

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

JULY 13, 2005

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

John Mitchell, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Dian Brownfield
Dr. Caplan
John Deering
Dr. Lester Johnson, Jr.
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring
Eric Meyerhoff
Joseph Steffen

Members Absent:

Ned Gay (Excused)
John Neely (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Mitchell called the July 13, 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: Amended Petition of Daniel Snyder, Agent for
Steven & Marianne Brower
HBR 04-3294-2
320 East Jones Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

RE: Continued Petition of Savannah Day Spa
Celeste Hobson
HBR 04-3392-2
18 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

RE: Continued Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik Puljung
HBR 05-3395-2
109 West Liberty Street
New Construction – Part II Design

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.
Louis Goodwin
HBR 05-3413-2
634 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

RE: Petition of David Moore
HBR 05-3416-2
211 East Gaston Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

RE: Petition of Hoffman Engineering Group
HBR 05-3420-2
110 West Gaston Street
Alteration/Elevator

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

RE: Petition of Jason House
HBR 05-3421-2
512 East Gwinnett Street
New Construction

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

RE: Petition of SEPCO
Ronald McGee
HBR 05-3422-2
600 East Bay Street
Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends APPROVAL.

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

RE: Regular Agenda

**RE: Continued Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder
John Deering
HBR 05-3379-2
22 Habersham Street
New Construction**

John Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a one and one-half story carriage house for 22 Habersham Street on an existing parking pad off East Bryan Street. The petitioner is also requesting approval to remove an existing wood fence with brick piers and a portion of a non-historic brick garden fence in order to construct the new carriage house.

FINDINGS

The petitioner submitted a historic photograph that shows an ancillary structure that had previously been located at the location of the existing parking pad and the proposed carriage house.

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

1. **Height:** As proposed, the carriage house will be one and one-half stories in height and 22'3" tall to the gable roof's peak. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first floor will appear approximately 9' tall.
2. **Width:** The East Bryan façade of the carriage house will have a width of 29'.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The garage doors will each be 9' wide. The second floor window openings are 3' wide and 4' tall. A 5' tall wood gate will be located to the east of the garage doors.
4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades/Directional Expression of Front Facade:** The East Bryan Street façade of the carriage house will have a three-bay rhythm on the ground level.. The relationship of the solids to voids gives the façade a horizontal directional appearance.
5. **Roof Shapes:** The carriage house will have side gable roof with dormer windows on the second floor.
6. **Setbacks:** The carriage house will have a zero line setback on East Bryan Street.

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.

- (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 muntins 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.
 - h. The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows.
 - k. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.

- (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 new tongue and groove flush bead board siding, with the tongues up, and painted to match the main house. The gable roof will be standing seam metal roof to match the main house in color and material. Copper downspouts will be used.
- 2. **Windows:** All windows will be double-hung, single-glazed, six-over-six, true-divided lite wood windows by Kolbe and Kolbe. Operable, louvered wood shutters will be used on the side and courtyard elevations.
- 3. **Doors:** The garage doors will be 9' wide, overhead doors.
- 4. **Colors:** The window trim and siding will match the main house. Shutters will be painted Charleston Green. The doors and garage doors will also be painted Charleston Green.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval.

Board Comments:

Ms. Brownfield asked what was the total lot coverage?

Mr. Deering stated the existing house barely covered 30 percent of the lot and they were under the 75 percent coverage. He said the historic structure that was there had been a stucco structure that was 18 feet along Bryan Street. He said they proposed a small wooden gable structure to sit as far away from the existing Spencer house as they could possibly get it. He said they left a very small alley way between the existing wall and the new wall construction of the wooden house so that it would be as minimally intrusive upon this house as possible. He said the proposed project was modeled after the historic photograph that was taken in the 1930's.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated since this was on a square and Trust lot the roof structure was imposing. He asked if they considered making the dormers the typical gable rather than the extended roof line?

Mr. Deering stated they felt doing the dormers in the shed style made them seem less obtrusive.

Public Comments:

Mr. Paul Hansen stated he was concerned about the scale of the building and its relationship to the street and houses across the street. He said there were several houses on Bryan Street that were much less in width than the garage. He said they were not facing a lane, but a street. He said it was not a house but a garage. He said he felt there should be some additional study to minimize the massing and impact that the building would have on the street scape.

Ms. Jean Brooks stated she lived adjacent to the proposed garage. She said she agreed with Mr. Hansen. She said she felt it was all right to add a carriage house to your property. However, she was concerned about the mass. She said the building will be 29 feet wide. She said her carriage house was 18 feet wide. She said she felt the mass of the structure would be visible from Habersham Street and also visible from St. Julian Street.

She further stated when she lived there in 1985 the fence was there and Mills Lane was having it repointed. She said the fence collapsed and Mr. Lane told her that it was due to the age of the fence because it was much older. She said she lived on one-half of a Trust Lot and she built her addition so that it did not encroach on any part of her land other than the parking. She said there were beautiful fences on Bryan and St. Julian Streets. She said they were younger than the fence that was being called nonhistoric. She said most of them have also taken advantage of the easement program by Historic Savannah. She said she would like time to research that because it seemed to her that was a conflict with the Department of Interior and IRS because they all got credit for the existing walls.

Mr. Graham Sadler (404 East Bryan Street) stated he did not oppose the idea of a carriage house because he felt it would strengthen the street scape. He said he was concerned about the size and mass of the building. He said when you looked at the foot print of the proposed building in relation to the main house it did not strike as a subservient building because it seemed to be too large for that purpose. He said at 29 feet wide it looked wider than Mr. Hansen's house and his neighbor's house which were prominent houses on the street as opposed to carriage houses.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated he wanted to clarify the issue of the easement or deed restrictions with this property. He said this was a project of the revolving fund and there were deed restrictions on the property. He said the property owner through the architect has met with Historic Savannah. He also stated on a couple of occasions there were larger masses that were proposed earlier and the applicant was asked to scale those down on two separate occasions, which they did. He said HSF did not have objections as the easement holder.

Ms. Jean Brooks stated if the easements ever rebut because of the tax liability she assumed that would fall to them and not Historic Savannah, which she would like to research further. Also, according to Mills Lane, IV. the structure that was on that property was a cook house. She said the neighbors were asking for a reduction in the size and not the elimination of the project.

Mr. Deering stated the wall that was put back at some point after 1953 began from this point over to approximately here. He said they were only taking out about this much of the existing wall. The structure that existed before was two structures. He said one was a stable that had a large opening in it (masonry building covered in stucco) that was about 18 feet wide. He said the two buildings together on the same site that they were proposing for the carriage house, if you scaled it off of the photograph the combined length of the two buildings was about 52 feet long. He said they were proposing a 29 foot building. He said if the two structures were still there today it would make up a viable part of the street scape. He said to build back something that was a structure whether it was a carriage house or house on this street, there was a historic pattern established for the reconstruction.

Additional Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated this was probably the only Trust Lot where the buildings did not go all the way across the side of the Trust Lot. He said he felt because of the open space the Review Board was always conscious of that and wants to fill in the corners of an intersection rather than setback. He said the building appeared bigger because of the open space that was created.

Ms. Seiler stated she was concerned about the height and mass, but it was in compliance.

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

RE: Petition of Dawson & Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson
HBR 05-3381-2
320 Montgomery Street
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson.

Mrs. Reiter stated that she was just informed that the petitioner would like to continue the petition until next month.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of Jacqueline Somesso
HBR 05-3390-2
641 Indian Street
Alterations – Color Change**

Present for the petition was Jacqueline Somesso.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of the existing deck at 641 Indian Street amended as follows: 1) extend the brick skirting around the open sides to match existing. 2) Repaint main body of the building Behr 390F-7 “Wilderness”.

FINDINGS

The petitioner wishes the building to be painted a shade of green because of the name of the business. Staff suggests that 390F-7 “Wilderness” would be a more appropriate shade than the more olive colors.

The deck and railing should be stained, perhaps a dark slate gray, to transition between the building color and the gray brick.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval to repaint the building “Wilderness” by Behr; stain the deck a slate gray and extend the brick skirting.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering asked if the brick would be the same type as what was there?

Ms. Keisha Martin stated yes.

Public Comments:

Mr. Russ Sill (Representative for Comfort Suites at 630 West Bay Street) stated they opposed the deck. He said he went before City Council in opposition to the club because of the noise. The Mayor and City Council forewarned the petitioner that his opposition was because of noise and activities that they have to refund money to his customers. He said he was told that anything affecting Comfort Suites making money while they were making money, they would have a show cause hearing. He said the petitioner was not aware of it because he has not been able to reach the petitioner. The deck represented more noise outside the building. He said Comfort Suites would like to oppose it.

Mr. Mitchell stated they appreciated him coming to speak before the Board. However, the issues that he was bringing before the Board were not within their purview. He said the petitioner had taken it to the correct place the first time which was the Mayor and City Council’s office.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated the Board was only approving the color. She said if there were any objections as to whether or not the deck was compatible, those objections should have

been addressed when the deck was addressed and approved. She said the only way the Board would be able to stop the deck would be if it was not compatible and in violation somehow with the ordinance. She said the Board was only here today for the color and brick. She said she felt he may need to talk to a lawyer and look at his options.

Mr. Sill stated he was informed by this office to show up for this meeting because the deck had not been approved. (Staff stated the deck was to be reviewed today).

Mr. Steffen stated he felt the confusion was that the Board has the ability to look at structures as to whether they were architecturally and historically compatible. He said the Board had zero power to discuss what activities go on either within a building or on the deck. He said if his objections and problems were based on those issues the Board could not help him because that was not their purview.

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it was passed 7 - 1. Opposed to the motion was Ms. Seiler.

**RE: Continued Petition of Zunzi's
HBR 05-3393-2
108 East York Street
Sign**

Mrs. Reiter stated the petitioner requested a continuance.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of American Commercial
Developers
HBR 05-3394-2
513 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Alterations**

Present for the petition was James Reardon.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations to a one story non-historic grocery store building, built ca. 1959. A second structure, now a part of the main complex is located on the corner of Hull and Houston Street.

FINDINGS

1. The alterations are as follows:
 - a. Install new aluminum storefronts painted Charleston Green in existing openings.
 - b. Add brick façade to Oglethorpe, Hull, Houston and Price Street facades. 606 "Old Lexington" brick style.
 - c. Install four new windows on Oglethorpe elevation at Houston Street and one on the Price Street elevation.

- d. Stucco existing metal cornice. Add aluminum frame on top of existing metal canopy and cover with black and white striped awning.
- e. Install 4" x4" steel tube columns and 1" x1" steel tube brackets on Oglethorpe Avenue side.
- f. Place awnings, Black and White stripe over entrances on Houston and Hull Street elevations.
- g. Remove infill from existing window openings on Hull Street elevation and install 9/9 Anderson 400 Series double hung true divided light windows with operable panel shutters.
- h. Install new steel doors on Houston Street elevation per plans.

2. The following standards apply:

- (5) Nonrated structures: "The construction of a new structure or the moving, reconstruction, alteration, major maintenance, repair, or color change materially affecting the external appearance of any existing non-rated building, structure or appurtenance thereof in the Historic District visible from a public street or lane shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, material, texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with other structures in the historic district, particularly nearby structures designated as historic..."

Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18-24" base of contrasting material...

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 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.

The structure was built in 1959 as a grocery store. An earlier industrial building is attached on the Hull and Houston Street corner. This has a stepped gable end parapet.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of amended submittal.

Public Comments:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF would like to complement the petitioner on the proposal and felt it was an improvement. He said there has been in effect for years a Landscape Ordinance that required parking lots that are not screened to be screened. He said HSF asked him to inquire of the Board today whether or not landscaping to screen the parking lot should not have been included as part of this application.

Mrs. Reiter stated landscaping was not in the purview of the Board unless it was a fence or wall.

Mr. Reardon stated they proposed landscaping along the streetscape.

Mr. Deering asked if the building that was at the corner of Houston and Hull Streets was painted brick?

Mr. Reardon stated yes.

Mr. Deering asked if they had to put new brick over that? He said he would rather see the old painted brick left without a new veneer placed over it.

Mr. Reardon corrected himself stating that it was a block building.

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

**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 Ms. Lynch.

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

The following standards apply:

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	Entries are delineated and recessed on each street frontage.

	building.	
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.	The proposed construction is divided into three bays with a separate entry bay on each street. The projecting bays are supported on brackets. The garage opening is 12 feet.	This standard has been met.
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 roof pitch to parapet height.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff: I'd like to make a comment. This submittal is not in compliance with our guidelines as to submission. If you look at these elevations that were submitted, they are less than sketches and not only do they not meet the guidelines as to submittal, but it is not fair to all the presentations that precede where we have a set of drawings where we can identify from the drawings as to what is going on. These little sketches and elevations do not meet our requirements for submittal.

Mr. Deering: It seemed to me that for the height and mass submittal everything was there.

Mr. Meyerhoff: Can you tell me then on the north elevation next to the porches there are some squiggly horizontal lines. Do you know what they are?

Mr. Deering: I would assume that would come back in the detail submittal.

Mr. Meyerhoff: Do you know whether it is recessed or flush with the wall. Do you know whether they are flush with the wall?

Mr. Deering: That came on the plan. I looked at the plan.

Mr. Meyerhoff: It doesn't show. That is part of height and mass. I am just very much against this type of submittal when everyone else goes to the trouble of making complete architectural drawings and presenting their elevations. This is just scratching and I don't know how we can make an honest height-mass opinion here as to solids and voids, setbacks and articulation which is all part of height and mass. It isn't here.

Dr. Johnson: I would think the drawings show the envelope of height and mass. And I would expect at the design stage we would see those things r. Meyerhoff is talking about in addition to what we see on the plans and drawings. The drawings even though we call them sketches are better than a lot that comes before us.

Dr. Caplan: I understand that this is artistic license and presume for the purposes they are alright but in all honesty, I would have expected more from this particular architectural firm and I agree with Mr. Meyerhoff on that score. Because I think they are sketches and maybe it is supposed to be a thing of modern beauty. I don't know but for our purposes I would have expected more.

Ms. Lynch: We agree with staff's recommendation for approval and in terms of the clarifications on the roof pitch, the roof on the top of the building is intended for all intents and purposes to be flat and it has a minimal pitch and the condensing units will be screened from the street. In terms of addressing the issue of hand-drawn elevations versus CAD-drawn, we have submitted hand-drawn elevations in the past and it wasn't an issue. It's been approved and it is not a part of the criteria for submission and was submitted this way because this is a preliminary approval and not an elevation submission but we will address that with the next submission and if the Board would like to recommend changing the submission criteria we would definitely concur with whatever they recommend.

Mr. Deering: On the drawings it looks like these sloped roofs above the projecting bays are curved. Is that what your intent is?

Ms. Lynch: That is a design development issue as to end form of it, but yes, that is what it is shown to be at this time. It will not come up any higher than the parapet.

Mr. Deering: If I may recommend that you not curve them I think they would be more successful. I also agree with staff's comment that the building does feel sort of like an apartment building and if you could do anything as far as mass or whatever to break it up I would encourage that. As many people have said before that corridor is becoming a corridor of large-scale development and this just seems to be another. It would be nice to see it broken up further.

Ms. Seiler: Ms. Lynch we have talked about the squiggly designs before, so this is not the first time we have talked about them.

Dr. Caplan: I agree with Mr. Deering's comments about breaking it up a little bit because it does look like one solid thing and if you could make it look more like a residential rather than a big mass apartment building, I think it would be nice if you could do something like that when you go for Part II design.

Mr. Meyerhoff: Two of our members have just talked about mass and for the next submittal that is what we are supposedly approving today...

Mr. Deering: Looking at...

Mr. Meyerhoff: What we are looking at that we don't approve at this time from the verbage I just heard. I think mass is what we are here for in this first submittal and if we want to make alterations or recommend alterations to the massing she ought to ask for a continuance until you present us with something we can all concur with.

Ms. Lynch: I fully understand the concerns for having a building that is not overly massive on this corner, but I think that the Board should also consider that there are other economic concerns for doing a development of a building here. It is not necessarily going to be just row homes and we have taken a number of efforts to break it down despite the fact that it clearly is an apartment building. It is broken up into flats and that does offer some limitations as to how much you can break it up. The efforts that we made were in bringing out the projecting bays to engage the street, therefore clearly articulating these bays, the 30 foot bay, the rhythm of what might be an historic town home on a street and recessing the main entries so that it is not over whelming on either linear façade. We investigated having entries to the ground floor units at each floor, but we felt that was in conflict because this is actually an apartment building with a single entrance and it seemed like it was giving a false reading of the building to the street. It would be trying to be more than one thing. But, we would consider that if the Board feels it would be important to engage pedestrian that much further to the street but we thought that the building maintained more integrity not having pedestrian entries at each ground floor unit in this type of building. The other way we tried to engage the street, because we realized that is an issue, was rather than just having windows in the projecting bays we are proposing French balconies so rather than just having porches which would give that same feeling this allows us to maintain that as interior space but still address the street we feel that we have looked at all these issues and feel that for this program we have been pretty comprehensive in trying to break down the mass to be respectful of the context of row homes and to the historic context while at the same time maintaining the integrity of the type of building which it is which is in this case is not row homes but is an apartment (condominium building) and if that's an issue maybe we need to bring that up with the owner that the Board doesn't find that appropriate with that street.

Mr. Deering: I was trying to be gentle at first, but I will try not to be insulting, but at present it appears to me that you took a Buckhead apartment building and put it down on this corner. It looks like a post property development with these projecting bays and little French balconies on it. You can find it almost anywhere in North Atlanta and I really don't think it is appropriate for here.

Mr. Meyerhoff: In line with that as I read your little sketches here we have 114 lineal feet along Montgomery Street on the ground floor that just run on and on like they came out of a

toothpaste tube and that is not what Savannah is. We have in Savannah a scale of about 30 lineal feet of building and we have very few buildings but unfortunately we have them, that do just run on at one level. We have tried so hard at every*(tape ended lost some of the comment)* ...an aspect of a typical Savannah block. This doesn't do it. The projections on the second and third floor do not break this building up into a smaller scale as a typical Savannah block. The 114 feet on Montgomery Street and the 110 feet on Alice Street just run on. That's not what a typical Savannah block is.

Mr. Steffen: I will try to be polite and respectful too. I am not an architect and I've only been on this Board four months but I have to tell you that as an attorney, for example in Workers Comp hearings or Social Security hearings people walk in all the time in jeans and tennis shoes, but attorneys don't. I was dismayed at getting handwritten drawings from what I consider one of the pre-eminent architectural firms in the state. It is not going to be an issue as to how I decide this thing but I would tell you that the message that I get from seeing that is that either you are not ready, you're not sure what you want or there's something that's in there that you don't want me to see. Those aren't good messages coming from a firm with your reputation. So while I agree with you that there is no requirement to do it, this is not what I would expect from your firm.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: I have a comment as the other attorney on the Board. As long as you comply with the requirements, they don't have to be pretty and you don't have to raise and increase your client's fees.

Mr. Deering: I think just because it is a certain architectural firm that we should not be held to certain standards when every submittal is different and they vary.

Mrs. Fortson Waring: I move that the HDBR approve etc. because it is in compliance with the Visual Compatibility Standards. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion.

Dr. Caplan: Could I get a little clarification? You are talking about the mass of the building only?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: Height and Mass

Dr. Caplan: You are not talking about the number of entrances?

Mrs. Fortson Waring: Height and Mass and to demolish.

Dr. Caplan: Because some of us have differences of opinion as to what is height and mass. Now to me height and mass is this is a block and that's it. Mr. Meyerhoff for example takes into consideration more things we consider design characteristics. Number of entrances, window placement bays and things of that sort. So, if we have the distinct understanding that this is just for the block of the building, that's fine and the footprint of the building and the height of the building. That's fine because the other things I would vote against it and I think the majority of the Board would but I think that has to be clarified with the petitioner.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: Well, I think that you should have made the motion. I am not accepting that as a friendly amendment to the motion. My motion is...

Dr. Caplan: I want to have it clarified. It has nothing to do with either you or me. I just want it to be clarified on what we are voting on so that we have that understanding with the petitioner.

Mrs. Fortson Waring: To that point then next month we can say no, we approved height and mass but no, now that we are looking at the design there are too many windows, too many doors those are design. My motion is to approve demolition and the height and mass as presented.

Mr. Meyerhoff: Height and mass is more than being presented with a block that is 110 feet long and 100 feet wide as a rectangle. Mass includes articulation of the building, includes a direction that the building has, and the voids, openings and solids are a part of mass as far as I am concerned and this building does not have the mass that we normally approve for a new building in this city.

Mr. Steffen: I am thoroughly confused. I really am. I understand the common use of the word height and mass not involving the articulation of this project or any project and yet it seems to be that Mr. Meyerhoff's suggestion that it is part of the discussion. If we are going there I don't want to go there yet. I suggest that at the workshop coming up we should have a consensus of among all of us as to what height and mass really means. I have heard from this Board two different views as to what height and mass are.

Mrs. Reiter: The application lists exactly what is to be considered for Part I and Part II. This was amended during the last amendment process.

Mrs. Fortson Waring: Call for the vote. The motion failed.

A conversation ensued and a second motion was made to continue the petition.

**RE: Continued Petition of Concept ARC
International
HBR 05-3402-2
201 East York Street
Renovation**

Present for the petition was J.C. Woodall.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate 201 East York Street, including the demolition and replacement of the non-historic connector between the main house and the carriage house. This petition was continued at the June Review Board meeting.

FINDINGS

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards:

- (1) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District: An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenances related thereto, visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural

features shall include, but not limited to the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors and signs.

- (2) Visual Compatibility Factors: New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the Historic District which are moved, reconstructed, materially altered, repaired, or changed in color shall be visually compatible with structures, squares and places to which they are visually related.

DISCUSSION:

York Street elevation:

1. The existing front door will be replaced with a new door to match the style of the original doors, using the front doors on the adjacent property to the east as a guide to match materials and proportions. The existing sidelights and transom will remain. A detail of the front door has been provided. On the street level, a new window and door will be installed within the existing openings after the removal of the existing infill. The new window will match the existing window on the adjacent property to the east in material and proportions.
2. The non-historic brick veneer will be removed from the ground floor. The original sandstone water table will be restored.
3. A new copper canopy will be installed over the restored ground level entry.
4. The existing decorative iron grills below the first floor windows will remain, be cleaned and painted to match the existing iron railing on the front stairs.

Abercorn Street Elevation:

1. existing metal canopy over a ground floor entrance will be removed. This entrance will be returned to a window to match existing double-hung windows on the façade. Other non-compatible windows on this façade will also be replaced with wood, double-hung windows to match the historic windows.
2. The brick veneer will be removed from the ground floor level.
3. A new carriage house door will be installed with a copper canopy.
4. At the third level, the existing addition will be stuccoed with a two inch corbel to match the existing profile. A new double-hung window will be installed at the third level facing Abercorn Street.

Connector:

1. The existing non-historic connector between the historic addition of the main house and the carriage house will be removed. There is internal evidence that an open porch had been located on the second floor of the historic addition. However, the petitioner will maintain the brick exterior wall in this area.
2. The new ground level entry and first level balcony are recessed five feet from the exterior face of the building. A new retail display window will be installed on the ground level.
3. The new addition will have a stucco exterior finish on the recessed component painted in "Antique White", by Sherwin Williams. New double-hung windows and French style doors will be added. Information on the doors and windows has been provided.

4. A new wood balcony with wood columns and railing will be installed on the Abercorn Street elevation at the second level. New wood stairs will be installed to provide access to the second level from the ground floor. A new wood balcony railing will be installed from a third level terrace above the new connector/infill. The columns align on the ground and second level.

Carriage House:

1. New carriage doors with glass panels in the top half will be installed on the lane elevation.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated he was concerned about the details of the new materials. For instance, the columns and railings on the implied porch on the Abercorn Street side. He said it looked from the elevation that they were trying to establish an order or historicist appearance to it. But in the details it was not clear as to which type of columns they were using. In regard to the railings they had a simple 2 X 4 with pickets which he felt was acceptable, but the 2 X 4's should have some more substantial or molded shape to it.

Mr. Woodall stated the columns were tapered round wood. He said they would be happy to have a more elaborate handrail or lower rail.

Mr. Deering stated there were some good examples at the corner of Habersham and Congress Streets.

Public Comments:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) commended the petitioner for the project. He said HSF also agreed with Mr. Deering about the design details. He said both the handrails on the rear elevation and there was also a design detail around the transom (front door and sidelights). He said HSF would like to encourage the petitioner to restore the original transom and sidelights. He said HSF would also like to offer their design consultant services to the petitioner.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the following conditions: (1) The petitioner shall refer to the round columns used on the new construction at the SW corner of Congress and Habersham (Harvey Jones, architect) and revise the Abercorn porch columns and railing; and (2) Revise the front transom and sidelights; bring revisions to staff for approval. **Dr. Caplan** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Ronald Erickson
HBR 05-3414-2
462 & 464 Montgomery Street
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Ronald Erickson.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Materials and Design Details for the new construction of two-semi-detached townhouses at 462 and 464 Montgomery Street and the approval of the demolition of a non-historic garage structure which was constructed in 1996 and is attached to an existing historic structure at 466 Montgomery Street.

FINDINGS

Demolition:

Section 8-3030: Demolition of Historic Structures:

- a. All requests for demolition of any building within the historic district shall come before the board of review.
- 1. The petitioner is proposing to demolition a non-historic side addition to the historic structure located at 466 Montgomery Street. The historic building will remain.
- 2. The addition was constructed in 1996 and is a two-story structure with corrugated metal siding. It contains a garage on the lower level and living space above.
- 3. The petitioner is requesting the demolition in order to have the space to construct the two semi-detached townhouses, as indicated on the site plan.
- 4. Staff recommends the approval of the non-historic side addition.

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

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

DISCUSSION

- 1. Setback: The proposed townhouses will have a 0' setback from Montgomery Street which is consistent with the adjacent historic structures. An encroachment permit is being sought from the City by the owner. Porch encroachments are consistent with the historic precedent for the area.

2. Height: The proposed two-story height is within what is allowed in this three-story height maximum area. Other two-story historic structures are located in the adjacent area. The exterior expression of the height of the first story is 11'4" and the second story is 10' which is consistent with the requirements of the ordinance.
3. Street Elevation Type/Proportion of Structure's Front Façade: The proposed townhouses will utilize a two-story vertical proportion with a street level entrance, slightly elevated from the ground level. The adjacent 457-467 Montgomery Street are two-stories structures with a slightly elevated street level entrance of approximately 3 to 4 risers.
4. Rhythm of Solids to Voids and Proportion of Openings: A three bay rhythm is proposed for each of the townhouses which is consistent with the adjacent historic buildings. The windows and doors are aligned vertically on the front and side elevations. The proportions of the front windows and doors are not less than a vertical to horizontal ration of 5:3, which is required in the ordinance.
5. Rhythm of Entrances and porches: The proposed townhouses will have front porches with wood porticos to serve as the main entrances. On the side facades of each townhouse, a 3' wide balcony is proposed. The balconies will have metal railings and metal brackets.
6. Roof Shape: The roof will be hidden behind a parapet wall. The parapet will also conceal the roof mounted HVAC equipment.
7. Walls of Continuity: The side and rear garden will be enclosed by a 9' brick fences with cast stone coping and wrought iron gates.

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Standards apply for Part II: Design Details:

Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards

- (6) Visual Compatibility Factors:
- (g) Relationship of materials, texture, and color.

1. Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards

- (8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following:
 - c. Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.

(9) Windows

- a. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.
- c. Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided however that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8", the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.
- d. "snap-in" or between the glass muntins shall not be used.
- e. The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.
- f. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3, provided however, nothing precludes an arched window being used.
- g. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.

- h. The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.
- k. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.
- (10) Roofs: Roofs shall comply with the following:
 - c. Parapets shall have a string course of not less than six inches in depth and extending at least four inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and one- and half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum of two-inch overhang.
- (11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches.
 - a. Wrought iron brackets shall not be used with wood balcony railings.
 - b. Residential balconies shall not extend more than three feet in depth from the face of the building and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.
 - c. Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street.
 - d. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate; provided, however, the historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the developer that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.
 - e. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base moldings.
 - f. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distance between balusters shall not exceed four inches.
 - g. Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood unless the proposed material matches other façade details on the same building, such as terra cotta or wrought iron.

DISCUSSION

1. Exterior Materials: The exterior will be brick, selected to match that found in the Historic District in respect to size, texture, and color. The queen size brick will be used in the walls, with dimensions of 7 5/8" x 2 3/4" x 2 3/4". The brick pattern will be running bond and joints will not exceed 3/8" in width and tooled, not raked. The petitioner provided a sample of the brick and mortar color to be used.
2. Windows and Doors: The windows and French doors are manufactured by Norco and are wood clad, six-over-six, double hung windows, double glazed with simulated divided lights. The windows and doors are clad in extruded aluminum coated with a thermoset polyester finish; an extruded aluminum brickmold with the same finish will be applied to the frames. The muntins are 7/8" wide with a profile that simulates traditional putty glazing. The lower sash is wider than the meeting and top rails. The centerline of windows and French doors are aligned vertically; all windows and doors are recessed a minimum of 3" from the façade of the building; all window and doors facing a street are rectangular and have a vertical to horizontal ratio not less than 5:3. The distance between the windows or doors is not more than two times the width of the window or door. The petitioner provided window information showing the muntin and brickmold profiles. The proposed window has been approved for new construction and is being used on the new semi-detached townhouses at 441 and 443 Montgomery Street in the

adjacent block on Montgomery Street. The front doors will be mahogany raised six panel with a semi-gloss clear varnish finish.

3. Roof: The proposed townhouses will have a flat roof, concealed by a parapet. HVAC equipment will be located on the roof and screened by the parapet. The parapet will have a metal and brick coping, 6" high and overhanging approximately 1". The parapet will have a string course, 6" wide and projecting approximately 1 3/8" from the face of the building, running the full width of the building, and located between 1' and 1 1/2' from the top of the parapet.
4. Balconies: Balconies will be located on the sides of the townhouses. The balconies will have wrought iron railings and iron support brackets. The balconies will not extend more than 3' in depth from the face of the building.
5. Porticos: The front entry porticos will be constructed of wood with wood columns with cap and base moldings. Balusters and decorative castings will be placed between the upper and lower rails and the distance between the balusters does not exceed 4". Design details were provided by the petitioner. Front stair treads and risers and the porch pavers will be constructed of brick to match the wall brick.
6. Lintels and sills will be made of precast stone. The petitioner provided a sample.
7. Garden Walls and Gates: The side and rear garden walls will be enclosed by a brick wall with brick coping. Wrought iron gates for vehicular and pedestrian access will be provided. The walls will be at most 8' tall. Similar scaled walls are located at the new construction on Montgomery Street.
8. Colors: The windows and all wood trim will be white. The wrought iron work will be black. Colors samples were provided by the petitioner.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of demolition of non-historic addition, Approval of Parts I and II for new construction.

HDBR Action: Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition Part I and II as submitted. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Leah Mischler
HBR 05-3415-2
511 East Gordon Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was David Kelly.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to replace existing windows with new windows to match existing and to add a rear second floor addition. Also to add a new window on the second floor side elevation and new windows on first floor rear enclosure.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Section 8-3030 (l) (9) Windows: Historic windows, frames, 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.

(l) (12) Additions: 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 an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.

Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including, but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, brackets. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building.

Additions, including multiple additions to structures, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.

Comments: No window condition survey was provided to justify wholesale removal of existing windows. The proposed Windsor “Legend” window does not meet the standards for historic replacement window. Wood, true divided light windows of the same dimension as the original must be used. All dimensions and profiles must match existing.

The proposed addition does not meet the standards in that it is not sufficiently subordinate in mass and height to the main structure to meet the standards. The applicant should explore “indenting” the addition slightly so that the end wall is not aligned with the end wall of the lower addition. Also, can a shed roof be used so that the addition is under the existing eave?

RECOMMENDATION

Discussion of proposal and continuation for revisions.

Additional Staff Comments:

Mrs. Reiter stated she handed out information on the condition of the windows. She said there were also some photographs showing the conditions of the existing windows that the petitioner was requesting to replace. She said there was also a new drawing based on the staff recommendation. The petitioner has withdrawn the request to use Windsor windows and instead wanted to use wood single glazed, true divided light double hung windows with profiles and sizes to match the existing. She said they also provided a condition survey and as mentioned the photographs showed the conditions of the windows. She also stated the drawing showed the height of the addition reduced to below the eave line. She said they also pulled have pulled it in so that it inset and read as a smaller addition and not part of the main house. She said the second floor rear addition was for a bathroom and based on the lowering of the roof line below the pitch of the main roof, the indentation of the addition from the side of the house and the use of wood, true divided light windows Staff would recommend approval of the revised addition.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended. Mrs. Brownfield seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
Gretchen Ogg
HBR 05-3417-2
102 East Liberty Street
Renovations**

Mr. Deering recused himself.

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. Addition of a penthouse to an existing non-conforming 12-story building in a five story height zone.
2. Existing aluminum windows to be cleaned and glazing compound replaced. Replace non-historic glazing with frame and glass to match the original. The applicant has found a source to match the original tinted Solex glass.
3. Replace existing entrances to replicate original entrances.
4. Add roof terrace at second story and roof.
5. Clean stucco.

FINDINGS

1. The Drayton Arms Apartments is listed on the City's Historic Buildings map and opened in 1951. It is probably Savannah's most conspicuous manifestation of modernism in the postwar era. Richard Longstreth, architectural historian and Director of the Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, George Washington University, Washington D. C. writes in a 1999 report for the Chatham-Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission:

The Drayton Arms rose as, and remains, a singular work, contrasting in form, scale, materials, and character from its environs. Unlike work of the same period on Broughton Street, it never became part of a larger group of similar buildings. This isolated physical context, makes the Drayton Arms more susceptible to criticism that it is incompatible with its surroundings. However, many other examples can be found locally and in historic districts nationwide where such singular examples from earlier periods are listed as contributing and receive protection. The fact remains that the Drayton Arms stands as a locally important manifestation of new tendencies in architecture during the mid twentieth century. Every effort should be made to retain the character-defining features of the window and spandrel bands and other details in any work undertaken in the future.

2. The following standards apply: Section 8-3030 (k) Preservation of historic structures within the historic district: An historic structure...shall be maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure...In considering proposals for the exterior alterations of historic structures in the historic district and in applying the development standards, the documented original design of the structure may be considered.

3. There is an existing penthouse on the roof containing storage, stairs, elevator equipment etc. It is proposed to expand this space by surrounding it with a glass curtain wall system set 17' from the front and rear roof parapet and 20' back from the side roof parapet. An elevated terrace and glass guard rail will also be constructed. At present only the existing chimney is visible from certain aspects of the public right-of-way. The new construction will be lower than the existing penthouse and given the height should not be visible from the public-right-of-way.
4. The existing limestone veneer on structural concrete block will be cleaned.
5. A new guard rail will be added at the second story roof terrace on the east and west elevations. This will be made of stainless steel pipe and cable. (See details provided)
6. Install new glass entrance doors per detail.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval.

Board Comments:

Mrs. Brownfield stated they did not address the existing awning. She asked if that was not part of their purview to do that?

Mr. Deering stated yes. He said they showed it gone which was what they intended.

Ms. Seiler asked if he could describe the windows?

Mr. Deering stated they will be cleaned. He said where there was cracked glass, discolored glass, replacement glass that occurred in the past that did not match the original green glass it will be replaced with a green tinted glass that will match the existing original glass. The glass will be reglazed with glazing compound because that was how it was held in the building and the other materials on the exterior of the building will be cleaned. He said there was also a little bit of steel underneath the limestone panels that was painted and it was in a bad color. He said they will repaint that with a correct color to match the limestone.

Ms. Seiler stated they have always had the draperies that blocked the green glazing, so it was hard to visualize what it looked like without the draperies.

Mr. Deering stated part of the condo declaration will be that all the window treatments that were visible from the public right-of-way are to be the same exact material. He further stated the penthouse addition and the glass railing was not visible from the immediate streets adjacent to the building.

Public Comments:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF would like to commend the owner for taking the project on. He said HSF would also like to commend the architect team for their sensitive rehabilitation of this building.

Mrs. Ida George (Neighbor) stated she was concerned about the limestone bands that were going to be cleaned. She asked if they would be regularly maintained so that they don't acquire mildew?

Mr. Deering stated the building has been owned by a group that has rented it for a economical place to live. He said it will not be the same type of building anymore. He said it was going from 180 apartments to a maximum of 80 apartments which will all be owned. He said he was sure that whomever lives there he felt would be interested in seeing the building maintained better than it has been in the past.

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

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

Present for the petition was Christopher Dean.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a two-story carriage house for 523 and 525 East Broughton Street on the existing vacant parking area.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Height:** As proposed, the carriage house will be two stories in height and 24' tall to the parapet. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first floor will be 9'1" and the second floor 8'1".
2. **Width:** The lane façade of the carriage house will have a width of 40'8". The carriage house will have a depth of 24'.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** As proposed, each of the two garage door openings will each be 16' wide. The second floor window openings are taller than they are wide.
4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades/Directional Expression of Front Facade:** The lane façade of the carriage house will have a two-bay rhythm, with the windows and garage doors aligned vertically. The relationship of the solids to voids gives the façade a horizontal directional appearance.
5. **Roof Shapes:** The carriage house will have a flat roof with a parapet. The parapet will shield a roof top terrace, accessed by a spiral stair located on a balcony over the courtyard. The interior balcony and spiral stair to the roof will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

6. **Setbacks:** The carriage house will have a zero line setback on East Broughton Lane and to the western and eastern property lines.

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.
- (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 muntins 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.
 - h. The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows.
 - k. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.
- (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 have sand finish stucco over lath. The stucco will be scored. As proposed, the parapet section will have "panel" appearance above the cornice. Staff would recommend deleting this feature and continuing the scored stucco to the parapet.
2. **Windows:** All windows will be double-hung, single-glazed, true-divided lite wood windows. Windows on the western half of the carriage house are proposed to be four-over-four, while the windows on the eastern half are proposed to be six-over-six. Staff would recommend keeping the pane configuration consistent. Operable, louvered wood

- shutters will be used on the western half only. Again, Staff would recommend using shutters consistently on the lane elevation
3. **Doors:** The garage door openings are proposed as 16' wide. The garage doors will be overhead doors. The 16' width is inconsistent with the ordinance which states garage door openings shall be a maximum of 12' wide. This width of the garage door should be reduced to the 12' width maximum. A pedestrian door with a standing seam metal roofed canopy supported by wood brackets will be located between the two garage doors. The wood door will have a four lite glass panel on the upper half.
 4. **Colors:** The stucco exterior will have a sand finish in "Navajo White." The shutters and wrought iron will be Charleston Green, and all window and door trim will be "Stowe White."

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with the following conditions:

1. Reduce the size of the garage door openings from 16' to 12' per the ordinance.
2. Continue the scored stucco pattern to the parapet.
3. Window pane configuration and use of shutters should be consistent on the lane elevation.

Board Comments:

Ms. Seiler stated this would be visible from Houston Street. She said she agreed with Staff about the width of the garage. She said this would be the third set of garage apartments to be constructed on that lane within a year. She said it was tight turning on to that lane and she felt it has become very congested.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the drawing showed a total height of the garage as being virtually even with the eave line of the building. The drawing the Board has on the lane elevation showed the parapet being several feet above the eave line. He asked if that has been modified?

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if they were okay with the spiral staircase?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes, it would not be visible from the lane and it would be on the courtyard side.

Mr. Dean stated the parapet was approximately 3 foot from the inside where the parapet started. The existing houses that were built in the 1970's were approximately 3 feet or 4 feet off of the ground. He said that was the reason why the eave height matched as far as the parapet.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what was the dimension to the eave line on the building?

Mr. Dean stated it was 8 inches above grade. He said it went up 1 foot before it goes to the top of the slab where the existing slab was for the house. He said it went up 9 feet and it had 12 inches of existing floor joists. He said it then went up 8 feet with 2 X 8's. He said the existing height from grade would be approximately 23 feet.

Mrs. Brownfield asked if they were going to take into consideration the recommendation proposed by Staff?

Mr. Dean stated yes. He said the reason for the 16 foot garage doors was because the owner had problems getting in/out of his garage. He said they could design the doors to make them look like double doors so that it would give the appearance.

Mr. Deering asked if there was another solution for the spiral staircase?

Mr. Dean stated the only time the staircase would be seen was if you were at the corner of Houston and East Broughton Streets across the street in the newly renovated structure.

Mr. Steffen asked what was the purpose of the spiral staircase?

Mr. Dean stated to get up to the roof access.

Ms. Seiler asked what would be on top of the parapet besides the HVAC?

Mr. Dean stated nothing.

Dr. Caplan stated the guidelines were very specific. He said felt that he would not get the 16 foot garage doors.

Mr. Dean stated it would be either the 16 foot approval as far as making the doors appear like they were two separate doors or going down to a 12 foot door. He said the lot did not have the width to accommodate two 8 foot or 9 foot doors.

Dr. Caplan asked if he was amenable to changing it to 12 foot doors?

Mr. Dean stated yes.

Public Comments:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF felt the guidelines should be honored in regard to 12 foot doors. He said HSF was also concerned about the spiral staircase.

Mr. Tim Steinouser (523 East Broughton Street) stated in regard to the roof garden there were no plans for any extensions on the roof or penthouses. He said he lives across from the Acura dealership service department. He said they would like to be able to go up onto the roof top and watch the fireworks and enjoy the lights. He said in regard to the garage doors, the lots were very narrow and he did not want his cars parked on Houston Street where he has had issues before.

Discussion:

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she did not see any problem with the spiral staircase. She said she was concerned about the 16 foot doors and felt that they should not be allowed and they come before the Board all the time.

Mr. Deering stated he was concerned about the spiral staircase, but not a problem with the 16 foot doors.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated on Page 23 of the Guidelines it says – “structures which attach themselves to the primary mass of a building such as porticos, stoops, exterior stairs to parlor

level entrances, porches, bays, etc. are an integral part of the richness of Savannah's residential and civic buildings. They provide depth, shadow, and human activity on the street.

Mr. Deering stated the problem with that was it says "parlor level." He said he felt the spiral staircase was not visually compatible with any historic structures that surround the site.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the following conditions: (1) Reduce the garage openings to 12 feet in width, (2) Eliminate the parapet panels and carry scoring to top, (3) On the rear elevation use consistent windows and shutters, and (4) Conceal the spiral stair and bring design to staff for approval. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Tobias Properties, LLC
George Cohen
HBR 05-3419-2
532 – 534 East Gaston Street
Renovations**

Present for the petition was George Cohen.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations to a non-historic duplex as follows:

1. Alter existing double front facing gable roof to appear as a hip from the front.
2. Add flat skylights on roof deck and sides (will not be readily visible from public right-of-way due to position and solid masonry fire wall)
3. Remove bay windows.
4. Replace masonite siding with smooth face Hardi-board.
5. Replace existing porch with a copper standing seam metal roofed hip porch; columns to match adjacent row houses.
6. Add wood operable, louvered shutters.
7. Replace rear fence with 5' wood vertical board fence.
8. Infill existing rear two story recessed porches and add new two-story six foot deep porch with trellis roof.
9. All doors and windows on rear to be reconfigured. Two over two windows to match the existing front windows. Add wood or clad wood glass doors on rear and porches.
10. Colors: Main body Valspar "Lyndhurst Estate Cream" 3004-8c.
Window trim, porch trim, cornice Valspar "La Fonda Territory Green 5004-2c; Accent color: Valspar "Molera Vaquero Red" 2001-7a; Shutters "Charleston Green"

FINDINGS

The existing duplex was built in 1985 and is 20 years old and therefore not historic. The proposed changes will bring the front elevation into a more compatible relationship with the adjacent properties.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval as submitted.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering asked the petitioner if he could provide to Staff sections through the railings, describe the porch columns, sections for the cornice of the porch, trellis details, etc.?

Mr. Cohen stated yes.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dave Raymond (536 East Gaston Street) stated he felt the project would be an asset to the block.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the petitioner submit a section of the front and rear porches indicating the profile of the railings and trellis. **Mr. Steffen** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik Puljung
HBR 05-3423-2
9 & 11 East Macon Street
New Construction**

Present for the petition was Erik Puljung.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval for two four-story townhouses at 9 and 11 Macon Street.

FINDINGS

In November, 2000 the Review Board approved Part I height and mass for a six unit development to be built in three phases. A Part II design approval was granted on January, 2001 for 5 and 7 East Macon Street. Phase I is now complete. The proposed Part I does vary from the previously approved Phase II.

See attached table for discussion of standards.

RECOMMENDATION

Additional discussion and clarification of issues raised in table.

Standard	Proposed Development	Comment
Dimensioned site plan showing parking, fences, roof or ground mounted equipment.	Parking is in garages facing Charlton Street recessed 16” from the face of the building. Openings are 9’-4” each.	Meets standard for width of garage openings.
Elevations showing height and width relationships to existing		Provided

adjacent buildings and sections of projecting details.		
Section through the building and mass model.		Provided
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setback except where there is a historic setback along a particular block front.	A 2' setback has been provided on the Macon Street side. The elevation aligns with the adjoining Phase units.	
Dwelling unit type and street elevation type	A high stoop townhouse type is proposed	High stoop townhouses are found in this block.
Height: The exterior expression of the height of raised basements shall be not less than 6'-6" and not higher than 9'-6". Second story – not less than 11' and each story above the second not less than 10'.	The stoop is proposed at approximately 9'. The exterior expression of the second story is greater than 11' and the 3 rd and 4 th stories are greater than 10'. The overall height is 48'-1 1/2 ".	Drawing A1.5 indicates a height of 46'-9 1/2" – which is correct? In the original Part I approval the tallest buildings were proposed for the Drayton Street end of the block. What is planned for this end lot now? The proposed buildings appear to be the tallest buildings in the ward. Will two additional units of the same type be built to make a row? (See also comments on orientation of the stoops)
Proportion of front façade:		
Proportion of openings:	The window openings are rectangular and align vertically with the doors.	The proportion of the openings appear to meet the standards.
Rhythm of solids to voids Bay windows are not permitted on structures over three stories in height.	A three bay rhythm is proposed. An oriel window is proposed for the second and third story.	While there are two four-story buildings in Brown Ward (one ward north) that have oriel or bay windows, this is not a typical feature of a Historic District façade. The ordinance prohibits this feature on four story buildings. Also it is not clear how the stairs relate to the projection of the window.
Rhythm of structures on the street.	This phase continues the established pattern of attached townhouses approximately 22.5 feet wide.	In the Phase I staff report it was pointed out that in this ward paired attached townhouses generally varied the direction of the stoops while row houses that were alike ran all the stoops in the same direction. This was not considered in the Phase I decision, but the proposed Phase II project continues the anomaly of having a pair of townhouses with the stoops oriented in the same direction.

Board Comments:

Ms. Seiler asked why did they not want any courtyard?

Mr. Puljung stated there was a limited amount of space being on a Trust Lot so they tried to develop outdoor space from upper levels as opposed to trying to limit the footprint of the building. He further stated in regard to the issues raised by Staff the intention was to build the next two townhouses as 4-story townhouses. He said they would continue with a four story mass as they continued toward Drayton Street. He said they also saw what Staff was talking about with the staircases. He said there was a desire on the developers end of this and he felt architecturally they could make this work with the stairs going the same direction, so that the row would begin to develop as its own row.

Mr. Deering stated he felt they should reconsider that because the first two houses that Mr. Shaver built were built like a double townhouse. He said Mr. Muntis was headed in a direction that made it not look like a row. He said with this submittal it looked like three different developed pairs of townhouses. He asked why did they not accept that and move on rather than trying to force the stoops to all face the same direction. He said it was not doing anything other than making it look peculiar.

Mrs. Brownfield asked what about the bay in the front and Staff's concern about that?

Mr. Puljung stated they have looked at the ward and outside of the ward. He said included some images of other bay windows or oriel windows in the area. He said it seemed to be a ward of large groupings and pairings of windows. He said he felt that would continue that rhythm within the ward.

Mr. Deering stated oriel windows were not by ordinance allowed. He said if the Board found it visually compatible then he could take it to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Ms. Seiler stated it almost made you wonder if something went wrong in the design of the first two.

Mr. Puljung stated the first two were designed to help to tie the whole row together with the initial two built by Mr. Shaver.

Ms. Brownfield stated she was concerned about the rhythm and that bay windows were not permitted generally on four story buildings.

Mr. Deering stated he felt you have to look behind the intent of the ordinance. He said when this was written it was designed and intended so that you would not end up with a bunch of developer driven bay windows on buildings that were tall. He said he was concerned about the houses not addressing each other or departing from each other. He said he felt one should be mirrored. He asked if the petitioner would consider a continuance?

Mr. Puljung stated he would like to be able to move forward with some design detail.

HDBR Action: **Mrs. Fortson-Waring** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I – Height/Mass. **Mrs. Brownfield** seconded the

motion. The motion Failed 2 – 6. Opposed to the motion were Dr. Caplan, Mr. Deering, Dr. Johnson, Mr. Meyerhoff, Ms. Seiler, and Mr. Steffen.

HDBR Action: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I – Height/Mass with the exception of the protrusion of the bay windows, and stoop and stairs. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was passed 7 - 1. Opposed to the motion was Mrs. Fortson-Waring.

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay
Patrick Shay
HBR 04-3318-2
S.E. Corner of Bay & Jefferson Streets
Sign
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL.

2. Petition of Dana Braun
HBR 05-3405(S)-2 / Ref. # HBR 02-2918-2
120 East St. Julian Street
Door Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL.

3. Petition of John Neely
HBR 05-3406(S)-2
106 West Jones Street
Door Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL.

4. Petition of T.C. Pipkin
HBR 05-3407(S)-2
103 West Congress Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL.

5. Petition of Brian Sherman
HBR 05-3408(S)-2
304 East Hall Street
Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL.

6. Petition of R K Construction
HBR 05-3409(S)-2
312 Broughton Street
Door/Window Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL.

7. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 05-3410(S)-2
204 East Bay Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL.

8. Petition of Ciphers Design
Gary Sanders
HBR 05-3411(S)-2
208 East Jones Street
Siding Replacement
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL.

9. Petition of Eldon & Sharon Kennedy
HBR 05-3424(S)-2
225 East Gordon Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL.

RE: Other Business

Mrs. Fortson-Waring asked Staff if they have received any suggestions as far as possible topics to be discussed at the Retreat?

Mrs. Reiter stated no.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she would like to have some discussion on legal aspects particularly as pertained to comments from the Board on matters that were not within their purview that might cause them to be reversed.

Mr. Mitchell asked if she could do a discussion on that at the Retreat?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring agreed.

Mr. Deering stated he would like to see discussion on how the Board could appear to the public more organized, cohesive in their thoughts and decisions, so that they are not looking like they do not know what each other was talking about.

Ms. Seiler stated not to take anything from Mrs. Fortson-Waring, but she felt it would help to get an attorney that may have come before the Board.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she would not want some one who has come before the Board because they some time tend to be biased. She said may be some one like J. Blackburn.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated sometimes the Board made suggestions that are not within their purview, but they make them such as there was another case with a spiral staircase. He said he mentioned to the applicant that they could not have that, but according to the building code as a secondary exit. He said he felt that was helpful even though it was not within their purview.

Mr. Deering stated he felt it took up too much time. He said what happens is that you have the applicant bringing up things that were not within the Board's purview as well as members of the Board. He said by the time you add all that up the Board has spent a significant amount of time discussing things that were not within their purview.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board was an appointed Board, therefore they were acting on behalf of the City of Savannah. He said as the Board acting on the City of Savannah, he felt they had a bit of public duty as stewards to the public. For example, there were a number of people who left today's meeting angry. He said if the Board had had the freedom to explain to them quickly that the petition was continued because the petitioner has a right to a continuance. He said maybe they would have been a little less angry. He said he did not want the Board to rush so much that they fail to take an opportunity to explain to someone how this works. He said he was concerned about people's perception which was reality even if it was wrong.

Mr. Mitchell stated he agreed. He said he was not so much of a strict constructionist of what they were supposed to do that they did not have a little flex in order to say something a little above what they should say to make everybody understand a little better. He said he felt it helps to cut down on the misperceptions about what the Board was about.

Ms. Seiler asked in regard to the Retreat about having a couple of the architects that have come before the Board as a panel.

Mr. Mitchell stated he thought about it as well as past chairs coming to their Retreat.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she would not want to hear from any of the architects who have not been to any of the preservation commission meetings. She said she felt the key was as a commission there were certain things, which was why she made sure that she attended the annual commission trainings.

Dr. Caplan stated in 2003 a delegation of architects met with Mayor, City Council, and all and presented the Board with a lot of recommendations which the Board voted on. He said they were very receptive to their recommendation. He said the Board does listen to the architects and developers.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated compared to Board's in the past, he felt this Board was extremely lenient. He said he felt as a result of that there have been buildings approved that were not compatible with the Historic District.

Dr. Caplan stated he felt maybe something else that could be added to the Retreat's agenda was police function (inspection), things were approved and the Board did not know because there was not enough Staff in place to go back and see. He said they did not have the Staff to know if people were doing things without approval. He said they depended upon friends, neighbors, and as much as the Board could do themselves, which was wrong.

Mr. Steffen stated he would really like to see the Board come out with a definition of where they were with height/mass. He said as it was explained to him today it meant height, mass, and configuration. He said he felt they were confused amongst themselves and the public may have been even more confused. He said he would like for Mr. McDonald to give the Board a copy or synopsis of that study from the University of Georgia which tried to define what height and mass was and was not.

Dr. Caplan stated for every criticism he has heard ten favorable comments. He said someone used the term that they were a lenient Board. The way he looked on it was that the Board gets something submitted to them and it was their job to help them do that within the guidelines. He said he felt the Board has done a remarkable job in helping people.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt that was because the committees in the last 3 to 4 years have revised, interpreted the guidelines and now Staff puts in how a particular petition satisfies or violates the guidelines. She said the process has evolved significantly. She said she the Board's job was easier than it was when she first started on the Board 5 years ago.

Mr. Mitchell stated he agreed.

RE: Work Performed Without Certificate of Appropriateness

RE: Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – May 11, 2005
2. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – June 8, 2005

Mrs. Brownfield stated there was a correction of the June 8, 2005 minutes. On page 25 it needed to be corrected to say **Shannon Scott** instead of Sharon Scott.

Mr. Deering stated there was a correction of the June 8, 2005 minutes. On page 22 under Board Comments where it said that Mr. Deering said ...that there was not original should say **were original**.

HDBR Action: **Mrs. Fortson-Waring** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of May 11, 2005 and June 8, 2005 as corrected. **Mr. Deering** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca