

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

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

SEPTEMBER 8, 2004

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Swann Seiler, (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer
Lee Webb, Preservation Specialist

RE: Call to Order

Dr. Caplan called the September 8, 2004 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

All signs were properly posted.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Mansion on Forsyth Park
Martin Hogan
HBR 01-2674-2
700 Drayton Street
Signs

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Continued Petition of T. Heyward Gignilliat
HBR 04-3240-2
124 East McDonough Street
Gate/Fence

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

RE: Continued Petition of Kern Coleman & Co.
Tom Olson
HBR 04-3247-2
11 East Perry Street
New Construction – Part I & II

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Time Saver
Harris Slotin
HBR 04-3258-2
502 West Bay Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Jane F. Espy
HBR 04-3260-2
222 East Liberty Street
Alterations – Rear Stair & Deck

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of The Spriggs Group
C. Kenneth Spriggs
HBR 04-3262-2
146 Whitaker Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Bloomquist Construction
David Bloomquist
HBR 04-3263-2
612 Barnard Street
Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

RE: Regular Agenda

RE: Continued Petition of Hansen Architects
HBR 04-3206-2
458 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.
Addition/Part II – Design

Present for the petition was Patrick Phelps.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part II Design and Materials for an addition to the Civil Rights Museum as follows:

South (Alice Street) and North (Wayne) Street) Elevations

Walls: Buff Brick Palmetto Brick “25 Greystone” with light sand mortar.
“White” cast stone columns, banding, cornice and base.

Aluminum Storefront “Clear” anodized for windows and doors. A combination of clear glazing and spandrel glass is proposed. Please delineate where the spandrel glass will be used and its color.

East and West elevations

Palmetto brick “Dark Red” wirecut.

FINDINGS

The applicant has provided a written explanation for the material choices.

The materials reflect, but do not replicate the materials on the original building.

The rhythm of bay spacings, base lines and cornice lines repeat those on the original building.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. John Lessel stated they were going to use a darker spandrel glazing similar to the gray color to the glazing below. He will submit a sample to Staff.

Mr. Deering asked if the upper two panes of the four light windows would be spandrel glass?

Mr. Lessel stated yes.

Mr. Deering asked why did they changed to red brick in places?

Mr. Lessel stated because the existing building had two facades with buff brick along Alice Street and M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. and on the zero – lot line elevations it was a red brick. They were doing a similar condition along the east and west elevations of the addition.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if there was any particular reason that on the east elevation, which runs about 100 feet and the west elevation which runs about 50 feet that there is so little articulation other than the indent of the simulated windows?

Mr. Lessel stated the reason for that was it was a 0 – lot line condition and their neighboring properties were not owned by them.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the condition that samples of the glazing be brought to staff for approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

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

Present for the petition was Jose Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design for a six unit row of two-story townhouses.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

1. Section 8-3030 (I) Design Standards, Subsection
 - (1) Height Map. This is in a four story zone. The exterior expression of the height of the first story shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each subsequent story shall not be less than 10 feet.
 - (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: A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the East-West street.
 - (8) Exterior walls: Wood siding is permitted on row houses only in wards where...more than 75 percent of the lot frontage in the ward contains wood sided buildings.
 - (9) Windows: Residential Windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.

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.

(10) Roofs:

- a. Gable roof pitches shall be between 4:12 and 8:12. Gable and hip roofs in excess of 8:12 pitch are permitted only where a similar historic building roof pitch exists within the same block front.
- b. 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.
- c. 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.
- g. Roofs visible from a street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles; 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.

(11) Stoops:

- d. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate.
- e. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base mouldings.

(12) Fences and garden walls:

- b. Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building.

(13) Lanes and carriage houses:

- d. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.
- e. Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by a parapet.

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 nearby structures designated as historic...The Following Guidelines apply Section 8-3030 (k) (6) Visual Compatibility Factors

- a. Height
- b. Proportion of structure's front façade
- c. Proportion of openings
- d. Rhythm of solids to voids in front façade

- e. Rhythm of structures on the street
- f. Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection
- g. Materials, texture and color
- h. Roof shape
- i. Walls of continuity
- j. Scale
- k. Directional expression

FINDINGS:

The following is a discussion of the applicable standards in Section 8-3030 listed above.

1. Height: The proposed construction is two stories within a four story permitted zone. There is a one foot-six inch elevation above grade. The first floor appearance on the exterior is 12'-6" from grade. The second floor is 10'. The floor-to-floor height standard has been met.
2. Street elevation type: The adjacent and nearby street elevation types have raised crawl spaces with 6-10 steps. The proposed row is raised with 3 steps. The proposed street elevation type appears compatible in this context.
3. Setbacks: A four foot setback is proposed with stoop and a 9 foot setback with a one story porch aligned with the face of the adjacent units. The proposed row meets the average setbacks along the street.
4. Entrances: The primary entrance fronts the East-West street. This standard is met.
8. Exterior Walls: The immediate block has all wood structures. Smooth HardiPlank is proposed. This standard is met.
9. Windows: The proposed window openings are approximately 3:5 in proportion. The sash is by Marvin Clad Ultimate Double Hung with a 7/8" SDL with spacer bar. This standard is met with the spacer bar. The lower windows might be extended in height to mitigate the large amount of space between the lower and upper windows. The shutters are wood, operable and sized to fit the windows. The shutters on the doors should be eliminated. A louvered screen door could be used.
10. Roofs: The proposed gable roof has a pitch of 10:12. No back-up material was provided for proposing a roof that is steeper pitch than the standards allow. The covering is a Fabral 5V crimp with a 2" height according to the petitioner's written submittal. (Is this dimension correct? It appears 1/2" in the manufacturer's submittal.) Color: Hunter Green. A 5 V crimp roof is not appropriate for an urban residential application. It has a more commercial or rural appearance. How will the exposed edges be treated? The exposed edges also give a more rural appearance. A standing seam metal roof is the more appropriate treatment. The parapet is still hard to understand. Is it a freestanding element or does it wrap?
11. Stoops: A single story and a two story stoop type are proposed. The end units have hip roofed single story stoops with wood posts. The center units have two story stoops with front facing gable roofs and the other units are recessed with full width one story covered porches. The proportion of the stoops on the end units is awkward. The top of the stoop appears to extend into the second floor area. The stoop appears too tall, particularly in

light of the unusually narrow width of the unit. A flatter roof is recommended. On the remaining porches, the fascia boards are too deep. None of the posts have bases that are called for in the standards.

12. Fences and Garden Walls: The drawing of the proposed wall is still hard to understand. It appears that the back porch rests on top of the column and it is not clear that the columns support any top beam. The fence does not reflect the material of the main house, nor any detail of traditional fences in the neighborhood. Shutters are not used for garden walls. Brick and wood would be appropriate, but the design needs to be reconsidered.

Discussion of Compatibility Factors

Rhythm of solids to voids: A three bay rhythm is predominant in this neighborhood. The proposed project has a two bay rhythm. This is due to the unusual narrow width of the units.

Rhythm of structures on the street: 15' wide brick townhouse rows are not typical of this neighborhood. The petitioner has stated there are examples three blocks away. The immediate context is what should be considered. However, the ordinance and plan can tolerate certain anomalies, provided the majority of the details are in conformance.

Colors: Six shades of beige are proposed for the townhouses as follows: 'hazy skies', 'ashwood', 'halo', 'swiss coffee', 'misty air' and 'overcast' (Paint company not specified). Six contrasting colors are specified for the shutters "black", 'espresso', 'old navy', 'gray', 'hunter green' and 'rust'. The porches and doors are proposed to be white and the roof hunter green.

13. Carriage House:

The size and design of the garages doors meet the standards. The height of the carriage houses is lower than the main structure. The roofs are shed with a parapet, however, it is not clear why there are breaks in the cornice on the rear elevation of the carriage houses.

RECOMMENDATION

The amended proposal corrects many of the previous deviations from the standards. The principal remaining deviation is the width of the units. The project would appear to be visually compatible with the following revisions.

1. Eliminate the shutters on the doors.
2. Increase the height of the lower windows.
3. Revise the proportion and details of the stoops per the discussion above.
4. Revise the side garden wall to utilize a combination of brick and wood in a more traditional pattern.
5. Clarify the rear carriage house parapet detail.
6. Justify the steeper gable roof pitch and clarify how the inner unit parapets will work. Also, reexamine the type of "standing seam" metal roof system.

Petitioner's Request:

Mr. Gonzalez stated in the submitted photographs there was significant variation in roof pitches. The guidelines indicated 8:12, but they decided to use 10:12. He said to balance the site in terms of scale and so forth they went with a slightly higher pitch. If the pitch was changed to an 8:12, the center section would probably drop about 3 feet. He said if the Board wanted them to lower the pitch to the standard they would not have an objection, but they felt the higher pitch was justified.

He further stated they had no objection to reducing the fascia. One of the reasons that they kept the fascia larger was because it not only provided a scale over the doors and the porch that would not be too vertical, but also provided an elevation that they felt when you saw it in 3-D would provide a nice balance of form. But if the Board felt they needed to make the fascia narrower they could do that. Also, with regard to the screen wall detail the last column support for the balcony would be a column above a column. In essence they extended the column in brick above to support the end of the balcony. He said they felt that was a nice way to integrate the wall and its scale, as well as the fact that the floor was at a different level.

Board's Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if there was any reason why the wall was 8 feet where the extension of the pilaster of the wall comes into a column to support the end of the group on the Tattnall Street end?

Mr. Gonzalez stated the garden that was inside would be approximately 6'-8" above the ground above the floor in the inside of that courtyard.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if there would be 2 feet of fill in there?

Mr. Gonzalez stated yes, some of the units would have fill and some would have either a garden, pool, or Jacuzzi. He said the function was strictly for privacy. He said he would say if there was a concern with height then they would not want to go any lower than about 5'-6" in order to maintain visual privacy.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if there was a way to integrate the 3 foot high column above the pilaster, why couldn't he make it brick all the way up to the other side of the balcony?

Mr. Gonzalez stated they could and that was what they wanted to do. Also, they were trying to show the highlighting of the fence line with a cap to show the termination of the cap as the wall continued. But, also the column would continue on and the column would be mimicked inside of the courtyard as well.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated overall on his elevation by changing the pitch of the gable roof, the ridge was a couple of feet higher than the ridge of the north – south ridge. He asked if there was any reason that he could not bring the ridge points to the same level?

Mr. Gonzalez stated if you go down that street there was such a variation in roof lines that they felt it would be an appropriate way to mimic. He said this particular lot was zoned multi-family and all around it were single-family lots. He said they wanted to keep that same diversity. However, they could match the ridges, but they did not think that would be as attractive as the variation.

Ms. Brownfield asked if he said that he could reduce the pitch of the roof by 3 feet?

Mr. Gonzalez stated he would reduce it to the 8:12, which was the recommended scale.

Ms. Brownfield asked if he said that he would reduce the fascia as well as the pitch of the gable from the porches? She said she felt it would be better.

Mr. Gonzalez stated the Victorian area was the only area where you actually saw significant variations with higher pitches. He said from his experience, particularly in this vernacular they thought the higher pitch would work better. But they had no objection to making all the pitches 8:12.

Mr. Deering stated he did not have a concern with the steeper pitches on these houses. He said he felt the petitioner was correct that the Victorian neighborhoods do have some houses with steeper pitches. He said on the two center smaller porches he liked the steeper pitches. However, what he was perplexed with was the use of the parapet with the elliptical element in the two units on the front to break up the block. He said he found it to be an anomaly in this area to have a row of houses with a different structure on the two units that were within the same row. He said he felt it was peculiar and it did not suit the neighborhood. He said he also agreed with Ms. Reiter in reducing the porch fascias and that it would help a great deal to make them smaller.

He further stated regarding the colors, he felt that it would be more successful to paint the row one beige color and then have different shutter and door colors as accents. He said he really did not know if you would see that much difference in the color once you were outside if they were all just different shades of beige. He asked what was the elliptical element in the parapet on the two units?

Mr. Gonzalez stated it was a stylized restatement of something that was done in the past.

Mr. Deering asked if it was screened?

Mr. Gonzalez stated no.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked where were they putting the condensing units?

Mr. Gonzalez stated they would probably go where they showed them in the back section on the site plan.

Public Comments:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the main concern HSF had with the project was the scale. He said the site plan was much larger, more than double the size of most of the buildings in the neighborhood. He said HSF felt that Mr. Gonzalez was trying to break up the big façade with all the elements. However, they felt in doing so the petitioner has created an architectural design that was not at all in a Savannah row house tradition. He said he felt that it was the wrong building on this site. He said if the project were broken up into two separate buildings it would have a lot of possibilities for the designer to do different things with the architectural elements. If they had two buildings with some side yard setback between them it would more approximate the footprints of the other buildings in the neighborhood. He said HSF found that the façade already had a function of the six units with its differing roof shapes. He said they felt that looked like a suburban shopping center development, and did not look like

something you would find in the landmark district. He said HSF feels that it is an incompatible building and would harm the neighborhood around it. He said they respectfully request that the Board deny the project.

Additional Comments:

Mr. Gonzalez stated they appreciated the concern regarding the scale. However, this particular pocket of land was a project that was zoned multi-family. He said it was a different zoning from what occurs around it and could not be looked at in the same context. He said their position in the design was that they agreed with the fact that the property is completely surrounded by single-family homes. They were trying to reconcile an existing zoning with what was occurring in the neighborhood. He said they wanted to create the multi-family component of it while at the same time addressing some of the rhythms and changes in scale that occurred in this Victorian single-family neighborhood. He said he felt they were complying with the rules, but at the same time felt the Board needed to keep in mind that this was not a single-family lot or two single-family lots, but a single multi-family lot surrounded by single family residences.

Ms. Brownfield stated she keeps looking back at the compatibility factors and thinking maybe the pitches would make a difference. But clearly, the three bay rhythm that is established in that neighborhood was not here. She said she also felt that the 15 foot width was bothersome because it was not typical of that neighborhood.

Mr. Deering stated they could do six units in two buildings on this site. He said he also felt the scale was not right and thought the Board made that clear last month.

Mr. Mitchell stated he felt they were trying to compress a lot of units on a lot.

Mr. Gonzalez stated the lot is zoned for 21 units, which was the dilemma. He reiterated that this was not a single-family lot. He said it was an area surrounded with single-family lots.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it seemed like they were going between two extremes. He said last month's presentation was a strip with no articulation and went on for the entire six units. The Board asked at that time if they would consider more articulation. He said the Board looks at it this month and it looked like the petitioner went overboard with articulation not only just to make his setback, but changes in the roof and so forth, which made it look a little disjointed. He said even in consideration of the fact that this was a multi-family zoning and they were putting multi units there it seemed like there was a way of doing that with a little more uniformity to the surrounding buildings.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition as submitted based on the design is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Brownfield seconded the motion and it was passed. Mrs. Fortson-Waring abstained.

RE: Continued Petition of T. Heyward Gignilliat
HBR 04-3246-2
116 East McDonough Street
Alterations

Present for the petition was Patti Gignilliat.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to install louvered-shutters as screens, as façade elements, to hide condensers, satellite dishes, and a future elevator access landing, on the third floor of 116 East McDonough Street. This petition was continued from the August 11, 2004 Review Board meeting.

FINDINGS

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

- (1) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District: An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenances related thereto visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include, but not limited to the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors, and signs.
- (6) Visual compatibility factors: New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the Historic District which are moved, reconstructed, materially altered, repaired, or changed in color shall be visually compatible with structures, squares, and places to which they are visually related.

DISCUSSION

1. The petitioner is proposing to use a louvered shutter screen system to hide condensers, satellite dishes and a future elevator access. The screens would use 4"x 6" thick timber frames, with 11.5" thick louvered shutters. The framed shutters would be 6'11" tall and span 18'5" on the McDonough Street elevation. The shutters would be in Charleston Green and the timber frame and siding would be in Ivory. A photo is included of a similar screen wall on a house at Gaston and Drayton Streets. Staff agrees that this detail would be appropriate; however the proposed drawing does not indicate this level of design detail.
2. Staff would recommend increasing the framing elements of the shutters to be more substantial and appear similar to the example provided by the petitioner located at the corner of Gaston and Drayton Streets.
3. Staff would also recommend only installing the new screen on the main section of the house. From the submitted drawing, it appears the screen would float over a gate on the McDonough Street façade. This is an awkward approach. Staff would recommend not installing the screens at this area until the logistics of the future elevator are worked out.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of concept with the followings conditions:

1. Increasing the size of the framing elements around the shutters to be more substantial.
2. Eliminating screens on the McDonough Street elevation over existing gate at this time.

3. Revised drawings to be submitted to Staff for review and approval.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended to delete the portion of the screen over the gate area. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed. Mr. Mitchell cast a nay vote.

**RE: Petition of Ronald Erickson, Architect
HBR 04-3259-2
441 – 443 Montgomery Street
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

Present for the petition was Ronald Erickson.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I: Height and Mass for the construction of two semi-detached townhouses at 441 and 443 Montgomery Street.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

1. Section 8-3030 (I) Design Standards
 1. Height Map. This is in a four story zone. The exterior expression of the height of the first story shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each subsequent story shall not be less than 10 feet.
 2. Street Elevation Type: e. Where the aforementioned conditions cannot be met the proposed building shall meet the Visual Compatibility Factors.
 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. Residential Windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.

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.

1. 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.

2. Stoops: Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate.

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 nearby structures designated as historic...

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

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

DISCUSSION

1. The proposed townhouses will have a 0' setback from Montgomery Street which is consistent with the adjacent historic structures. An encroachment permit is being sought from the City by the owner. Porch encroachments are consistent with the historic precedent for the area.
2. Height: The proposed two-story height is within what is allowed in this four-story height maximum area. Other two-story historic structures are located in the adjacent area. The exterior expression of the height of the first story is 11'4" and the second story is 10' which is consistent with the requirements of the ordinance.
3. Street Elevation Type/Proportion of Structure's Front Façade: The proposed townhouses will utilize a two-story vertical proportion with a street level entrance, slightly elevated from the ground level. The adjacent 457-467 Montgomery Street are two-stories structures with a slightly elevated street level entrance of approximately 3 to 4 risers.
4. Rhythm of Solids to Voids and Proportion of Openings: A three bay rhythm is proposed for each of the townhouses which is consistent with the adjacent historic buildings. The windows and doors are aligned vertically on the front and side elevations. The proportions of the front windows and doors are not less than a vertical to horizontal ration of 5:3, which is required in the ordinance.
5. Rhythm of Entrances and porches: The proposed townhouses will have front porches with wood porticos to serve as the main entrances. On the side facades of each

townhouse, a 3' wide balcony is proposed. The balconies will have metal railings and metal brackets.

6. Roof Shape: The roof will be hidden behind a parapet wall. The parapet will also conceal the roof mounted HVAC equipment.
7. Walls of Continuity: The side and rear garden will be enclosed by a 9' brick fences with cast stone coping and wrought iron gates.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of Part I: Height and Mass. The proposed townhouses appear to meet the requirements of the Ordinance and are Visually Compatible.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated it was a nice project and a nice job. He said when he comes back with details next month if he could look at the column spacing and porch widths. He said if he was going to try to do a historicist style that the transom and the side lights could be better detailed to resemble a little more mass and mullion between the door and sidelight and also the door and the transom.

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

**RE: Petition of BMW Architects
Frank Neagle
HBR 04-3261-2
410 West Broughton Street
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **continuation for design revisions**.

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

Mrs. Brownfield stated that they did not have a sign posted and they would need to get one before the next meeting.

RE: Request for Extensions

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Marlene F. Coleman, For
Forsyth Homeowner's Association
HBR 04-3256(S)-2
106 West Gwinnett Street
Door
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Marc Boise
HBR 04-3257(S)-2
527 East Jones Street
Color

STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

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

Mr. Deering stated just the one that he continues to mention on top of the old C & S bank building at 300 Bull Street.

Dr. Caplan asked Mrs. Reiter if she had a report?

Mrs. Reiter stated she did not.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that there was a coffee shop or something like that that opened up in either the 0 or 100 block West Broughton Street on the south side of the street. He said it had all sorts of details on the windows.

RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements

Dr. Caplan stated the Board was sorry that Swann Seiler could not be here today. He said she had emergency surgery and was home recuperating, and the Board would like to wish her well.

RE: Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – July 14, 2004
2. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – August 11, 2004

Mr. Deering stated the minutes from August 11, 2004 on page 16, paragraph 2 that he meant to say **context** instead of **contacts**.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of July 14, 2004 and August 11, 2004 as corrected. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it unanimously passed.**

RE: Report on Items Deferred to Staff

No report.

RE: Other Business

- I. Unfinished Business

Mrs. Reiter stated the workshop with the Mayor will be 10:00 a.m. September 30, 2004. She said Staff will be meeting on the second floor of City Hall in the room at the top of the stairs.

Dr. Caplan stated that they did not know if the Mayor wanted all the Board members to be there or just some of them. He said they have to get more information. He also said if Board

members had any suggestions about things they needed to include in what they hoped to be a report to the Mayor to please call Beth or Lee and discuss it with them. He said that he and Beth hopefully would be meeting either this week or next week to try to get some information together.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she did not see the Board vacancy listed on the website. She said that would be something that needed to be brought to their attention.

Mrs. Brownfield stated Staff should come up with a list of items that would really endorse this Board's continuing in its role. She said in other words there has been a lot of talk in the past about the role of this Board and how it plays in the community with regard to decisions. She said she thought the Board talked at one time about various projects that had come before the Board whose outcome would have been quite different had this Board not been in effect.

Mr. Webb stated that Beth has been compiling figures on approvals and denials.

Mrs. Brownfield stated she guessed what she was thinking of was some kind of introductory statement that basically talked about how this Board has affected this community.

Dr. Caplan stated he felt they were going to give them some amazing statistics and he was hoping that they would get a lot of things out of this. He felt they would be well prepared to answer critics and to justify whatever actions the Board may have taken. He said the Board really had an amazing approval rate. And as a matter of fact they may be a little too good because they needed to do their job. And their job was to make sure that they keep our landmark status and encourage development downtown, but also to make sure that it is done properly in the landmark district.

Mr. Mitchell stated he thought a model showing inappropriate projects if they had been allowed might be telling. He said the tourist business was a major industry. And if it is not overseen it would get away.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring asked why was it necessary to justify their decisions.

Mrs. Brownfield stated she thought that on some past Councils that there had been talk that maybe this Board of Review is unnecessary.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she understood, but she had not heard it from this Council. Plus, the Board has a problem trying to get the revisions out. She said the Board has an important job to get their revisions codified, especially the one about the demolition of buildings. She said the Board did not want to get them side tracked on whether or not they should even exist. The Board needed to focus on the revisions that would enhance the entire district.

Dr. Caplan added that the fact of the matter was there were very few projects that came to the Board that were denied. He said they may be continued and revised, but very few were denied.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated he was a member of the revisions committee and he remember that when they were doing the revisions they prepared a short power point presentation for their time with Council that had some facts and statistics about review rates. He said it was about two years ago and the presentation was about the positive aspects and how the Review Board protected the economics, tourism industry, and

those sorts of things. He said he felt it was a good idea to come out positive and not in defensive mode.

Mr. Mitchell stated a couple of years ago if the Board noticed in their minutes that all of the Board members names were in bold, whereas before that was not the case and you had to do a lot of reading to find out what you said. He said that was a suggestion that he made a little while ago to change it to that format because it was easier to find who said what without a ton of reading. He said he would like to suggest that the minutes and a lot of the paperwork that comes to the Board be three-holed punched if possible.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated that the minutes were also made available on MPC website.

Dr. Johnson stated for the Board members who felt like they were being criticized he looked back to his first term on the Board, which was in the old Gamble building. He said if they had witnessed some of the things that happened there, in comparison to what is happening now, it was like a 300 percent improvement the way the Board and Staff operates.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca