

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW**

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

**JULY 14, 2004**

**2:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**Members Present:**

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

**Members Absent:**

**John Deering (excused)**

**MPC Staff Present:**

**Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer  
Lee Webb, Preservation Specialist  
Wanda Dixon, Acting Secretary**

**RE: Call to Order**

Dr. Caplan called the July 14, 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 Gunn Meyerhoff  
& Shay Architects  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 03-3007-2  
Between Barnard & Howard Streets  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Amended Petition of Tom Wirht &  
Laura Potts-Wirht  
HBR 03-3110-2  
543 – 547 East Perry Street  
Alterations**

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

**RE: Continued Petition of Patricia J. Lanese  
HBR 04-3198-2  
615 Tattnall Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Amended Petition of SCAD  
Glenn Wallace  
HBR 04-3202-2  
112 Montgomery Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Sign  
Donna Swanson  
HBR 04-3216-2  
223 West Broughton Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, For  
Kathy Ledvina  
HBR 04-3218-2  
226 East Bryan Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, For  
Tina Gurley  
HBR 04-3219-2  
541 East Gordon Street  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

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

RE: Regular Agenda

RE: Continued Petition of Gregory Gill, AIA  
HBR 04-3174-2  
201 M.L.K., Jr. Boulevard  
New Construction – Part II Design

Present for the petition was Mr. Christopher Allred, representing the petitioner. Mr. Allred stated that he

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report:

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part II: Design Details for the new construction of a hotel at 201 MLK, Jr., Blvd. The Part I: Height and Mass was approved by the Review Board on April 14, 2004. The petition was continued at the June Review Board meeting.

### **FINDINGS**

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Standards apply for Part II: Design Details:

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

- (6) Visual Compatibility Factors:
- (g) Relationship of materials, texture, and color.

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

- (5) Commercial Design Standards:
  - 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). Such architectural features may be placed at the top of the second story when the first and second stories have the visual appearance of a separate exterior expression.
- (8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following:
  - c. Commercial exterior walls shall be finished in brick, concrete formed or assembled as stone, precast concrete panels with finish to simulate stucco texture, polished stone and glazed brick or tile where similar historic examples exist along the same block front; 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.
- (9) Windows
  - c. 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.
  - d. "snap-in" or between the glass muntins shall not be used.
  - e. The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.
  - f. 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.
  - g. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.

- h. The distance between windows shall be not 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.
- (10) Roofs: Roofs shall comply with the following:
  - c. Parapets shall have a string course of not less than six inches in depth and extending at least four inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and one- and half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum of two-inch overhang.
- (11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches.
  - a. Wrought iron brackets shall not be used with wood balcony railings.
  - b. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base moldings.
  - c. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four inches. Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood unless the proposed material matches other façade details on the same building, such as terra cotta or wrought iron.

## DISCUSSION

1. Exterior materials: The exterior walls will be “Ole Savannah Tumbled” gray brick for the first level, and a hard-coat stucco for the upper levels. The petitioner provided a sample of the stucco. The petitioner provided brick sample at the last meeting. Cast stone accents will be incorporated into the facades, and the cornice will be shaped polystyrene with a hard-coast stucco to match the cast stone. A sample of the cast stone was provided at the last meeting.  
Cornice and other details: The cornice and other design details, including lintels and brackets, are in polystyrene with a hard-coat stucco finish. In response to comments from the Review Board and Staff, the parapet designs have been simplified. The number of lintel designs has been reduced to two styles, as shown on the revised elevations. The main entrance elevation on MLK, Jr. Blvd has a different lintel and parapet style to distinguish it from the remainder of the building (the rear elevation has the same lintel and parapet style as the front elevation).  
PTAC grilles: Aluminum grilles will be used beneath the windows on the façade. The design of the grilles was modeled on the existing grilles at the Courtyard Hotel on Liberty.
2. Roof: The roof will be flat, with a parapet. A parapet section was provided. A component of the MLK, Jr. Blvd, façade will have a barrel and cove terra cotta tile roof.
3. Windows: Pre-finished aluminum double hung, double glazed windows with simulated divided lites are proposed for the project for all guest rooms. The windows will have 7/8” mullions. A polystyrene shaped lintel and brackets with hard coat stucco finish to match the cast stone accent band will be located at each window. The main entrance storefront will have an aluminum storefront system. There will be a minimum of 3” to the face of the sash from the outside wall. It appears the petitioner still needs to provide a window sample for Staff review, once the manufacturer has been selected to ensure the windows meets the specifications of the ordinance. The windows and doors will match Sherwin Williams “Mills House Green.”  
  
Doors: Exterior doors will be painted aluminum and metal.
4. Portico: The proposed portico will not encroach on city right of way. The center bay on the east elevation (MLK, Jr., Blvd.) projects 8” from the plane of the front façade. The

portico will project 6' from the façade of the building. A series of pre-formed fiberglass columns will support the roof of the portico. The columns have caps and bases and will be finished to match the cast stone on the façade. A wrought iron railing will be placed on top of the portico. The petitioner provided a section of the portico.

The petitioner has addressed the Board's concerns about having entrances on the Oglethorpe Avenue façade. Revised elevations show entrances with porticos on the Oglethorpe Avenue side. The porticos appear to be supported by columns similar to the front portico. Signage will be applied to the portico. Staff would ask petitioner to clarify that the new porticos are of the same materials as the main entrance portico.

5. Fences and garden walls: Brick piers and cast iron fencing are being used at the entry off of MLK, Jr. Blvd, and also at the west end of the building near Papy Street.
6. Colors: Proposed colors are as follows: Window, door, and decorative fencing: Sherwin Williams "Mills House Green"; Hard coat stucco: Sherwin Williams SW 6120 "Believable Buff," and cast stone in "Pure Pearl."
7. HVAC Units: Condensers will be located on the top of the roof.
8. Signage: Signage will appear on the northwest corner of the building facing Oglethorpe Avenue and the southeast corner on the parking lot side. The signage will span 19' 6" and a height of 7'4". The signs will be 8" deep, internally illuminated, self contained channel letters, red with gray trim, in the trademark script reading "Hampton Inn and Suites." The total square footage of each of these principal use signs is approximately 136 square feet.

The entrance porticos have 1½" deep self contained simulated brass channel letters to span 11'4" and 8" in height, in Times New Roman font to read "Hampton Inn and Suites."

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1) Petitioner provide window sample once manufacturer determined.
- 2) Clarification of materials on new entrance porticos on Oglethorpe Avenue elevation.

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

**Mr. Christopher Allred** stated that the window sample would be provided once it is determined. He also stated concerning the secondary porticos on the Oglethorpe Avenue elevations that the same portico details that they are using on the Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard elevations would be used. They would be premanufactured, preshaped fiberglass columns, and polystyrene cornice details, all finished with the hard coat stucco to match the cast stone that they are planning to use on the architectural trim and the window lintels.

### **Board's Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they have considered extending the grill in front of the air conditioning upward to a point where it looks like a balcony.

**Mr. Allred** stated that they felt that with the number of windows it would be overwhelming as far as the number of handrails. He said this level of ornament over such a large building add too much to the window.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he was thinking that the grill would be at the floor level and a plain rail at the three foot level.

**Mr. Allred** stated he would look at it.

**Board's Comments:**

**Dr. Johnson** stated that he noticed on the site plan that Pappy Street was still blocked off. He wanted to make sure that the Board's approval does not include the closing of the street as it was not within the Board's purview.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he thinks that this is understood by the petitioner.

**Mr. Allred** stated that they understood that they would need further approval to close the street.

**Mr. Neely** stated that the Oglethorpe façade from a pedestrian's point of view, was a long, stark, boring, façade from the ground level.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that one manner in which it (breaking up the lengths into smaller elements) could be to (vary the material) of the two shorter towers.

**Mr. Allred** stated that the finish above the brick was a hard-coat stucco. The polystyrene only happens at the second floor or above and some of the cornices. Everything within 20' or below is actually cast stone. He reiterated that there would no polystyrene within 20' of the ground.

**Mr. Neely** asked what they thought about bringing the material down.

**Mr. Allred** stated that he thinks that it would help break up the façade a great deal. He further stated that they were under the impression that they were to use a single material at the base. He stated that he is in agreement that this method would greatly help break up the elevations.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that it is not the Board's purview to redesign the project for the petitioner, however, he does think that it is fair for the Board to point out such things for their consideration.

**Mr. Neely** stated if the petitioner's concurs with the suggestions of the Board, they could include a stipulation that the items be reviewed and approved by the Preservation Officer and not come back before the Board.

**HDBR Action:** Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition subject to the petitioner reconsidering the base material on Oglethorpe Avenue and provide a window sample once the manufacturer is determined for Staff review and approval. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Hansen Architects  
HBR 04-3206-2  
458 M.L.K., Jr. Boulevard  
New Construction – Part II Design**

Present for the petition was Paul Hansen Architect.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff Report:

The petitioner is requesting a Part I Height and Mass approval for a new one story addition to the Civil Rights museum.

**FINDINGS**

Due to the size of the addition the petitioner has requested a two-part submittal. The following Standards apply:

1. As a museum the structure falls under the requirements for Monumental Structures. Section 8-3030 (l) (14) states that Monumental Structures shall comply with
  - a. The height limits as shown on the height map. The lot is located within a five story height zone.
  - b. Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setbacks except on Tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.
  - c. Large Scale Development standards
    - i. Large Scale Development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width.
    - ii. Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street.

**COMMENT**

1. The proposed addition is one story. The first story aligns with the first story of the main building.
2. The Solids and voids reflect the window and pier structure of the existing building. The addition has been offset from the original building by an interval of 7'-4" with a 1'-4" deep reveal on the Alice Street façade which reveals the pilaster return and cornice return.
3. The setback is essentially the 0 lot line. Projections and recesses are similar to those on the main building. The pier project 12" and the entry is recessed 3'.
4. The width of the addition on Alice Street reflects the width of the original building.
5. The building materials on the North and East sides suggest that it was intended that this building be added to. In fact, the original plans called for additional building on the north side. It is staff's understanding that the property north of the museum on MLK is not a part of the museum's property.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of Part I Height and Mass. The 60 foot rhythm of the Oglethorpe Plan is retained. The Standards are met and the main building still "reads" as a prominent mass.

**Mr. Neely** asked what was the date of the original building.

Mrs. Reiter stated, 1914.

Mr. Mitchell stated that years ago he had a talk with Mr. W. W. Law about this particular building. He stated with regard to the original design, there was a tower next to the building on the M.L.K, Jr. Boulevard façade. A replica of what's there now was on the northern side of the property, but was never finished. He stated that this is why the building was left like it is. He stated that he had always wished that they had completed the building because it was a beautiful structure. He further stated that now they don't have access to the property, which is unfortunate.

**Petitioner's Comments:**

Mr. Paul Hansen, stated that he is one of the associate architects for the property along with two other architects out of Atlanta. He further stated that there are representatives present from the firm along with members from the Board of the Museum, and the Executive Director to answer any questions.

Mr. Hansen stated that when they started the project they were hoping to look at something more than a one story addition. However, due to money constraints they had to cut back to a single story building. There were discussions about possibly providing structure so that they can add to two floors to the proposed one-story building later.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Mitchell made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition subject to: Approval of Part I Height and Mass. The 60-foot rhythm of the Oglethorpe Plan is retained. The standards are met and the building still "reads" as a prominent mass. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, For  
Cathy James  
HBR 04-3220-2  
537 East Congress Street  
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends that the petition be continued until the August 11, 2004 Meeting per the petitioner's request.

**HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until the August 11, 2004 Meeting. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

RE: Petition of Hussey, Gay, Bell, & DeYoung  
Frank Pennington  
HBR 04-3221-2  
123 Abercorn Street  
Alterations

Present for the petition was Frank Pennington, agent for the petitioner.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report:



The petitioner is requesting approval to make the following alterations to the parking garage of 123 Abercorn Street, a non-historic building built in 1997:

1. Remove existing louvers on President Street side and replace them with new wood window to match the existing windows.
2. The existing garage door on the President Street side will be removed and the opening infilled with a new window and stucco to match the new windows
3. The center louver on the State Street facade will be removed and the sill portion of the opening will be removed. A new wood door and sidelights will be installed in the opening.
4. All exterior finishes and colors will match the existing colors of the exterior.

### **FINDINGS**

The Ordinance states: "Double-glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic façades 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." And "Snap-in or between the glass muntins shall not be used."

1. From the submitted elevations, the proposed new wood windows on the President Street façade will be nine-over-nine, paired to fit the existing opening. Where the garage door opening is, two, nine-over-nine paired windows will also be used, matching the other new windows. Stucco to match the existing stucco exterior will complete the infill.
2. On the State Street façade, the center louver will be replaced with a new wood door and frame, with sidelights and a transom.
3. It appears that all the proposed changes to this non-historic building are Visually Compatible to the context.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with clarification from petitioner that the new windows meet the requirements of the ordinance.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that the names of the elevations were reversed.

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

**Mr. Frank Pennington, Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung**, stated that they would meet the requirements for the windows.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were planning to redo the sidewalks to eliminate the curb cuts and eliminate the slope.

**Mr. Pennington** stated that they had not looked at that, but they would certainly take that into consideration.

**Mr. Neely** stated that he is in agreement with Mr. Meyerhoff's comments. There will never be a driveway there again and aesthetically the curb cut looks out of character.

Mr. Pennington stated that the actual overhead door is going to remain on the north elevation and they are actually doing a room so that the trashcans can be kept.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition subject to the side walk on the south elevation being brought into conformance through the elimination of the curb cut. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Francis Hayes, For  
David Therrien  
HBR 04-3222-2  
224 A & B West Charlton Street  
Alteration/Addition**

Present for the petition was Francis Hayes, agent for the petitioner.

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 round cage 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. Elevator shaft material to be dryvit. (Please refer to substitute drawing for rear elevation and 4<sup>th</sup> floor plan which indicate windows in 4<sup>th</sup> floor elevator addition) Bird cage stair to be twisted rebar on 2.5-3" centers with continuous handrail or equivalent. Fourth floor addition to have three doors to balconies on Jefferson Street elevation. The fourth floor addition is set back on the Charlton Street side to allow for a deck. This has a parapet with iron insets. 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.  
Add round windows on north elevation of new 4<sup>th</sup> floor.
2. Uncover corner post at corner commercial entrance. Corner entrance to be natural wood, stripped, sealed and varnished.
3. Widen entrance on Charlton Street and add folding iron gate.
4. Remove infill from garage entrance and add folding iron gates.
5. Add cedar louvered shutters, sized to fit the windows and hung on hardware by Cobblestone or equivalent. Paint black-green.
6. Remove existing balcony. Add new balconies one bay wide at 2<sup>nd</sup> and third floors at new windows. Balconies to be made of twisted rebar painted black green.
7. Reopen infilled doors at second and third stories on the Charlton Street side and install custom door and transom. Paint windows ivory.
8. 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.

The following information is needed:

1. Depth of proposed balconies from façade.
2. More information on windows and doors; Verify whether they are single or double glazed, size of muntin, profile of muntins, is there a spacer bar etc?
3. Will elliptical or over gates be open iron work also?
4. Clarify materials and colors of walls new addition and parapets. Is the green color submitted as a substitute a color for the shutters? Which green is intended?
5. It is not clear, but appears that a complete new "skin" is proposed for the building due to the expansion joints shown on the drawing. Please clarify the treatment of the existing and proposed facades. The existing cornice is to be removed for the addition. It would be desirable to skim coat the existing stucco surface and differentiate it from the addition using a band at the connection point where the cornice had been.
6. What is the depth of the new window sashes from the face of the building?

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval provided the items to be clarified meet the standards and further discussion of treatment of existing stucco walls. The roof garden addition does not appear to be visible from the front.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the plans show a trellis on top of the roof. The west elevations drawing as shown on the screen did not show the trellis. The trellis, while not visible from Charlton Street, is certainly visible from Jefferson Street. He further stated that the Board should see the elevation with the trellis drawn on it. He stated that the Board has had some problems with trellis' before.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that the petitioner can address this. The site plan shows the extent of the trellis, but the petitioner can address what the site lines area. It is setback from the chimney.

**Ms. Seiler** asked for further clarification of the proposed stairs.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that the stairs on the rear are a spiral metal staircase in an iron cage. She further stated that the petitioner is present and can describe the stairs further. On the drawings the stairs appear to be solid, but it is representational.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she is having a hard time with the rooftop garden.

**Ms. Brownfield** stated the balcony does not appear to meet the guidelines.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated the balcony is 36”.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked are there round windows on the north elevation.

**Petitioner’s Comments:**

**Mr. Francis Hayes, agent for David Therrien**, stated that it is a birdcage and it essentially surrounds the circular stairs and exits at the fourth floor.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked are the stair intended to be a fire stair.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that it is a full dimensional egress out of the building.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he thinks the petitioner is going to have trouble with the proposed stairs, because the building department doesn’t like circular fire stairs.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that the first floor is commercial with residential above.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the building department will tell them that they can’t have circular stairs. Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he would like to ask why the trellis was not shown on the elevations.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that the site lines would require you to go over to Montgomery Street in terms of the angles. The trellis has been setback from the front and similarly from the sides so it’s not visible on Jefferson Street, looking up. However, it is visible from the back, which is allowed.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated at the parapet the plans show some grill work. He asked if this were old metal grill work. He asked if the metal was opened or closed.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that the metal work is open.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that this would allow the trellis to be visible.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that you can not see through the metal work in terms of the depth and the fact that there is a ten inch masonry wall.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked for an explanation of an open masonry wall.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that it is a decorative wall and can be seen on the Jewish Synagogue on Abercorn Street. Mr. Hayes stated that an alternative to this would be to use ceramic.

**Ms. Brownfield** asked if the petitioner considered the original balcony extension.

**Mr. Hayes** stated, yes, and that the building was bastardized. At the time the building was converted the balcony was added and it was rather slipshod. The balcony consists of strips of metal that have been bent and placed into an iron bar. There is nothing decorative about the existing balcony. The decorative part is the brackets and they will be utilized in terms of the two small areas in restoring and opening up the doorways. The doorways located to the right on the second and third floor are still there and will be opened. The brackets on the first floor will be moved over and above.

### **Public's Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the Architectural Review Committee was very concerned with the matter in which this building was proposed for expansion. There doesn't seem to be a whole lot left that appears to be historical or to help one identify the former character of the building, especially with the large overhang being removed and not brought back in any way, shape or form.

The new building elevations, because of the parapet and the expansion joints in the stucco, tend to look more like new construction. The proportions have been further diluted, especially on the ground floor doorways. He stated that he can see that the arch over the doorway comes from the arch over the window; the end result is not as Italianate as the existing building. In fact it harkens back to more of a Georgian or Federal. Mr. Hardison further stated if the original width of the doorways, which were narrow, tall, and vertical, could be retained it would be a help. They were also hoping that the fire stairs in the back would go away because of code issues. Also, it further dilutes the historic character of this building. Once the chimneys are raised, the roof is gone, the overhangs are gone, the new expansion joints are in, the ground floor doorways are expanded and transoms changed, there won't be a whole lot left. If this building is that bad maybe it needs to go away. If the building needs to be expanded this is not the way to do it and maybe it doesn't need to be expanded. Mr. Hardison stated that the petitioner needs to work within the parameters of the existing building.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that the expansion joints are inscribed into the skin of the building. He stated that this is not something that is an absolute, but was an attempt to integrate the new with the old. It would be easier to leave the building unscored. Mr. Hayes stated as far as a matter of taste there is no dispute and one man's view is not necessarily shared. A great deal of time was spent on trying to be sensitive to the building. The proximate buildings that influenced some of the philosophy were Dr. King's residence and Charlton Hall. They both have architectural detail on them that is similar to this particular building. He stated they actually thought about taking all of the stucco off and going back to the brick, but there is an example of where this was done on Jefferson Street and the brick is deteriorating. The intended color of the building is something that is found in the existing structure and it is Ochre.

He disagreed with Mr. Hardison in terms of the architectural elements. It becomes a matter of the looks and the color, one can modify the garage door opening so that it is more intone, but it is the intent to keep the existing theme. With regard to widening the door on Charlton Street, at the time the door was constructed there was also a door on Jefferson Street. The property was building originally as a quasi hotel. There were eight rooms that shared a common bath and no kitchen facility. It was built as a commercial structure in its entirety and was near the railroad station and at some point became a tenement. There is no green space. There was an attempt here to restore some green into the building.

He also stated that at one time the city was going to broaden Jefferson Street so that there would be green space along Jefferson Street, but now in his opinion Jefferson Street was an alley way. The courtyard will have parking inside, but the iron gate will open. He said the commercial corner is being kept in its entirety. With respect to the doorway and the color he said he did not have a problem changing it from a natural to a solid color.

**Mr. Hayes** stated the intent of the balcony on the third floor is to be able to put some greenery along that block. A shallow balcony would be perfectly fine.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that staff was given three green colors and she was not sure what goes where. She stated that no information accompanied the colors.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that the shutters would be Harrisburg Green. The color treatment is consistent with Greene Meldrim and also with the Mills Lane building constructed recently on Pulaski Square.

#### **Board's Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he had concerns with the incompleteness of the drawings. The building currently had balconies that were plain flat bars that had a belly on them. They aren't shown on the plans. The plans read: balcony to be made of twisted rebar. He stated that this could be anything. He would like to see details. Mr. Meyerhoff stated that balconies need support. The existing balconies have a support under them. The plans show no support. He stated that he doesn't believe that they can build the balconies without having some sort of support on them.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that there was a second set of drawings that show support.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he did not have the drawings. He further stated that the rooftop trellis should be shown on the elevations whether it can be seen from the street or not. The Board needed a set of complete elevations. The twisted rebars that are going around the spiral staircase. He stated that he would like to see a detail of that. Currently, you have a building with an eave projection. It is proposed to remove the eave. He stated that he did not believe that it was possible to do because the current roofing would have to be removed. He believes there would be a projection where the new building meets the existing building. He further stated that he doesn't believe it can be made flush as shown on the plans.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he was suggesting that until they get complete drawings that the Board will have a hard time approving the petition. This is not a height and mass thing, but a final design approval that they are being asked to approve and they don't have the details of the final design. Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it was an incomplete submission in his view.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that the existing brackets would be reutilized.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that was very nice, but it was not a drawing. He stated that he would like to see it in a drawing rather than in words.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that he was in agreement with the comments. He stated that he understood the Board's position and was probably in sympathy with it.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that he would like the Board to give the petition an okay on height and mass and he would bring back the other details.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he did not know how the Board would address this.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he wanted it to be made absolutely clear that the Board had concerns with the drawings. He stated that he wanted all of the issues addressed so there would not be additional continuations.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the drawings as presented are what they would normally have for height and mass. The plans did not show how far the roof would project in, nor how far the brackets underneath the balcony would project out. He further stated that they don't show the trellis or the design of the circular stair.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that there were also questions as to whether some of the issues, like projections, would come under height and mass and not design. He stated that it may be necessary to have a continuation of the entire thing.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that he was in agreement with Mr. Meyerhoff. He also stated that he felt it had lost its original grandeur through changes.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated in his opinion that a simple alteration might be to repaint the eave line to show that it was a three story building and then build the fourth story above the eave line in some manner.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that he would consider the suggestions. He stated that technically, from a system standpoint, the proposal could be done.

**Mr. Hayes** stated that the existing brick walls were 15 to 18" thick. There was a considerable depth on the top. The walls are in the range of nine inches wide so you could achieve the recess.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that there seemed to be a consensus that more information was needed. He further stated that in all fairness to the petitioner he should know precisely what information they are looking for. There were concerns regarding the retaining wall and the original design of the building. There were concerns regarding the balcony. There were concerns relative to the materials. It might be well if the petitioner would ask for a continuance and further look at the issues.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if the windows were going to be double glazed.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated just the new windows at the fourth floor.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Meyerhoff** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition to the August 11, 2004 meeting to include a full design submission including elevations, roof trellis, balcony and detailing of floor, roof sections, indentations, detail of balcony railing, railing around circular stairs, and parapet complying with guidelines. **Dr Johnson** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
Keith Howington  
HBR 04-3223-2  
19 West Broughton Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Keith Howington.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to remove the non-historic marble and stucco façade of 19 West Broughton Street and replace with a new storefront of stucco and painted wood.

**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 marble veneer will be removed.
  2. The existing storefront glazing will remain.
  3. The existing stucco finish will be cleaned and panel moldings installed to match the existing.
  4. The existing storefront doors and transom will be removed.
  5. New pressure treated wood panels with panel moulds will be installed above and below the existing glazing.
  6. New wood doors will be installed within the recessed area.
  7. Three new exterior light fixtures will be installed.
  8. A new canvas awning will be installed which will project 4' from the façade.
  9. All colors for the storefront and awning have not been determined. Staff would recommend that colors be submitted for a Staff review once determined.
  10. The petitioner provided sections of the rehabbed façade.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval with colors and awning to come back for Staff review and approval.



**HDBR Action:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition subject to the colors and awning to come back for Staff review and approval. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
Keith Howington  
HBR 04-3224-2  
532 Indian Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Keith Howington.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. On South and east facades remove existing steel columns, metal canopy, metal railing, steps and east ramp. Demolition portion of brick wall for new window openings. Loading dock to remain.
2. In front of the loading dock create a new façade and covered loggia in brick with metal roof.
3. West elevation to remain as is and be cleaned and painted.
4. Add new window openings on South end of existing building
5. On River Street elevation remove stoop, steps, and masonry infill in windows. Three doors to be removed and infilled with brick to match existing.
6. Build new fronts in brick with cast stone trim, metal handrails with steel cable, new aluminum storefront windows in new openings, Galvalume roof. On River Street install new wood, aluminum clad windows double glazed by Kolbe and Kolbe, in existing openings. Add new aluminum glazing infill in freight door openings.
7. Materials: Old Virginia red brick; Kolbe and Kolbe aluminum clad windows; Colors not determined yet, metal roofs.

### **FINDINGS**

1. The existing building on Indian Street was formerly used by the U. S. Post Office as an annex to their main post office on Fahm Street. It is not a rated historic structure. It is located in a context with industrial buildings including red brick industrial buildings. The commercial treatment and industrial nature of the proposed materials is consistent with the surrounding blocks.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

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

**RE: Petition of Dawson Wissmach Architects  
Neil Dawson  
HBR 04-3225-2  
112 West Gaston Street  
Renovations**

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson, agent for the petitioner.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval for a rehabilitation of 112 West Gaston Street, including a new color scheme, and additions to the rear façade and carriage house.

**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) Windows: Windows shall comply with the following:
  - a. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.
  - c. 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.

Rehabilitation:

1. The front and east façade will have general stucco repair, window repair, and glazing replacement where needed, iron railing repair, and a new paint scheme. The petitioner will come back before the Review Board to request approval to replace the front wood steps with stone steps at a later meeting.
2. At the back south east corner, the façade will be pulled forward to accommodate a new bath room, laundry, and garden level entry. The new façade for this alteration will match the existing appearance. The façade will be pulled forward 6' 4 ½" towards the front of the property.

3. All iron work will remain and be repainted black and the entry door paint will be removed and the wood left natural.
4. The proposed color scheme is as follows: base and trim color to match Benjamin Moore “Powell Buff” HC-35; Main body color to match Benjamin Moore “Windham Cream” HC-6; Window and soffit color to match Benjamin Moore “Black.”

Rear Alterations/Additions:

1. The rear façade has an existing addition that houses small bath rooms at each level. This addition will be removed and a new addition will be constructed.
2. Due to the size and location of the carriage house for 112 West Gaston Street, most of the rear façade is not visible from the public right-of-way. A small portion of the rear is visible when looking through the rear gate of the adjacent property to the east.
3. The new rear addition will have a contemporary appearance. It will be skinned with true Portland cement stucco along with a glass and aluminum. New stairs and a three-story trellis structure will be incorporated into the rear façade addition.
4. The carriage house will be rehabbed as well. The courtyard façade will be altered to reflect the rear alterations of the main house. The same materials will be used on the carriage house. These changes will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

**DISCUSSION**

Staff met with the petitioner and conducted several site visits.

1. The changes to the front façade appear to be visually compatible and meet the ordinance.
2. The existing rear façade windows and doors will be removed. The existing openings will be altered to accommodate the new aluminum casement windows. However, the exterior stucco material will be maintained.
3. The new rear addition façade will consist of aluminum storefront structure with aluminum casement windows. This façade will have a curved expression. The petitioner will provide additional information on the storefront manufacturer and other details at a later date.
4. The façade materials will be true Portland cement stucco.
5. The existing garden level door openings will remain and be replaced with aluminum doors.
6. On the east elevation, a new skylite is proposed above the existing stairwell. This alteration is not visible from the public right-of-way.
7. On the proposed alteration on the east elevation, an aluminum storefront window is proposed for all levels.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of rehabilitation and approval of new addition in concept with clarification of aluminum windows manufacturer.

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

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

The Preservation Officer recommends that the petition be continued until the August 11, 2004 Meeting per the petitioner's request.

**HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until the August 11, 2004 Meeting. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs  
Donna Swanson  
HBR 04-3227-2  
117 & 119 Whitaker Street  
Sign**

Present for the petition was Donna Swanson.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval for two principal use signs for a new restaurant establishment at 117 and 119 Whitaker Street.

### **FINDINGS**

1. 117 and 119 Whitaker Street are two commercial storefronts fronting Whitaker Street.
2. According to the petitioner's application material, the frontage is 42'.
3. The petitioner will use the existing metal frames that were installed on the façade of the building during the recent rehabilitation. These frames match the other frames on the façade that were approved by the Review Board and meet the size requirements of the Historic District Sign Ordinance.
4. The two new signs will be double sided, sandblasted HDU signs within the frames, 30 ¾" x 41 5/8".
5. The text of the sign will read "Larry's Giant Subs", with a gorilla holding a sub sandwich.
6. The colors of the signs will be a white background, text in red and yellow outlined in green, a sandwich in cream and green and a gorilla in two shades of gray.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

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

**RE: Petition of Kenneth Lawton, For  
Ann Palmer  
HBR 04-3228-2  
615 Price Street  
Stoop/Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends that the petition be continued until the August 11, 2004 Meeting per the petitioner's request.

**HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until the August 11, 2004 Meeting. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Request for Extensions**

There were no requests for extensions presented to the Savannah Historic Board of Review.

**Ms. Brownfield** asked why one particular sign came up for Board approval and another sign, number 5 on the Consent Agenda, didn't.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that the Staff had a split opinion on the petition for Larry's Giant Subs. She stated that she did not think that the sign was appropriate, but Mr. Webb did.

**Mr. Webb** stated that there is nothing in the ordinance prohibiting a gorilla on a sign.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that she didn't think the sign was very historic. She said that the petitioner stated that sign was in keeping with the historic character of the building. She stated that she did not think that it was sympathetic to the historic character of the building.

**Mr. Webb** stated that the petitioner stated in his petition that he was trying to create a turn of the century neighborhood deli appeal.

**Ms. Brownfield** stated on the regular agenda, number 3 has asked for a continuance until August. She stated that they have a sign up, yet number 9 and 11, who also asked for a continuance till August had no sign up. She further asked what was the requirement.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that one of the petitioners, number 3, did not ask for a continuance until very very late. She stated that they couldn't get their sign up.

**Ms. Brownfield** asked do they have to have the sign posted.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that the sign has to be posted only if the petition is going to be heard. She further stated that they had intended to be heard and had to reschedule.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that the Board votes on these petitions, but the ruling is that the Board doesn't have to vote or do anything if they haven't been any official notice.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that the petition was included in the official notice.

**Mr. Webb** reiterated that both of the petitions were very late withdrawals.

**RE: Staff Reviews**

1. Petition of Kathryn Shaver  
HBR 04-3213-(S)-2  
411 East Gordon Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Paul Robinson  
HBR 04-3214(S)-2  
220 East Gordon Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Quality Inn  
HBR 04-3215(S)-2  
300 West Bay Street  
In-kind Replacement – Metal Railing  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of Cynthia Perkins, For  
Cora Bett Thomas  
HBR 04-3217(S)-2  
608 Habersham Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

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

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that Mr. Webb has spoken with a gentleman on Hall Street who erected a fence without approval. He is bringing it in next month.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that Staff is still working on the other items from last month.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if Staff put a “stop work” order on something located on Bryan Street. He further stated that a lady indicated that she had spoken to staff about a site where somebody had done a lot of work without any approval.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that Staff has looked at the wall located on Hall Street. Mrs. Reiter further stated that she could not recall anyone calling.

**Ms. Brownfield** stated that the properties may have been approved long before she came on board. The property is located at 220 Hall Street has a carriage house that was almost complete.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that this was a Scott Barnard project.

**Ms. Brownfield** stated that she thinks the Board approved a carriage house at 407 Hall Street. She stated if you drive down the lane there is a real drop between the lane elevations and how they plan to get a car up into the garage.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that the Board had discussed the lane.

**Mr. Webb** introduced to the Board, Victor Evans, a new intern who started today. He is an undergraduate at the University of Alabama.

**Ms. Brownfield** asked if Staff had heard from the Inspections Department on the additions to the DeSoto tower on Harris Street.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that she would have a report next month.

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

**Mrs. Reiter** stated there were no items to report.

**RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements**

There were no notices, proclamations or acknowledgements to come before the Board.

**RE: Other Business**

#### **Old Business**

**Dr. Caplan** stated that Mrs. Reiter had made overtures to the Mayor's office and nothing had happened. Mrs. Reiter prepared a letter to the Mayor from the Chair which went out last week. He further stated that they would wait to see if the Mayor addresses the fact that the Historic Review Board would like to have a meeting with him.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** asked if the Board was aware that City Council was reviewing the procedures and appointments onto all Boards.

**Dr. Caplan** stated, no.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that they announced it the other day. She stated that they were thinking about having an application.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that in preparation for the meeting with City Council in order to address concerns about how the Board operates, Mrs. Reiter was preparing a break down of everything that this Board has done. She is preparing a document listing how many petitions have been submitted in the last 3½ years. How many have been passed, how many have been turned down and the basis for the denial, and a list of continuances.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that they also needed to do something about the meter boxes. He asked if Staff had spoken to anyone about that recently.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated, not recently.

**Ms. Brownfield** asked if the Board had taken a look at the house located at the corner of Park Avenue and Drayton Street. She stated that it was the most shocking pink, purple and green.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that under the State Enabling Legislation color could not be reviewed. She said that the only reason the Board reviewed color in the Historic District was that they were grandfathered.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if there was a report from the Public Relations Committee.

**Ms. Seiler** stated no.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he had asked Staff to update the Board's brochures and to give one of the brochures with every application. He said that they were also going to put them in local real estate offices.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that they had not been able to print the brochures because the computer system is being entirely changed.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if there was any information on the appointment of a new Board member.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated, no.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he noticed that Hansen Architects did not use the new application form. He asked that before Staff accepted any application that it be on the new application form and that all architects are made aware of the new form.

**Mr. Webb** stated that Staff had sent out the new application forms to every architect, but would make sure that they check future submittals.

**RE: Approval of Minutes**

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – June 16, 2004

**Ms. Brownfield** stated that she had a correction to the June 16, 2004 Minutes. Ms. Brownfield stated that the minutes read 416 East Macon Street the sign was on the ground and may need to be rescheduled. **She stated that she stated that the sign needed to be repositioned. The sign needed to be put back up.**

**Dr. Johnson** stated that he was present at the last meeting and this was evident in the first action, because he seconded the motion.

**HDBR Action: Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of June 16, 2004 as amended. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR:wdd