

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

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

MAY 12, 2004

2:20 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

Dr. Gerald Caplan, Chairman  
Dian Brownfield  
John Deering  
Ned Gay  
Eric Meyerhoff  
John Neely  
Swann Seiler  
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring

Members Absent:

Dr. Lester Johnson (excused)  
W. John Mitchell (excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Dr. Caplan called the May 12, 2004 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:20 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

All signs were properly posted.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Petition of Lott & Barber Architects  
Steven Stowers  
HBR 04-3186-2  
102 West Broughton Street  
Alterations/Sign

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, Agent for  
Juanita Crumbley  
HBR 04-3188-2  
514 East Taylor Street  
Renovations**

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, Agent for  
Gladys Wise  
HBR 04-3189-2  
501 East Huntingdon Street  
Fence**

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Katherine Demicco  
HBR 04-3192-2  
124 East Oglethorpe Avenue  
Renovations**

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Jason T. House  
HBR 04-3194-2  
512 East Gwinnett Street  
Fence**

The Preservation officer recommends approval of fence and trim.

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

**RE: Regular Agenda**

**RE: Continued Petition of City of Savannah  
Thomas Perdue  
Corner of Drayton & Hall Streets – Forsyth Park  
HBR 04-3179-2  
Pergola & Skylight**

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations to the front and rear pergolas as follows:

1. Simplify the columns and add a pink granite top and bottom band. Color to be coordinated with paving and presented to staff. Columns to have a vertical groove.
2. Alter the cornice band to have raised panels to differentiate it from the main building cornice.
3. Add an oval metal and glass skylight over the front portico.

**FINDINGS**

1. Provide dimensioned section of a typical column with new cornice for the file. Include diameter of new columns.
2. The curved form of the rear portico is appropriate because it acts like a proscenium for the stage, however staff is concerned that the shape of the front portico is incongruous with the streamlined appearance of the Fort. There was Board discussion at the April meeting suggesting that the portico be detached from the Fort (See attached minutes). The comments of the Board are based in part on the Development Standard in the Historic District Ordinance that historic structures should only be altered in a manner that will preserve the Historical and exterior architectural features. If a covered seating area is desired for tourists, then the petitioner may wish to consider a separate less massive loggia or arbor out in front of the structure. Garden structures covered with flowering vines were in Forsyth Park in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and might be a suitable prototype.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of rear pergola as amended. Consider separating the front portico structure and redesign to be a garden type structure with less massive columns. If the Board decides to approve the front portico as submitted, eliminate the skylight, which competes with the smooth modern forms of the original building and glass roof addition.

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

**Mr. Louis Hodges (City of Savannah)** stated they would like to get the petition approved as submitted and would like to work with Staff on changes.

**Mr. Thomas Perdue (Architect)** stated there were two sides to this building. The reason they put the skylight in the portico was to open it up to make it feel more open in the center. He said he felt the petition needed to be dealt with as two sides. He said you could see the line of demarcation where it went from a Fort structure to a formal side.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he mentioned last month that where the cornice of the portico butted into the cornice of the existing Fort it should be indented so that it did not look like the cornice came across.

**Mr. Perdue** stated he had no problem with that.

**Ms. Brownfield** asked if they were willing to eliminate the skylight as recommended by Staff?

**Mr. Hodges** stated yes.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if they could make the skylight flatter?

**Mr. Perdue** stated yes.

**Mr. Hodges** stated they would like to have the skylight, but if that was a point that they needed to take out they could do it. Also, they could modify the cornice.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that on both sides of the front portico there be an indentation where the portico cornice meets the cornice of the main building; that the skylight be a minimum height so as to not be readily visible; and a revised drawing be**

presented to staff for approval. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, Agent for  
Albert Nordine  
HBR 04-3190-2  
405 East Liberty Street  
New Construction

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a two-story brick carriage house facing East Liberty Lane to serve the main structure at 405 East Liberty Street. A new decorative iron gate with brick pillars at the garden entrance on East Liberty Street will be proposed under a later application.

1. The lot area for the project is 3000 square feet. The proposed new carriage house will have a lane frontage of 29'1" and a depth of 24' for a total square footage of 698.4.
2. Height: The proposed carriage house will be approximately 24' tall, with an 11' first floor expression and a 9' second floor expression.
3. Roof: The carriage house will have a flat roof with parapet.
4. Materials: The carriage house will be constructed of "Savannah Grey" bricks by the Old Carolina Brick Company. Cast stone sills and lintels by Continental Cast Stone will be located over and under the windows. Copper coping, downspouts, and collectors will be installed.
5. Windows: The proposed windows are wood clad, double-hung, simulated divided light, in a six-over-six pane configuration, manufactured by Kolbe and Kolbe, with the sashes 3" from the exterior face of the brick. The windows will be 2'10" wide and 4'8" tall.
6. Garage doors: Sectional wood, overhead garage doors with traditional carriage door trim will be used. The garage doors will be 10' wide and 8' tall, painted "Swan black," by Duron.
7. Shutters: Operable, wood louvered shutters, painted "Swan black", will be installed.
8. Utilities: A meter box insert will be located between the two garage doors, with a wood door, painted "Swan black."
9. Courtyard elevation: Most of this elevation will not be visible from the public-right-of-way, with the exception of the staircase through the new front gate. For this elevation, a wood deck on brick piers is proposed, with wood railings. Three sets of French doors, 5' wide and 6'8" tall, by Kolbe and Kolbe are proposed to open to the wood deck. Above the doors will be a 1' transom. The doors will be painted "Swan black". All trim will be painted "Nacre" by Duron. A section of the deck was provided.

## **FINDINGS**

The following standards apply:

Section 8-3030 (k)(6) *Visual Compatibility Standards:*

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 the structures, squares and places to which they are visually related.

Section 8-3030 (l) (13) *Lanes and Carriage Houses*:

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

**DISCUSSION**

The proposed new construction of a carriage house for 405 East Liberty Street is visually compatible to the main house and adjacent historic structures. It meets the applicable design standards in the ordinance.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval as submitted. The actions are consistent with the Historic District Ordinance development standards.

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

**RE:   Petition of Lott & Barber Architects  
      Forrest Lott  
      HBR 04-3191-2  
      110 East President Street  
      Alterations/Sign**

Present for the petition was

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations to 110 East President Street as follows:

1.    Enclose the porte-cochere with structural silicone aluminum glazed curtain wall system. The new framing will have a black finish.
2.    The new system will utilize 1” butt glazing on the exterior, with the joints located inside the existing structure.
3.    Replace the existing storefront entrance system, located on President Street side entrance with a new entrance.
4.    Install a black, flat, horizontal, illuminated sign panel, 15’x2’ integrated into the proposed curtain wall system on both State and President Street façades. No text is proposed at this time
5.    The existing non-historic railings will be removed.

**FINDINGS**

The following standard applies:

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 architectural features of the historic structure or appurtenances thereto.

### **DISCUSSION**

A similar proposal to alter the building was approved by the Historic District Board of Review on June 13, 2001.

The glass enclosure curtain wall system is reversible and does not alter the original historic building fabric. The proposed framing method allows for the openings to be preserved. However, staff would comment that the use of shades or curtains in the future would obscure the illusion of openness of the porte-cochere, and should be discouraged.

Staff would recommend that the text for the proposed signage be brought back for staff review and approval.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval. The actions are consistent with the Historic District Ordinance development standards.

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

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

Present for the petition was Jose' Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to add a covered loggia with three floors of balconies above to the north elevation of 21 West Bay Street. The length of the construction is 57'-9" and it projects 7' on a 10'-2" sidewalk. Also to remove the infill from four windows and to replace the infilled 4<sup>th</sup> story with windows (Marvin wood magnum historical double hung with authentic divided lights) to match existing. At the third story it is proposed to lengthen the two infilled window openings and install doors and transoms (Marvin wood French in swing doors). All wood to be painted white.

### **FINDINGS**

The applicable Standards are:

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

The applicable Guidelines are:

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

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

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

**DISCUSSION:**

1. 21 West Bay, originally known as the City Hotel, is attributed to William Jay, architect. Only one historic image is known of the building and that is the 1837 watercolor of Savannah by Firmin Cerveau. This indicates that there was a one story ground supported porch across the entire front of the building with a railing. The view shows 8 columns, evenly spaced except there is a wider space centered on the entrance between columns 4 and 5. This is reflected in the railing above. The existing building has undergone several changes including the ground floor windows have been replaced with storefront windows. The second story door opening appears to have been enlarged.
2. The proposed four story porch across the front of the building is inappropriate. It does not preserve the historical appearance of the building; it obscures the features of the façade of a William Jay building; the proportion of the columns and posts is too massive and the posts do not appear to reflect the design of the original view. A four story full width front porch is out-of-character for an 1820 building in Savannah. The City Hotel was a simple Greek Revival building with a one story ground supported uncovered porch.
3. Petitioner needs to pursue the encroachment permit with the City and then resubmit a design for a single story portico that replicates the historic view. The only other recent porch encroachment of this type was the Marshall Hotel on Broughton Street which recreated the historic iron porch.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Denial based on incompatibility with regard to

Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards (1) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District

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

- (f) Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection.
- (j) Scale of a building

**Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated his client wanted him to present this concept to the Board. He said they have had several discussions on this building, which is a notable building. Although the interior has not been kept up very well, the skeleton and a lot of the fabric was still intact. He said they hoped as they finished the project that they would be able to restore a significant portion of the building to its original splendor. Originally, the building was designed as a hotel and their goal was to continue to allow the retail component downstairs, which in this case was a restaurant and have residences above. He said they were not in a rush, but wanted the project to go through the process to the point where all could feel that they have made a significant improvement to what exists there today.

He further stated that he would like to present an alternative to get some input as they go through the process. One of the considerations that they made was to restore the original porch. In essence they would restore what was there before in this scale. The only modification that they would be doing to the façade beyond that would be to put balconies as a way to work within the existing window openings to allow the units to work and adapt them to a contemporary component. In doing so they believed should the building ever have to be altered back they were working with the existing lintels of the windows, so that they were not widening what was there. He said they could also work with the fabric that was there, while at the same time trying to adapt it to a more contemporary use. He asked if the Board could give him some feedback about how they were proceeding with the project.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt this solution was a much better solution. However, he felt that the balconies were inappropriate to this hotel. It was a very important structure and it has survived with its façade with just the simple removal of the colonnade and portico on the front all these years. He agreed that there was a lot of historic fabric left inside. He would hate to see it altered with the balconies. He said if the Board were to allow the balconies on the upper floors that they be carefully considered. He said William Jay was an architect that worked at a time between the Regency and Greek Revival periods. And he did not think the balconies were appropriate to either of those periods and should be studied further if the Board should want to allow balconies on this building.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated from a functional standpoint he could not see why anybody would want a balcony with the noise and traffic that is on Bay Street.

**Mr. Neely** asked if it was envisioned that the restaurant might have sidewalk tables?



**Mr. Gonzalez** stated no.

**Mr. Neely** asked what about on the second level deck?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated no, and that the second level was going to be residential. He added that this alteration to the windows was done before they were involved. He said he felt that was probably the most significant alteration that was done aside from the removal of the portico. He stated they would take into account Mr. Deering's comments, but he wanted the Board to understand that the balcony component was a significant amenity.

**Mr. Gay** asked if he was saying that there was no chance that they could do anything with the large windows at the bottom to take them back to how they originally were?

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated as best as they could tell the original building had a window, door, window, and they were not quite sure if that was a door or if it was symmetrical.

**Ms. Brownfield** stated there were so few William Jay buildings. She said she would love to see them go back as closely as they could to what he originally created there. She said she felt that would be an advantage to have the simplicity of it. She did not see any advantage at all in having balconies.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated he understood that the Board did not like to be polled. But he asked for some feedback even if it was just an informal polling on the issue of the balcony because it was somewhat critical to the functionality of this project.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF agreed with the Preservation Officer and the remarks of several of the Board members that these balconies definitely impair the architectural integrity of this building and HSF ask that the Board deny them. He said what has been shown as a substitute, he did not think was properly before the Board. However, in the interest of feedback he would say that HSF agree with the Board's comments that they did not have any opposition to replicating the original balcony on this building, but serious research needed to go into establishing exactly what those architectural details were. Also, HSF felt that any of the other changes needed to be faithful to what the original fabric of the building was.

#### **Discussion:**

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that she also agreed with the comments made by Mr. Deering and Ms. Brownfield.

**Mr. Deering** stated to the petitioner that he would not vote for putting balconies in the upper stories of this building.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he felt the building should be restored in such a way that it was true to the original fabric of the building.

**Mr. Gonzalez** requested a continuance.

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

**RE: Petition of Laura Kessler  
HBR 04-3195-2  
300 Block – East State Street  
New Construction/Part I Height/mass &  
Part II Design**

Present for the petition was Lou Oliver and Gray Reese.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting Part I Height/Mass and Part II Design for a four story condominium

**FINDINGS**

The following Standards apply:

1. Section 8-3030 (I) Design Standards
  - (1) Height map. This lot is in a four story zone.
  - (2) Street Elevation Type: a. A proposed building on an East-West Connecting Street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front or on an immediately adjacent tithing or trust block.
  - (3) Setbacks; There shall be no front yard setback except on Tithing Blocks where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.
  - (4) Entrances c. A building on a Tithing Block shall locate its primary entrance to front the East-West street.
  - (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 3 inches from the façade of a masonry building.
    - h. The distance between windows shall not be less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3

- k. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.

(10) Roofs

(11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches

Section 8-3030 (k) (5) Non-rated structures. The construction of a new structure...shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, structure, material, texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with other structures in the Historic District, particularly nearby structures designated as historic and nearby squares and other places to which the building, structure or appurtenance thereto is visually related.

The following Guidelines apply

Part I Height and Mass

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

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

**DISCUSSION**

1. Height: The proposed construction at four stories meets the height map standard. The overall height is now 51'.
2. Street elevation Type: There are four apartment houses on raised crawl spaces on the adjacent Tything block to the west. The apartment building type is the closest appropriate building type to the proposed condominium use. There are also other larger residential conversions on Oglethorpe Avenue in this ward (Oglethorpe Row) and a large four story former hospital building on York Street in Anson Ward to the west.
3. Setbacks: If the wall is not pierced by openings, no setback is required. The west wall has no windows and is built to the lot line. A 3'-6" setback has been provided on the east.
4. Entrances: The primary entrance fronts the East-West Street and is ADA accessible. This is an open breezeway with a gate.
5. Windows: The proposed windows are double hung. They meet the proportions prescribed in the ordinance. The muntins, however at 1½", are larger than the ordinance allows. The petitioner has agreed to reduce them to 7/8". The ground floor windows have French doors that open inward into the ground floor rooms. Iron grillwork is in the ground floor openings. A detail has been provided. The windows are metal clad wood and are inset more than 3" from the façade.

6. Roofs: A parapet made of Hardiplank will conceal the HVAC equipment. A profile has been provided. Guttering is internal.
7. Balconies: The balconies have been reduced to three feet on the front and are ornamental on the rear. The balconies are accessed by a French door.
8. Visual Compatibility Factors:

A three bay rhythm has been used and the siting is consistent with similar apartment structures in the next block.

Materials, Textures, Colors:

The main material is brick (Sample provided) 17<sup>th</sup> Century L-200, Queen size with common bond and flush joints.

The base is limestone.

The lintels are brick.

The windows are metal clad wood. Please provide manufacturer and model.

The doors in the window openings are metal clad wood. Please provide manufacturer and model number.

The balconies are metal with wood floors in a metal frame. A detail has been provided.

Colors: Cornice is Duron "Warm Shadows" 8823W; the windows are Duron "Stone Frieze" 8824M; the ironwork is Duron "Jacaranda Brown" 8825D.

Walls of continuity: There is a 5' high metal fence with 6' brick pilasters along the lane on the outside of a stucco wall with brick cap that leads into the garage. The petitioner has written that "Both the walls to the east and west will remain in place during and after construction. The basement will be set back at grade to provide protection for the wall foundations as required."

Scale:

The proposed construction is within the 75% lot coverage. The scale of the windows has been addressed. The proportions of openings have been brought into line with the surrounding residential buildings.

**Other**:

There will be a utility room in the basement. Trash goes directly to the basement and will be wheeled out on collection day.

Detail B is mislabeled – the lintels will be brick.

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

**Board Comments**:

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the submittal did not meet the requirements of Part II submittal. The Board had rendered elevations, but no drawn elevations. He said there should also be floor plans. He said he felt the submittal was fine for Part I, but inadequate for Part II.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated it was the opinion of Staff that this was a sufficient submittal. She said it was dimensioned and everything required as stated under Part II submittal.

**Mr. Lou Oliver (Representing Laura Kessler)** stated they redrew the exterior and took into account all the comments from the Board. He said they reduced the height of the building to 51 feet. They pulled the building off of the Davenport property line 3'-6" and off the opposite property 6 inches. He said they have expressed the piano noble' on the ground floor. They have reduced the number of windows on the side, front, and have elongated the windows making them taller in proportion. They have reduced the overall balcony widths and projection to 3 feet.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if he knew the depth from ground level?

**Mr. Gray Reese** stated 14 feet and the building was raised 2 feet above the grade to accommodate for the structure.

**Ms. Seiler** asked have they been able to talk to the adjacent neighbors again about the drilling and what that was going to do in regard to their home next door?

**Mr. Reese** stated they have had a couple of subsequent conversations confirming to them that every precaution would be made to protect their wall and property.

**Ms. Seiler** commended the petitioner for coming back and making the changes that they had. She said she felt that they addressed a number of the issues raised by the Board and felt it looked much better. However, she felt this was a big project height/mass to go into this quiet little stretch. She said she felt whatever had to fit in there needed to fit very peacefully. And she felt they have come back with something very suitable. But the drilling and going underground concerned her.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated the concerns of Mrs. Moore and of the Davenport House had been sent to City Inspections and the City Manager. She said she felt that everyone understood them and should not be dwelled on in this forum.

**Mr. Deering** stated in the window and door types, the upper story balconies were shown with windows and then the window type sheet shows the window as a double hung where you have to crawl through the bottom sash to get onto the balcony.

**Mr. Oliver** stated they were in fact double hung and you would have to crawl through the bottom. He said he felt they would want the ability to be able to resubmit that.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF was pleased with the setback against their wall and the fenestration on the east side. And HSF was overall happy with the design. He said HSF felt the three bay rhythm blended it with the neighborhood.

**Ms. Carol Hunt Chamberlain (Representative of Owens Thomas House)** stated they were concerned about the underground construction. She said they would like to know what methods were going to be used. For instance, how much vibration it would cause. Also, vibration from construction equipment such as cranes and how they would be brought in and the impact that it would have on the Owens Thomas House and the buildings more adjacent to the proposed site.

She asked what type of pile driving, drilling, or what methods were going to be used? She said she did not know if that was appropriate for this forum. And, if not where could she go to find out that information.

**Dr. Caplan** stated the reason it was not addressed was because this was not the forum for that type of discussion. He said it would be addressed at the Department of Inspections.

**Mr. Tim Walmsley, Attorney, (Representing the Moore's)** He said since the last meeting the Moore's had not received any additional information. He said he was able to get some information to get up to speed with where they are. As an observation, it seemed that a phase was skipped over. He said at the last meeting last month the Board unanimously decided that as far as Phase I - Height/mass the building did not comply. To reiterate the Moore's position on this was not that nothing should go onto that space, but simply if construction occurs that the construction was consistent with the neighborhood. He said the building that they were now looking at was not that much different when it came to height/mass from what they looked at last time. He said there had been some design changes, but as far as the building itself you were talking about 3½ feet off the Davenport side, 6 inches off the Moore's property, and then a relative small drop in the roof. He said the model showed a large rectangular monolith in the middle of the neighborhood. He said the way the building looked now as compared to the way that it looked before was great. But the issue at the last meeting was when you look from the square west, what did you see. A large rectangle, which was the Moore's concern. He said the design elements were fine.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that Lee Webb and she had met with Mrs. Moore and had reviewed the drawings.

**Mr. Webb** stated that Mrs. Moore also received a copy of the Staff report.

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** commended the developer and architects for the improvements made to the project. He said the design of the balcony with the railing was not consistent with the support elements underneath. He said HSF would like to suggest that the architects look at some of the other buildings that have more ornate railings or alternatively make the support more simplistic to go along with the railings. He said there was also concern about the details of the entrance gate and how it was going to look.

### **Discussion:**

**Mr. Oliver** stated they looked at a perspective that showed the building as it would be situated to see what it would look like from the square, which would be the longest vista. He said they found that the blocks that made up the side of that street was almost entirely consistent. And that the Davenport House and Kehoe House, which was the architecturally significant icons on the square remained that way. He said they felt their design was appropriate. He said as far as the balcony detail and front gate they would like to come back and clarify some of those details. He asked the Board if they would consider the cornice work out of a plaster finish stucco instead of hardi board put on masonry. He said they wanted as durable material as possible.

**Mr. Deering** asked if they considered copper?

**Mr. Oliver** stated yes. He said it would be a budget issue. He said he would propose putting those out there as alternates for them to be able to work with and price.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated it was the purview of the Board to review compatibility. He said he felt the applicant made significant changes from last month's presentation addressing some of the comments. But he also felt it was the obligation of the Board to preserve existing historic buildings. Therefore, he was very concerned that on this block they were about to excavate approximately 81,000 cubic feet of earth to make a parking garage underneath this building. He said he felt it would affect percolation of drainage and the neighboring building. He said in his experience of practicing architecture in the historic district he felt removing 81,000 cubic feet of earth in one block would affect the existing buildings.

**HDBR Action:** Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that the window muntins be 7/8" and that the entry gate, balcony design, cornice, and window design come back to the Board for review. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was passed 6 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Meyerhoff.

**RE: Petition of Mellow Mushroom  
Hilton – Johnson  
HBR 04-3196(S)-2  
11 West Liberty Street  
Color, awning, sign, lighting**

\*Mr. Neely left the meeting approximately 3:30 p.m.

Present for the petition was Jim Morehouse and Steven Daniel, Owner.

The petitioner is requesting alterations as follows:

1. Extend awning to cover door and window to the East for a new total length of 57'-4 1/2"; alter shape to have two shed sections each 17'-2" on either side of rectangular center section (which is covering a metal suspended fire stair). Graphics to remain the same. Fabric Mainstreet Dark Green # 204. (No mushroom graphics on awning)
2. Paint red trim around windows; red door is existing. (Petitioner withdrew request to paint building façade, by phone)
3. Install a menu board
4. Install 7 gooseneck lights over awning H-18110/HL-K-95- color brown
5. Install light over menu board
6. Install 8 exterior sconces on building. (actual sample provided)

### **FINDINGS**

The following Standards apply:

Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards (5) Non-rated structures. The construction of a new structure, or the moving, reconstruction, alteration, major maintenance or repair involving a color change materially affecting the external appearance of any existing non-rated building, structure or appurtenance thereof in the Historic District visible from a public street or lane, shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, structure, material, texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with other structures in the Historic District, particularly nearby structures designated as historic and nearby squares and other places to which the building, structure or appurtenance thereto is visually related.

Section 8-3121 Historic District Sign Ordinance (7) Announcement Signs (a) Announcement sign(s) attached flat against the building shall be permitted for each entrance or exit...(b) The aggregate area of announcement sign(s) per entrance shall not exceed two square feet of display area. Provided, however, licensed establishments serving food or drink may have an additional announcement sign not to exceed four square feet for the purpose of displaying menus and/or entertainment provided therein.

### **DISCUSSION**

1. Petitioner has been asked to provide the size, material, color and design of menu board. This has not been received.
2. The number and design of the sconce lights is inappropriate. They have a nautical appearance. They are inconsistent with the industrial style lights used elsewhere on the building.
3. The number of goose neck light fixtures over the awning should be reduced to just over the signage area.
4. It is inappropriate to paint the window and door frames red. This is not compatible with the existing building and buildings to which it is visually related. The door may be red.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Approval of the menu board light fixture.
2. Denial of the wall sconce design and approval to use the same menu board fixture on either side of each entrance only, for consistency of design.
3. Approval of the gooseneck fixtures provided the number of gooseneck fixtures is reduced to one or two over the signage portion of the awning.
4. Denial of the red trim
5. Approval of the awning change and color.
6. Approval of the red doors (not the door surround).
7. Remand the menu board design approval to staff.

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

**Mr. Morehouse** stated there were two submissions made. He made one for an awning independent of Mr. Daniels' submission for the remainder of the alterations. He suggested that the Board separate the awning because most of the comments were favorable and in that way he would be able to proceed.

**Ms. Brownfield** asked the petitioner if he understood Mrs. Reiter's recommendation?

**Mr. Morehouse** stated yes. He said Mrs. Reiter was recommending that the windows not be painted the trim, the lights be changed, which was not part of his submission, and awning signage submitted to Staff.

**Ms. Seiler** asked how big was the signage going to be?

**Mr. Morehouse** stated it has not been determined. He added that it would be as large as it could be, but still comply with the standards.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt Staff's recommendation was very straightforward. He said the Board could basically say that they approve or deny it based on the recommendation.



**Ms. Brownfield** asked Mr. Daniels if he was willing to agree with Staff's comments on the number of lights and her recommendation with regard to that?

**Mr. Daniels** stated that he was fine with Staff's recommendation.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF did not think the goose neck lamps could go in the square part of the awning because that was where the fire stairs came down.

**HDBR Action:** Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the following conditions: (1) The menu board design and size is to be worked out with staff, (2) The proposed wall sconce design is to be replaced with the type of fixture approved for over the menu board and the number of sconces is to be reduced to one on either side of each entry way, (3) The number of goose neck fixtures is to be reduced to one or two over the signage portion of the awning, (4) Awning signage to be worked out with staff, and (5) Denial of the red trim color around the windows and around the door. The red door was approved. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Petition of Patricia J. Lanese  
HBR 04-3198-2  
615 Tattnall Street  
Garage Door (after-the-fact) & Shutters

Present for the petition was Patricia Lanese.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval of an overhead garage door system installed in the back fence facing Jefferson Street. Also approval to install Atlantic shutters "Manchester" style, color, Black on 615 Tattnall Street.

**FINDINGS**

The following Standards apply:

Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards (13) Lanes and carriage Houses (d) Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.

Section 8-3030 (l) (109) (l) Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window.

(m) 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.

The following Guidelines apply:

Applied trim to sectionalized overhead wood doors should be used to simulate the first garage doors which were similar to barn and carriage house doors. Where such doors cannot be used, and with Review Board approval, a plain sectionalized door may be used, painted black or black-green. Doors with raised wood grain or panels are not permitted.

Carports should appear as openings in walls with a parapet.

### **DISCUSSION**

Two site conditions make this an unusual site. One is that the back of the house faces a street, rather than a lane. The second is that the existing fence is wood.

The mechanism for the operation of the garage encroaches on the public right-of-way. No encroachment permit was applied for.

The door design does not meet the best practice guideline regarding the appearance of overhead doors. There are similar doors on the same street a few blocks north, but it appears they did not receive Review Board approval.

The door opening dimension appears to be 12'. Please verify. The door could be reinstalled so that the operating mechanism is on the courtyard side. Provide a new drawing of the final exterior appearance of the installation. It is recommended that the fence be painted either the beige or tan sample submitted and the door Savannah Green.

Provide information on which windows are to receive shutters. Staff recommends that the shutters be painted Savannah Green rather than pure black.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Continuance for petitioner to provide new drawings and any other information the Board may add.

### **Board Comments:**

**Ms. Brownfield** asked Staff what would happen if there were other properties such as this one north of this particular site?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated she did not know when the garage doors were installed or how long they have been there.

**Mr. Deering** stated the new construction that Wells did, he thought was part of the original submittal.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated she felt it was not an appropriate door style. She said she felt if it were painted out it would not be noticed as much.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the interior pictures showed a very neat condition of covering the rollup door. And the exterior as it appeared was somewhat messy looking. He said he felt if the petitioner could do what she did on the inside on the outside it would be more appropriate.

**Ms. Lanese** stated she has an elderly mother and she walks with a walker. She said it was one of those things and it used to have a piece of plywood when she bought the house, which was pretty nasty. She said this piece right here was the mechanism and the other part was the cover. She said she agreed that it was not attractive, so that was why she put the pyroncanthe. She said she also had about four or five different trees that were growing. And she put holly trees on the outside, so it would not be visible. She said she also had no problem with painting the fences.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if she agreed with Staff's recommendation for continuance?

**Ms. Lanese** stated yes. She asked the Board if she needed to take the plants down to paint behind it?

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt the whole thing should be taken down. He said he felt it was completely inappropriate.

**Ms. Lanese** stated the problem with that was she would not have a way to get her mother into the house.

**Mr. Deering** asked why she could not put in a garden gate that was about 3½ feet wide?

**Ms. Lanese** stated it was not easy for her with a walker. Also, her Dad could pull the car right to the back steps for her mom to get in.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated if she pulled the mechanism paralleled to her property line and then make the street side like she made the inside it would be fine.

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

**RE: Request for Extensions**

1. Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects  
Jerry Lominack  
HBR 02-2941-2  
East Broad Street between Nicoll and Huntingdon Streets  
New Construction  
Approved 06-11-2003  
First request for 1 year extension
  
2. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 03-3007-2  
Between – Barnard Street & Howard Street  
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass  
Approved 05-14-2003  
First request for 1 year extension

3. Petition of Holmes Bell  
HBR 03-3015-2  
19 West Gordon Street  
Alterations and additions  
Approved 05-15-2003  
First request for 1 year extension

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the above-mentioned petitioners request for 1 year extensions. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed. Mr. Meyerhoff abstained on the Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay, HBR 03-3007-2.

**RE: Staff Reviews**

1. Amended Petition of Ed Swift  
HBR 04-3162-2  
214 West Boundary Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

**Ms. Brownfield** asked what the approval was for the aforementioned petition.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that the petitioner had an awning and he placed the signage on the awning and therefore he will not be able to have a separate sign.

2. Petition of William Saxman  
HBR 04-3181(S)-2  
601 Whitaker Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
3. Petition of Davis Cohen  
HBR 04-3182(S)-2  
221 East York Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
4. Petition of William & Helen McWalters  
HBR 04-3183(S)-2  
513 East York Street  
Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
5. Petition of Lynwood Willis  
HBR 04-3184(S)-2  
532 East Broughton Street  
Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jim Morehouse  
HBR 04-3185(S)-2  
547 Indian Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
7. Petition of Michael Caputo  
HBR 04-3187(S)-2  
216 East State Street  
Shutters/Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
8. Petition of Daniel Kaminsky  
HBR 04-3197(S)-2  
21 East Jones Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

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

**Ms. Brownfield** asked about the status of the Sakura sign on Broughton Street?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated it has been removed.

**Mr. Deering** asked what was going on the NE corner of State and Abercorn Streets.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated the balconies were being taken down to be sandblasted and painted and they will be put back.

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

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

**RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements**

**Dr. Caplan** stated that Mrs. Fortson-Waring has announced that she is running for Superior Court Judge.

**RE: Other Business**

- I. Unfinished Business
- II. New Business
  1. Reminder about June meeting date change to June 16 because of the G-8 Summit.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he is a stickler about the presentations and several months ago he was asked to rewrite the requirements for presentations, which he did and they were approved by the Board. He said there were two occasions today, which he felt did not meet the

requirements. He said he felt the Board needed to take a better look at the submittals to make sure they met the requirements.

**Mrs. Seiler** stated she agreed with Mr. Meyerhoff. For instance, the signage petition that was on today's agenda did not have the lettering size. She said if that would have come up separately the Board would not have referred it back to Staff. She said the Board would have ruled on that separately. She said the Board did not have the size lettering and the graphics were entirely different. The Board turned it back over because it was one separate element and that was not how the Board would have normally done that. She said it was like the third time that she could remember where the signage had gotten sloppy and the Board has sent it back.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated another case in point was the Fort. He said the Board had a rendering that showed the front portico had five or six columns, but when you looked at the floor plan it had three columns.

**Dr. Caplan** stated when there are that many changes and it has been approved by Staff, that the petitioner submits a drawing reflecting the changes and that would give the Board and public something to look at. He said he felt the drawing that was shown to Board with the mushrooms was confusing.

**Ms. Brownfield** added that even if it was on the day the Board meets after getting with Staff that they had determined it was a different look, if the Board has it that day it would be helpful for everybody to have a clear conscience about how they voted.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** added that when the Board gets a submittal for design approval he felt they should have a complete set of drawings instead of having rendered elevations.

**Mr. Webb** stated that last month was when they finally got approval for the new application that incorporated all the comments for months that Staff had been working on, which made the submittal requirement as streamlined and as explicit to the public. He said Staff was not able to get it on the web site until last week. So, now they will encourage applicants to use it and Staff will use it as their checklist when accepting applications.

**Dr. Caplan** reminded the Board that the June meeting has been postponed until June 16, 2004 at 2:00 p.m., which will be the third Wednesday because of the conflict with the G-8 Summit.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that many of the Board members attended the Georgia Trust meeting. He said one of the suggestions, which the Board was already trying to do, was when the Board made a motion for at least denial that you specify the section of the Ordinance that was covered. He said he asked Staff to make up a cheat sheet for the Board in which they have gone one step further of noting each item they discussed under the Ordinance number. So, if the Board has something for denial they can refer to these numbers in their Staff reports.

#### **RE: Approval of Minutes**

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

**Ms. Brownfield** stated there was a correction on page 18 Mrs. Fortson-Waring should say "...that the mass and the depth were not visually compatible with the neighborhood."

**Dr. Caplan** stated there was a correction on page 31, second paragraph should say “...**they would like to discuss approval at this meeting.**”

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated the Board must also remember that the minutes were not an exact transcript of the Review Board meetings.

**HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of April 14, 2004 as corrected. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

**BR:ca**