

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

DECEMBER 14, 2005

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

**W. John Mitchell (Excused)
John Neely (Excused)**

MPC Staff Present:

**Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer
Sarah Ward, Preservation Specialist
Christy Adams, Administrative Secretary**

RE: Call to Order

Ms. Seiler called the December 14, 2005 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:05 p.m.

RE: Sign Posting

All signs were properly posted.

RE: Consent Agenda

**RE: Petition of Lynch Associates Design
Rebecca Lynch
HBR 05-3502-2
407 East Charlton Street
Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

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

Ms. Seiler asked the Board if they would consider hearing the petition of Andrew Wilford first on the Regular Agenda because he has to catch a plane.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review move the Petition of Andrew Wilford, HBR 05-3506-2 to the beginning of Regular Agenda. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Regular Agenda

**RE: Petition of Andrew Wilford
HBR 05-3506-2
311 East York Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Andrew Wilford.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

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

1. Erect a 22 foot by 20 foot wide carriage house with living unit on the existing slab for a 100% building lot coverage.
2. Replace all windows with wood 6/6 and 6/9 sashes. Most of the current sashes are aluminum.
3. Install louvered shutters by Atlantic, Manchester style.
4. Add third story to rear two story addition.

FINDINGS

1. The structure is located within an R-I-P-A zoning district that allows for a maximum building lot coverage of 75%. The current lot coverage is approximately 75.5%. The proposed construction would request a 25% building lot area variance approximately.
2. One off-street parking space is required per dwelling unit, plus approximately one space for every 200 square feet of leasable area for a professional office. The existing configuration appears to include a ground floor professional office and one dwelling unit above. The proposed configuration appears to include the office, dwelling unit and an additional dwelling unit over the new garage. The existing off-street parking consisting of two spaces appears to have been deficient for the existing uses. This deficiency will be increased with the additional dwelling unit.
3. The applicant was advised by the Zoning Administrator to apply first for a Certificate of Appropriateness, prior to applying to the ZBA for a lot area variance and any applicable parking variances.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Section 8-3030 (l) (14) Carriage Houses Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width. Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed with parapet. Special conditions: Secondary structures which face a lane shall be no taller than two stories. Guideline: Carriage houses were	A 12 foot garage opening is proposed with an overhead door with applied wood treatment to simulate a barn door look. The roof is flat or shed with a parapet. The height is secondary to the main structure and the structure is two stories.	The relationship of the height of the first floor to the height of the second floor is not compatible with typical carriage house structures. See comments below. The width of the garage door meets the standard, but appears to be non-functional for the parking requirements. The distance between the cornice and top of the second floor windows

traditionally accessory to a main house in mass and scale.		is unusually high.
Windows: Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design and material.	The current windows in the historic portion of the existing building are not original and some are made of aluminum. It is proposed to replace them with 6/6 and 6/9 windows.	The applicant needs to submit dimensioned drawings of the proposed windows indicating the width and profile of muntins etc. and clarify that they will be single-glazed, true divide lights.
Windows in carriage houses and additions: 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 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. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.	The third floor addition windows are to match the existing third floor window. The carriage house windows will be 6/6.	Dimensioned drawing of a typical new window is needed. The windows on the rear of the carriage house are not symmetrically spaced.
Ironwork	Restore ironwork on façade.	More specific details of the proposed work are needed. Is this just painting?
Additions	Add a third floor to the existing second floor.	This is consistent with the treatment of the rest of the row.

General comments:

The proposed work appears to require several variances. In discussing the petition with Board of Appeals staff it is not evident that the variance criteria are met. The applicant also needs to clarify certain questions.

Will the office use be a separate tenant, or will it be a home occupation?

Will the carriage house unit be a rented apartment?

The parking in the carriage house as proposed is not adequate for the parking requirements of the site. The proposed uses will require 2-3 spaces or more. Although the proposed garage indicates that it is a two-car garage, the design and dimensions only allow one car.

Columbia Ward consists of both commercial and residential uses. Historically, it was more residential with courtyard space between the carriage house and main house. Staff cannot support the 100% lot coverage and recommends that the applicant reconsider the layout of the lot. The existing deck structure could be removed to create a courtyard. The staircase of the carriage house could then be placed outside in the courtyard in a traditional manner. If the

living unit above the garage functioned as an additional bedroom for the main house (without separate electric meter or kitchen), an off-street parking space would not be required for that unit. The corridor could be eliminated from the garage space and two garage doors installed so that the garage could truly function as a two-car garage. The carriage house could be constructed so that a lot area variance would not be required.

Also, in detailing the carriage house, care should be taken in the spacing of the windows with less space between the top of the windows and the cornice above. The existing cornice detail on the main house might be used as a template for the cornice and parapet treatment on the carriage house.

RECOMMENDATION

Continue for reconsideration of design so that variances are not required and staff questions can be addressed.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Wilford stated he agreed with the comments made by Staff and did not have a problem with what was recommended. He said it was his understanding that what was wanted were shorter carriage house, symmetrical windows, two doors, and a center passageway or door. Also, he needed a site plan showing the carriage house, yard or garden, third floor bumped out, and the rest of the building. He said the details on the windows and the ironwork were some of the reasons he was in town today.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring asked if he was asking for a continuance?

Mr. Wilford stated yes.

Public Comments:

Ms. Mary Kay Blackshear stated she lives next door to the petitioner. She said she was concerned that in the rear the concrete pad overlapped into her yard.

Mr. Steffen stated that if what the petitioner proposed to build went over the property line onto her property that was a legal issue between property owners. He said the Board will approve what the petitioner puts on his lot and not hers.

Ms. Chris Taylor (315 East York Street) stated she did not have a problem with the new drawings. She said her concern was that the petitioner did not answer the question of whether or not the carriage was going to be rental.

Ms. Seiler stated that was not within the Board's purview.

Ms. Taylor stated she asked because she was concerned about the parking.

Mr. Wilford stated with regard to Ms. Blackshear's concern, the parking slab that he has was poured one foot or so over the line. He said when they rip that out to put the carriage house up they will take the whole thing up and she will have her yard back. He said with regard to the unit over the carriage house there was no intention to make that a rental unit.

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

**RE: Amended Petition of Residential Concepts
HBR 05-3418-2
523 / 525 East Broughton Street
New Construction**

Present for the petition was Tim Steinhouser.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to amend a previously approved petition as follows: Add two feet to the height, from 24' to 26' and the use of two entrance doors on the rear rather than a single entrance.

FINDINGS

1. The petitioner made the changes required in the conditional approval of the board dated July 13, 2005. These include Reduction of the garage openings to 12'; elimination of the parapet panels and carrying of scoring to the top; consistent windows and shutters on the rear elevation; and the placement of the spiral stairs within the footprint of each carriage house to conceal them from view from the right-of-way.
2. The height change is requested because of the loss of storage space due to Board of Appeals requirement that two staircases be used instead of one.
3. The proposed change leaves the carriage house 6' lower than the main house.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of Chris Norman, For
Capers Martin
HBR 05-3441-2
315 West Lorch Street
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Chris Norman.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Details for a new two story residential building at 315 West Lorch Street.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setbacks except as follows: On tithing blocks where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.	The new building aligns with the two adjacent historic structures.	This standard is met.
Dwelling unit type	Detached	This standard is met. Detached structures are typical of this block.
Street Elevation Type	Two and one half stories on a crawl space.	Similar to the houses on either side. This standard has been met.
Entrances A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to face the east-west street.	The front entrance faces Lorch Street.	This standard has been met.
Building Height: The exterior height of the first story shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet.	The height to the porch floor (crawlspce) is 2'-6"; the height of the first story (to the floor of the second story porch) is 11'; the second story is 10'. The story under the roof is a little less than 12 feet to the roof ridge.	The proposed structure appears to be equivalent to the height of the three story house in the block.
Visual Compatibility Factors		
Proportion of structures front facade	The width of the houses on either side of the proposed house is 21' according to applicant's drawings. The proposed house is 26'.	Has the applicant considered a narrower house to give more breathing room between the structures?
Rhythm of solids to voids	A three bay façade is proposed. Windows and doors align vertically.	A three bay arrangement is typical of this block.
Rhythm of structure on street		The structure is sited similarly to other historic structures on the street.
Rhythm of entrances and porch projections	Double porch with deck on top. Columns.	The porch interprets the use of horizontal siding on adjacent porches in a modern manner.
Roof Shape	A hip roof with dormers is proposed.	There are hipped roof structures in this block
Walls of continuity		The proposed structure maintains the street wall.
Scale	The scale of the columns is maintained on both floors.	The adjacent property uses lighter columns on the second floor porch. Has the petitioner considered how this might look on the proposed project? Also, on the adjacent house the width of the horizontal siding on the porch varies in a subtle manner. This might be looked at for the proposed project to lessen the visual impact of so much horizontal siding on the porches.
Materials	Siding-Concrete Columns-wood Windows-Marvin Ultimate clad	Is this HardiPlank? Is it smooth? Has an example of the roof tile been provided?

	Roof-Light weight concrete roof tile-grey slate Foundation-cast concrete	
Colors	Siding- Windows, garage doors, trim, porch details- Martha Stewart Nori (Dark slate) Stucco-lighter gray Martha Stewart Zinc	No color given for siding. The dark slate color appears inappropriate for this block face. Where is stucco being used? Why does it refer to garage doors? Are these the gates in the back?
Fences	A vertical board wood fence is proposed, stained.	One drawing says the fence posts are stuccoed cmu and other says stained wood. Please clarify.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval pending clarification of issues raised above and discussion of colors.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Norman stated the siding was smooth Hardi-Plank. With regard to the width of the building they considered decreasing it to 24 feet. He said with regard to the columns it was typical for them to get slender as they increase in elevation, so they would not have a problem with slenderizing the columns at the top. He said they were round. He also said with regard to the piers in the rear were stucco. He said the porch sides were wood and they liked the way it was.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated he felt the building was too large for the lot and neighborhood. He said he felt it was too deep and too tall. He said he also felt that the dormers were not the right solution for the neighborhood because they were very modern in inspiration and the rest of the building was not. He said the dormers seemed at odds with the building. On the front porch the column pedestals were very wide and the columns were wide. He said he disagreed with Staff in that if the pedestals were wide, he felt the columns should stay big.

Mr. Norman agreed with the comment about the pedestals being wide and the columns staying big.

Mr. Deering suggested pairs of columns on the pedestal. He said he felt that might be a better solution because the porches and the third floor balcony above the porches were very heavy especially with clapboard on it and it was not transparent. He said with the mask he felt that having more support rather than less would be more effective.

Mr. Norman stated when he talked about slenderizing them making them more narrow, it would not be a lot.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he was concerned with the length of the columns in relation to their width. He said he did not show a pedestal under the columns at the ground floor, but rather a railing. The columns were cut off and they looked like they were no more than 4, 5, or 6 feet tall and yet they had the width. He said he felt if he delineated a pedestal under them, then the width of the column would be okay.

Mr. Norman stated with the railing he did not know how that would look. He was not amenable to exploring a change.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if he delineated the railing across and had a projection of 2 inches that would delineate the column going down to the floor level rather than sitting on top of the rail or being just 6 or 7 feet tall. He said he felt it was the length of the column to the width that made it look so heavy.

Mr. Norman stated he respectfully disagreed.

Mr. Deering asked if he was willing to look at the dormers?

Mr. Norman stated as far as the dormers what they were trying to do was create floor area for a third floor. He asked if the Board was saying to eliminate them completely?

Mr. Deering stated no. He said he felt that it did not work with his building let alone within that neighborhood. He said there was a house on 35th Street between Drayton and Abercorn Streets that they put dormers like this on that was a big, wood clapboard house and it looked ridiculous.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was concerned with the visual heaviness of the front porches especially the second floor columns and the rail of the deck above. He said HSF hoped that the petitioner would consider reconfiguration of these elements to create a lighter feel. He said it was a characteristic of Savannah porches that they were very light. It changed further out towards Victory Drive, but not this much. He said it would be more in keeping with the neighborhood if they were to visually lighten the front porches at the top. He said HSF was also concerned about the size of the dormers. He said HSF hoped the petitioner would agree to some further exploration of how the dormers could be used on this project.

Discussion:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt this building's front elevation was overpowering. He said along with the dormers and the relationship of the column length to its width, the heavy accentuation of the railing (solid railing of the porch). He said if you look at the elevation sheet that was presented to the Board, the houses next door on either side were much lighter. He said he felt it needed further study in its front elevation.

Mr. Deering agreed.

Dr. Caplan stated he felt there was a lot of subjectivity, but he felt the recommendations were valid and felt the petitioner should consider them.

Mr. Norman stated he felt something could always be looked at and made better. He said what he would like to know was if the Board was going to have a problem with a three story building, even though it was allowed, or something that was close to a three story building.

Ms. Seiler stated she felt what the Board was saying was they were not going to approve it this way.

Mr. Deering stated he felt if the building was not as deep or the floor-to-floor heights were not as great or styled more like the three story building that existed on that block with a high stoop or something like that it would suit the neighborhood better.

Ms. Seiler stated it may be best that he request a continuance.

Mr. Norman agreed to a continuance.

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.

**RE: Continued Petition of John Cronk
HBR 05-3472-2
542 East Harris Street
New Construction**

Petition continued per Petitioner’s request.

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.

**RE: Continued Petition of Albert Faragalli
HBR 05-3487-2
418 East Liberty Street
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petitions was Albert Faragalli.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff reports.

The applicant is requesting approval of a continued petition for new construction, Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design, of a two-story carriage house at the rear of the property at 418 E. Liberty Street. This building will extend to the property at 416 E. Liberty Street. This application has been filed separately.

FINDINGS

The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density). 418 E. Liberty Street is a rated building within Savannah’s Historic District constructed from 1882-1883 as part of a row of two-story brick townhouses. Currently there is a non-historic one-story garage/shed at the rear of this property. The non-rated building was constructed ca. 1985 and is not present on the 1955 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The south elevation of the proposed carriage house faces the interior of the lot and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: There shall be no front	The lot is 1,800 square feet. The	The standard is met. The building

yard setback except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided. There is a maximum 75% building lot coverage. New carriage houses may provide up to a 4' setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.	proposed footprint, including the existing building and garage, is approximately 1,261 square feet for a 70.5% building lot coverage. There are no rear setbacks for the proposed garage.	coverage was reduced by 7% from the previous submittal.
Height Sec. 8-3030 (l)(1) Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.	A two-story carriage house, 19'-8" tall is proposed.	The standard is met. The overall height was reduced by 2'-8" from the previous submittal.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Scale Sec. 8-3030 (k)(6) The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.		The carriage house is equal in height to the main residence. The height was restudied and reduced 2'-8" and the overall massing has also been reduced.
Lanes and Carriage Houses Sec. 8-3030 (l)(14):		
Site: Carriage houses, garages, and auxiliary structures must be located to the rear of the property. Overhead garage doors shall not be used on street fronts, adjacent to sidewalk, unless they are detailed to resemble gates.	The proposed carriage house is at the rear of the property facing the lane. The overhead garage doors front the lane and not a street. The design is for custom built wood veneer doors with an arched top panel.	The standard is met.
Openings: Garage openings shall not exceed 12' in width.	Garage openings are to be 10' wide.	The standard is met.
Roofs: Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.	A shed roof behind a parapet is proposed.	The standard is met. The parapet has been reduced in height from 4'-1" to just over 2' and has been extended around the entire roof, shielding the shed roof from view.
Exterior Walls: Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.	A smooth sand finish stucco is proposed for the exterior finish. Scoring to resemble a building on the same lane is proposed.	The standard is met. Staff recommends that the scoring not be highlighted and should be painted to match the exterior stucco. Previously, a rough finish stucco was proposed but has been restudied to resemble historic stucco finishes.

<p>Windows Sec. 8-3030 (1)(9) 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”; 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. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>The windows will be true divided light double-hung windows.</p>	
<p>Standard</p>	<p>Proposed</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.</p>	<p>The window and door openings align vertically.</p>	<p>The standard has been met. The applicant has restudied the window placement to align the windows vertically on the lane facing elevation.</p>
<p>All windows facing a street, exclusive of top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3; provided however, nothing in this section precludes an arched window being used.</p>	<p>The window openings are 32” by 60” and feature a raised stucco arched jack arch to correspond to the main building.</p>	<p>The standard is met. The jack arch detail has been simplified and will not be raised.</p>
<p>Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3” from the façade of a masonry building.</p>		<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>Shutters Sec. 8-3030 (1)(9): Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window. Shutters shall be constructed of durable wood. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials.</p>	<p>Shutters will be operable wood louvered shutters with hinges and stops on the lane elevation. The south elevation, facing the house will have false shutters on the ground floor; however this will not be visible from the public right of way.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Lighting:</p>	<p>Two light fixtures are proposed by the garage and pedestrian entrance. They will be mounted on a outdoor wall bracket and will be 6½“ wide</p>	<p>This fixture appears visually compatible with the area.</p>

	by 15½“ tall and extend 8” from the façade wall. They are constructed on deep cast aluminum in black. A standard 75 watt bulb is specified.	
Colors:	Body: Grey stucco finish Trim: White stucco finish Shutters: Evening Emerald PPG 401-6	Staff approves, the colors are visually compatible.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval upon verification of the window material, muntin profile, and dimension of recess into exterior wall.

**RE: Continued Petition of Albert Faragalli
HBR 05-3488-2
416 East Liberty Street
New Construction – Part I & II**

The applicant is requesting approval of a continued petition for new construction, Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design, of a two-story carriage house at the rear of the property at 416 E. Liberty Street. This building will extend to the property at 418 E. Liberty Street. This application has been filed separately.

FINDINGS

The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density). 416 E. Liberty St. is a rated building within Savannah’s Historic District constructed from 1882-1883 as part of a row of two-story brick townhouses. Currently there is a masonry privacy wall at the back of the site which will be torn down for the construction of the carriage house. The south elevation of the proposed carriage house faces the interior of the lot and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setback except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided. There is a maximum 75% building lot coverage. New carriage houses may provide up to a 4’ setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.	The lot is 1,800 square feet. The proposed footprint, including the existing building and garage, is approximately 1,196 square feet for a 66% building lot coverage. There are no rear setbacks for the proposed garage.	The standard is met. The building coverage was reduced by 7% from the previous submittal.
Height Sec. 8-3030 (l)(1) Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.	A two-story carriage house, 19’-8” tall is proposed.	The standard is met. The overall height was reduced by 2’-8” from the previous submittal.
Scale Sec. 8-3030 (k)(6) The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies		The carriage house is equal in height to the main residence. The height was restudied and reduced 2’-8” and the overall
Standard	Proposed	Comment

and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.		massing has also been reduced.
Lanes and Carriage Houses Sec. 8-3030 (1)(14):		
Site: Carriage houses, garages, and auxiliary structures must be located to the rear of the property. Overhead garage doors shall not be used on street fronts, adjacent to sidewalk, unless they are detailed to resemble gates.	The proposed carriage house is at the rear of the property facing the lane. The overhead garage doors front the lane and not a street. The design is for custom built wood veneer doors with an arched top panel.	The standard is met.
Openings: Garage openings shall not exceed 12' in width.	Garage openings are to be 10' wide.	The standard is met.
Roofs: Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.	A shed roof behind a parapet is proposed.	The standard is met. The parapet has been reduced in height from 4'-1" to just over 2' and has been extended around the entire roof, shielding the shed roof from view.
Exterior Walls: Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.	A smooth sand finish stucco is proposed for the exterior finish. Scoring to resemble a building on the same lane is proposed.	The standard is met. Staff recommends that the scoring not be highlighted and should be painted to match the exterior stucco. Previously, a rough finish stucco was proposed but has been restudied to resemble historic stucco finishes.
Windows Sec. 8-3030 (1)(9) 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"; 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. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.	The windows will be true divided light double-hung windows.	Verify materials and muntin profile.
The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.	The window and door openings align vertically.	The standard has been met. The applicant has restudied the window placement to align the windows vertically on the lane facing elevation.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
All windows facing a street, exclusive of top story windows,	The window openings are 32" by 60" and feature a raised stucco	The standard is met. The jack arch detail has been simplified and will

shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3; provided however, nothing in this section precludes an arched window being used.	arched jack arch to correspond to the main building.	not be raised.
Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3” from the façade of a masonry building.		Verify dimensions.
Shutters Sec. 8-3030 (1)(9): Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window. Shutters shall be constructed of durable wood. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials.	Shutters will be operable wood louvered shutters with hinges and stops on the lane elevation. The south elevation, facing the house will have false shutters on the ground floor; however this will not be visible from the public right of way.	The standard is met.
Lighting:	Two light fixtures are proposed by the garage and pedestrian entrance. They will be mounted on a outdoor wall bracket and will be 6½“ wide by 15½“ tall and extend 8” from the façade wall. They are constructed on deep cast aluminum in black. A standard 75 watt bulb is specified.	This fixture appears visually compatible with the area.
Colors:	Body: Grey stucco finish Trim: White stucco finish Shutters: Evening Emerald PPG 401-6	Staff approves, the colors are visually compatible.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval upon verification of the window material, muntin profile, and dimension of recess into exterior wall.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Faragalli stated the building has also been reduced in depth.

Mr. Deering asked if the stucco was a cement stucco or an acrylic based stucco?

Mr. Faragalli stated cement.

Mr. Deering asked if he would consider looking at the window muntin patterns so that the pane proportions were more vertical rather than horizontal?

Mr. Faragalli stated he did not know who was going to build this yet. He said the builders usually liked different manufacturers. However, he could specify it clearly on the drawings.

Mr. Deering suggested that the windows be 6/6.

Mr. Faragalli stated okay.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that he Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petitions (HBR 05-3487-2 and HBR 05-3488-2) with the condition that the windows be 6/6. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of City of Savannah
Thomas Perdue
HBR 05-3495-2
110 West Congress Street
Sign**

Present for the petition was Carol Moon.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a continued application to install a projecting neon sign for the Sapphire Grill Restaurant at 110 West Congress Street. In addition, they are requesting approval to an awning sign on the Congress Street elevation.

FINDINGS

This property is part of a larger rated building within the historic district which consumes the entire block. The original sign and entrance for the business was located on St. Julian Street; however, due to the street closure in front of this elevation, the applicant is relocating the primary entrance to the Congress Street elevation. The applicant has reduced the size of the neon projecting sign and has eliminated six proposed awnings from the south elevation based on board discussion.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Historic Sign District		
Principal Use Requirements Section 8-3121 (B) (11): For each nonresidential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. For nonresidential zoning districts the maximum size area for projecting signs is 30 square feet. The maximum projection of outer sign edge for projecting signs is 6 feet in nonresidential districts.	The proposed sign is 12’-8” tall and varying widths of approximately 1½’ wide. The overall square footage for the projecting principal use sign is approximately 23 SF. The maximum projection of the sign from the building is 2’-7”.	The standard is met. The proposed sign has been reduced 4’-2” from the previous submittal. The overall square footage has been reduced by about 3 SF and the maximum projection of the sign from the building reduced by 1½”.
Clearance Sec. 8-3121 (B)(2): Adequate sign clearance shall be provided to assure that pedestrian or vehicular traffic movements and safety are not adversely affected. Minimum	The proposed projecting sign is located 14’ above the pedestrian sidewalk.	This standard has been met. The sign has been lowered by 1’-7” from the previous submittal.
Standard	Proposed	Comment

clearance shall not be less than 10' above pedestrianways.		
Location Sec. 8-3121 (B)(2)(a): Projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the structure and shall not project over the roofline or parapet wall elevation of the structure.	The sign will be located on the primary entrance elevation, is 12'-8" in height and does not extend to the top of the roofline or parapet wall.	These standards have been met. The proposed sign has been moved to the east side of the façade, further away from the Sorry Charlie's Fish Sign.
Lighted signs Sec. 8-3121 (B) (3): Lighted signs of an enclosed lamp, neon or exposed fluorescent design are not permitted within any "R" zoning district. However, such lighted signs, are permitted within the nonresidential zoning districts. Such signs shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open spaces.	Neon is proposed for the lettering and border over the painted sign. The property is zoned B-C-1 and is surrounded by commercial establishments. The neon will be "Neo Blue" when lit and clear during the day.	The proposed neon sign is compatible with the surrounding commercial neighborhood. Another historic neon sign is located at the western end of the block.
Design	The sign is aluminum and attached to the building with metal brackets having a stainless steel finish. The ground will be "Polo Blue" – Benjamin Moore #2062-10 and the lettering will be "Stonington Gray" – Benjamin Moore #HC-170. A pinstripe border will be "Wickham Gray" – Benjamin Moore #HC-171. The individual letters are mostly 7" tall with the capital letters being 10½" and 16" tall.	Staff recommends approval
Awning sign Sec. 8-3121 (B)(11)(a): within nonresidential zoning districts, in addition to the permitted principal use sign, one canopy or awning principal use sign shall be permitted for each entrance providing public access. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than 1 SF of sign face per linear foot of canopy or awning, or a maximum of 20 SF; provided however, that the aggregate total principal use sign area for the subject use is not	A 20' wide awning sign is proposed to extend the width of the Congress Street elevation. It will be located above the entrance and commercial store front and the valance will contain 6" letters with the name of the business. The awning is to be navy blue (sample submitted) with white lettering.	The standard is met.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
exceeded along that street frontage. Individual letters not to exceed 6"...shall be exempt from this provision.		

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Ms. Moon stated they considered all the concerns and comments that were made from the last meeting with regards to the size and the competition that they were having with the Sorry Charlies sign. She said reducing the square footage, lowering the sign, and moving it to the right side of the building they felt they accomplished those things.

HDBR Action: **Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed 4 – 3. Opposed to the motion were Mr. Deering, Mr. Meyerhoff, and Mrs. Fortson-Waring.**

**RE: Petition of Lee Meyer
HBR 05-3501-2
15 West Bull Street
Window Alteration**

Present for the petition was Lee Meyer.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the exterior of the building at 15 West Bull Street. Alterations consist of adding seven new window openings on the west elevation (facing Bryan Street Parking Lot) to provide light for the interior office space.

FINDINGS

1. The commercial building is not historic and the proposed alterations are on the side of the building.
2. On June 16, 2004 the board granted approval to replace the non-historic second floor windows by blocking in existing openings and cutting new openings to match size on Bull and Bryan Street elevations. Approved windows were Kolbe and Kolbe true divided light wood windows.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p>Nonrated Structures (Sec. 8-3030 (k)(5)): The alteration materially affecting the external appearance of any existing nonrated building in the historic district visible from a public street or lane shall be compatible with other structures in the historic district.</p>		
<p>Proportion of openings (Sec. 8-3030 (k)(6)c): The relationship of the width of the windows to the height of windows within a structure shall be visually</p>	<p>The proposed window openings are on the west side elevation facing a vacant parking lot. The historic structure on the other side of the lot has no window</p>	<p>The proposed alterations are to a nonhistoric building and are on the side elevation fronting a parking lot. Staff would like to note however that the size,</p>

compatible to the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.	openings that face this building.	shape, and configuration of the windows do not relate to the design of the building or the restoration efforts that have been completed.
Windows (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(9)): 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"; 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.	The proposed windows are 1'-4" in height by 3'-10" wide. They will be wood with two fixed lights, single pane glass and painted to match the existing windows above (Benjamin Moore Black Forest Green).	Staff recommends that the dimensions of the openings be restudied to relate more to the existing openings that are taller than they are wide. They appear disproportionate to the existing openings within the structure.
The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.	The proposed windows do not align with the rectangular window openings above.	The standard has not been met.
Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3" from the façade of a masonry building.	No dimensions were given.	Verify that windows will be inset 3" from building face.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends a continuance to restudy the alignment and shape of the window openings.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Meyer stated this building was going to be the mortgage brokerage arm of Regents Bank called Morgan Kegan. He said each office wanted to have a window to the outside. He said they took a portion of the top windows and brought them down and made them darker. He said they will be the same wood construction with glass and will match the same colors.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering asked if there was more along this elevation?

Mr. Meyer stated yes.

Mr. Deering asked if they could be made full sized windows so that they related to the rest of the building?

Mr. Meyer stated no, because this was a bank. He said on the western exposure there was concern about security.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if there was a way to tie the first floor windows together horizontally rather than being little punched holes that would be a strip in a horizontal accent.

Mr. Meyer stated no.

Discussion:

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated Mr. Deering had a good point about there at least being some type of alignment with the coupling of the windows. However, she was concerned that if there was a building there it would not matter.

Dr. Johnson stated he felt the configuration of the floor plan and the desire to have some light or windows dictated what could be done on the exterior.

Mr. Deering stated he felt if things are approached with that attitude it would be form follows function, which was not the way most of the Historic District was done.

Mr. Steffen stated he felt like the Board was arguing about what color the bonnet was on the pig.

Mr. Deering stated what the petitioner and Staff was not showing was when you see the façade of the building with those windows on the second floor it works. When you show the façade of this building facing Bryan Street with the little slip windows on the side that had no relationship to the front then you would wonder why were those slip windows there. He said it did not make sense because there was no relationship from those windows to the front of this building, which could be seen in three dimensioned when you stand on the street. He said he felt everyone seems to forget that.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated which makes it visually incompatible.

Mr. Deering stated correct.

Mr. Steffen stated with itself.

Mr. Deering stated yes, not even including anything around it.

Dr. Caplan stated the petitioner talked about functionality and wanting light. He said it may be moot because there may be another building there. He said forgetting that, he wondered how much light there would be from the small windows and what it was going to accomplish. He said he also wondered if it was worth changing the appearance of the building to that extent for that little bit of light. He said he was not sure how functional the windows were.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt the elevation lacked a lot of things as presented. He said putting those windows in was not going to add nor detract from the existing or nonexisting elevation.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was tied 4 – 4. Opposed to the motion were Mr. Deering, Mr. Gay, and Mr. Steffen, and Ms. Seiler. Voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Meyerhoff, Mrs. Fortson-Waring, Dr. Caplan, and Dr. Johnson. The motion was defeated due to a tie.

Ms. Seiler asked the petitioner if he would like a continuance?

Mr. Meyer stated yes.

HDBR Action: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay
Patrick Shay
HBR 05-3503-2
544 East Liberty Street
New Construction**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass for a four story mixed use structure at the North East corner of Liberty Street and Houston Street.

FINDINGS

The property is located in a R-I-P-B zone (residential medium density)

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Section 8-3030 (I) (1)Height The exterior expression of the height of residential raised basements shall not be less than 6’-6” and not higher than 9’-6”. The exterior expression of the height of the ground floor of a commercial building shall not be less than 14’-6”.</p>	<p>The building with a total footprint of 150 feet by 90 feet has been designed to resemble two buildings. The corner portion of the building has a first floor height of 15 feet, a second floor height of 12 feet, 3rd and 4th of 10 feet each with a corner tower element of an additional 13+ feet. The interior block portion is designed to resemble two attached high stoop townhouses. The stoop is at 9 feet. The second floor at 11 feet and the remaining two floors at 10 feet each. There is a “shade pavilion” indicated on the drawing which is not fully described. It is 9’-8” tall at its apex.</p>	<p>Historically, from the Sanborn maps, it can be seen that Crawford Ward had a number of smaller frame and brick houses with courtyard space. While some of these were supplanted by large footprint heavy commercial structures or were lost through fire and demolition to vacant lots, recent construction has been primarily residential. What is proposed with its 100 percent lot coverage is the most massive construction in the ward. The construction would require a 25% building lot coverage variance. Staff recommends that the height and mass be reduced to better fit the neighborhood. This could be achieved by lowering the first floor of the corner building. It is residential with incidental retail. The first floor does not need to be 15 feet tall. The corner tower adds to the height and mass and gives the residential building more of an institutional look. If eliminated and replaced with simple corner</p>

		balconies or a rounded corner the mass would be reduced.
Section 8-3030 (1) (2) Street Elevation Type A proposed building on an east-west through street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward. Where these conditions cannot be met, the proposed building shall meet the visual compatibility factors.	High stop townhouses are simulated on the mid-block portion of the lot. The corner building introduces a new element into the neighborhood.	Staff recommends that the corner building street elevation design be revisited to reduce the mass of the elements.
Section 8-3030 (1) (3) Setbacks There shall be no front yard setbacks except as follows: On tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.	No setbacks are provided except at the ground floor corner where the entrance has been setback under the tower element. 100% lot coverage is proposed requiring a 25% building lot coverage variance.	No setbacks are required. Staff recommends reconsideration of the design to provide more open space.
Section 8-3030 (1) (4) Entrances A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street. In large scale development, primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street.	Entrances are placed on both elevations and at the corner.	This standard has been met.
Large Scale development – shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width.	See site plan.	The standard has been met technically, however the visual effect is very massive. See Visual Compatibility Factor discussion below.
Visual Compatibility Factors		
Height	The parapet is basically at 49'-8" with a corner element of 60 feet. There is an additional roof structure.	Four stories are allowed , but the height of this building overwhelms the surrounding ward.
Proportion of structure's front facade		The proportion of the elements used to break down the mass of the façade are too massive for the rest of the ward.
Proportion of openings	No dimensions given	
Rhythm of solids to voids		The stair tower and matching projecting on the Liberty Street side of the building by the entrance is an awkward transition. The small window and exit door on the front of the building is not compatible. If the entrances were recessed enough the tower could exit to the side rather than facing Liberty Street.
Rhythm of porch projections	Two three-tiered partially recessed and projecting porches are proposed. One set is 22 feet wide and the other is over 33 feet wide.	The porches with their massive decks and supports add to the mass of the building and become the most prominent visual elements on the building. The ironwork in comparison appears too light.

		It is not clear what the blank area under the balconies between the brackets is.
Roof shape	Flat behind a parapet	The solid parapet is broken by a projecting iron picket railing over the projecting balconies.
Walls of continuity		The wall of continuity is interrupted by the corner tower.
Scale		Crawford Ward traditionally had buildings with fine grained details. The scale of the elements on the proposed building need to be refined more.

RECOMMENDATION

A continuance to revisit how a four story mixed use building might better fit with the neighborhood without the necessity of 100% lot coverage. Lowering the first floor height, reducing the projections in mass and scale, eliminating the corner tower piece and revising how the corner is treated such as using an angled or curved transition might help reduce the overall height and mass.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Shay stated they met early on with the folks at MPC because the property that was under contract at the time had a B zone. He said they decided to have the property down zoned to RIP-B so that it would be reduced in its use intensity before they came to the Board. He said from the pictures the Board could see that the majority of Crawford Ward has already been altered or reconstructed with non historic buildings. He said what they were proposing was something that was consistent with what was planned in both the original and the recently revisited Historic District Zoning Ordinance which allowed four story throughout this area. The boundary between that and the Beach Institute neighborhood district is right there and that was deliberately set down to 2½ story. Clearly, the idea and intent was four story buildings would in fact be located along here. Also, there were a number of development parcels that were in the area that were vacant, including their site and others which he felt would be developed in the near future. He said the only other significant large structure in the area was a row of condominiums that were under construction which were three story. He said although they were three story they were the same height as a four story building that they designed about 10 or 12 years ago in Crawford Ward.

He further stated that he agreed with Staff’s comments. He said he did not understand that since the ground floor of this building was going to be commercial that they were allowed to deviate from the standard for commercial buildings. He said he felt if they were allowed it would be a good thing for them to be able to reduce that height. He said staff analyzed it as two buildings, but they hoped it read more as a series of individual buildings. He said they tried to step down the massing on this side to be differential to the fact that there were only two story buildings that were there on the corner. He said if they reduced the larger part of this building down so that they had 12:10:10:10 then the mass of this would be reduced by 5 feet and would be similar to the massing of what was being proposed on this side which he felt would be a positive thing although they would lose the differential gesture of stepping down at this point to get to the two story. He said he felt the context that was relevant was the context of the Liberty

Street corridor. He said also the thought that went into the height map was to try to encourage buildings that were approaching four stories in height.

He also stated if the hat that was over the corner which was something that was added after they did the three dimensional digital model was of objection, then they were willing to restudy the hat over the corner element. With regards to the criticism of the small window and the fire exit door they could also restudy those elements. However, they strongly wanted to retain the corner entrance. He said they would also like more input from the Board if there were other concerns in addition to those mentioned by Staff.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated the shade pavilion on the top did not help alleviate the public view of this which was massive. He said he felt the building was too massive and dwarfed everything around it.

Mr. Steffen stated down zoning this from B to RIP-B was probably a good thing for that site in the sense that probably something else could have been there. He said he felt despite the fact that it was being stepped down he was having a hard time understanding why the left two-thirds of this had to be attached to the right one-third. He said it seemed to him that creating some space or green space between there and still developing that site as a modest project might fit in a little better with the streetscape even on Liberty. He said he was fine with the idea of trying to create retail on Liberty and some vibrancy. However, he also felt like Mr. Deering that it was so big. He said he felt there was a character to that neighborhood and he did not know how it really fit. He said he was also concerned that he would like to see the building pulled back from Liberty Street far enough that you could have slant parking instead of on-street parking if they were going to develop retail.

Mr. Shay stated the retail that was being proposed, the parking would be below ground.

Mr. Steffen stated he felt it could be better visualized if the two things had some separation to the them and there wasn't 100 percent lot coverage.

Mr. Deering stated on the Houston Street elevation on the bottom of the screen the brick row house that you see the end of was one of the biggest structures in that ward. He said if you look at the size of the building being proposed to the right of it, it would dwarf the whole thing. He said he felt you would notice nothing else in the ward except for this building.

Mr. Shay stated the zoning in the area, the map says 4 story.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated they could deal with the footprint and the Board would have to approve 4 story which was one of the changes.

Dr. Caplan stated this was a big building. He said he felt Mr. Steffen had a good suggestion which might address some of the concerns. He said they probably could have the same number of units if they had a separation of those buildings.

Mr. Steffen added that it would not have to be a complete separation, they could go back half way and still have the connect from the back and provide some type of a break and a green area on Liberty Street which he felt was important.

Dr. Caplan stated he felt the petitioner was very creative and if they could come up with some way to decrease the mass, not only the height but the appearance on the Liberty Street elevation and perhaps on the Houston Street elevation. He said that might alleviate some of the concerns.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was concerned that this building will overwhelm not just the neighboring historic structures, but the entire ward which has up until this point been reinforced by most of the new construction in this area. He said this ward should not be overwhelmed because it was of a smaller scale and some might consider it to be of lesser importance.

Ms. Beatrice Arden (Resident Houston Street) stated she was concerned about the green space. She asked if it would be inside the courtyard?

Ms. Seiler stated they have designs for a roof garden on the top.

Ms. Arden stated she also felt that it was too high. She said also her neighbors felt that it would block their sunshine as well as privacy. She said the neighbors were also concerned about traffic. She said she was concerned that it was too big and the corner with the upside down bay window on top of the building was unattractive.

Ms. Cynthia Hunter stated she thought the height map said that you were allowed to build four stories and you have the Chadbourne guidelines to decide whether or not it was visually compatible.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated in the design standards on page 9, L – 1 under Height it says – “maximum heights on the height map shall be permitted.” She said that was the new ordinance that was approved by the City, February 2005.

Discussion:

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated although the Board was required to honor the maximum heights, they can express their concerns in the floor-to-floor heights.

Dr. Caplan asked Mr. Shay if he would consider in view of the comments continuing the petition to restudy the heights as well as perhaps the lot coverage or at least making some attempt to visually separate the buildings if not factually separating them so it would decrease the mass.

Mr. Shay stated as he mentioned they welcome a relaxation of the commercial building height standard which they felt would considerably bring down the scale of the building. He said he felt they could make it lower in actual height than the three story buildings that were being constructed in the next block. He said they will take into consideration the comments heard today and come back. He said they were okay with a continuance.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt staff's comments with regard to the corner projection were valid.

Mr. Deering asked if they would also consider may be not pursuing all the lot coverage.

Ms. Seiler stated she also share the concerns of the neighbors as well as her colleagues. She said she also felt that this was a massive building for the property. She said she felt anything they could do to scale it back would be better.

Mr. Shay stated he did not disagree, but wanted to make sure the Board understood that the depth of this into their courtyard was such that their own carriage house was going to provide shade in their courtyard garden. He said he promised that the façade they present to the neighbors would be a whole lot better than the façade they present to them. He said remembering that their façade was basically garage doors, pitch roof, and some chaotic mechanical units and so forth.

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until the January or February 2006 meetings. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
Keith Howington
HBR 05-3505-2
3 East Macon Street
Alteration**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was Keith Howington.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting to make exterior alterations to the rear (south) elevation. Alterations include the removal of the parlor floor porch infill and third-story railing. A two-story porch above the garage is proposed for this space.

FINDINGS

The attached residence at 3 East Macon Street is not a rated structure within Savannah’s Historic District. It was constructed in 1980 and is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density).

The following design standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Certificate of Appropriateness required (Sec. 8-3030 (f)(1)c.): Material change in the exterior appearance of existing structures located in the historic district by additions, reconstruction or major alterations.</p>	<p>Remove the existing porch infill and balustrade on the rear and replace with two-story porch with turned columns and decorative balustrade.</p>	

<p>Nonrated structures (Sec. 8-3030 (k)(5)): The alteration, major maintenance, repair, or color change materially affecting the external appearance of any existing nonrated building, structure or appurtenance thereof in the historic district visible from a public street or lane shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, structure material texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with other structures in the historic district.</p>		<p>Neither of the adjacent structures are historic.</p>
<p>Standard</p>	<p>Proposed</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>Exterior Walls (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(8)(c)): Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible.</p>	<p>The newly exposed wall on the rear second floor will be constructed of stucco to match the existing exterior walls.</p>	<p>The standard has been met.</p>
<p>Windows (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(9)): Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on nonhistoric facades and on new construction, provided, however, that the muntin is no wider than 7/8", the muntin 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. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>Three sets of paired French doors are proposed for the exterior wall within the second floor rear porch. They will be aluminum clad wood with ten lights each of double-pane glass. They are 4' wide by 6'-8" tall. A raised stucco header will be located above each opening to match the existing French door on the third level above.</p>	<p>Verify that muntin is no wider than 7/8".</p>
<p>Additions (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(12)): Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly as appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.</p>	<p>A two-story rear porch will open up a previously infilled porch and balcony above. The porch is clearly seen as an addition to this non-historic building and will incorporate wrought iron elements from the front to relate to the main building.</p>	<p>The standard is met. The porch will be added on to a non-historic, non-rated building; however it should be noted that the more traditional style Doric columns and wrought iron balcony conflict stylistically with the wooden pergola roof.</p>
<p>Porches (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(11)): Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.</p>	<p>8" round columns are proposed for the rear porch. The eight columns all feature capitals and bases. They do not extend outward of the porch as the pergola extends beyond the columns.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed 4". For one and two family dwellings the height of the railing shall not exceed 36".	A wrought iron balustrade, similar to the one on the main façade of the dwelling, is proposed for the porch. The railing is 30' in height.	Verify that railings are within 4".
Decks shall be stained or painted to blend with the colors of the main structure.	New wood deck proposed for porch floor.	
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Roofs (Sec. 8-3030 (1)(10)): Roof decks and pergolas shall only be visible from the rear elevation.	A pergola (wooden trellis) is proposed for the roof of the porch. It is located on the rear of the building and will match the pergola roof on the adjacent structure.	The standard has been met. This building and the adjacent structure both featured pergola roof structures on the second floor porches, but the one at 3 E. Macon Street was enclosed. The exposed rafter tails are existing and will remain.
Exterior paint color	No colors submitted.	Submit colors to staff for final review.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

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

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Carlo Soffretti
HBR 05-3499(S)-2
408 East Hall Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Cecelia Linton
HBR 05-3500(S)-2
320 East Huntingdon Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Old Town Restoration
David Myers
HBR 05-3507(S)-2
311 Berrien Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
Pete Callejas
HBR 05-3508(S)-2
107 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – October 12, 2005
2. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – November 9, 2005

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of October 12, 2005 and November 9, 2005 as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Other Business

1. Nominating Committee - Report

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

HDBR Action: Dr. Johnson made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review close nominations. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was passed. Abstaining to the motion was Mr. Steffen.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review elect Joseph Steffen, Chairman and Swann Seiler, Vice Chairman. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed. Abstaining to the motion was Mr. Steffen.

2. New Board Member

Mrs. Reiter stated a new Board member (Gene Hutchinson) has been appointed by City Council. She said she tried to contact him but has not been able to reach him. However, she did leave a message for him to return the call.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she was recently nominated to fill Lee Webb's position on the Georgia Association of Preservation Commissions and as such she would like to encourage the Board to attend as Mr. Steffen did in November the GAPC training session. She said the next training session will be held in the Spring.

Mr. Steffen stated the training session was very worthwhile and he and Mrs. Reiter got to sit in on some tremendously informative workshops. He said one of the items that he thought was particularly relevant was demolition. It was clear that the sense of the Council was that on demolitions, the Board act only as an advisory board. He said the Board hears them, give their opinion, and then if someone appeals it and as the Board knows in demolition that was often the case, that when it is appealed it will go to Council, and they will have a completely new hearing. He said they will have the Board's record, but their record is not presented. He said they hear their own evidence, they can take new evidence, hear from who they wish, and decide as they

wish. He said when he and John Mitchell went to Council yesterday, they did not go there with a recommendation on the demolition. In fact, what he said was that they were specifically not making a recommendation because the Board was not unanimous on that decision. But that they needed some guidance as to what their role was in those cases. He suggested to Council that on most of the Boards in the State, which he learned from the training session, that on those types of appeals, Council normally just reviews whether the Board followed procedure or abused their discretion which was completely different than a whole new hearing. However, it was absolutely the sense of the City Manager and of everyone from Council who spoke up on it that they wish to undertake that responsibility. He said they may regret it, but they are going to hear demolitions de novou when they go to them. He said he was giving the Board two bits of information in that he was reporting back what happened at City Council yesterday, but in response to what Mrs. Fortson-Waring said he felt being able to address that issue with them and knowing what goes on in the rest of the State how the Board's decision was respected and what role they have.

Mr. Deering stated it almost seemed as though the Board should not spend any time on demolition petitions because if Council can hear it again what was the point of the Review Board hearing it.

Mr. Steffen stated he felt the Board should not spend any more time on them than was necessary to let people have their say and handle them as perfunctorily as they could without disrespecting Council.

Dr. Caplan stated he will have to look at the ordinance again because he thought that responsibility was the Board's by the ordinance.

Mr. Steffen stated the ordinance says that you can appeal to Council. He said the word *appeal* is not define and it normally is. He said it was very vague and they have interpreted as meaning that they were going to hear it completely. He said he specifically suggested that they consider hard how they wanted to define appeal. He said he was sure Council heard what they had to say but as of yesterday they wanted to hear it.

Dr. Caplan stated he would suggest that this Board send a letter to City Council with strong objections to this. He said if that was going to be the case then the Board should refuse to listen to those petitions.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt the Board needed to see what the City Council does with this first.

Mr. Steffen agreed. He said he felt that anyone there or who may have watched it knew how the Board felt. He said he and Mr. Mitchell basically said this is how our Board feels...He said he told them they were not going to address specific issues because they were divided on it, but they felt they had a role in demolitions and if they don't then tell them they don't.

Dr. Caplan stated either that or change the ordinance.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated as a reminder the GACP sessions were held in the Spring and Fall.

Mrs. Reiter reminded the Board that MPC will pay for one Board member to attend in the Spring and in the Fall.

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

Mr. Meyerhoff stated 514 State Street the Board approved it some time ago and they have virtually completed construction, but the porch railing was metal. He said it was a wood design with square picket, but they were metal.

Mr. Deering asked about the height of the row of houses being built on Perry Street between Habersham and Price Streets?

Mrs. Reiter stated it was exactly like the Board approved. She said she went over with the drawings and it was correct.

Dr. Johnson asked Staff if they could check on the color of what used to be the Bread and Butter Café on Gwinnett and East Broad. He said it was black with a greenish color.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca