

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

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

JUNE 16, 2004

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Dr. Gerald Caplan, Chairman (excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Mitchell called the June 16, 2004 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:05 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

Ms. Brownfield stated with regard to #5 on the regular agenda, 416 East Macon Street, the sign was on the ground and may need to be rescheduled.

Mr. Faragalli stated that he was not aware that the sign was on the ground. The sign had been posted for the proper amount of time. Mr. Faragalli stated that there was not a current resident there to make sure that the sign stayed up.

RE: Consent Agenda

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

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Ryan MacDonald
HBR 04-3204-2
22 West Taylor Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, For
Betsy Garten
HBR 04-3208-2
520 East Bryan Street
Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Brent McCullough
HBR 04-3209-2
302 East River Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Lee Meyer
HBR 04-3211-2
510 Hartridge Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Lee Meyer
HBR 04-3212-2
508 East Jones Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Regular Agenda

RE: Continued Petition of Park Place
Patrick Shay, Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
HBR 03-3007-2
Barnard & Howard Streets
New Construction – Part II Design

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay, agent for the petitioner.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from both the vote and discussion on the aforementioned petition.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff Report:

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part II: Design Details for the new construction of four townhouses facing Barnard Street. The Part I: Height and Mass was originally approved on May 14, 2003, and an extension granted by the Review Board at the May 13, 2004 meeting. The remaining two buildings facing Howard Street will be reviewed for Part II: Design Details under a later phase of the project.

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.

1. Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards

- (8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following:
 - c. Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.
- (9) Windows
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - k. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.
- (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. Residential balconies shall not extend more than three feet in depth from the face of the building and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.
 - c. Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street.
 - d. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate; 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.
 - e. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base moldings.
 - f. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distance between balusters shall not exceed four inches.
 - g. 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.
- (13) Lanes and carriage houses:
 - d. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.

DISCUSSION

1. Materials: From the submitted drawings, the two interior townhouses have brick veneer front facades and stucco rear facades and the two outer units will be stucco, with the first story being scored. The Brick shall be manufactured by Richtex style 555, modular sized, using a sand color mortar with a grapevine joint. A brick sample panel was provided by the petitioner. The stucco will have a sand finish in color to match “Cornsilk” as provided by petitioner. The proposed stucco is a polymer based finish coat over two coats of Portland cement stucco. Precast stone lintels will be used on the brick townhouses and stucco lintels on the stucco townhouses.
2. Colors: The proposed exterior paint colors are: Pittsburgh Paints 114-1 “Lotus Flower” for the wood trim, and Pittsburgh Paints 506-7 “Dark as Night” for the metal railings and copings, and 506-7 “Distant Thunder” for the porch decks and stairs. Samples of the paint colors were provided by the petitioner.
3. Windows: The proposed windows will be two-over-two, true divided light wood clad windows, either by Kolbe and Kolbe or Weather shield. The following windows have been approved for new construction by the Review Board: Weathershield: HR 175, 7/8” true divided light, with insulated glass and Sterling Double Hung by Kolbe and Kolbe. Staff would request that once the windows have been selected, the petitioner would inform Staff so a note could be made to the file. The windows will be recessed from the face plane of stucco or brick by a minimum of three inches.
4. Exterior doors: Exterior doors will be solid wood in raised panel design. The proposed overhead garage doors on the east elevation appear to be less than 12 feet in width.
5. Roofs: Parapets will be incorporated at the roofs, with metal caps.

6. Porticos: Raised stoops with covered porticos are proposed for the Barnard Street façade. The pressure treated wood steps will have ornamental metal railings of galvanized steel, which will also be used on the porch. The stoops of the stuccoed townhouses will be supported by stucco piers and the stoops of the brick townhouses will be supported by brick piers. As proposed, the portico will have precast fiberglass round columns, that are approximately 9' in height. The columns will support a porch of wood fascia and a granular membrane roof. The portico decking will be pressure treated wood. The south façade will have balconies supported by ornamental metal brackets, with an ornamental metal railing; however, the decking material of the balconies is unclear. Staff would request the petitioner clarify. The east elevation will have covered porches, accessed by wood French doors, with the same materials as the front porticos.
7. Utilities/Garbage receptacles: Electric service entrances and telephone cable to be located under the high stoop at ground floor entrance from Barnard Street. Heat pump units will be located on the roof. Garbage receptacles will be curbside units near the street entrance on to Howard Street.

The proposed materials and design details for the new construction of four townhouses facing Barnard Street are visually compatible and meet the requirements of the Standards of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval. The Standards and Guidelines outlined above have been met.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Shay stated that he was with Gunn, Meyerhoff, and Shay Architects. The petitioner would be happy to submit the actual window once it is selected. He stated that he had not decided between two manufacturers, but they both make windows that have been approved on similar projects before. The deck material on the projecting balcony will be the same as it is for the porches, tongue and groove pressure treated wood, sloped, in order to shed water.

Ms. Brownfield asked what is the width of the garage doors.

Mr. Shay stated that the garage door is exactly nine feet wide.

Mr. Neely asked that the petitioner show the Board on the drawing exactly where the utility box will be.

Mr. Shay stated that the box will not be visible from the street. He further stated that the street level underneath the high stoops is where the meters will be located in a phone outlet box.

Mr. Deering stated that he thinks that it is unusual for a row in Savannah to have two materials on the front elevation. He stated that he would like to ask why this was done and if there is any reason or precedent for it.

Mr. Shay stated that in the block face on the opposite side of the street there are a couple of townhouses that he used as the inspiration for this project. He stated that he liked this better than having four identical units.

Mr. Deering regarding the French door on the (south elevation) parlor level with a sidelight and a transom above is out-of-keeping with the rest of the window rhythm and spacing on that elevation.

Mr. Shay stated that he is just trying to get as much light as he could into the floor plan. He asked if Mr. Deering thought the transom was over doing it.

Mr. Deering stated that it is a little modern. He asked that the petitioner take a look at this feature.

Mr. Shay stated that this could be eliminated and he doesn't think it will be a problem.

Public Comments:

Ms. Elizabeth Oliver stated that she is the property owner immediately adjacent to the site. She further stated they have a covenant on the five town homes where she lives, which also includes the property that is being developed. As a part of the covenant, there is a drive that is 24' wide and has an electric gate. She stated that the proposal is for four units. There are five property owners already using the drive with their garages opening on to it. She stated that she thinks that it can handle four more units. Ms. Oliver stated that she is really concerned about Phase II which would add about eight more units.

Mr. Shay stated that there will be six more residences.

Ms. Oliver stated that she is very concerned about the ultimate number and also about the garbage cans. Presently the only place they have to put their garbage cans is along the side of the building on Howard Street. She further stated that Mr. Shay plans to have Phase II facing Howard Street and she doesn't think he'll want the garbage cans right in front of the units. She said there is no place else to put them.

Ms. Oliver stated she was concerned with the density of the entire subdivision. She said when they purchased their lot the developers plan was to develop five units identical to what they have that would back up to each other. She stated that she isn't sure that the covenant should be binding when the plans have changed. She stated that maybe this is a legal question that the Board can't rule on. Ms. Oliver stated that her main concern is about the density and trash cans. The property is designated as an entire subdivision and once all of the units are built and sold they will need to have their own association and maintain the common areas as an association under the covenants.

Mr. Shay stated when Phase II is completed there will be a designated area for the storage of garbage cans during the week. They will also take a look at providing some type of enclosure that will screen the property a little bit better. The rule is that the sanitation department won't come onto private property in order to get the garbage can. He stated that they will work with the residents on how to handle this. Also, they will ask if they could open the closed street so that they can have access to both streets. He stated that it was not permitted in the past because of the proximity to the intersection.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition subject to amending the south elevation French doors by eliminating the sidelights and transom. Ms. Brownfield seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**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. 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.

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” grey brick for the first level, and a hard-coat stucco for the upper levels. The petitioner provided a sample of the stucco. A brick sample was provided. 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.

Cornice and other details: The cornice and other design details, including lintels and brackets, are in polystyrene with a hard-coat stucco finish. It has been past experience that such details are not distinctly defined and do not replicate cast stone.

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 ½” 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. It is staff’s understanding from the petitioner that the actual window manufacturer has not be determined. It is unclear what “sight-line” means on the submitted window details. Will there be a minimum of 3” to the face of the sash from the outside wall? The petitioner 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.

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 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.

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 SW6214 "Underseas"; Hard coat stucco: Sherwin Williams SW 6120 "Believable Buff."
7. HVAC Units: Condensers will be located on the top of the roof.
8. Signage: No information was provided on the logo signage on the façade of the building. The signage is a component of design review. Staff recommends that signage be continued and resubmitted for Board review and approval at a later date.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1) **Signage is continued and resubmitted for Board review and approval.**
- 2) **Windows: Once a window manufacturer is selected, a sample of the window will be provided for Staff review and approval. Please clarify the depth of window sash.**
- 3) **Further discussion on appearance of polystyrene material.**

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Christopher Allred stated that he is representing Greg Gill. The polystyrene component is a premanufactured preshaped component. Mr. Allred stated that the product is not directly made by drivet, but comes prefinished and preshaped. It is their intention that the material not be used within 20' of the ground level. All of the material will only be used above the second floor. He stated with regard to the drawings on sheet 8.1, the reference to sightlines is a manufacturers reference. Sightlines refer to the width of the sash jams and side sashes. The windows will be recessed from the exterior face of the stucco a minimum of three inches. He further stated that they would provide the signage information for review and approval as well as a window sample once a manufacturer has been chosen for Staff review.

Board's Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he understands the strong effort to make the building not have contemporary features, but five different lintels and four different parapets in one building is a bit much.

Mr. Allred stated that they looked at many different facades, layouts and designs. He stated they thought with the length of the building that it was appropriate to try to break up the massing to keep it from being so linear.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated regarding the lintels, it seemed as if they were trying to represent every architectural style. Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it disjoins the building in his opinion. The same thing applies to the parapet where every unit has a different type of a parapet.

Mr. Allred stated at the Board's request they could look at the pediment design and reduce the number of design details. He stated with regard to the parapet they have tried to use the parapet to highlight the different sections of the building. The actual parapets are three different designs.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he sees what they did, but in his view what they did is a little bit overkill. The short bays on the Oglethorpe Avenue side (with two windows) start at the ground floor with a rounded arch and then a straight arch and then a pediment arch over the lintel. Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the vertical mass is over detailed.

Mr. Allred stated that they can definitely revise the layout.

Ms. Brownfield asked what other option they might consider other than the polystyrene.

Mr. Allred stated that one choice was a cast fiberglass material not too dissimilar from the polystyrene, however it will be a fiberglass instead of the treated foam. Another option is to create it out of stucco in conjunction with the façade.

Ms. Brownfield asked is there a cost difference.

Mr. Allred stated, yes.

Ms. Brownfield asked why they would consider polystyrene.

Mr. Allred stated that they have worked with this material before and had great success with the use of the product. He further stated that they have been in contact with the manufacturer and are more than satisfied with the outcome of the product.

Mr. Deering stated that he had several comments. He stated that in a 280' long façade on Oglethorpe Avenue he believed that there was supposed to be an entrance. He stated that he understands that there was an entrance along there, but it should be a slightly more celebrated pedestrian entrance so that it looked like one. Mr. Deering further stated that in looking at the detail he thought that the portico and graphic details were too simple and not well executed. He stated that the petitioner should rethink those.

Mr. Deering further stated that he agreed with Mr. Meyerhoff that there were too many pediment designs. The muntins in the proposed windows are one-half inch and on a building this size he thinks this would be too small. Mr. Deering stated the petitioner might want to look for something in a 7/8" size. He stated that the Board has allowed other windows in the Historic District of this nature with thin muntins and they disappear. They don't do what muntins are designed to do and that is create a shadow line.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the petitioner was intending to close the Pappy Street.

Mr. Allred stated that they are actually considering petitioning to close Pappy Street with the thought of security for the foot traffic from the secondary parking to the actual hotel site.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he would like to propose that since the petitioner has agreed to restudy some of these items, rather than voting on the petition he might consider a continuation

until the next meeting. This will allow the petitioner time to see what he can do to enhance the building.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the petitioner wanted a continuation.

Mr. Allred stated, yes.

Mr. Webb stated that Staff would work with the petitioner to make sure that they get all of the issues that were brought up in discussion as well as the Staff issues.

Mr. Neely asked if either any of the architects on the Board or Staff has had any experience with polystyrene.

Mr. Deering stated that it had been on buildings for about 20 to 24 years now. He stated that it depended on how it was installed to determine if it would last.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it needed to be installed above the ground floor because if it was any where near public traffic it could easily be damaged. However, if it was above ground floor, one couldn't tell the difference in his opinion.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition to the July 14 Meeting. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and passed unanimously.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends a continuation until the July 14, 2004 Meeting.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until the July 14, 2004 Meeting. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of SCAD
Glenn Wallace
HBR 04-3202-2
112 Montgomery Street
Alteration/Addition**

Present for the petition was Mr. Michael Hambleton, project developer and Mr. Delgado

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report:

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations and an addition as follows:

1. North elevation: Remove existing door and replace with a window. Remove existing elevator and install two new windows. Remove fire escape. Remove HVAC equipment.
2. South elevation: Remove fire escape; convert two windows to doors.

3. West elevation (Front): Install new glass entry doors into existing openings.
4. All windows except stained glass front windows: Replace sashes with double pane aluminum /vinyl clad wood windows. A mock up will be installed. Marvin Windows.
5. Mechanicals will be placed inside and on roof.
6. Add a new addition attached with a glass “hyphen”. Precast in two colors of gray and two textures; smooth stucco in gray (See description supplied by the petitioner).

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

1. Section 8-3030 (l) (1) Height: The building is located in a four story height zone.
2. Section 8-3030 (l) (3) Setbacks: Setbacks shall comply with the following: On Tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.
3. Section 8-3030 (l) (9) Windows: Historic windows, frames, sashes and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented that they have deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original windows in composition, design and materials.

The following guidelines apply:

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

- a. Height
- b. Rhythm of structures on streets
- c. Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection
- d. Relationship of materials, texture, and color.
- e. Roof shape
- f. Scale

COMMENTS

1. The new addition has four stories and a mechanical attic space.
2. The setbacks are consistent with the setbacks of the existing building.
3. With the exception of the stained glass windows on the front most of the windows according to the petitioner do not appear original. It is proposed to replace them to match existing configuration, but in a vinyl or aluminum clad wood. A sample will be installed.
4. Entrances: The petitioner needs to provide photographs and description of the front doors to be replaced.
5. The addition has been attached by a glass hyphen to denote the new from the existing. The materials have been alternated in texture to simulate the “scoring” of the main building. The addition is simple and modern to differentiate it from the original. The slanting of the elevator shaft wall and roof however do not reflect the original building. It is recommended that this element be squared off to be consistent with the perpendicular lines of the main building.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with the conditions that the elevator shaft walls and roof be squared off and that the ornamental pole on the elevator shaft be deleted. No recommendation is made regarding the front doors until more information is received. Recommend final window approval be granted to staff review of installed sample.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Michael Hambleton, project developer, for SCAD stated that Mr. Art Delgado, the principal in Delgado & Associates, Washington, D.C. was also with him. He stated that Mr. Delgado prepared the drawings. He stated that they agreed with all of Staff's recommendations with one exception, which was the slant to the elevator tower which they thought would add a little bit of fun to the back of the building. It is also in the center of the addition so it is not really viewable from Montgomery Street. Even as you approach the lane from two angles it is not visible. He said they were willing to yield on the tower ornament.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked why there were windows in the elevator shaft at the top.

Mr. Hambleton stated that the idea was to illuminate the area from the interior to make it somewhat more attractive and to add light to the dark parking area.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he agreed with staff in that the heart of this building are the two domes. They reflect the two religious groups that had been there. The top of the elevator shaft will conflict with the two domes. It should be toned down to a point where the domes remain the two pinnacles of this building, rather than trying to have a lighted shaft at the top of the elevator. Mr. Meyerhoff also asked for the materials on the building to be identified.

Mr. Hambleton stated that they used a tapni that is the mainfield material. He stated the horizontal accent material is a smooth faced material.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the 13' x 4" from the ground, with the exception of the water table, was stone.

Mr. Hambleton stated that it was precast stone.

Mr. Deering stated that he admired what they were trying to do with the modern addition. He further stated that he liked the angled elevator shaft and the lighted top and it really did provide a beacon in the parking lot at night. Mr. Deering stated that he didn't mind the finial to project through the cornice element. He stated that they might want to consider dropping the height so that it did not conflict with the two domes

Mr. Deering asked whether the front doors would be frameless glass doors.

Mr. Delgado stated that they were thinking of having them be frameless sliding doors with motion detectors on the inside and outside. The reason for the change in the doors is that there would be quite a bit of activity coming in and out.

Mr. Hambleton stated that this would be the primary ingress for the building.

Mr. Deering stated that he did not mind changing the doors to glass. He stated that he did agree with Staff that the original doors should be stored somewhere.

Mr. Hambleton stated that this would not be a problem.

Mr. Deering stated he thought that the stucco water table below the precast first story might feel a little weak because the precast is going to read as a heavier, stronger material on top of the stucco. He suggested taking the precast all the way down.

Mr. Hambleton stated that the water table line was in reference to the original building where it was also done in stucco. He stated that they could certainly consider changing the material.

Mr. Deering stated that they could use the smooth precast material and then go to the rusticated above that.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if they were interested in lighting the parking lot from the top of the shaft it would seem to him that they would project the area where they have the glass outward. The glass could be in the eaves so that it goes down rather than have a beacon of light at the top that is certainly not going to light the parking lot.

Mr. Hambleton stated that he would like to clarify that the light of the parking lot from this element is a secondary feature. The primary feature of this was an architectural beacon. Any light that it cast down to the parking lot would be superceded by actual parking lot lighting located at a lower level.

Mr. Hambleton stated that there is a certain amount of over travel on the elevator shaft dealing with the equipment. He stated that they could study bringing it down as far as they could and still make it work.

Ms. Seiler stated that the proposal is refreshing and she is delighted and thinks it will be a wonderful addition to the neighborhood.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that since they are trying to accent the top of the contemporary addition they might want to consider, at the same time, lighting the two domes so that they have three features at the roof instead of just one so that one can see the contrast.

Mr. Hambleton stated that this is a very interesting suggestion.

Mr. Neely asked with regard to the exterior brick of the main building is it their intention to clean it or leave it like it is.

Mr. Hambleton stated that it is all in pretty good shape, but there is work to do on the existing north side where there is an existing air conditioning unit that they plan to get rid of. There is an existing two-story elevator shaft that they are going to get rid of as well. They are basically going to try to clean up the north side so that it looks like the south side with a nice little courtyard garden. They really want to try to clean it up and where they have to fill back the holes they will try to reuse as much of the existing brick as possible. They need to treat the domes and they need to be looked at so they can be restored to their original condition. The only reason they are replacing some windows (not the stained glass windows) is that these windows are in horrible shape and don't have the original materials as some even have Lucite in

them. The windows are rotten to a large degree and they don't need operating windows for egress requirements. He stated that they wanted to save as much of the original building as they can. The windows are very simple.

Ms. Brownfield asked if they were putting in sprinklers in the building.

Mr. Hambleton stated, yes. He stated that the addition had two fire rated egress stairs and they are keeping the front stairs for a kind of grand stair.

Public's Comments:

Mr. Joe Sasseen stated his objections to elevator shafts in the historic district. He said if they are necessary, they should be disguised.

Mr. Dirk Hardison, Historic Savannah Foundation, stated that their Architectural Review Committee wished to commend the petitioner. He stated that they are constantly asking for contemporary additions which use mass and scale to make them compatible. He stated that they finally have something with a bit of contemporary flair. The new building certainly has a lot of historical flair which made it all the more compatible. Mr. Hardison stated that they were concerned about the storage of the front doors. He stated that too many times things that are removed, even when scheduled to be put back, disappear. He stated that they wished the petitioner would consider some way of keeping the doors there, but opened, at all times.

Ms. Brownfield stated that she agreed with Mr. Hardison with regard to the front doors. She asked was there any way they could consider keeping the doors.

Mr. Deering suggested that the doors could be incorporated permanently into the interior design.

Mr. Hambleton stated that this might be an option. He stated leaving the doors up and open was not an option for both security and air conditioning reasons.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that they could be used in the lobby as paneling on the wall.

Mr. Hambleton stated that they took the old steel doors and hung them on the wall in Montgomery Hall. He stated that it did expose them to the public and showed what they were like. He stated that he was certain that they could find a way to incorporate the doors into the interior design of the project.

Ms. Brownfield stated that the students will value seeing the old doors.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition subject to the elevator tower coming back to the Board and the base of the building to have a precast concrete finish below the water table. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Petition of Albert Faragalli
HBR 04-3205-2
416 East Macon Street
Alterations
Part II Design**

Present for the petition was Albert Faragalli, petitioner.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. On the north (Harris Street) elevation replace existing 6/6 windows at third story with custom made French casement mahogany true divided light single glazed windows to match those previously approved next door at 414 East Macon Street. Paint Benjamin Moore 960 White
2. Replace existing door at second floor and lengthen existing windows to floor length and install new custom made mahogany French door with true divide light single glazed doors.
3. On the ground floor treat window and door openings the same as second floor.
4. Install new operable cedar shutters hinged and sized to fit the windows and doors to match those previously approved and installed at 416 East Macon Street.
5. Remove existing non-historic ground supported wood deck and replace with new full width by 7'-6" projection iron deck and columns to match that previously approved next door at 416 East Macon Street.
6. Remove existing fence and install new brick fence, Savannah Grey with ivory buff mortar on same location and of a height (8'-4") to match height of existing wall at 416 East Macon Street. Install a new iron gate to match railing. Existing car parking pad to remain.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Section 8-3030 (I) Design Standards (9) windows

- a. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.
- b. Historic windows, frames, sashes and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented that they have deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design and material.
- c. Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening.
- d. Shutters shall be constructed of durable wood, 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.

- (12) Fences and garden walls: Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building, provided however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.

The following Guidelines apply:

Rhythm of entrance and or porch projection. The relationship of entrances and porch projections to sidewalks of a structure shall be visually compatible to the structure, squares and places to which it is visually related.

Comments:

1. This row was restored before the Historic District Zoning Ordinance was adopted. The row was a shell with no windows so that the windows in the building date from the late 1960's or early 1970's. At that time the end unit received casement windows.
2. Over time rear porches and decks have been added. When the first deck appeared before the Board the owners of the row were asked to get together and agree on a consistent design for the rear of this Trust Lot row. This proved impossible to do so the row was added on to in various ways at different times.

The proposed rear uncovered porch helps unify two of the rear facades, however it projects 1'-6" deeper than the previously approved porch. Staff recommends that the porch be reduced in depth to six feet to maintain a uniform appearance

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the casement windows and doors with the condition that casement windows will not be used on the primary (Macon) Street façade. The current windows are not historic fabric and the Harris Street elevation is the rear façade of this row. The opening widths will not change. Four windows will be lengthened into doors.

Approval of the new ground supported porch with the condition that it be reduced to 6' deep to match the previously approved adjacent porch.

Approval of the new fence. The design standards for fences have been met.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Albert M. Faragalli, of AMF Residential, stated that the only issue was the projection of the rear balcony. He further stated that currently there are wood balconies in the area that have been mentioned as "add ons" in the 1970's. He stated that they were supposed to remain consistent, but haven't. He would like to add that the wood porches project out 9' – 6" or actually 10' 6" in most cases along the row. The proposed balcony would project out 7' – 6" inches which is actually two feet less than what's there now. In the elevation on the unit there will remain a wood deck which is still out 9' – 6" and will project our further than either of the two balconies on 416 or 414 East Macon Street.

Public's Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that they hoped that the Board follows the Staff recommendation on the depth of the balcony. The row changes after the petitioned unit. There are two rows that are in line and hopefully all of the alterations will stop after this point which will make one row consistent with itself and the other row may come on-line with it self later on.

Mrs. Reiter stated do not call the proposed addition a balcony or you will be pulling it back to three feet. She further stated that the proposal is for a porch. It is a ground supported porch and not a balcony.

Mr. Deering asked if the existing porches for 414 East Macon projected six or seven feet.

Mr. Faragalli stated that the porch currently projects 6'.

Mr. Deering stated that he would suggest that they keep the porch at 6' to reestablish the consistent back of this row. One more in and out would not be a good thing. He said, if you want to make them consistent, just pull the other one out.

Mr. Faragalli stated the reason behind making it come out further is the fact that it is an end unit and will help announce that it is the end unit. The other reason is that 6' isn't very much space for a porch. It adds a little more comfort in making this a usable space.

Mr. Deering asked if the windows on the Macon Street elevation were a part of the petition.

Mr. Faragalli stated that the front would be restored as is.

HDBR Action: Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition subject to reducing the rear porch to a depth of six feet as recommended by Staff. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
HBR 04-3206-2
458 M.L.K., Jr. Boulevard
Addition/Part I – Height & Mass**

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition per the petitioner's request. Ms. Seiler 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.

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of William Marmion
HBR 04-3200(S)-2
454 Price Street
Door Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

2. Petition of John Hoof (McLean)
HBR 04-3201(S)-2
403 Tattnell Street
Color & Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Martin & Rosemary Hill
HBR 04-3203(S)-2
107 East Jones Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Coop's Classic Grill
Greg Marini
HBR 04-3207(S)-2
17 West Broughton Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 04-3210(S)-2
116 West Congress Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

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

Mr. Deering asked if there is anything on what was added to the top of the old C & S Bank Building at Bull and Liberty Streets. He stated that the structure is visible from Drayton Street.

Mrs. Reiter stated, no.

Mr. Deering stated that he keeps bringing the matter up. He further stated that there is a whole new little penthouse that looks like a living area that's been added to the roof. He asked what the building is being called now.

Mr. Webb stated the Condo Building.

Mrs. Reiter stated that she has called the Inspections Department, but they didn't do anything.

Mr. Neely stated another property is the roll up metal gate at 615 Tattnall Street.

Mrs. Reiter stated that is Pat Lanese's petition and it has been continued until next month.

Ms. Brownfield stated that she asked month's ago about the roof top addition near the Hilton also.

Mrs. Reiter stated that Staff will go back to the Inspections Department. Staff did bring the matter to the attention of the Inspections Department and they will contact them again.

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

Mr. Deering stated that he would not be at the July Meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review.

RE: Approval of Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – May 12, 2004

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of May 12, 2004 as presented. 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 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:wdd