have to check.

**Ms. Seiler** stated this has been the first that she has seen this in the Historic District. She said she felt that it was setting a precedent for all night entertainment television on the sidewalk. She said really felt this was a dangerous precedent

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition as submitted and requests that the exterior fans and t.v.s be removed within fifteen days of the receipt of this decision. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 04-3293-2  
15 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.  
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval for a five story hotel located at the NW corner of Bryan and M.L.K., Jr. Boulevard.

### **FINDINGS**

*The following standards apply: Large Scale Development: (a) Large scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width. No wall plane exceeds 60 feet. This standard is met.*

*(b) Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. The primary entrance is on Bryan Street with another entrance on MLK. This standard is met.*

*Tall building standards: (a) The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide. This standard has been met.*

*(b) Buildings greater than four stories in height shall use window groupings, columns or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width. This standard has been met.*

*(c) Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched, the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature. The roof is flat with a parapet. This standard has been met.*

*(d) Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances. This standard is met.*

*Setbacks: There are no front yard setbacks required. Historically, structures are built to the lot line on MLK. This standard has been met.*

*Commercial building heights: (a) The exterior expression of the height of the ground floor shall not be less than 14'-6" (b) The exterior expression of the height of the second story shall not be less than 12 feet. (c) The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet. This standard has been met.*

*Proportion of structure's front façade: There are no adjacent historic structures of this scale with which to compare this structure, however the three bay rhythm of the façade and placement of windows echoes the historic commercial structures along this street.*

*Proportion of openings: The rectangular and vertically aligned windows are compatible with commercial structures along MLK.*

*Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades: The vertical and horizontal divisions meet the standards. The top story windows have been revised replacing the stucco panels with brick. Two projecting bays have been added on the MLK side at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor level. The standards state that Bay windows are not permitted on structures over three stories in height.*

*Rhythm of structure on streets:* The required utility easement helps create the appearance of a lane. Historically the commercial buildings were built to the lot line. More recent commercial buildings did not adhere to the traditional siting and are incompatible with the typical commercial urban pattern of this area. This siting reestablishes the historic urban pattern. One comment to consider is whether the building line could be pulled northward toward the utility easement to allow more room for tree planning along Bryan Street in front of the hotel?

*Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection (includes balconies):* The arrival court is now located on Bryan Street

*Roof shapes:* The roof shape is compatible. The pediment on the east elevation is flush with the building.

*Walls of continuity:* The urban street wall is maintained.

*Scale:* The openings help break up the scale of the building.

*Directional expression:* The projecting bays on the MLK elevation adversely affect the verticality established by the rhythm of the windows and piers.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of Part I Height and Mass with the condition that the bay windows be eliminated.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Shay** stated they had no problem with removing the bay windows as recommended by Staff.

**Mr. Deering** stated he would like to thank the petitioner for making the changes they did. He said he felt this concept worked so much better. However, he agreed with Staff and felt that the bays were incongruous.

**Mr. Shay** stated they would also take a hard look at pushing the building back. He said at the time there was a survey conflict and they were not sure if that little bit of land right in there was a part of this property or not. But if they can they will try to shift the building back in the design development stage.

**HDBR Action:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I – Height/mass with the condition that the bay windows be eliminated. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE:   Petition of Tony Phillips  
      HBR 04-3298(S)-2  
      313 Abercorn Street  
      Awning/Stucco Removal**

Present for the petition was Tony Phillips.

The applicant is requesting approval of 17 new awnings to be installed on the front of 313 Abercorn Street. The proposed color is black. The applicant is also requesting approval to remove the remaining stucco from the first floor walls.

### **FINDINGS**

1. The applicable standard is Section 8-3030 (k) Development standard (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...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 purposes 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...

The applicable Visual Compatibility Standard is (d) Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades.

2. The awnings were submitted to staff for review. Based on staff's decision for denial, the applicant has requested that the petition be heard by the full Board.
3. Although parts of the house may be earlier, the basic style of the house is late 19<sup>th</sup> century Victorian, including bay windows on the second and third stories connected by porches. The placement of awnings at every window on the front façade, including the bay windows adversely affects the rhythm of solids to voids and creates an appearance that is not consistent with the historical treatment of late Victorian residences. Awnings were not usually placed under porch roofs or on every window of a bay. The first floor awnings do not meet the City Zoning Ordinance clearance standards of 8' clearance.
4. Interior blinds or shades would suffice for privacy and glare reduction and be more compatible with period window treatments.
5. The structure is located between two brick structures. Since the stucco is falling off the basement bricks and the bricks seem to be in good condition, there does not seem to be a reason to not expose the bricks.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Denial of the awnings based on the alteration of the rhythm of solids to voids and that the treatment is not consistent with historical treatments of awnings on Victorian structures. Approval to remove remaining stucco and repoint bricks to be left exposed.

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

**Mr. Phillips** stated the drawings that Staff received were inaccurate as well as the measurements. He said they wanted to put the canopies on the second and third floors. He said the canopies would be about half the size as shown. He said the use of the property was an Inn. Historically, inns that were in that era had canopies on them. He said if there was a way to downsize the canopies he would be willing to do that. He said for clarification there were existing shutters on the first floor that would be maintained. And on the second and third floors there would be canopies.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Neely** stated the brick on the ground floor was in bad shape. He asked if they were going to repoint?

**Mr. Phillips** stated yes.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF hoped that before anything was approved that reasonable drawings showing the size of the awnings as well as where they attached would be submitted to Board, so the Board would know what they were voting on.

**Discussion:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the building had some really nice architectural detailing. He said with the two bays it created a great deal of interest and he felt that any awning on the building would take away from what the building was.

**Mr. Gay** stated he felt interior shutters would accomplish the same thing of shading people on the inside from the sun.

**Mr. Deering** stated he agreed with the comments by Mr. Meyerhoff and Mr. Gay. He said typically on Victorian houses even the bay windows would have exterior shutters that would stand out from the building.

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the addition of awnings and approve the removal of the stucco. It is also noted that the shutters on the first floor will be retained. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Ships of the Sea Maritime Museum  
HBR 04-3300-2  
37 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.  
Demolition**

Present for the petition was Gary Arthur, Trustee, and Dan Snyder, Architect.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting to demolish 37 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard due to its loss of historic and structural integrity. The wall between the site and the Scarbrough garden will be built with wood according to the plan provided utilizing portions of the remaining brick wall.

**FINDINGS**

1. 37 MLK, the Kramer Building was built in 1919 as a commercial building associated with Savannah's automotive industry. It was added to the Historic Buildings Map in 2000 as an example of an early 20<sup>th</sup> century commercial building and for its architecture. The

- building appears to have been last occupied in 2002. Ships of the Sea purchased the building in November, 2004.
2. There has been no roof on the building for years which has caused the interior to collapse. Recently more of the wall along the north side of the Scarborough House garden collapsed. Of the original building only approximately 50 percent of the exterior walls remain standing. The roof and interior are gone. The East elevation does retain most of its Art Deco façade, however there is little holding it up structurally.
  3. An engineer's report has been submitted stating that the remaining structure is in a state of failure and that further collapse is very likely.
  4. It is staff's understanding that an exhibit and lecture hall annex for the Scarborough House is planned for the site.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Given that the advanced deterioration of the structure has destroyed the historic and architectural integrity of the building and that rehabilitation of the structure would consist of almost a complete new reconstruction it is recommended that the remaining East elevation be documented through measured drawings and photographs and that these documents be placed in the Georgia Historical Society. It is further recommended that the existing building be allowed to be removed. Also that the temporary wall along the north edge of the Scarborough House garden be approved.

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

**Mr. Gary Arthur, Trustee**, stated they have never been in the business of ridding the City of its heritage. He said they have been in the forefront of spearheading preservation. He said their late chairman, Mills Lane, saved the Scarborough House, restored it, and brought it back to life. He said through the years they made repeated offers to buy the automotive garage from SCAD because as long ago as 1991 it was listed as vacant. He said it was bought by the college in 1993 and was left by them to continue to deteriorate over the course of another 11 years. And as stated most of the flooring system was yanked out and the biggest part of the roof has caved in. He said because it has been a shell opened to the elements it was now rotting. It was only last month that they succeeded in acquiring the building from SCAD. But it was after a 35 foot long section of wall collapsed into the museum garden. He said he wanted the Review Board to understand that the Ships of the Sea Museum did not cause this state of affairs. Now, there was little left of the real fabric of what makes a building a building. He said the structural engineer's report attests to that fact as does Staff's findings.

**Mr. Dan Snyder, Architect**, stated when you looked at the building from the outside it looked deceptively stable. He said when the wall collapsed into the garden at the Ships of the Sea Museum, the contractor called in a panic because he felt the whole building was going to come down. Because it was reasonably maintained on the exterior it looked deceptively stable, which it really was not. He said when you looked at this as to the historical significance of it the wall that you saw would ultimately be covered by any building that was put on the lot. Therefore, the only one that really comes into question was the front façade, which was the one that had the most fabric. He said because this building has no roof, this façade has had exposure on two sides. He said the steel windows therefore received water on both sides and were more rusted. He further stated that when you get on the first floor the storefront has been replaced with aluminum storefront, which was not original historic fabric. The transoms if you looked closely had all been pushed out and the glass block around the front door was set in a wood frame and because the water came in on the inside the wood frame has completely deteriorated. So,

when you looked at this one façade that was the last remnant of character on the street, you really did not have much left but a skeleton. He said the only thing that was really character - defining were the capitals on top of the pilasters. He said he felt it was important that the National Park Service interprets a building as having four walls. Because this would not constitute a building in the International Building code there was one provision for historic buildings that exempted them from a lot of requirements of the code. He said this no longer constituted a building, therefore the whole building would have to be brought up to code. He said they felt strongly that the shell was beyond their ability to preserve. He said they also agreed with the Staff report would be happy to do the measured drawings and place them in the Georgia Historical Society.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated when she looked at this her first thought was could they just keep the façade until a new design came about because in her mind it comes almost like a gaping hole in a mouth where a tooth was missing. She said it tended to show the evolution of the streetscape. However, after listening to the petitioner's argument she could understand their having to do demolition.

**Mr. Deering** stated he sort of also felt the same way that Mrs. Brownfield did. He said he has looked at this building for a long time and remembered when it became vacant and remembered when the museum tried to buy it at that point. Therefore, they were at no fault for the state of the building. He said it would be a shame to lose it because of the evolution of that area of the City. But, the Board just reviewed a project for the empty lot next door, so you had one tooth being filled with a new building and he would guess that there would be another one at some point in time. He said in other cities in the country when they have tried to keep facades and plan new buildings behind them they almost end up worse projects in the end because the limitations of keeping the façade.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated she felt that as much as they could she wanted to see them preserve the City. However, in this extreme circumstance she could understand why it was not a good idea.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if they had any plans for the 1779 historical marker that was in the brick on the façade?

**Mr. Arthur** stated they would want to retain it and not destroy it, but they had no plans for it otherwise.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated hopefully the current recommendations going before the MPC about buildings not being attended to would eliminate some of what the Board keeps facing.

### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF was concerned that if the Board finds that this building should be demolished that there be no mistake that it goes because of the structural condition of the building, and not simply because someone did not like it or it was an aesthetic that they did not approve of. He said regarding a newspaper article in the paper yesterday, that he had received phone calls from people asking how to instigate demolition of buildings in the Historic District because they thought that when this address was given in the paper that it meant that demolition by neglect was a valid path to pursue. He said there was a

lot of misunderstanding about the article and HSF wanted to make sure that the public knew from this meeting that demolition by neglect was not the correct path to follow to get what you want in the Historic District. He said HSF's other concern about the documentation had already been addressed.

**Ms. Cynthia Hunter** stated she did a report on this building while she was a student at SCAD. She said she wanted to oppose the demolition of this building. In the paper she wrote for SCAD she had a historical statement that says – “the original commercial building built by F. Chris Kramer in 1920 has historical significance based on the structure's historical evolution and linked to the contextual history of the area. The area surrounding the site was focused on the transportation industry of carriages. As the car became more widely used the area turned from horse and buggy services to automobile based businesses.” She said from the research she did while at SCAD there were few of these buildings left along M.L.K. The third item on the list for today was the hotel on M.L.K. and last month there was also another one approved. She said she felt M.L.K. was becoming a hotel alley and there were few structures left that needed to be saved in order to keep the vacant lots from becoming more of these high rise hotels. She said she would like to ask the Board to deny demolition to allow interested persons, historical societies, and other organizations the opportunity to acquire or to arrange for the preservation of this structure in particular.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** stated she would also like to ask the Board to deny demolition. She said she felt that the City has lost so much of its historically and architecturally significant 20<sup>th</sup> century architecture.

#### **Discussion:**

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated she felt the Board would never agree to demolition by neglect. But she felt the Board had to take into consideration the fact that a structural engineer has said that it was structurally unsound and recommended that the building be demolished to eliminate risk to public safety, as well as the Preservation Officer's report and from everything the Board has seen. She said she felt there was nothing there to really preserve at this time. Again, in every case that she thinks it was possible to preserve a façade or to do something to an existing building they should preserve it. But in this case where you have a structural engineer saying that it should come down she felt the Board should pay attention to that.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated she was concerned because if the former owner was here making this presentation to the Board, would they sit here and say okay, yes you have let it fall apart as they did with the wall (Up-freight warehouse) that they had to go out and actually look at and the Board did not let them tear that down even though they let it fall down. But because there was a new owner who was stuck with the problems, she would have to agree with the last two members of the public who made presentations. She said she could not vote to demolish it.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated she knows that Mrs. Fortson-Waring was referring to the railroad structure, but she felt there was so much more to that complex that the Board had to consider and she was not in favor of tearing that down because there was more substance there and structural engineers saying who were involved and said that it could be saved, whereas this one seemed not to be.

**Mr. Deering** stated you could hire a structural engineer that would say this could be saved too, because a lot of the Central of Georgia complex was in that very same condition and has been saved.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she felt there was a tremendous difference in the condition of the two buildings. She said she knew the Board of the Ships of the Sea Museum were not in the business of tearing down anything remotely historic.

**HDBR Action:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the conditions that the existing historic plaque on the building be preserved and that the structure be documented in archival quality photographs and measured drawings to be deposited with the Georgia Historical Society. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed 6 – 2. Voting for the petition were Mr. Neely, Ms. Seiler, Dr. Johnson, Mr. Gay, Mr. Meyerhoff and Mrs. Brownfield; Voting nay were Mrs. Fortson-Waring and Mr. Deering.

**RE: Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder  
Keith Howington  
HBR 04-3301-2  
108 West Broughton Street  
Renovation**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate the façade of 108 West Broughton Street.

### **FINDINGS**

The following Standards shall apply:

Section 8-3030(l) (5) Commercial Design Standards:

- (a) The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront.
  - (b) The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course (i.e. a projecting horizontal band.)
  - (e) Retail storefront area glazing shall be not less than 50%. Such glazing shall be transparent, provided, however, black glass may be used in the sign area above the storefront window transoms. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18-24 inch base of contrasting material, to the lintel.
  - (g) Entrances shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.
  - (j) Storefronts shall be constructed on wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a galvanized storefront system; bronze, glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront; provided, however, the Historic Review Board may approve other materials upon a showing by the developer that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.
1. The existing storefront, including doors, plywood panels, and painted brick, at the first level will be removed.
  2. The existing metal canopy will be removed.

3. The existing brick façade will remain, with the paint to be removed, and any mortar or masonry repaired in kind where needed. All down leaders and scuppers will remain and will be cleaned and painted.
4. The plywood panels covering the windows on the second and third floors will be removed, exposing the existing windows which will remain and be repaired where needed, and painted. The color of the windows has not been determined and will be submitted for a Staff level review at a later date.
5. The existing brick sills will be restored and repaired where needed.
6. The existing cornice will remain and be repaired where needed.
7. A new aluminum storefront will be installed on the first level. The storefront will consist of new aluminum storefront glazing, new storefront doors, a new four-panel metal door on the right to provide access to upper floors, new pressure treated wood pilasters (to be painted), and a new brick base to match the existing face brick. The large glazing panels will be located between the pilasters.
8. The submitted drawings shows the new main entrance centered yet flush with the storefront. According to the ordinance, the entrance should be recessed. This would also be in keeping with the other storefronts on this block. The petitioner needs to address this issue to bring the project into conformance with the ordinance.
9. A horizontal wood string course will be incorporated into the façade above the storefront.
10. A new canvas, shed-style awning, with an aluminum frame, will be installed which will project 5'6" from the facade. The color of the awning has not been determined and will be submitted for a Staff level review at a later date.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the entrance be recessed accordingly and that all paint colors and awning color be brought back for Staff level approval.

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

**Mr. Deering** stated they were willing to recess the center entrance storefront and resubmit drawings to Staff for approval.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked what will be the color of the aluminum frames?

**Mr. Deering** stated it has not been determined. However, they were thinking of an opaque finish to match the painted pilasters.

**Mrs. Brownfield** asked how impossible would it be to emulate the photograph to replicate this photograph with wooden sash windows and stone pilasters?

**Mr. Deering** stated the owners were trying to do this work within a budget and it would be quite expensive. He said they actually felt that the pilasters were stone very much like the Marshall House Hotel and they were not prepared to do that.

### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated because this was one of the older commercial buildings HSF was hoping to encourage the owner to think about reestablishing the

pattern of columns, windows, and storefronts across the bottom of the building. He said HSF appreciated the steps forward that this one was taking and did not want to take anything away from that. He said HSF felt that it would solve the problem of recessing the storefront, but the larger pilasters, windows moved to the front, the doors moved to the back of the pilasters would solve a lot of problems that was going on with these buildings as they change.

**Mr. Deering** stated from what they could tell from the historic photographs the doors were not recessed. And the current ordinance asks that the doors be recessed, but the owner did not want that to happen and asked them to present it with the doors flushed with the face of the building. He said there was sort of a conflict between what the ordinance asked and what historic photographs show. He said they tried to encourage the owner to go back to this but they did not want to go that far.

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated a number of developers on Broughton Street have gone to great lengths to restore the buildings as they were. For instance, the building at Whitaker and Broughton. He said HSF felt that it can be done and felt that it would come upon the Board to see that work was done to as high quality as possible for the benefit of the Historic District.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the center doors be recessed and that all colors be brought to staff for approval. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed. Mr. Deering recused himself.**

**RE: Petition of Richard Guerard, For  
Alan Sadler  
HBR 04-3302-2  
412 East McDonough Street & Price Street  
New Construction**

Present for the petition was

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting Part I: Height and Mass approval to construct sixteen attached, single-family row houses on the block bounded by East McDonough, Price, Habersham, and East Hull Streets.

### **FINDINGS**

Three structures are located on the block at present, including the ruins of a metal and brick shed and a two-story structure with a stucco front and red brick sides. These buildings appear to retain no historic integrity. A third building is a one-story warehouse built ca.1950. None of these buildings are rated structures or listed on the Historic District Building map. These structures will be demolished as a component of the project.

The block's context has a prevalence of vacant and asphalt parking lots. The block is bounded by a large, vacant lot to the north; a large, asphalt parking lot between the three-story brick police headquarters and the stucco façade of the old jail on the west; a three-story brick duplex facing Habersham with an asphalt parking lot behind and a one-story brick and concrete building facing Price Street to the south; and a vacant lot and a one-story concrete block

building to the east. Some historic residential two-and three-story duplexes are located across Price Street facing East Hull Street.

The block is located in an R-I-P-A zoning district which allows for 75% building lot coverage, which as proposed the project meets.

As proposed the project would provide one off street parking space per unit, in a front entrance garage, off both East Hull and East McDonough Streets.

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards from Section 8-3030 apply to new residential construction for Part 1: Height and Mass:

1. **Height:** The block is located in a four-story height zone. As proposed, the row houses would be three stories, with a total height of 34'. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first floor will be 10'6" in height, the second floor 10'6" in height, and the third floor 9' in height. According to the Ordinance, in regards to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights: "The exterior expression of the height of the first story...shall be not less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall be not less than 10 feet." The proposed height of three stories is visually compatible; however, the exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights does not meet the requirements of the ordinance and needs to be corrected to the requirements of the ordinance.
2. **Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:** Eight units will face East Hull and eight units will face East McDonough Streets. The front façade of each row house will have a width of 19'8", with a 10'8" garden wall between paired row houses. With the vertical alignment of the front façade's voids, the front façade will have a vertical directional expression, which is visually compatible.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The front elevation of each row house will have a three bay rhythm on the second and third floors. The first floor has a single window, the main door, and a wood garage door. The small window on the first floor appears to be out of place and scale with the remainder of the elevation. Staff would recommend deleting the window feature on the first floor. The second and third floors have single windows that are aligned vertically. The openings appear taller than wide. A courtyard space is located between paired groups of row houses, with a garden gate and window. The Habersham and Price Street elevations have a garden wall at the street level, and six groupings of windows, aligned vertically. The proposed height and width of windows in the structure appears to be visually compatible.
4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades/Directional Expression of Front Façade:** As designed, the Habersham and Price Street ends of the block will have a courtyard space. Within the block, the row houses are paired, with a courtyard space between each pair of row houses. Behind each courtyard space, a recessed component of a row house is located. The front façade of each row house will have a three-bay rhythm on the second and third floors, with the windows aligned vertically. The relationship of the solids to voids gives the front façade a vertical directional appearance. The proposed new construction is visually compatible in respect to the rhythm of solids to voids on the front façade and the vertical directional expression of the front façade.

5. **Rhythm of Structures on the Street:** Attached row houses are characteristic of the Historic District. Attached duplexes are located across Price Street facing East Hull Street. The attached row houses will face East Hull and East McDonough Streets. As proposed, the project has the appearance of mews houses.
6. **Rhythm of Entrance and/or Porch Projects/Street elevation Type:** Each row house will have a street-level entrance. The adjacent historic residential duplexes across Price Street have raised and high stoop entrances. The adjacent historic building facing Habersham Street has a high stoop entrance. However, the use of street level entrances is appropriate in this context, in that the row houses have the appearance of mews houses.
7. **Roof Shapes:** The row houses will have flat roofs with parapets which is characteristic of the adjacent structures and is visually compatible.
8. **Setbacks:** The row houses and garden walls will have a zero line setback on all elevations.
9. **Walls of Continuity:** The row houses and garden walls will maintain a wall of continuity around the entire block.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of Part I: Height and Mass, with the conditions that the exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights is corrected to conform to the ordinance and that the single window on the first floor is eliminated.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Gay** asked if it was typical for garage doors to be on fronts of buildings in the Historic District?

**Mr. Webb** stated he felt that was one of the challenging features of this building. He said they met with the petitioner about off-street parking spaces within the confines, however it was not prohibited by the ordinance.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated on page 11 in the Guidelines under Building Entrances Illustrated it says – “Streets in the Historic District should be animated with the presence of dwellings... and not lifeless processions of ... driveways and garage doors.”

**Mr. Webb** stated he understood her point and felt it was a challenging feature of this project. However, he did not know if that one issue would make this visually incompatible.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she understood that this was Part I – Height/mass. However, she was also concerned about the garage doors and main door at this level. Also, when she looked at the site she saw the neighborhood lacked in parking. She said she felt the only thing the Board could focus on was the mass and the number of units. She asked if Staff talked to the petitioner about the garage doors?

**Mr. Webb** stated yes, and from his perspective the garage doors would come in design detail and they were also looking at the need for some type of emphasis over the main door. He said he felt it could be mitigated.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated from other instances similar to this petition, the end result has been parking was provided under the building and they did not put a garage door. He said it was open on the Hull Street side and the owner was able to park there. He said when you have two streets with no lane you either have a garage door or you make it open.

**Mr. Webb** stated his professional preference would be to have a well detailed garage door over just a void opening because he felt it would be more aesthetically pleasing.

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

**Mr. Guerard** stated regarding the garage doors, currently there were five or six garage doors that already faced these two streets. He said they were only asking for an additional twelve doors. He said they came up with the concept from Taylor Street. He said the way that they handled their off-street parking was they allowed the 10 feet on the side of the house for parking. Since then they now park on the street facing the house. He said what he talked about at staff level was if they could get the garage door in front of the building to look similar to the ones on Perry Street it would benefit the City as far as aesthetics to have a nice bricked wall with a nice green space courtyard.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the concept of what he had with recessing a courtyard which allowed light into the building was very good. But in fact, at street level, he had an 8 foot high wall with four narrow openings almost in the same plane as the building. He said he felt if he was going to have a courtyard and a recess, that if he put a wall on an even plane with the building wall you lose that. He said he needed to either push the wall back or make it a half wall with wrought iron, but show the void to the pedestrian.

**Mr. Deering** stated to the petitioner that he was not saying that there were not examples of garage doors scattered through out the Historic District, but there were not twelve on one block. He said he felt his massing plan was a good approach, but he was going to have sixteen units with a lot of garage doors on two block fronts in the Historic District and there was not a precedent for it.

**Mr. Guerard** stated there was significant costs to the property. He said he want to build something that contributed to the Historic District. He said to meet the requirement he could take down the brick wall and lose the courtyard, but he really did not want to do that.

### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF respectfully disagreed with Staff on this issue. He said even though it was technically not a Trust Lot, the development pattern has been set on the adjacent block to the east. He said the row should face McDonough with automobile access from Hull. He said HSF felt that if the development could not conform to this set pattern then it should be built elsewhere. He said if the Board wanted to review this it was in the ordinance on Page 10, 4 - B. He said HSF has objected to garage doors facing the same way as entrances (when there is a lane). Therefore, HSF felt there was no reason for the garage door to sit immediately beside or in close proximity to the front entrances. He said this was not something that occurred in the Landmark District. He further

stated, in reference to the visual compatibility factors, it violated Rhythm of Entrances. He stated that the building also should not be set back from Habersham and Price Streets. In summation, as he has said in previous meetings, we were missing opportunities for pedestrian – friendly redevelopment especially on the west side, and now on the east side. He said as was pointed out, the driveways will become parking spaces.

### **Discussion:**

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated she felt the petitioner was on the right track for a great project for that area. She said if she were a personal buyer of a house right there she would much rather see him have her green space and her house look beautiful from the street and let her worry about finding a parking space.

**Mr. Deering** stated the petitioner is required to provide parking.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he would like for the petition to be continued for restudy because he could not approve the height/mass with the garden wall, the ground floor doors and garage doors next to each other.

**Mr. Guerard** requested a continuance.

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

**RE: Petition of Dawson Wissmach Architects  
Neil Dawson  
HBR 04-3303-2  
26 East Bay Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson.

The petitioner is requesting approval to make alterations to the facades of 26 East Bay Street, including the addition of awnings, balconies, and replacement of windows.

### **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.
- (9) 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.
- (11) Balconies, Stairs, Stoops, Porticos, and Side Porches:
  - a. Wrought iron brackets shall not be used with wood balcony railings.

## **DISCUSSION**

### Bay Street Façade:

1. The existing doors and windows will remain and be repaired where necessary.
2. A new canvas awning will be installed over the two entrance doors. The awning will project from the façade of the building 4'6" and will have a clearance of 7'10" Two options were submitted. Staff would recommend using option one. Option two appears overwhelming to the façade. In addition, the option one awning should be placed within the arch so as not to obscure architectural detail. The awning's color will be Foam Green with white stripes and the fabric is manufactured by Weblon, in a vinyl laminate material. The petitioner provided a sample of the color and material. The text will read "The River Grill." The petitioner should submit a revised elevation showing option one fitting within the arch for a Staff level review.

### River Street Façade:

1. Balconies: One original iron balcony remains on the River Street façade. This balcony will be repaired with new wood decking and new bracket supports added. It will be painted Charleston Green. The existing balcony projects from the façade 4'8" and has a railing height of 3'6". Seven new bracketed supported balconies will be installed on this façade. These balconies will be made of iron and will have a different design so as not to compete with the historic balcony. The new balconies will also project 4'8" from the façade and will have a railing height of 3'6". The new balconies will span 10'8" The new balconies will also be painted Charleston Green.
2. Eleven aluminum windows/French doors on the River Street façade will be replaced with new, wood windows or doors. The new windows will be fixed. The replacement windows

are shown bubbled on a revised River Street elevation. The replacement windows will match the existing opening size and late configuration. On the fourth and fifth levels, new wood doors and transom with double glazed glass will be installed. All trim will be painted white. Staff request petitioner to clarify if the existing windows are fixed and to confirm that the replacement windows conform to the requirements of the Ordinance.

3. Sign: A new sign is proposed for the River Street entrance. The wood sign will be 2'6" x 2', painted white with text in dark blue. The sign will read "The River Grill." Two new Emblem shade lamps by Baselite will be installed over the sign. The lamps will be dark green bronze.
4. Storefront entry: The revised elevation of A102 shows changes to the entry from River Street, with a new storefront entry with the frame painted dark bronze and the addition of new stucco pilasters with 2" reveal in Benjamin Moore Powell Buff HC-35. Also a new stucco cornice is proposed over the entry, where an awning currently exists, also in Benjamin Moore Powell Buff HC-35. No other information was provided. This change differs with the original elevation submitted in the application. Staff would request Petitioner to clarify this change.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1) A revised elevation showing changes to the proposed awning on the Bay Street façade be submitted for a Staff level review.
- 2) Petitioner clarifies the replacement windows on the River Street façade meet the requirements of the Ordinance.
- 3) Petitioner clarifies changes to the River Street entrance.

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

**Mr. Dawson** stated in reference to the awning they agreed with Staff's recommendation to bring it inside the decorative brick work of the arch. He said in reference to the signage he did not think about it being redundant. He said he will get with the owner to eliminate the wording on one of the awnings. He said they had no problem with restudying the railing on the rear and the horizontality of the railing. With regard to clarification of the windows he had issue with the ordinance standards requiring true divided light. In answer to Staff's question these were fixed windows with the intent of meeting the hurricane codes. He said with the simulated divided light they would have a spacer bar between with applied mullion on either side that would give the look of divided light. He said because of the requirements of the building code they could not do a true divided light window without significantly increasing the mullion bar. Also, as a point of clarification they were showing transoms on the doors with standard French doors below. But on these they actually were windows and they did not intend to have balconies on the three that he crossed out.

**Mrs. Reiter** asked the petitioner if they had to have the impact resistant glass at the third story level? She suggested in order to approve what they wanted to do they could say that it was up at the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> levels and no one would be able to see it but it would have to go to the Board of Appeals with a recommendation from this Board.

**Mr. Deering** stated what they did at Lady & Sons was use a simulated divided light with a single glaze.

**Mr. Dawson** stated Staff was correct in that this would only be an issue for the third floor and above.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF would prefer to see no awnings on the front of the building. But if they choose to then HSF would like them placed inside the arches. He said they would also like verticality on the balconies. And on the French doors on the original building had windows that went up to the arch otherwise you would see the transom eliminating the French doors with a curved top going up to the top.

**Discussion:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he liked HSF's suggestion of taking the French doors up like the windows used to be.

**Mr. Dawson** stated in their research to do a French door that meets hurricane requirements with the three part block mechanism and arched head would be a lot more expensive.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Deering** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review make the following Finding of Fact: That the upper windows do not meet Standard 9 regarding the use of true divided light windows in historic structures, however in this case they are required to meet the hurricane standards in the International Building Code and are located at the third story and above and are visually compatible due to their location. The Historic Board of Review approved the amended petition with the following conditions: (1) Revised new balcony design with a more vertically oriented design to be submitted to staff, (2) Window information to be submitted to staff for review and approval, and (3) Any changes to bay street awnings to be submitted to staff. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Dawson Wissmach Architects  
Neil Dawson  
HBR 04-3304-2  
7 East Gordon Street  
Renovation/Addition**

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate 7 East Gordon Street, which would include changes to the south (rear) façade, including an addition, and the existing garage will be reconstructed to include a second story to appear as a traditional carriage house.

**FINDINGS**

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

## Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

- (2) 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.
- (9) 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.

**DISCUSSION****Front Façade:**

1. The front façade will remain mostly unaltered. The existing stucco veneer will be repaired where necessary.
2. At the ground level, the existing external stairs to the ground level will be removed and replaced with a ramp. Planters will be placed to match existing planters, after the stairs are removed. The ramp will be located to the east of the façade. A new railing will be placed behind the planters matching existing railings on the first level.

**Rear Façade:**

1. Most of the proposed changes to the south(rear) façade will not be visible from a public right-of-way, especially after the second level is added to the garage.
2. The top level windows will remain. The existing stucco veneer will be repaired where necessary.
3. The addition will accommodate interior renovations to the family room and kitchen at the entry level. The upper level will include a screen porch and sun room. The new façade will match the existing conditions. A single ply membrane, metal roof will cover the addition.
4. The new windows on the sun porch will be six-over-six true divided lite, double hung wood clad windows by Kolbe and Kolbe. New French doors with transoms will be located at the main level. Wood pilasters will frame the new windows and doors. An existing balcony railing will be reused on the rear deck.
5. A second level will be added to the current one story garage. With the addition, the carriage house will be 21' in height to the ridge, matching the pitch of the adjacent carriage houses. Stucco will match the existing color on main house. The lane façade will have two six-over-six, true divided light, wood clad windows by Kolbe and Kolbe, with color to match the main house. The courtyard elevation will have French doors opening to balconies, with wrought iron railings. This façade will not be visible from the public-right-of-way. A new side door and garage door will be added off the lane. However, no information was provided on the new entry door and garage door. The proposed garage opening is 18' wide which exceeds what is allowed per the ordinance at 12'. The petitioner needs to provide information on the new entry door and new garage door, including materials and color. The garage opening must be reduced to 12' in order to comply with the Ordinance. Petitioner also needs to clarify roofing material for second floor addition.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1) Petitioner needs to provide information on new entry door and garage door off lane, including material and color.
- 2) New garage door opening must be reduced to 12' in width, with revised lane elevation showing changes provided to Staff.
- 3) Petitioner needs to clarify roof material on second floor addition of carriage house.

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

**Mr. Dawson** stated they agreed with Staff's comments. He said one point of clarification with regard to the roof on the second floor addition that it was a single file membrane roof. He said they did not believe it would be visible. He said in regard to the rear façade, his client would like to request to change the screened porch to a sunroom with the same proportions. He also stated that the design that they submitted was to emulate two garage doors with a simulated division between them. He said with the width of the house it would be difficult to fit two 9 foot doors in there. He said they respectfully request the Board to consider the deviation from the standard.

### **Discussion:**

**Mr. Dawson** stated the existing garage door was a two bay wide aluminum door. He said if they had to, they could retain that existing door as a grandfathered condition.

**Mr. Webb** asked what was the width with the existing opening?

**Mr. Dawson** stated 17 feet.

**Mr. Webb** stated as a point of clarification to the Board it was the opening and not the door.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated for the record when they have problems in the Historic District and there is new construction or renovations the Board tries to make it proper. Therefore, she will be voting against putting in a larger door in the existing space. She said down the road someone is going to come back and say there is a new door that the Board approved.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated she felt this was an in-kind replacement. She said she felt in new construction or in construction where one does not exist the Board should stick to the 12 feet. But in this instance she felt it was a good example of someone making something better.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the amended petition with garage door color and material to be brought to staff. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed 7 – 1. Mrs. Fortson-Waring voted nay.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, For  
Richard Kessler  
HBR 04-3305-2  
130 Habersham Street  
Addition**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a side addition which would house a new elevator and related equipment for 130 Habersham Street.

### **FINDINGS**

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

- (3) 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 proposed addition would measure 5'4"x13' and will be slightly over 34' in height, matching the height of the adjacent building at 128 Habersham Street. It would be recessed from the front façade 7'.
2. The addition will be constructed of concrete block covered with true stucco over metal lathe. The stucco will have a smooth sand finish and will not be scored to avoid a false historic appearance.
3. The roof will be near-flat with a 1:12 slope to the east or rear of the property. The roof will be hidden from Habersham Street by a parapet wall. Gutters and a downspout will be located on the east façade and will not be visible from any public right-of-way.
4. The stucco and coping color will match the existing color of the house.
5. Staff does have a concern that the location of the proposed elevator addition will remove four windows on the north façade. From the petitioner's submittal, it is stated that this location was selected for two reasons: 1) the alignment of exterior openings at this location minimizes the alteration of historic building fabric, and (2) this location utilizes the internal circulation core of the buildings. Staff agrees that this location appears to be the best location for the elevator addition. The petitioner has expressed to staff that the window sashes and lintels will be saved and stored for possible reuse.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the mechanical room was the full length height of the elevator or just one story?

**Mr. Kessler** stated one story.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Request for Extensions**

**RE: Staff Reviews**

1. Petition of Gary Hall  
HBR 04-3297(S)-2  
21 West York Street  
Color/Logo

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

2. Petition of G.B. Williams  
HBR 04-3299(S)-2  
519 East Congress Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

3. Petition of Jeffrey Kenney  
HBR 04-3306(S)-2  
349 Tattnell Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL**

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

**Mrs. Brownfield** asked if Staff checked the house she reported last month. The blue house with red trim on Jones Street with purple doors and shutters.

**Mr. Webb** stated they went by the property but they have not talked to the owner. He said they could not remember what was there.

**Mrs. Brownfield** stated there were no purple doors there. She said she was pretty sure they were red to match the trim.

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

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she and Dr. Johnson were noting on the news project that there was no indication of refuse storage. She said you would be next door to the courtyard where the refuse would be stored.

**RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements**

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that Lee Webb has been appointed to the Board of Georgia Alliance of Preservation Commission. He also stated that Beth Reiter passed the American Institute of Certified Planners exam.

**RE: Other Business**

I. Unfinished Business

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he asked Beth if the Board members (whose terms had expired) had to come to the January 2005 meeting.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated yes. She said Board members serve until they are replaced.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated also according to the new Bylaws you have to elect the officers at the last part of the agenda today. And in January the new officers will start. She said the nominations were closed last month (November), so it was just a matter of conducting the elections. She said the Nominating Committee submitted John Mitchell, Chairman and Swann

Seiler, Vice-Chairman and the nominations have been closed. She said the Board needed to conduct the elections.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Mitchell called the question and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Minutes**

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – October 13, 2004
2. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – November 10, 2004

**HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of October 13, 2004 and November 10, 2004 as submitted. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

**BR:ca**