

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

AUGUST 10, 2005

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

John Mitchell, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Dr. Caplan
John Deering
Ned Gay
John Neely
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring
Eric Meyerhoff
Joseph Steffen

Members Absent:

Dian Brownfield (Excused)
Dr. Lester Johnson (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Mitchell called the August 10, 2005 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: Continued Petition of Zunzi's
HBR 05-3393-2
108 East York Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects
Jose Gonzalez
HBR 05-3433-2
325 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

HDBR Action: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Items Requested to be Removed
From Regular Agenda**

1. Petition of Jerry Lominack
HBR 05-3435-2
37 Whitaker Street
Renovations

The Preservation Officer recommends **reconsideration of design.**

Continuance Requested Per Petitioner.

RE: Welcome

Mr. Mitchell welcomed Harmit Bedi, Deputy Director, to MPC.

RE: Regular Agenda

**RE: Continued Petition of Dawson Wissmach
Architects
Neil Dawson
HBR 05-3364-2
100 Block – West Bay Street &
West Bryan Street
Reconsideration**

John Neely recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part II Design approval for a new six story hotel. Part I Height and Mass was approved April 13, 2005.

FINDINGS

The Part 2 Height and Mass has changed from the Part I submission in terms of relationship of solids to voids, roof shape, Directional expression of front façade; scale and proportion of elements within the façade; entrances

The following table lists staff's concerns regarding Height and Mass.

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Relationship of solids to voids	A flat masonry wall with punched openings is proposed. At the main corner entrance and at the garage entrance a glass and spandrel glass wall is proposed.	No sections were presented to explain the glass and spandrel bays and the fin system with cross bars that is proposed. There are no significant recesses or projections.
Roofs: Mansard roofs shall slope from all four sides to a flat or low hipped plane, shall have a molded cornice both above and below the lower roof slope, and shall be used only in conjunction with a habitable story	In the Part I approved petition the top floor was recessed with a flat roof. The Part II proposal is for a mansard roof with arched windows. No section was provided so the projection of the windows is unknown.	<p>The staff comment in the Part I decision regarding roofs was that “the predominant historic roof shape of the commercial buildings in this area is flat with a parapet or cornice. With the exception of one mansard roof (which was not a predominant roof form in Savannah) these cornices projected. The recess of the top floor of the hotel seems weak and might be revisited in the design phase.”</p> <p>The mansard roof as proposed does not meet the standards. In addition the juxtaposition with the Barnard and Bryan Street corner is awkward, as is the rear corner where the brick pilaster extends beyond the mansard. The separation of the corner piece from the two sides needs to be considered.</p>
Directional expression of front façade:	The classic commercial elements of base, shaft and top are proposed.	The establishment of vertical bays is negated by the use of two highly contrasting materials; the strong band at the second floor level; the recessed mansard roof shape; and the change of proportion of the pilaster elements. The use of a two story base contributes to the visual truncation of the sense of verticality. There is not a sense of base and shaft but of two equal elements within the height of the bay. There is no strong top.
Scale and proportion of elements within the facade	Pilasters of varying materials and widths and groupings are proposed.	The pilasters as proposed do not help define the rhythm of the bays. The applicant needs to consider the size and proportion of elements within the bays. Manuals such as <u>The American Vignola</u> would be helpful in establishing correct proportional

		relationships between shafts and entablatures (bands).
<p>Entrances:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street.</p> <p>Storefront entrances shall be recessed and centered in the storefront.</p>	<p>A recessed corner lobby entrance is proposed as well as a lobby entrance on Barnard Street. A secondary entrance to the parking garage is proposed on Bryan Street.</p>	<p>There was a distinct corner tower on the original scheme. The proposed corner design meets the two sides in a very awkward manner and does not rise above the roof line. An opportunity to emphasize the corner needs to be explored.</p>
Balconies	<p>Small balconies are implied through the use of railing between pilasters.</p>	<p>It is not known if these are doors that swing inward. The overall appearance is a very flat 234' long façade.</p>

Part II comments

Standards	Proposed Action	Comments
Windows and Doors:	<p>Punched openings are proposed with aluminum storefront windows.</p>	<p>The openings have no depth or definition, accentuating the flat façade.</p>
Materials, Textures, colors	<p>Off white hard coat stucco is proposed for the first two stories with a flat stucco band separating the first two stories from the next three red brick stories. The mansard roof is galvalume. Faceted metal panels are proposed. Patterned brick under the windows.</p>	<p>The materials and colors of this building need to be carefully considered in context with the large red brick Days Inn and the new terracotta brick hotel that is to be built across the street.</p>

Staff has concern over the mix of design approaches – the building is neither modern nor traditional. The transition of design elements such as between the modern corner element and the brick facades and roof is awkward. The potential for a monumental corner entrance needs to be explored. Proportions of elements within the façade such as the two-story stucco element needs to be reconsidered. Colors, textures and sizes and shapes of elements need to be reconsidered taking into consideration the context. If there is a desire to suggest the News Press building complex, then consider the use of a granite or a granite-like base material. In staff’s opinion the red brick and white stucco or cast stone hotel formula needs to be varied. The originally approved roof concept needs to be developed, rather than the proposed mansard. The Shaw Park Plaza building, featured on the Belden Brick web site shows the direction such a roof might take, along with a corner treatment that illustrates the separation of such an element from the main body. A second building on this site, the two story Millenium Centre also illustrates how a corner might be treated. Whether the proposed structure is contemporary or traditional, the design approach should be consistent.

RECOMMENDATION

Continuation for revisions based on the approved Part I submittal.

Board Comments:

Dr. Caplan asked Staff if she was satisfied with the verticality factor as compared to the horizontal appearance that she mentioned in her initial staff report?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

Petitioner's Comments

Mr. Dawson stated the only significant change they made from the submittal received in their packets was the mansard going to a vertical roof. He said they agreed with Staff's comments that some additional study could be done to decrease the height and to add more windows in spandrel and glass. He said they felt that would create more of the intent that was submitted and approved in Part I – height/mass. He said they also felt that would give it more of a contemporary read. He said in terms of material selection they wanted it to have contemporary commercial materials. Hence, the aluminum store front and the heavy ribs on the store front piece. On their Part I submittal, both of the entry elements were flat. He said they felt like the additional depth that the ribs provided gave some interest and more shadow line. He said this was the primary entrance to the hotel and they felt like that needed to be something that was distinct and recognizable. The context of the building would be much different from what it was now. Essentially, the site where this perspective was taken would hopefully be a beautiful square with some live oak trees. He said they also recessed the entry to create more of a pedestrian access at the corner. He said it was about 14 feet on the sidewalk, so they had more of a dramatic canopy that stuck out further that created an inviting public space.

He said that the other significant entry element was the primary access to the parking garage for the general public. The spaces on either side were retail spaces. He said they moved the entrance down, so the retail space complies with the distance to the corner entrance and garage entrance.

He stated in regard to Staff's comments about the horizontality there is some additional refinement that they would like to study. He said they changed the cornice line from cast stone to brick which picked up more of the shadow lines created by the balcony recesses. He said he felt some additional study would help them break that up.

He said in regard to Staff's comments regarding additional study of the upper floor, colors, and materials they would like a continuance.

Additional Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated what they have done was an improvement over the first presentation of the exposed grid. He said he wondered if maybe he could break the spandrel where the recesses were.

Mr. Dawson asked if he was saying to make the pilasters more pronounced? He said he felt that was one of Staff's comments as well. He said when they met with Staff they felt if they

treated this more like a column capital at the top of the pilasters and made these pilasters more pronounced that would create more of the vertical emphasis. He said they also agreed with those comments.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was relieved to see that the architects original vision of a clean contemporary building in a historic compatible configuration had been restored after a rather jarring detour with the mansard roof. He said HSF saw nothing but positive things happening, especially since they seemed to be in agreement with Staff's other comments.

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Amended Part II Design with the following conditions that the colors be brought back at a later date and that consideration be given to amending the sixth floor window treatment to have more glass, similar to the Part I approval and to breaking the lower cornice in some way at the balconies. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was passed. Mr. Neely recused himself.

**RE: Continued Petition of Dawson Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson
HBR 05-3398-2
455 Montgomery Street
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish two non-historic structures at 455 Montgomery Street and Part I Height and Mass for a three story, 14 unit condominium.

FINDINGS

1. The buildings to be demolished consist of a c. 1965 concrete block commercial building and a c. 1980 prefabricated steel warehouse. They are not listed on the Historic Building map and do not meet the requirements for a historic building.

The following standards apply to the Part I New Construction review:

Standard	Proposed Development	Comment
Submission requirements – Dimensioned site plan showing parking areas, fences, roof or ground mounted equipment	The condensing units will be on the roof. There is a four foot stair elevator tower on the roof.	The roof appears to be hip with a four foot parapet. What is the height of the peak of the roof. Will the condensing units be visible from the street?
Elevations showing height and width relationships to existing adjacent buildings, Dimensioned sections of projecting details	Provided.	

Section through the building and a mass model.	Provided.	
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setback except where there is a historic setback along a particular block front.	The proposed development is built on the 0-lot line on both street frontages.	This is consistent with adjacent historic development.
Dwelling unit type	The proposed Dwelling unit type most closely fits an apartment building.	Entries are delineated and recessed ten feet on each street frontage.
Street elevation type	The proposed project is raised on a crawlspace. Part of the second and third stories is elevated over surface parking.	The adjacent historic buildings are raised on crawl spaces. The parking is screened from the Alice street view.
Entrances	Two entrances are proposed. One on Alice and one on Montgomery.	The entrance standards have been met.
Building Height: The exterior expression of the height of the ground story shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the ground story shall not be less than 10 feet.	The proposed ground story plus crawl space is 13'-6". The second and third floors are 10'-8".	This standard has been met.
Proportion of front facade		
Proportion of openings	The proposed window openings are aligned vertically and are rectangular.	
Rhythm of Solids to voids: Bay windows shall extend to the ground unless they are oriel, beveled or are supported by brackets. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.	<p>The proposed construction is divided into three bays with a separate entry bay on each street. The bays are approximately 30' on Montgomery Street and 40' on Alice Street.</p> <p>The three foot projecting bays are supported on brackets.</p> <p>The garage opening is 12 feet.</p>	<p>This standard has been met. For the design development phase the projections are bays not oriels. The brackets are a weak element in the design.</p> <p>The openings on the West elevation where the building floats over the parking are visually incongruous. The effect is a large heavy building held up on thin elements. These bays should be regularized to match the rear bay openings with wider piers.</p>
Rhythm of structure on the street	Historically, row houses with individual unit entrances occupied this lot. The proposed development is like a multi family apartment building.	Each street frontage has a pedestrian entrance. The building is visually subdivided into bays by window groupings and projections.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of Part I Height and Mass, with clarification about relationship of the roof pitch to the parapet height and whether the HVAC equipment will be visible near the top of the roof. Also redesign and regularize the openings at ground level on the West elevation at the parking area to match those under the rear porch.

For the design phase consideration needs to be given to the interface of the top of the bays to the parapet. It is visually incompatible and was a concern expressed by the Board. Also the use of wood for the bays on a stucco building is unusual. On historic buildings in the Historic District such a treatment occurred when the bay was added at a later date. It would be helpful if the petitioner provided photographs of the inspiration for the bay treatment. It is understood that such treatments appear on recent modern buildings elsewhere, but since it is a distinct departure from historic bay treatment in Savannah, additional visuals would be helpful.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Dawson stated in regard to the mechanical equipment, the pitch indicated on the roof plan was a 1:12 pitch, so it was a flat roof. He said these being residential mechanical units they did not anticipate them being 3 feet tall. He said they would be well concealed behind the parapet. With regard to Staff's comments on the parking that projected out from under the building, they agreed that it created a dichotomy to have the car sticking out from under the building. He said his client preferred to have a larger screen wall. He said they would make that instead of a picket fence.

He stated in regard to the west elevation they felt that Staff's comments would be appropriate to mirror the smaller bay openings. He said it was obvious these were parking spaces and the more obstructions they created the more difficulty it created. However, he felt it would help the façade. Ideally, at some point in the future the lot will be developed. He said hopefully in the future as the area develops it will only have two main facades. However, they were in agreement with Staff's comments in regard to the west façade.

He stated in regard to the projecting bays with brackets, they agreed that some additional study needed to be done on the mass and scale so that they were more appropriate. He said he noticed in reading last month's comments it was pointed out that the base needed more anchor to it. He said they also agreed with that comment. He said they would like to propose a rusticated base. He said they have regularized the windows, so that it had a more traditional feel of being grounded. Also, it was pointed out from the last meeting that the intersection of the bay roof to the building needed some resolution and that it created some kind of an awkward juncture between these two forms. He said that was something they would study in Part II.

He further stated with regard to the entry pieces in Part I they were showing them as squared openings. He said they would like to get some feedback from the Board about this. He said they felt the arched openings as they presented them last month with a projecting bay had more of the feel they were looking for. He said he understood Staff's comments preferring it to be more of a entry with a door and glass, which he agreed. He said also after reading the Board's comments from last month, he would like to apologize if in some way his firm offended them for presenting sketched drawings of the elevations. He said they had CAD drawings done, but they felt that the sketches conveyed a better sense of the feel of the building than the hard line drawings. But, from reading the Board's comments that was a misjudgment on his part.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF supported the basic height/mass of this project even though they felt the bays in their current form appeared awkward in their relationship to the rest of the building. Also, this was true in the way that the cars had to park (half in and half out) of one side of the building. He said HSF encouraged

resolution of this awkwardness through contemporary details instead of continued forced manipulation of historic ones into a non historic massing. He said HSF felt the relationship between the bay roofs and the parapet wall required the most attention in their opinion.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I – Height/mass. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Rudd M. Long
HBR 05-3432-2
128 East Broughton Street
Renovations**

Present for the petition was Rudd Long.

Ms. Seiler stated Savannah Electric was only a lessee. She said they had no commercial interest in this other than her company was leasing. She said she was not recusing herself from the petition because they had no interest other than occupying the building as a lessee.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate the front and rear façades of 128 East Broughton Street

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.

Storefronts: Materials

The following materials are not recommended for storefronts in the Historic District:

- Reflective films and coatings on glass
- T-111 siding
- Metal panels

-Vinyl siding

- Exterior Insulation Finish Systems (EIFS) over existing historic surface materials, nor for the constriction of façade details. (The use of EIFS is discouraged anywhere in the Historic District.

However, where it can be demonstrated to the Historic Review Board that the use of EIFS system would not adversely impact the visual appearance of a block, and the Board approves its use, such system shall be placed over a rigid substrate on the first story.)

DISCUSSION

1. The upper two floors of 128 East Broughton Street currently have stucco, covering the window openings. The rear façade has also been altered with stucco covering window openings. Internally, the window openings are still evident.
2. The petitioner provided a historic photograph as part of the submittal and will use as a guide to rehabilitate the facades.
3. On the front façade, the petitioner proposes to removed the existing stucco covering on the second and third floors, expose the existing window openings, and replace missing decorative details,
4. New stucco will be installed and scored to resemble the historic photograph. Staff requests a sample of the new stucco color.
5. On the front, existing wood windows will be repaired when present; missing window components will be replaced to match the existing. All windows will be wood, double-hung with true divided lights. The second floor windows are six-over-nine and the third floor windows are six-over-six.
6. The existing wood cornice will remain.
7. The missing brackets will be replaced with fypon. Staff requests the petitioner provide a sample of this material.
8. The petitioner proposes using EIFS for the missing lintels. The new lintels will be rectangular while the historic photographs showed temple shaped lintels. Staff concurs with the guideline that EIFS is not appropriate for the front façade to use to replicate missing lintel details. Staff would recommend using a compatible historic material.
9. The proposed EIFS cornice above the storefront is also inappropriate and would recommend using a different material.
10. On the lane elevation, five clad one-over one double hung windows will be installed. This elevation does not appear to be historic
11. While the first floor storefront will not be altered, a new shed awning will be installed. Staff requests a swatch of the awning color. The door, frame and stucco will be painted to match the new exterior.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the EIFS design details be changed to a different material and receipt of colors as requested.

Board Comments:

Mr. Gay asked if staff was recommending that the lintels be made more pedimented than rectangular?

Mr. Webb stated the historic photograph showed them to be pedimented. He said they were more concerned with the fact that they were using EIFS to replicate the lintel. He said the petitioner may want to address why they chose to do a squared lintel instead of a temple shaped lintel.

Mr. Long stated he had a sample of the stucco and paint chip. He said he would also supply a sample of the fypon material. He said they were hoping that the brackets were still up there. If the Board noticed in the photographs the stucco work rolled out and may be they were still there. He said as far as the use of EIFS they typically do buildings with traditional three coat stucco and use applied EIFS decorative elements. He said if that was not acceptable they could change to something else. He said he has also tried to dissuade his client of the use of EIFS. He said he could also provide a swatch of the awning color.

Mr. Deering asked if they have considered doing the pedimented lintel?

Mr. Long stated they discussed that with Staff, and he looked for a fypon type prefabricated pediment and everybody wanted them to look like this. He said they did not look anything like that.

Mr. Deering stated they could do a mould of an existing one and have it cast in fiberglass.

Mr. Long stated he has not seen any like that around town. He said he would hate to put something that was almost right, therefore he felt the rectangular might be a good solution.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was concerned with the current proliferation of EIFS materials. He said of particular interest was the window header design since the originals were gone. He said HSF did not expect a total replication because any kind of 3-D replication was probably going to be conjecture. He said HSF would like for the petitioner to consider a pedimented form of the originals as close as possible in order to maintain the original proportions of the building. And because putting squared lintels back gave it a completely different look than it originally had. So, now you would not have the historic look, but a third generation configuration of the façade. He said if the petitioner was going through this much effort to come back with a historic façade, HSF would like for it to be as close as possible.

Ms. Cynthia Hunter (Savannah Young Architects Forum) stated they were also concerned about the rectilinear lintels. She said they would like to see them more accurate as to what was there. She said not trying to cast them exactly as they were since you don't really know since there were not any there.

Discussion:

Mr. Meyerhoff asked the petitioner if he has done a study as to what was under the stucco coating as to the lintel, window shape, etc.

Mr. Long stated yes. He said there were three buildings going front to rear. He said it was wooden building with planks on the outside and stucco. Historically it was the residence of Captain Derst. He said there may be a ghost when they pull the new stucco off. But there was also a chance that the 1960's stucco will pull off.

Mr. Deering asked when they were up in the building if the window frames and everything visible from the interior?

Mr. Long showed a photograph that they were.

Mr. Deering stated the way they presented the lintels, if they could not replicate the cast iron or the brownstone lintels that were there, then to go back with rectilinear lintels because it did not misrepresent what was there originally.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that the EIFS be changed to hard coat stucco and that the cornice material and colors be brought back to staff for approval. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it was passed 7 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Steffen.

RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison
HBR 05-3434-2
517 East Perry 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 one-car, one-story garage to the lane at the rear of 517 East Perry Street.

FINDINGS

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards from Section 8-3030 apply to new construction:

1. **Height:** As proposed, the garage will be one-story in height and 16'6" tall to the side-gable roof's peak. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first floor will appear 9'6" tall (the eave height).
2. **Width:** The lane façade of the garage will have a width of 16'.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The garage door will be 12' wide.
4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades/Directional Expression of Front Facade:** The lane façade of the garage will have a one-bay rhythm. The relationship of the solids to voids gives the façade a vertical directional appearance.
5. **Roof Shapes:** The carriage house will have side gable roof.
6. **Setbacks:** The carriage house will have a zero line setback on East Perry Lane.

Design Details and Materials

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Standards apply:

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.

- (14) Lanes and Carriage House.
 - c. New carriage houses may provide up to 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 parapets.

DISCUSSION

- 1. **Exterior Materials:** The exterior walls will be sand finish stucco. The side gable roof will be 20 year composition shingle with color to match the main house.
- 2. **Doors:** The garage door will be 12' wide, overhead door with traditional wood trim. Wood French doors will be on the courtyard side of the garage but will not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- 3. **Colors:** The main body stucco will be "Almond Cream" and the garage door will be "Stone Gray" by Pittsburgh Paints. Colors samples were provided.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated he felt the building was incompatible next to those small townhouses that were there.

Mr. Hardison stated it would be advantageous if the whole row were doing something, but that was not the case.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it was passed 7 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Deering.**

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
Pete Callejas
HBR 05-3436-2
20 West Gaston Street
Addition**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of the following:

1. add a second and third floor addition to the northwest corner above an existing first floor kitchen wing
2. add a two-story connector between the main house and the carriage house, and add a small two-story extension to the south side of the carriage house
3. add an operable wood louvered-panel privacy wall to be constructed to surround an existing roof on the rear
4. add a small two-story extension to the south side of the carriage house
5. insert three new garage doors openings on the lane elevation of the carriage house.

FINDINGS

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

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

DISCUSSION

1. The site plan submitted demonstrates that the project will not exceed the allowable building coverage of 75%. The site plan and floor plans provide dimensions for the additions.
2. An existing metal fire stair on the rear elevation at the third floor will be removed. The door will be returned to a window using a relocated matching window.
3. Over an existing first floor wing, a second and a third floor addition will be constructed on the rear, at the northwest corner.
4. The addition will be compatible to the existing building but different so as to be distinguished as new construction. The exterior material will be stucco on the second and third floors and on the third floor's east elevation facing the courtyard, vertical tongue and groove cedar siding. The third floor will consist of a covered porch with new wood doors, wood columns, and railings (columns and railing details were provided.) The west elevation will have wood louvered shutter privacy wall. The addition will have the same terne metal, standing seam metal roof, as the existing roof. The colors will match the main house. Staff is concerned about the vertical tongue and groove cedar siding on the east elevation and would suggest changing the siding to either horizontal or use wood panels.
5. The existing brick wall on the west elevation that connects the main house and the carriage house will largely remain. A section will be removed for the new two-story addition which will connect the main house and the carriage house. This addition will have a new stucco wall above the existing brick wall on the west elevation. No windows will be located on this elevation. On the courtyard elevation, a bay window will be located on the second floor. This addition will have a flat roof with a stucco parapet and cornice and copper coping. A skylight will be located on the addition's roof.
6. A louvered shutter privacy wall will be installed to create a roof garden over the existing roof on a section of the building, on the north elevation. The petitioner provided details on the louvered-shutter privacy wall.
7. The carriage house will be extended 5'4" into the courtyard area, with a second floor porch. The new wall will have a stucco exterior. The porch will have a standing seam metal shed roof, wood railings and columns.
8. All new windows on all additions will be wood, double-hung, true-divided light, windows by Kolbe and Kolbe, painted in the same color as the existing windows on the house. Window details were provided however, the muntin profile was not included. The petitioner needs to confirm that the new wood windows meet the requirements of the ordinance.

9. The shutters are wood, louvered, and operable, and painted “Charleston Green.” Shutter details were provided.
10. Three new garage door openings will be introduced on the lane elevation of the carriage house. Each of three openings will be 9’ wide and will have new wood overhead garage doors with traditional carriage house door detailing and painted “Charleston Green.” A new four-over-four, double-hung, true divided light wood windows will be located on the lane elevation of the carriage house.
11. A new 7’ tall stucco wall with a wood gate will be constructed on the western property line of the lane.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with the consideration that the vertical tongue and groove siding on the third floor addition be changed and clarification that the new windows meet the requirements of the ordinance.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Deering stated the window muntins will be putty glazed in profile to appear like traditional historic windows and they will be no wider than 7/8”. He said in regard to the vertical siding in between the pilasters, they would like to try to maintain that in the design because they felt it looked like an infill porch that might have been put back at some time. He said they also felt that it did not detract from the character of the overall structure.

Board Comments:

Mr. Steffen asked if the existing structure dated from 1857?

Mr. Deering stated most of what was there seemed historic and was in good shape with the exception of the exterior stucco that was done perhaps six years ago. He said the Scardino’s that owned it for 34 +/- years did make alteration to the interior, but it was evident as to what was new.

Mr. Gay asked how were they going to do the garage doors?

Mr. Deering stated these were the proposed garage doors and that was the proposed stucco wall with a single gate. He said they will be wood designed to resemble carriage doors.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if on the west elevation the new stucco wall over the existing first wall in the same plane?

Mr. Deering stated yes. He said they were going to cantilever the joists on the second floor of the connector.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF holds the easement on this property. He said HSF also hoped the Board would grant the petition as submitted.

Discussion:

Mr. Steffen stated he had a hard time digesting adding an addition on to the actual structure of an 1857 house. He said he was not troubled by the carriage house or the connector because it seemed clear that was a way to get from one facility to another. He said what troubled him was changing the actual form and mass of a historic building, irregardless of the fact that it was done in extremely confident and accurate way.

Mr. Gay stated there seemed to be a lot of different rhythms with a house. He said if you are adding something else on there, he did not see that that really detracts.

Mr. Steffen stated he guessed what he was trying to say was that if someone put this together in 1857 they had an idea of how the whole house should look. He said they did not have an idea he would believe that by adding things on that would still be the whole house. He said he felt the Board's mission was to try to preserve what was historic.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt it was bringing it up-to-date. She said the Board was not here to preserve the Historic District and not grow. She said the Board was here to make sure that any growth was compatible with what was historic.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated every historic house in the district virtually has an addition to it. Particularly, when the plumbing came they had bathrooms and kitchens added on to the back, etc. He said there was enough differential in his view of the addition that clearly showed that it was not part of the original house. Consequently, to him that was what most of the Historic District has. He said as long as you made a strong or medium definition between what the original building was and what the new building was (new addition) you stay in tuned with the times.

Mr. Mitchell stated he felt that Mr. Steffen was not the only one struggling with that. He said at the end of the day the Board's purview was a little different than that and they have to uphold true to that. He said the Board has to do the best job of balancing it that they could. He said he felt overall that it has been done very well as evidence by the tourists who come to Savannah to look at its beauty.

HDBR Action: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was passed 6 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Steffen.

**RE: Petition of Curtis McKenzie, For
George Newnan
HBR 05-3437-2
619 / 621 Montgomery Street
Renovation**

Present for the petition was Curtis McKenzie.

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. Demolish existing roof, rear walls, foundation, chimneys and front porches.
2. Extend the building an additional six feet on the rear.
3. Replace all windows with dark brown Pella aluminum clad wood double hung windows with double glazing and snap-in or bonded grilles in a 6/6 pattern.
4. Sandblast painted brick and re-point.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

<p>Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards. (1) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District. An historic structure and any outbuildings...visible from a public street or lane...shall only be ...altered or maintained...in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure...For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include...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...</p>	<p>Demolish existing roof, rear walls, foundation, chimneys and front porches. Extend building six feet to the rear. New brick to be Arlington Antique brick by Boral is similar in color to Savannah Greys.</p>	<p>The roof is not visible behind the parapet. The parapet should be retained. The front porches do not appear to be original to the building. Their removal and replacement with handicap accessible stoops does not create an adverse impact on the architectural character of the building. The addition on the rear is visually compatible.</p>
<p>Historic windows, frame, sashes and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented that they have deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design and material. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.</p>	<p>Replace all windows with dark brown Pella aluminum clad wood double hung windows with double glazing and snap-in or bonded grilles in a 6/6 pattern.</p>	<p>The existing windows are 6/6 wood double hung windows. The proposed windows with snap-in or bonded grilles do not meet the standards. These need to be replaced in-kind with wood true divided light double hung windows on the front. An alternative for the rear addition would be to use 1/1 wood or wood clad double glazed windows.</p>
<p>Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on nonhistoric facades and on new construction, provided, however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8 inch; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be</p>		<p>See above.</p>

<p>covered with appropriate molding.</p> <p>Snap-in or between the glass muntins shall not be used.</p> <p>Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.</p>		
<p>Best Practices – abrasive cleaning (Sandblasting)</p>	<p>It is proposed to sandblast the brick to remove existing paint.</p>	<p>Sandblasting is not a recommended procedure. It erodes the surface of the brick and does irreversible harm to the building fabric. If the building is made of Savannah Grey Brick, this is a particularly soft material and highly susceptible to damage. Preservation Brief # 6 by the National Park Service can be accessed on-line www.2.cr.nps.gov/TPS/briefs/presbhom.htm for a discussion of gentle cleaning methods.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

Reconsider cleaning method and submit new window specifications that comply with the ordinance.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. McKenzie stated in regard to the request for change in the windows what happened was the specs that were submitted were submitted in error. The windows will be true divided light. He said they will have 6/6 for the front of the building. The rear of the building will be aluminum clad 1/1. The front of the building will also have painted wood windows in the colors indicated on the original submission. He said in regard to the exterior painted brick rather than sandblasted. He said they were looking at an alternative of using a paint stripper by Proso, which was basically an alkaline formula with organic solvents that removes multiple layers of paints and graffiti from masonry surfaces. He said it was slow working extended contract remover and remains active for 24 hours. He said it was applied in 1/8” coat of stripper and allowed to set for 24 hours. He also said that it was removed by using water (low pressure).

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering asked what surfaces was the special walnut stain color submitted?

Mr. McKenzie stated for the doors and windows.

Mr. Deering stated most residential windows in the Historic District were not usually stained. He said he wondered if he would change that to painted.

Mr. McKenzie stated yes.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF had a question of the demolition of the chimneys. He said HSF wondered if the chimneys should be allowed to be demolished because they changed the exterior appearance of the building. He said the issue of the windows seemed to have been resolved, as well as the understanding that sandblasting should not occur. He said HSF was also going to mention the possibility of peel away for that purpose, but it seems that petitioner has found a solution.

Discussion:

Mr. Gay asked what was the reason for taking down the chimneys?

Mr. McKenzie stated from the photographs you could see that the interior has suffered quite a bit of water damage. He said in changing the lay out of the floor plan, rather than having a duplex as it was now, it would become one facility. The existing chimneys would obstruct the design of the floor plan. It would not allow for the flexibility to accommodate the new proposal for a boarding house to maximize the use of space. However, the owner had a desire to reuse the bricks in as many ways as they could. He said they were looking at possibilities of how they could reuse the brick for the chimneys. He said there were four chimneys, two on the left side and two in the center.

Mr. Deering stated one fell where the stairway was and then 15 feet behind that where the laundry room was there was another.

Mr. McKenzie stated yes. He also said the chimneys were not visible from the street level because they were hidden behind the parapet.

Mr. Mitchell asked if they considered other options for their floor plan?

Mr. McKenzie stated he has considered redesigning and looking at ways of incorporating the chimneys. Originally, they were looking at keeping the chimneys, however the owner wanted to have at least 9 to 10 rooms to maximize the use of the facility. He said the chimneys would really hamper the flexibility of allowing that.

Mr. Neely asked if the fireplaces would be removed on the interior?

Mr. McKenzie stated yes.

Dr. Caplan asked if there was a possibility to retain the chimneys on the outside and may be as a compromise, eliminate the interior chimneys because of their being an obstruction to their project?

Mr. McKenzie stated they have considered the possibility of utilizing the chimneys on the left side because they were along the exterior wall and they would not obstruct interior spaces. However, the interior fireplaces would obstruct those spaces. He also said there were four units on the first floor and five units on the second floor, which were bedrooms. With that they were looking at the fact that they would have two or four of those units having chimneys and the rest not. He said so that was a possibility in that those on the right could be preserved as they were without obstructing the plan.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated from the picture submitted the interior chimneys stack was not visible. He said if they could find a way to retain the visibility of the two on the rear, he would not have an issue with removing the interior chimney and its stack.

Ms. Cynthia Hunter stated she felt if you took out the chimneys and left the hats that would complete the fake historic appeal from the outside. She said if you are going to leave the chimneys you might as well see how much of the rest could be saved as well.

Mr. Deering stated the Board did not have purview over the interior. He said the only thing the Board could do was to ask that the chimneys be saved, which may force the designer to reinterpret their floor plan.

Mr. Neely asked Mr. Deering what he thought about saving the exterior ones and letting the others go because you could not see them?

Mr. Deering stated he would like to see all of it saved, as well as the interior dividing masonry wall that the interior chimneys were against. He said in that way there would be some indication of what the historic plan was like.

Dr. Caplan asked if you could see from the exterior of the house the two interior chimneys?

Mr. Deering stated you could if you were coming down the street.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering made a motion that and the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the amended petition with the following conditions: (1) All exterior chimneys are to remain, (2) The windows are to be painted not stained.**

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt the building department was going to turn this down for lack of secondary exits. He said he would like to amend the motion to say if it is turned down for that reason by the building department that it be brought back to Staff for the outside stairwell.

Mr. Deering accepted the amendment. He said if there is a necessary exterior stair for the rear of the building that it be brought back to Staff for approval.

Mr. Steffen stated he was going to vote against the motion because he felt only those chimneys that were clearly visible needed to be maintained. He said he was not convinced that the two interior ones were visible under the purview of what the Board could look at.

HDBR Action: **and (3) If a rear exterior stair is found necessary its design is to be brought back to staff for approval. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed 6 – 2. Opposed to the motion were Dr. Caplan and Mr. Steffen.**

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
 John Deering
 HBR 05-3438-2
 Corner of Jefferson & West Hall Lane
 New Construction**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I: Height and Mass for the new construction of a single-family house at the corner of Jefferson Street and West Hall Lane.

FINDINGS

The project site is in a neighborhood of the Historic District composed of mixed building types and empty lots. Adjacent to the site to the north is a stucco one-story church. To the south is a used car lot with a six foot tall wood fence. To the west (the rear of the site) is a new clapboard carriage house under construction. Across the street are four vacant lots.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed Development	Comment
Submission requirements – Dimensioned site plan showing parking areas, fences, roof or ground mounted equipment.	The site plan does not show the location of HVAC equipment,	The Petitioner should clarify the location of HVAC equipment.
Elevations showing height and width relationships to existing adjacent buildings, Dimensioned sections of projecting details	Provided.	
Section through the building and a mass model.	Provided.	
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setback except where there is a historic setback along a particular block front.	The proposed building will have 2’ setbacks on the east and south sides of the lot. A courtyard will be located on the north.	This is consistent with adjacent historic development.
Dwelling unit type	The proposed dwelling unit type is a detached residence.	This type is found throughout the Historic District.
Street elevation type	The proposed street elevation unit type is two-story structure with street level entrance. building.	Similar types are located on West Hall Street.
Building Height: 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 story above the ground story shall not be less than 10 feet.	The building is proposed to be 2-stories in height and 24’ to the parapet. The exterior expression of the first floor is 10’-5”. The exterior expression of the second floor is 9’-1”.	The building is located in a maximum height zone of 3 stories so the 2-story proposed height is compatible. Floor-to-floor heights: This standard has not been met. The exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights must be revised to bring into conformance with the Standards.
Roof Shape	The building will have a flat roof with parapet, with what appears to be overhanging eaves on the north and south elevations.	A flat roof with parapet is visually compatible. The petitioner should explain the purpose of the overhanging eaves on the north and south elevations
Proportion of front facade	The building will have a three bay	This is visually compatible.

	rhythm with the windows and doors aligned vertically. The width of the front elevation is 28’.	
Proportion of openings	The proposed window openings are aligned vertically and are rectangular.	This is visually compatible.
Rhythm of Entrance and/or Porch Projections:	The main entrance will be a street-level entrance off of Jefferson Street. The entrance leads to a side porch area fronting the courtyard.	This is visually compatible.
Rhythm of Solids to voids: Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.	The front façade will have a 3-bay rhythm, with the windows and door align vertically. The relationship of solids to voids gives the front façade a vertical directional appearance. The garage opening off the lane is 10 12 feet.	This standard has been met.
Walls of Continuity	6’ tall wood fences will maintain a wall of continuity on the lane and Jefferson Street sides of the property.	This is compatible.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of Part I Height and Mass, with condition that exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights is brought into conformance with the standards.

Board Comments:

Dr. Caplan stated he realized this was a mixed neighborhood. He said he was trying to think what building(s) in this area this building was compatible with. He said it seemed to him like it was an entity unto itself in this neighborhood.

Mr. Webb stated it was a contemporary interpretation. He said it was compatible in height/mass in Staff’s opinion. The roof shape was a flat roof with a parapet which was visually compatible to other buildings in the adjacent. He said he felt this was a special area that there was not a lot of existing buildings to compare it to. He said it probably could be further addressed by the Petitioner.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Deering stated it was a very different neighborhood as far as structures and types. He said there were clapboard structures that were very Victorian in their nature. There were simple clapboard rows of houses that had little ornament. He said about a block away, there were really grand houses on Gwinnett Street some of which were brick, stucco, wood, etc. He said this being Jefferson Street, directly across the street were two small stucco based simple houses with an urban vernacular of about the 1870’s or 1880’s. He said over here were row houses that were stucco simple houses that were probably built in 1985 that were part of their context and it being a half block away as well.

He further stated his client wanted a simple modern inspired house that would suit the area. He said their inspiration was the stucco buildings because it was easier to care for a stucco building than a clapboard building. He stated with this being on the corner of a lane they felt it should be a diminutive building because on the lot next door was a very small stucco church. He said they thought they would come up with this rectilinear small house that faced the street and had sort of a Charleston appearance. He said they wanted this side of the house blank so you would not have intrusion from the garbage trucks and traffic on the lane. He said that was where their inspiration came from for this little stucco building that was simple on the façade with a three bay rhythm and a parapet wall. On the lane side they took cues from some of the older masonry commercial buildings that when they had sides on the lanes they would have little tiny windows up against the ceiling to let light and air in. He said they wanted to put one nice element in to let a lot of south light into the house. The north side they took and tried to give a Charleston inspiration to it, but a more modern interpretation of it with the porches and standing seam roof. The projection of the eave was the eave of the porch on the north side and on the south side of the building it was a projecting eave only in the break in the parapet to provide some shading to this big window.

He further said they just wanted to do a simple small structure with a modern influence and this was the result. He also said in regard to the floor to floor heights the intent of the ordinance with a 11 foot expression from floor to floor was so that you would end up with a 10 foot ceiling height on the first level with about a foot of floor thickness (11 feet). He said they were 10'-1" plus the 1'-4" makes an 11 foot 5 inches first floor expression. Then, the ordinance was written so that they would not have less than 9 foot ceilings heights on the second floor with another foot of floor material or ceiling joists or those sorts of things which would be the 10 foot minimum in the ordinance. He said they met the height requirements as drawn.

HDBR Action: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I Height and Mass, with condition that exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights is brought into conformance with the standards. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Linda Ramsay
HBR 05-3439-2
414 East Charlton Street
New Construction**

Present for the petition was Linda Ramsay.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting alterations as follows: Remove existing 16'-2.5" x 13'-2" deck and replace with a 17'-8.5" x 5' wood deck with an iron railing painted black or Charleston Green. Decrease stair width from 4' to 3'. The stairs will be brick but will not be visible. The piers will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment

<p>Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards (11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches. (i) Uncovered decks shall be screened from areas visible from the street.</p>	<p>The rear of this house faces Macon Street which is a local street in this block between Price and Habersham Streets. Only the railing will be visible and it will be obscured by an existing oleander hedge.</p>	
<p>(j) Decks shall be stained or painted to blend with the colors of the main structure.</p>	<p>The wood part of the deck is not visible from the public right of way.</p>	

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with final iron railing detail to be brought to staff.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF holds the easement to this property and hoped the Board would grant the petition as submitted.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the final railing detail be brought to staff for approval. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Storm Shield, Inc.
Nathan Dzendzel
HBR 05-3427(S)-2
201 West Jones Street
Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED.

2. Petition of Recovery Place
Michael Mack
HBR 05-3428(S)-2
406 – 416 West Gaston Street; 457 – 467 Montgomery Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED.

3. Petition of Lisa Carr & Sharon Stinogel
HBR 05-3429(S)-2
326, 324 East Harris Street; 311, 321 Habersham Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED.

4. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jeff Bradtmiller
HBR 05-3430(S)-2
1 West York Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED.

5. Petition of Memorial Health
Felicia Carr
HBR 05-3431(S)-2
305 West Harris Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED.

RE: Other Business

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

Mrs. Reiter stated Dr. Caplan called and commented regarding the house that faced Congress Street and its L-shape wrapped around and faced Price Street, that the wall was taller than what the Board approved. She said she took the drawings over there and it was built as the drawings looked, but Dr. Caplan was correct that the wall was taller. She said the Board approved it at 8 feet and it appeared to be possibly 10 feet. She said they also noticed in looking at it that the detail of the soldier course of brick was not on the wall. The stoop cover was columned and not bracketed. On the lane, one door was approved and there were two. She said the one good thing was the garage doors were better than what the Board approved, but they could not figure out how they worked. She said she felt they needed to meet with John Hutton to figure out how they were going to have interim inspections of these properties to catch these things as they occur. She said the only way she knew how to fix this was to tell the petitioner to ...

Mr. Deering stated to tell them to take 2 feet off of the top of the wall.

Mr. Mitchell stated the Board has said in the last couple of meetings and the retreat that these were the types of things they wanted to discourage.

Mrs. Reiter asked if the Board was saying for them to take 2 feet off of the garden wall?

Mr. Deering stated if Staff remembered they talked about the porch roof on the side door and several mentioned that they did not like the columns on the design. He said he showed brackets and then he put columns up any way.

Mrs. Reiter stated that could easily be fixed.

Mr. Mitchell stated he felt it was blatant disregard to what the Board had approved. He said the Board's response should be to commensurate with that.

Mrs. Reiter said the second thing they got a phone call from Dirk Hardison that 426 Habersham on Whitfield Square where the Board approved in-kind repairs to the siding. She said the petitioner removed the entire south wall from ground to the eaves and replaced it all with hardiplank. She said she called City Inspections Department and they said that was in client

response waiting for the Historic approval. She said she asked when was it submitted, and they said July 7, 2005. She said she has not heard or seen nothing, so they were operating without a building permit. She said she told them that she wanted a Stop Work Order put on it and Tom McDonald was going to follow up. She said hardiplank was not permitted in the ordinance, so the wall will have to come down and be rebuilt.

Mr. Steffen stated at the Board's retreat the City Manager indicated an interest in perhaps working with the Board to enhance their powers. He said he felt what they would need in both situations was not as outrageous as it might seem. He said he felt if the Board could put these people on notice to come before the Board when things were in non compliance and the City give the Board the authority to have an administrative fine levied by each day that were in non compliance that would provide a tremendous incentive to get it right. He said if the fine was assessed each day that were in non compliance they would either have to pay the fine or have it assessed against their property, or tear it down. He said it sounded like the City was willing to consider doing that if the Board presented them with a specific proposal.

Mr. Mitchell stated he felt in the nature of what these types of things were if the Board went to something like fining people and let it ride that would be no good. He said he felt that would encourage people to totally go against what the Board has approved.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated until the Board gets that done in these two cases that Board has heard today if it would be appropriate to send a letter to John Hutton with copy to the architect and/or owner on those particular projects. He said in the letter it could say the Board objects to this so it would be on record. He said the next time the Board has a retreat and they talk to the Mayor and Alderman the Board could say here is X-number of times that the Board has sent letters out because people were in violation. He said he would like to recommend that the Board send a letter in regard to these two cases heard today.

Mr. Steffen suggested that a copy also be sent to the City Manager.

Mr. Mitchell asked what about the tone of the letter?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated the letter should set out the facts period.

Mr. Steffen stated he received a phone call from one of his neighbors who was curious about what they thought was work performed without approval at 326 – 324 Harris Street, which is where the Fire Fly Café is. He said he assured them that must have come before Staff and received approval.

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

Mr. Mitchell asked how the Board wanted to work on some of the suggestions from the retreat? He said he asked Mrs. Reiter to delineate those items and put them on a separate sheet. He said some of the things the Board were not going to be able to do immediately, but there were also some that could perhaps be done this year.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated there were so many, the Board may want to just start at the beginning taking the first two or three.

Dr. Caplan stated on Mr. Steffen's draft, the last paragraph – "payment of which shall be sent to the Historic Savannah Foundation to be used exclusively for the purchase and renovation of

endangered properties.” He said as highly as the Board felt about the Historic Savannah Foundation it was appropriate that the Board must distant themselves from Historic Savannah. The Mayor, City Manager, City Council, everybody has stressed that it was very important the Board was not an offshoot of Historic Savannah nor were they offshoot of the Historic Review Board.

Mr. Steffen stated his draft was old. He said he wrote it a long time ago and that would not be a problem.

Mr. Mitchell asked Mrs. Fortson-Waring if she was saying the top two or first two?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated any two.

Mr. Mitchell stated the Board could start with the two most important ones.

Ms. Seiler stated she felt the endangered structures were crucial, which was number 1 on the list and people frequently ask that. She said she felt it was something that could draw attention to the work that everybody did and could be a rallying cry for not only neighborhoods but organizations as well.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the Board wanted to agree on numbers 1 and 2?

Dr. Caplan stated the second paragraph of the italicized portion of the exception – “at the end of the project Staff inspects the work to make sure it was done correctly and signs off on the Certificate of Occupancy.” He said the City Manager was very protective of the Inspections Department when they met because frankly, they should be doing this. He said he felt that was why he wanted documentation of these things. He said somehow they have to overcome this impath. Either make the Inspections Department responsible for that or give some means by which the Board could do this, as well as police what was going on. He said he felt the Board had to decide and present those alternatives to the City Manager and let him decide.

Mr. Deering stated when the building inspectors were out at the site they tended to look more at code issues than at paint and aesthetic issues. He said that was probably the biggest problem was that they were looking for code violations, which were outlined to them in their code book.

Mr. Mitchell asked how does the Board bridge the gap?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated the Board makes the case. She said they document and establish the violations and when they get sufficient violations that were documented then they also have presented sufficient evidence to get another person. For instance, Washington, DC has a Compliance Enforcement Officer. She said that person's job is to go around to document and then the fines generated based on the violations support their salary.

Dr. Caplan asked Mrs. Reiter how big of a job would it be to approve the various projects before they get their Certificate of Occupancy?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated it would be huge. She said Staff has extended responsibility in the other Historic Districts now.

Mrs. Reiter stated ...(inaudible)

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated that the Board also had to keep in mind that when you apply fines it was a taking of property and you have to have due process, which is notice and an opportunity to be heard. She said you have to implement the procedure, so that they have notice and an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Steffen stated he would be glad to redraft his suggestion before the next meeting and put in something about compliance officer and where the fines could potentially go. He said he felt the Board also had to remember what they were doing was taking a first step in asking the City Manager and the City to create some of this authority. He said it was obvious that the City and City Attorney were going to have a lot of say as to what this ended up being, if the Board has it at all. However, he felt if the Board did not take the first step nothing was going to happen.

Mr. Mitchell stated the Board has agreed that they would work on numbers 1 and 2. He asked how should the Board proceed from this point on items 1 and 2?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt the Board should come up with a time period for developing item 2. She said for number 2 a committee of folks could go back and look at all the different things because there have been things constructed that were not in compliance with what was approved.

Mrs. Reiter stated she felt the first step should be to go back and list the projects that have been done that were approved, but not in compliance. For example, Gwinnett Street and Barnard Street, which was a row of houses and the roof was built too high. She said as the Board thought of things they could send them to her.

Dr. Caplan stated on number it would be a massive project to make a list of endangered structures.

Ms. Seiler asked if it should be the top ten?

Mr. Deering stated he felt the Board should not limit the number. He said he felt the Board should just look.

Mr. Webb stated for this group, the focus should be the Historic District. He said when they get that accomplished then go into the others.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca