

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

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

NOVEMBER 10, 2004

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

Dr. Gerald Caplan, Chairman
W. John Mitchell, Vice-Chairman
Dian Brownfield
John Deering
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring
Ned Gay
Eric Meyerhoff
John Neely

Members Absent:

Dr. Lester Johnson, Jr. (Excused)
Swann Seiler (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer
Lee Webb, Preservation Specialist

RE: Call to Order

Dr. Caplan called the November 10, 2004 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

All signs were properly posted.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Lee Meyer, AIA
HBR 04-3177-2
402 West Broughton Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith
Ellen Harris
HBR 04-3292-2
517 – 519 East Broad Street
Alterations

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

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

RE: Regular Agenda

RE: Continued Petition of Ronald Erickson
HBR 04-3259-2
441 & 443 Montgomery Street
New Construction – Part II Design

Present for the petition was Ronald Erickson.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report:

The petitioner is requesting a Part 2- Design Details approval for two new semi-detached townhouses at 441-443 Montgomery Street.

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.

DISCUSSION

1. Exterior Materials: The exterior will be brick, selected to match that found in the Historic District in respect to size, texture, and color. The queen size brick will be used in the walls, with dimensions of 7 5/8" x 2 3/4" x 2 3/4". The brick pattern will be running bond and joints will not exceed 3/8" in width and tooled, not raked. The petitioner provided a sample of the brick.
2. Windows and Doors: The windows and French doors are manufactured by Norco and are wood clad, six-over-six, double hung windows, double glazed with simulated divided lights. The windows and doors are clad in extruded aluminum coated with a thermoset polyester finish; an extruded aluminum brickmold with the same finish will be applied to the frames. The muntins are 7/8" wide with a profile that simulates traditional putty glazing. The lower sash is wider than the meeting and top rails. The centerline of windows and French doors are aligned vertically; all windows and doors are recessed a minimum of 3" from the façade of the building; all window and doors facing a street are rectangular and have a vertical to horizontal ratio not less than 5:3/ The distance between the windows or doors is not more than two times the width of the window or door. The petitioner provided window information showing the muntin and brickmold profiles. The proposed window has been approved for new construction and is being used on the new rowhouses in the 300 block of West Taylor. The front doors will be mahogany raised six panel with a semi-gloss clear varnish finish.

3. Roof: The proposed townhouses will have a flat roof, concealed by a parapet. HVAC equipment will be located on the roof and screened by the parapet. The parapet will have a metal and brick coping, 6" high and overhanging approximately 1". The parapet will have a string course, 6" wide and projecting approximately 1 3/8" from the face of the building, running the full width of the building, and located between 1' and 1½' from the top of the parapet.
4. Balconies: Balconies will be located on the sides of the townhouses. The balconies will have wrought iron railings and iron support brackets. The balconies will not extend more than 3' in depth from the face of the building.
5. Porticos: The front entry porticos will be constructed of wood with wood columns with cap and base moldings. Balusters and decorative castings will be placed between the upper and lower rails and the distance between the balusters does not exceed 4". Design details were provided by the petitioner.
6. Lintels, sills, wall copings, steps, and porch pavers-all will be made of precast stone. The petitioner provided a sample.
7. Garden Walls and Gates: The side and rear garden walls will be enclosed by a brick wall and cast stone coping. Wrought iron gates for vehicular and pedestrian access will be provided. The walls will be at most 9' tall. Similar scaled walls are located at the new construction on West Taylor Street.
8. Colors: The windows and all wood trim will be white. The wrought iron work will be black. Colors samples were provided by the petitioner.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval for Part 2: Design Details.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering asked why did they elect to put the copper hip roof caps over the chimneys? He said he felt they were odd and brought more attention to the tops of the chimneys than the prefabricated metal.

Mr. Erickson stated the intent was to disguise the prefab metal chimney cap.

Mr. Deering asked if he could lower the slope of the chimney caps, so that it would not be so prominent?

Mr. Erickson stated that would not be a problem.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was concern about the 9 foot wall along the Wayne Street side. He said although a 9 foot wall was approved for the Taylor Row project, HSF felt in that case it was a mistake. HSF would ask that the petitioner and the Board consider going back to the 72" high as specified in the guidelines.

Mr. Erickson stated as Mr. Hardison said that was a suggestion in the guidelines. He said there were several historic as well as current precedents for walls higher than 72". He said the wall around at Taylor Row was 9 feet around their garden. He said they were asking for 8'4" – 9 feet. It would start at 8'4" on Wayne Street at the high end of the site and the grade sloped down, so they would have a 9 foot height on Montgomery Street, which was a very busy street.

Discussion:

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated the Board does not go by precedent. She said the Board goes by each individual project and look at it on its own merits.

Mr. Mitchell stated he was also concerned about the 9 foot high wall.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Part II design petition with the condition that the chimney caps will be lowered. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she also felt the fence was too high.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he would also like consideration to be given to lowering the fence.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Part II design petition with the conditions that the chimney caps will be lowered and the fence will not exceed 8'. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects
Jose' Gonzalez
HBR 04-3281-2
210 – 212 West Gwinnett Street
New Construction Part II Design**

Present for the petition was Jose' Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part II Design Detail approval to construct two duplex structures with rear garages for a total of 8 units. Part I, Height and Mass approval was granted October 13, 2004.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply for Part II submittals:

1. Section 8-3030 (I) Design Standards
 - (1) Entrances: A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the East-West street. This standard has been met. The front entrance is recessed 4' with half round engaged wood columns on either side of the recessed porch.

Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width. This standard has been met.

- (2) Residential Windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. This standard has been met.

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

- (3) Roofs: Pitched roofs parallel to the street with less than a 4:12 pitch shall have an overhang and be bracketed or otherwise projecting eave detail, or be screened from the street by a parapet wall. Parapets shall have a string course of not less than 6 inches in depth and extending at least 4 inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and one-and-a-half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two inch overhang. The roof meets the Standard with the exception that the parapet does not have a coping.

Garage and carriage house roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by a parapet. This standard has been met.

- (4) Stoops, porches: Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate. The steps are concrete with iron railings. The rear porch has 6" diameter iron posts by Cotswold and iron railings.
- (5) Fences: 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 building. A six and one-half foot +/- rusticated stucco fence is proposed between the main building and the carriage house on each end.

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

- a. Materials, texture and color: The material is stucco painted Benjamin Moore "Cypress Green" and Benjamin Moore "Santo Domingo Cream". The rusticated bases and fences are painted Benjamin Moore " Natural Beech". The window

detailing, banding, doors, gates and trim will be Benjamin Moore “Brilliant White”. The ironwork will be black.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with the conditions that the parapet have a coping and the step material conform to the standards.

Board Comments:

Mr. Gonzalez stated they had no issue with regard to the conditions recommended by Staff. He said in reference to the steps they could use precast stone.

Mr. Neely asked where were the HVAC units going to be?

Mr. Gonzalez stated in the back. He said they were concealed and would not be able to be seen.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he was concerned with the stairs being open underneath. He asked if he would consider enclosing the triangle underneath?

Mr. Gonzalez stated they had no objection to that. The only thing was they would like to make sure that they had appropriate clearances to enter the units at that location. He said they could build an 8” wall and cover it with stucco. He said the same band detail that they used on the building they would use on the stairs.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Part II Design petition with the conditions that the steps will be precast, there will be a 2” coping on the parapet and the triangular opening under the stairs will be enclosed. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of William Dye, Jr.
HBR 04-3290-2
108 West Jones Street
Alterations**

The aforementioned petition was withdrawn per the petitioner’s request.

HDBR Action: **Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review withdraw the petition per the petitioner’s request. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

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

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

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

FINDINGS

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

(b) Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. The primary entrance is on MLK, Jr. Boulevard. There are no entrances along Bryan Street which has a frontage of 169'-4". There is an exit and parking garage entrance on Bryan Street. An entrance to the bar/seating area would help place pedestrian activity along this main street elevation.

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

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

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

(d) Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances. See entrances above. An entrance needs to be added on Bryan Street.

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

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

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

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

Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades: The vertical and horizontal divisions meet the standards. The drive through drop-off beneath the second floor creates a massive void on the

front of the building that does not maintain the urban street front as well as a solid wall with drive in front of it would.

Rhythm of structure on streets: The required utility easement helps create the appearance of a lane. Historically the commercial buildings were built to the lot line. More recent commercial buildings did not adhere to the traditional siting and are incompatible with the typical commercial urban pattern of this area.

Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection (includes balconies): There are no balconies. See entrance comment above.

Roof shapes: See roof comments above. The roof shape is compatible.

Walls of continuity: See comment on rhythm of solids to voids. This feature needs to be revisited.

Scale: The openings help break up the scale of the building. See comment on solids and voids.

Directional expression: The verticality of the structure, established by the window groupings appears to end abruptly at the cornice. During the Phase Design phase this should be revisited. Eliminating the stucco panels above the fifth floor window and replacing them with flush brick might soften the juxtaposition of window head and cornice.

RECOMMENDATION

The height conforms to the standards. The standards for entrances on the east-west street and the voids on the front façade need to be addressed further. Recommend approval of height and continue mass related to the front façade to be addressed in the Phase II design submittal.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Shay, stated in reviewing the Staff comments they agree about having better expressed entrances on the Bryan Street side. He has had a chance to discuss this with the owner and there is no objection to having a better defined entrance where the bar and lounge is. He said he would also add a second entrance, but it would not really be that functional. The hotel security would be as such that they would prefer that it not be the real way that people come and go. But, it could serve as a fire exit. They probably wouldn't have hardware to allow entrance from the outside of the building.

Mr. Shay further stated that the second comment was about having a row of openings that opened back up to the street. He stated that Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard does need to have a continuous curb. They've presented a sort of "Loggia" approach to that. They would not have any objection to having more infill in the six smaller openings. His preference would be some sort of ornamental ironwork or something that would more strongly delineate the line of the exterior façade of the building. They would very much like to have that area open so that from the street you could see that through this opening that this is for pedestrians and beyond that is the actual doors that go into the lobby of the hotel. He stated that he has done several projects in the downtown area where they have glazed some of the openings. When you have cars that are coming behind it, he no longer finds this satisfactory. Mr. Shay stated that he is open to good suggestions on this, but he knows it would not be possible to set the entire building back.

He stated that with regard to the comment about the infill, he thinks that is a good comment and they will certainly agree to this change when they come back with the design detail.

Public Comments:

Mr. Gary Arthur stated that he has some concerns as a trustee of Ships of the Sea Maritime Museum, which is located in the William Scarborough House. He stated that it is one of the remaining Regency era mansions designed by William Jay. He stated that they are purchasing the property next to Scarborough House on Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and Bryan Street. This will be the site of their future education and exhibit hall.

The Scarborough House and its annex will be the immediate neighbor of the hotel that is being considered. He stated that they would be very grateful if the Board would, in the course of their deliberations, look at issues of tall building standards and rhythms of solids to voids. He stated that one of their concerns is the curved parapet across the void above the entrance canopy. He further stated this is on the east elevation, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard side. It is their understanding that the reason no wall plain is to exceed 60 feet in width is to break down the mass of a building, but by spanning across the void at the top of this building, the petitioner is really reconnecting the masses and thereby reinstating the larger mass of the building. They feel the parapet should follow the body of the building which would help to achieve the architecturally distinct sections the guidelines call for.

Mr. Arthur stated that they are assuming the stucco panel in the curved parapet is where the hotel sign is to be located. If it must be there, they would very much hope that it would be a visually light sign in the space between the flanking masses of the entrance. He further stated that perhaps the sign could be supported on metal hangers of the style of the canopy brackets at the entrance. The parapet would then follow the body of the building behind the sign. Similarly, the large curved parapet on the south elevation, the Bryan Street one, creates another set of problems. He said it was designed to emphasize the center of the building where one would anticipate a primary entrance, but there was no entrance on this side as already stated. He said they felt there should be an entrance or two on this side. He said recognizing that it would be a secondary entrance on M.L.K., and because of that secondary status its placement could well be somewhere other than on the centerline. He said they really felt the centered curved parapet should also be deleted. The whole issue of the problem of the relationship of the cornice to the body of the building and the application of stucco panels above the window heads as stated in the directional expression paragraph was a concern they also shared with Staff. As well as the tunnel affect of the drop-off drive beneath the second floor of the front of the building.

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF would like to reinforce Staff's concern about the motor loggia across the front of the building. He said this seemed to be an ongoing part of the problem in Savannah where areas that have been redeveloped do not pay attention to the pedestrian experience and it was slowly deteriorating. He said HSF would suggest that the loggia be moved to the Bryan Street façade of the building and more pedestrian friendly functions be moved towards the front entrance.

Mr. Shay stated the issue of the connected parapet was one that they could look at. He said the signage will come back to the Board when they decide what they want to propose. He said the curved parapet on Bryan Street they could study if they choose to put more emphasis on the doors. Regarding the motor loggia concern they studied at length having the arrival for the

automobiles on this side and it was not satisfactory to the owner. He said they wanted to make it obvious for anybody that was driving on M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. that was the entrance to their hotel. He said he felt it was very traditional, typical, and prudent for the main entrance to the building both for pedestrians and for other methods of arrival including taxicabs and so forth to face the main arterial street and not to face a secondary collector street.

Discussion:

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt HSF's comments about the streetscape on M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. were well taken. She said she knew there was a group of people who were working with Wendy's and some of the other places to bring more storefronts closer to the sidewalk to encourage more pedestrian traffic on M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.

Mr. Neely stated he did not have a problem with the open façade on M.L.K. and saw the difficulties with putting it around to the side. He said he would rather not see an enclosed wall. He said he felt the more open it was it invited pedestrians and people into the space.

Mr. Deering stated there were two other hotels that were designed by Patrick Shay in the City that had this very same situation. One being the Hampton Inn, which they put doors along Bay Street but they were never unlocked and it did not encourage pedestrian traffic. And in the loggia or auto court there was always a bunch of cars, buses, etc. and it was not psychologically pleasing to have to walk through that to get to an entrance. He said the Radisson was the same way. All of Bay Street was blank and dead. All of M.L.K. was blank and dead. He said when you go to the Radisson, it was like one of the loggias when you come out of the airport and you have the taxis, buses, tour buses, cars, etc. He said he felt this was not a pedestrian environment. He felt pedestrian environments needed to be encouraged in the City.

Ms. Brownfield stated she would also like to see the loggia restudied. She said she felt the points were well taken by HSF. Also, Mrs. Reiter's point and Mr. Arthur's point about the openings on Bryan Street were also good things to consider. She said she would also like to see reconsideration of the curved parapet because it seemed to denote an entrance on the building.

Mr. Shay stated he could come back and show the changes to the parapet and the relatively easy things to fix. But what the Board's direction was that the loggia on M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. was flat unacceptable then he supposed they would have to invent some other way to get in/out of the hotel. He said he hoped the Board would not say that because he felt the idea of a loggia facing M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. was not at the end of the day something that really detracted from the pedestrian experience.

Dr. Caplan stated he felt the loggia was the biggest concern right now and felt the others could be address very easily. He asked Mr. Shay if he wanted a continuance, so that he could further study the loggia.

Mr. Shay stated yes.

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

RE: Petition of Daniel Snyder, Agent for

**Steven & Marianne Brower
HBR 04-3294-2
320 East Jones Street
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

Present for the petition was Daniel Snyder.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part 1: Height and Mass for the new construction of a single-family, detached residence and carriage house at 320 East Jones Street.

FINDINGS and DISCUSSION

The proposed new house and carriage house are proposed to be constructed on a largely vacant lot at the corner of East Jones Street and Habersham Street. A non-historic carport to the rear of the property off Charlton Lane will be demolished as a component of the construction. The petitioner has expressed to Staff that the proposed design of the new construction will reflect a contemporary articulation rather than a historic replication.

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

1. **Height:** The lot is located in a four-story height zone. As proposed, both the main house and the carriage house will be two stories in height. The main house will be 29' in height and the carriage house will be 21'. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the main house will have 16' first floor and a 9' second floor. The proposed height and exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights appears to be visually compatible to the adjacent structures.
2. **Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:** The front façade will have a width of 29'. With the vertical alignment of the front façade's voids, the front façade will have a vertical directional expression, compatible to the adjacent structures.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The east elevation, looking into the courtyard area of the property, is proposed to have larger openings or voids. Since this is a secondary elevation and the petitioner is attempting to reflect a contemporary design statement, this treatment appears to be visually compatible. The proposed height and width of windows in the structure appears to be visually compatible with the adjacent structures.
4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades/Directional Expression of Front Façade:** The front façade of the house will have a four-bay rhythm, with the windows aligned vertically. The relationship of the solids to voids gives the front façade a vertical directional appearance. The immediate adjacent historic structures are two, semi-detached row houses. As a freestanding detached, single-family residence, the proposed new construction is visually compatible in respect to the rhythm of solids to voids on the front façade and the vertical directional expression of the front façade.
5. **Rhythm of Structures on the Street:** The proposed structure will be separated from the adjacent structure by a walled courtyard. The main house will be set at the lot line on

Habersham Street. Along East Jones Street, courtyard spaces separate different groupings of row houses. The project meets this factor.

6. **Rhythm of Entrance and/or Porch Projects/Street elevation Type:** The main entrance will be a street-level entrance to a side porch, off of East Jones Street. Other two-story structures with street level entrances are located in the adjacent block along East Charlton Street, facing Troup Square. This meets the requirements of the ordinance which states;” A proposed building on an East-West through street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.”
7. **Roof Shapes:** The main house and carriage house will have flat roofs with parapets which is characteristic of the adjacent structures and is visually compatible.
8. **Setbacks:** The house, side wall, and carriage house will have a zero line setback on East Jones Street, Habersham Street, and East Charlton Lane. A walled courtyard will separate the proposed house to the adjacent structures on the west side.
9. **Walls of Continuity:** The house and carriage house will maintain a wall of continuity on the Habersham Street side of the property. A garden wall will enclose the property on the north and west elevations and the remainder of the north(lane) elevation. This factor has been met.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of Part 1: Height and Mass because the proposed new construction appears to be visually compatible and meets the requirements of the ordinance.

Board Comments:

Mr. Neely stated the courtyard to the west looked about 31 feet wide. He said it looked like they may have a pool planned for that area and it appeared that there was enough width to even build another house.

Mr. Snyder stated it was a double lot and in reference to the pool it would not be visible from the right-of-way.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated on the west elevation the area between the porch going north where they have window, window indicated the large black mass on the second floor and the third floor. He said he could not imagine that they would run glass from the ground and then have less than a foot of solid between the first floor and second floor window.

Mr. Snyder stated they were only indicating there that they intended for that to be a large expanse of glass. He said how the glass meets the roof, intermediate floor, deck has not been addressed.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Board was going to try to approve this on the basis of height/mass and mass was solid and void. He said he could not imagine that the only solid for that area was going to be the 1 foot strip. He said between the ceiling, floor joints and the support there was a mass there that was greater than what was indicated. He said he was having trouble visualizing what he was going to do there.

Mr. Snyder stated they have not begun to design the fenestration at all. In fact, that was the one opportunity where they could be most contemporary.

Mr. Deering stated he was concerned that on the Habersham Street side (east elevation) was a continuous plane from the Jones Street corner all the way back to the lane. He said he felt that did not meet the intent of the guidelines. He said he felt there should be some break after the 64 foot length of main house some indentation for where the 16 foot width of infill construction was. He said it was an awfully long stretch. Like the Telfair and their wall on Barnard Street it did not feel good when you walked down it.

Mr. Snyder stated that was a good point and they would look at incorporating something there.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated in reference to the setback they still had the 64 foot elevation on the Habersham Street side that at this point had no indication of breaking it into any kind of rhythm that was to scale of most of the Historic District.

Mr. Deering stated there was a house (Gloria and Dean Horstman) at the corner of Charlton and Habersham had the same configuration.

Mr. Snyder stated they would be happy to address that in that one location.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I – Height/mass with the condition that the Habersham Street elevation is restudied to have some indentation and/or indentation and change in material along the Habersham Street side. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

RE: Request for Extensions

1. Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff and Shay
HBR 01-2772-2
423 East River Street
Alteration and Addition
Request for 1 year Extension
The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDBR Action: **Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the request for a 1 year extension. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Dana DeJames
HBR 04-3285(S)-2
540 East Charlton Street
Color/Roof Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Sarah Miller
HBR 04-3287(S)-2
24 West Harris Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Brannen Construction
Solomon Brannen
HBR 04-3288(S)-2
15 East York Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL
4. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 04-3289(S)-2
7 West York Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL
5. Petition of Betty Roane
HBR 04-3291(S)-2
111 West Huntingdon Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL
6. Petition of James Scott Gross
HBR 04-3295(S)-2
511 East Harris Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL
7. Petition of Laura Kessler
HBR 04-3296-2
130 Habersham Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

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

1. Steward Penthouse

Mrs. Reiter stated the determination from the Inspections Department was that there was not sufficient visibility to bring it to the Board.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he read the letter from the acting Building Inspector and he was curious as to whether or not we were having some overlap of duty, where the building department tells the Board what was appropriate and inappropriate. He said that was supposed to be the task of the Historic Review Board. He said he felt the Board should respond to the letter and copy it to the Executive Director, MPC.

Mr. Deering stated it was clearly written in the City Ordinance.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring suggested that section of the ordinance be cited in the letter.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated however it was worded he felt the Board should respond in writing so that it is in the files.

The Board agreed.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve that a letter is written in response to Inspections Department. Ms. Brownfield seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

Dr. Caplan asked Mrs. Reiter if she could draft a letter for review?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

Mrs. Brownfield stated there was a blue house with red trim on Jones Street across from Clary's with purple doors and shutters.

Mrs. Reiter stated they would check on it.

RE: Report on Items Deferred to Staff

Received revised drawings for 1 West Jones Street.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that a car accident happened at the intersection of York and Price Streets last week. The SUV skidded down York Street and wiped out the porch and has to be replaced. He said the owner is currently going the process with the insurance company and contractor. He said for her he called Mrs. Reiter and she said that once the lady gets the building permit for her to bring it to her office. He said Mrs. Reiter said that she would approve it because she was going to restore it. He said he was wondering if there shouldn't be something in the guidelines that covers such an incident.

Mrs. Reiter stated it was covered as in-kind maintenance.

RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements

RE: Other Business

- I. Unfinished Business
 - 1. Nominating Committee

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated the Nominating Committee would like to nominate John Mitchell, Chairman and Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman.

Dr. Caplan stated the nominations will be voted on next month. He also stated that last year they approached Mr. Mitchell about being Chairman. And Mr. Mitchell did not feel that he was able at that time to do so. He said he felt now Mr. Mitchell has expressed a willingness and ability to do so.

Mr. Neely congratulated Dr. Caplan on an excellent year as Chairman.

II. New Business

1. Revisions Committee drop-in Monday, November 8.

Mrs. Reiter stated she felt it went very well. She said there were about 24 people signed-in, but felt there were more people present who did not sign in. She said Staff received a lot good comments.

Dr. Caplan asked will the Revisions Committee have to act on any of the comments before it goes to MPC?

Mrs. Reiter stated she will have to get with Mrs. Horstman.

2. Section 106 workshop Wednesday, November 17.

Mr. Webb stated the Section 106 workshop will be held Wednesday, November 17. Currently, the workshop was full, but if there were Board members who wanted to attend they should let him know as soon as possible.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated there was also a Preservation Commission Training meeting in Cartersville, GA, on November 19 & 20. She said it looked like a good program and Cartersville was a wonderful historic spot of Georgia. She said the cost is \$75.00 and there were very reasonable Holiday Inns nearby, as well as the Resort.

RE: Minutes

1. Distribution of Regular Meeting Minutes – October 13, 2004

Dr. Caplan stated the minutes of October 13, 2004 has just been distributed to the Board, therefore they could not be voted on at this meeting. He said they will be voted on at the December meeting.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca