

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

JUNE 8, 2005

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Dr. Gerald Caplan (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Mitchell called the June 8, 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: Petition of Douglas Yuill  
HBR 05-3391-2  
541 East Gordon Street  
Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Hansen Architects  
Patrick Phelps  
HBR 05-3397-2  
711 East Broad Street  
Renovation

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
Jan DeVoest  
HBR 05-3399-2  
143 Abercorn Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of R.K. Construction, For  
Pirate House  
HBR 05-3400-2  
20 East Broad Street  
Alteration/Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Sign Mart  
Bill Norton  
HBR 05-3401-2  
402 West Broughton Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** requested that the Petition of Hansen Architects, Patrick Phelps, HBR 05-3397-2 be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed. Mr. Deering abstained from the Petition of Poticny Deering Felder, Jan DeVoest, HBR 05-3399-2.**

**Mr. Mitchell** stated before the Board began today's session of the June 2005 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review – "I, as Chairman, feel compelled to make a limited response to a recent event that has received front page press. It has received front page press, but it has cast an unfair negative perception on this Board. When this Board reviews applications for Certificate of Appropriateness we take into account the design standards that are set forth in Section 8-3029 1, 1 – 15, under Visual Compatibility factors that are set forth in Section 8-3029 (K)(6) of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance. In the event that last week's newspaper article has affected your perception of this Board, let me say to you emphatically this Board does not have people arrested for failing to abide by our findings. If your petition is denied, you have the right under law to appeal our decision to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The appeal, however, must be based on the basis of due process and procedure and not on the basis of the compatibility criteria. If you are considering the purchase of a property within the boundaries of the Historic District, alterations to a building are controlled by a local ordinance. Don't listen to anyone who suggests to you that it would be easier or cheaper to ask for this Board's forgiveness than it would be to ask for the Board's permission. It seems there are people out there who refuse to get the permit and Certificate of Appropriateness before doing the work. Then after the work is done they, in effect, ask this Board's forgiveness to let the work stand. It would be fool hearted to try it. Let me caution those who wish to underestimate our resolve. With this Board, your risk of trying this far outweighs your reward that you think you

might get by doing it. And lastly, if we approve your petition and issue you a Certificate of Appropriateness, please do the work that was approved by this Board. Doing anything otherwise, may very likely result in a stop work order. Trying to blow smoke pass this Board during our watch is an exercise in futility. Thank you all very much.”

**RE: Regular Agenda**

**RE: Amended Petition of Hansen Architects  
Erik Puljung  
HBR 04-3279-2 / 05-3395-2  
109 West Liberty Street  
Alterations & New Construction**

Present for the petition was Erik Puljung.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to modify the previously approved, new rear stairs, the iron work on the front balcony, and approval of Part I: Height and Mass to construct a new three auto bay, carriage house at 109 West Liberty Street.

**FINDINGS**

**Front balcony:**

1. The petitioner provided a historic photograph showing the iron work on the front balcony on the second level of the front elevation.
2. The petitioner would like to install a new iron railing and pickets to match the original height and style shown in the photograph.
3. This iron work will match the existing iron railing on the front steps.
4. The petitioner will provide a cut sheet of the new iron picket once it is received, for a Staff level review.

**Rear stair:**

1. The Review Board’s prior approval included a new rear porch stair that would exit toward the lane.
2. The petitioner would like to modify the rear porch stair design to exit to the side.

**Carriage House:**

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

**K(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.

1. **Height:** As proposed, the carriage house will be two stories in height and 26'3 5/8" tall to the roof's parapet. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first and second floors will each be 9'.
2. **Width/Depth:** The lane façade of the carriage house will have a width of 30', with a depth of 22'.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The three garage doors will each be 8'6" wide. On the second level a window will be centered over each garage door.
4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades/Directional Expression of Front Facade:** The lane façade of the carriage house will have a three-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 side gable roof.
6. **Setbacks:** The carriage house will have a zero line setback on West Liberty Lane and to the western property line.
7. In the Part II: Design Details and Materials, the petitioner will request approval of the new masonry wall and fence shown on the elevations and site plans between the residence and the parking lot to the west.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of front balcony iron work, pending receipt of cut sheet, approval of rear stair modification, and approval Part I: Height and Mass for new carriage house.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Neely** asked what was the site coverage ratio?

**Mr. Webb** stated 75 percent and Tom Todaro ruled they were okay.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt he has done a great job with the project and he liked it a lot with one exception. He said on the roof of the carriage house there was a cut away for the condensing unit and if he could put that somewhere else. He said he felt it hurt the roofline of the carriage house.

**Mr. Puljung** stated yes.

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the alterations as submitted and continue the carriage house for Part II design details with the condition that the HVAC equipment location be restudied. Mrs. Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
HBR 05-3327-2  
N.W. Corner of Barnard & Bryan Streets  
New Construction**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from the petition.

Patrick Shay was present for the petition.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting part II Design Detail approval for a six story hotel at the NW corner of Bryan and Barnard Streets. Part I Height and Mass was approved on February 9, 2005.

### **FINDINGS**

See attached.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Reconsideration elements of the design per staff comments, including number and placement of materials and simplification of color scheme.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Shay** stated in regard to the depth of the reveal from the face of the building, the depth of recess was the face of the frame (4 or 5 inches) which would be from the brick veneer. He said the window system they have chosen was the same window system that they presented as part of the petition for the Lindsey & Morgan building. He said there were some industrial sash windows in the back that there was a desire to preserve so they became familiar with this window system at that time. He said they had sturdy muntins and true divided lights. He said the aluminum storefront doors also had windows in the form of transoms and sidelights. He said they were about 4½ inches from the face of the brick veneer to the face of the glass.

He further stated in regard to the use of stucco as a material for the pediments, he disagreed with Staff's opinion. He said he did a quick survey of buildings in the immediate vicinity of the project and the majority of them were not wood. The most common use for pediments was stone or stucco. He said also a practical matter was putting wood up on top of a building at 75 feet in the air and asking the owner to repaint it at least every other year. He also stated that the entire remainder of the exterior of the building was noncombustible. He said he was not sure if it would be wise to put a combustible material on it. So, they would like to retain the stucco that they proposed in those pediments. He said all the glass would be clear and they would probably use some combination of "e"glass and laminated glass in order to meet energy requirements. He said in regard to the variety of material, they have only proposed three materials other than glass for the exterior of the building. He said it still consisted of brick which they would like to see in a terra cotta color, stucco, and cast stone. He said they would also have the contractor price other materials like limestone for the cast stone if it was comparable. Also, in the course of doing the rendering, it became obvious to him that the color of the cast stone and stucco needed to be a little greyer. He would like for it to be more like limestone grey. He said even if a material was comparable in cost, they still had to weigh the difference of

the cost of the installation methodology as well. He also stated on a large building façade having a variety of materials was not necessarily a bad thing. He said this building had the first two stories in a stucco material that was scored to look like stone. On the upper floors, it had brick panels that were strong vertical that went all the way up with precast material and the spandrels below the windows. When you get to the top it had a terra cotta glaze and multi-colored poly foam material that made for a beautiful façade.

**Mr. Shay** also stated regarding Staff's recommendation that a lot of the detail work in the lighter colored material be removed from the building. He said he did a quick sketch of how that would look. He said when you look at trying to decide how one façade related to the other it was unfair to look at that picture and then look at a picture head-on of the Bryan Street façade. The only way you could see both of them was from that perspective. He said his problem was when they go in this direction it tended to highlight the ironwork and blends out the amount of detail that was on the rest of the building. In addition to this being a hotel it was also going to be a memorial of sorts to the memory of Casimir Pulaski. He said from the beginning they wanted when they presented their height/mass to have some spectacular suites on the top floor. He said in perspective there is a strong emphasis on the center, which makes it clear when you were approaching the building.

**Mr. Deering** stated he agreed with the petitioner on some of his points and respectfully disagreed with the Staff. He said he has seen a lot of brick masonry buildings with stucco pediments and he felt it was appropriate. He said he did not mind how the cast stone brick related to the pediment and tied it to the ground (base of the structure). However, he was not sure about the cast stone brick on the flanking. He said he felt the building could be just as strong without it. He said he felt the red brick portion would read as a strong block supporting the thinner cast stone elements in the center.

**Mr. Neely** asked if he could comment on the railing.

**Mr. Shay** stated it was deliberately done to show a clear difference between the premier suites at the top. Also, the iron railing read as being basically transparent on a building.

**Mr. Steffen** complemented the petitioner on the use of red and white.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated she also liked the colors.

**HDBR Action:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended to reflect a limestone grey color for the cast stone and stucco. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it was passed 7 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Deering. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

**RE: Continued Petition of West Broad Development  
Walter Evans  
HBR 05-3359-2  
502 – 508 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.;  
419 W. Gaston Street  
New Construction – Part II Design**

Present for the petition was Walter Evans and Horoun Homayun.

The applicant is requesting a Part II Design approval for two new mixed use buildings on the MLK, Jr. corridor. Part I Height and Mass was approved April 13, 2005.

**FINDINGS**

The following Design Standards apply:

<b>Design Standard</b>	<b>Proposed Development</b>	<b>Comment</b>
The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront.	This is a mixed use building, but the first story has been designed as a storefront.	This standard has been met.
The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course. Such architectural feature may be placed at the top of the second story when the first and second stories have the visual appearance of a separate exterior expression.	On the MLK side the first and second stories have a separate exterior expression from the upper stories through the window groupings. The first story is separated from the upper stories on the MLK and Gaston Street elevations by the strong expression of the metal awning.	The intent of this standard has been met.
The height of the first story shall not be less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single story above the first story.	In this case the first and second stories on the MLK elevation read as a separate exterior expression.	The intent of this standard has been met.
The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story.		
Retail storefront area glazing shall be not less than 55 percent. Such glazing shall be transparent. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18-24” base of contrasting material.	The amount of glass exceeds 55 percent and is clear. It extends from a brick soldier course base.	This standard has been met.
Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system; bronze, glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront.	A wood storefront system is proposed with a brick base.	This standard has been met.
The Centerline of windows and doors shall align vertically.	Windows and doors are aligned vertically.	This standard has been met.
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.	On the MLK side wood casement windows by Andersen and stained wood doors with sidelights by Andersen are proposed. Catalog cuts have been provided. On the Gaston Street elevation a curtain	The intent of this standard has been met.

	wall system is proposed with casement windows. Circular accent windows are proposed in the stairwell.	
Parapets shall have a string course of not less than six inches and extending at least four inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and 1 ½ feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two-inch overhang.	The roof is flat with a metal coping. A metal canopy and soffit is a modern expression of a stringcourse. The tops of the projecting bays are flared.	The intent of this standard is met with a modern interpretation.
Balconies, Porticoes, stairs	A corner entry is proposed with entries also on MLK and Gaston. These are treated with wood and glass doors and sidelights and a metal awning. The stair tower becomes a corner focal point. Balconies project on the MLK elevation at the third level and above with metal railings and posts.	The use of balconies, porticoes and stairs is in a modern, yet compatible form.
Materials, textures, colors	A brown-red face brick and matching mortar has been chosen. The texture of the projecting bays is accented with a projecting brick pattern.  Gray metal will be used for the canopies, soffits and expanded metal panels.  All exterior wood windows and frames will be white.	The material and color scheme is compatible.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

**Board Comments:**

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the metal panels that were being used on the balconies were a treated material?

**Mr. Hodayun** stated they were a galvanize material and would not rust.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt the petitioner had done a good job incorporating many of the different forms and masses and materials that you find along M.L.K.



**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he concurred, however he was concerned with the slanted columns on the balcony and the round windows which were reminiscent of early Art Deco. He said he felt that it was not compatible with the rest of the building and Savannah.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt it had a modern feeling to it. He said he also felt a lot of the buildings have elements from that same period.

**Mr. Homayun** stated he studied the corner very closely. He said he was looking for something that would separate the corner and give it a spiral effect.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated a corner has a curve anyway, therefore he felt the spiral effect was evident without the column.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he felt the balcony read expanded metal. He asked if that was what the material was? He said he felt it was “cagy.”

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated her concern was because you have two historic structures next to it and it already dwarfed the other two buildings. She said she felt it was little difficult to see on a drawing the new construction. She said she believed that new construction should be a little edgy and she did not have a problem with new construction being a little different.

**Ms. Seiler** stated the corner was very important and she liked what the petitioner did with it. She said you will be coming off the ramp from the highway and in two different directions on M.L.K., so that corner was important from a visual standpoint. She said she liked what they did. She said the only thing that concerned her was the expanded metal rail.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF was concerned that there seemed to be a disconnect between elements and the upper window pattern which lead to an aesthetic hole that did not relate to any of the historic structures along M.L.K. He said since a similar problem often occurs with the larger projects proposed in the Landmark District, HSF hoped the petitioner might consider simplification of the upper window pattern to fewer different window shapes and/or sizes, possibly using horizontal elements to visually divide the façade as per the tall building compositional principles on page 17 of the guidelines.

**Mr. Patrick Shay** stated he would like to encourage the Board to approve the project. He said he felt as they looked at the overall Historic District, the history of the Board, and the standards that there were some sites that were perhaps too close in to the core of the Historic District to allow much experimentation. He said he felt he presented the Board an example of that today. However, he felt here was an area in the process of redevelopment. He said he felt having a beautiful original design on this corner would very much enliven the possibility for the future.

#### **Discussion:**

**Ms. Brownfield** stated she felt the expanded painted metal panel would be lighter although it appeared darker.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Deering** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the condition that an alternate material for the expanded metal railing be submitted to the Board for approval. **Ms. Seiler** seconded the

motion and it was passed 7 – 2. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Steffen and Mrs. Fortson-Waring.

RE: Continued Petition of Dirk Hardison  
HBR 05-3378-2  
120 West Harris Street  
New Construction – Part II

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a two-story, carriage house, with three auto bays. This request was continued at the May 11, 2005 Review Board Meeting.

### **FINDINGS**

1. The petitioner has reduced the depth of the proposed carriage house from 30' to 24'. The width along the lane has remained at 41'5" and the height has been decreased from 22'8" to 21'8".
2. An iron gate, painted black-green, has been added to the exterior lane pedestrian second level door. This door has been recessed and widened to accommodate utility meters.
3. While the petitioner has reduced the depth by 6', Staff maintains that the overall scale and mass of the proposed carriage house is still overpowering to the main house in this setting. No other carriage houses of this size currently exist on this block of West Harris Street.
4. Carriage houses should always be auxiliary structures to the main house per the Design Guidelines which states: "Carriage houses were traditionally accessory to a main house in mass and scale. They were secondary to the main structure." The scale, including the width, should be reduced so as not to visually compete with the main house.
5. Staff would recommend reducing the width of the carriage house by one bay. The scale of the proposed carriage house is not visually compatible to the adjacent historic structures.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends reduction of the carriage house by one full bay in order to meet the Guidelines and meet the historic scale of the neighborhood.

The original lot on which 120 West Harris Street stands was 20' wide. A non-historic metal and wood garage, less than 20' wide, stood on this lot in 1954. After 1954, approximately 20' of the adjacent lot to the west was acquired and added to the original lot for a garden. Based on the historic development, a 41' wide carriage house is not visually compatible. The carriage houses referred to in the Petitioner's justification were located on 30' wide lots behind 30' wide townhouses and do not relate to the 20' wide lot size.

### **Board Comments:**

Mr. Deering stated he respectfully disagree with Staff. He said they renovated a house on Jones Street about a block from this that was 27 feet wide and the carriage house was 60 feet

long. He said he did not feel it was unusual when you have a house and a side garden to look back and see the carriage house. He said you still knew that it was a secondary structure by its design, height and all those elements. He said when the lanes were really built with all the carriage houses they were continuous lines of little two story buildings and he felt this reestablished that.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted because it was visually compatible. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

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

Present for the petition was Jacqueline Somesso.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner has made a new petition for consideration of approval of the existing deck at 641 Indian Street.

**FINDINGS**

The deck was built without a building permit or Certificate of Compatibility.

The deck design was considered and denied by the Board of Review on March 9, 2005. The project was posted and the petitioner was notified of the meeting, however, the petitioner was not present at the meeting. The petitioner is asking to be heard by the Board.

A certified letter was sent to the petitioner requesting the deck to be removed and a new paint color submitted. The postal service was unable to deliver the letter and it was returned and given to the Department of Inspections.

The petitioner refers to parking in the current application. Parking is not within the purview of the Board of Review. Parking issues should be taken up with the Department of Inspections.

**RECOMMENDATION**

No recommendation.

**Petitioner's Comments:**

**Ms. Somesso** apologized to the Board for any misconceptions that she in any way tried to pull the wool over the eyes of any Board members. She said it was her mistake of not having been well read on the City Ordinance and taking the advice of others. She said she was also told by another City Official that they were not in the Historic District and that anything west of M.L.K. was not in the Historic District being that the area they were in was so industrialized. She said she did not come to ask the Board's forgiveness because she felt that she was also victimized like some of the Board members may also feel. She said her words or comments as far as the news article with WSAV, she had a 45 minute interview with them and they took 2 seconds of

that interview and put it on television. She said as far as the newspaper and phone calls to her she never received any phone calls. She said she has been in contact back and forth with Beth Reiter about the situation, so she indeed was trying to correct the situation. She said in regard to the first Board meeting she missed that meeting because Tom Todaro, City Inspections, told her that she did not need to be here. She said he told her that he would notify her after the meeting was held and let her know the decision. She said she concluded from that that it was not open to her. But she was here today and she wanted the Board to know how she chose her color and the deck for the building.

She further stated that she felt she needed a deck because the building was a loading dock and the way it was made it was unsafe and there was an unattractive stump in the front of the building.

**Ms. Martin** stated they were willing to follow any guidelines that were set for the City. She said they also did not have a problem with changing the color.

#### **Board Comments:**

**Ms. Brownfield** asked if she understood that they built the deck without a building permit?

**Ms. Somesso** stated yes, because she was told by the City Official that they were not in the Historic District. She said the only thing they were advise on the deck was to make sure that they were insured.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that the Savannah Development and Renewal Authority had a booklet for businesses that could help any business person regarding what permits were necessary. She said Staff made a recommendation about breaking up the bottom, but did not make a comment as to whether or not the structure as it was with the addition of the brick would still be visually compatible. She said what she would like to see (and maybe they could get an architectural drawing), with the brick, if it would be visually compatible and meet the ordinance or not.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt if they continued the brick so it did look more like some of the other structures in the neighborhood, and painted the railing a black-green color or black color and change the color of the building, he felt that would suit the neighborhood much better than it presently did.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated they could also get with Staff to select an appropriate color.

**Ms. Martin** stated they had a color that they would submit to Staff.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he felt that a reasonable approach to it would be to make sure the structural integrity was there for the deck because it would house a lot of people and they did not want it to fall. He said so whatever they could do to make sure the structural integrity was correct and then deal with the aesthetics of making it compatible with everything else then perhaps they would not have to go through the drastic step of tearing it down and starting over. He said sometimes there were people who would give new owners the wrong advice. He said his comments were directed at any one else who maybe planning on building in an area like this to not listen to those other people because this was the place to come.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he also was quoted and Mr. Bell quoted him exactly accurately. But he mentioned that there had been realtors in this town that have made that same statement about asking forgiveness. He said he wanted to make sure that it was not to be seen as painting all realtors with that. In fact, most of the realtors who work here in the Historic District were very aware of the guidelines and were very helpful to people.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she had a different interpretation of the guidelines on page 23 that she interpreted as that you could not have a deck off the front of a building.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated this was a nonhistoric industrial building in an industrial area.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt that section applied to residential structures.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated she felt before the Board made a decision that the Board needed a drawing so they could see what the brick work would look like extended and a sample of the brick, and the final color if the petitioner did not mind continuing their petition until next month.

**Ms. Somesso** agreed to a continuance.

**Dr. Johnson** stated his concern was the soundness of the structure. The Board could not see that from a photograph.

**Mr. Mitchell** suggested that they get a professional architect or someone and then they will be on the right track.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that was why she suggested the booklet from the Savannah Development and Renewal Authority because it would be very helpful.

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

**RE: Petition of Savannah Day Spa  
Celeste Hobson  
HBR 05-3392-2  
18 East Oglethorpe Avenue  
Sign**

No one was present for the petition.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to install a free standing painted metal, double faced, principal use sign in the public tree lawn in front of 18 East Oglethorpe Avenue.

**FINDINGS**

Standards Historic District Sign Ordinance		
Sign Clearance and Height: Minimum clearance shall not be less	Sign clearance is 7.25 feet.	This standard is not met.

than ten feet above pedestrian way.		
Free standing signs shall not exceed 20 in height as measured above the ground.	Over all height is 9.37 feet. (Height was also given as 10'-8")	This standard is met.
A nonilluminated freestanding principal use sign, no exceeding ten square feet in size, may be allowed to be erected in the grass plat between the curbline and sidewalk area if such site and sign design are jointly approved by the City Traffic Engineer, Park and Tree Director, and the Historic District Board of Review	Proposed sign is 30" high by 44 " wide or 9.37 feet.	This standard is met.
Sec8-3112 No portion of a freestanding or projecting sign shall be located within two feet, as measured horizontally, of a street right-of-way.	The location of the edge of this sign is not given.	If the sign is 44" wide and the pole is 44" from the edge of the street then the edge of the sign is at the curb and therefore, does not meet the standard.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of design of the sign with the condition that written approval is received from the Director of the Park and Tree Commission approving locating sign in the tree lawn and written approval and approval of a variance for clearance and setback is received in writing from the City Traffic Engineer. If no variance is granted then an amended drawing reflecting ordinance clearance and setback shall be submitted prior to application for a building permit.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Gay** stated he wondered if the petitioner had considered having the pole support in the middle of the sign instead of a projecting sign.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated she believed they were copying a sign that was at the Ballastone Inn.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he felt, under the circumstances, that the petition needed to be continued until Staff heard from Park and Tree and the City Traffic Engineer.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Meyerhoff 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: Petition of Zunzi's  
HBR 05-3393-2  
108 East York Street  
Sign**

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting a principal use projecting sign at 108 East York Street.

**FINDINGS**

1. 108 East York Street is in a BC-1 zone and falls under the Historic District Sign Ordinance.
2. The existing frame, brace, and lighting will be used for the new projecting sign. The new sign will drop 48” from the brace.
3. The two-sided sign will consist of a 1/8” thick stainless steel, hung from the frame by chains, with the words “TAKE OUT” in neon on both sides. This component of the sign will be 10” x 24”. The neon is not appropriate in this setting. This ward is primarily residential with a National Landmark structure (Owens-Thomas House).
4. Below this sign will be a circular component 30” in diameter, with the image of a bull cart painted on the stainless steel, in black and brown color tones. No text will be located on this component of the sign.
5. The neon and spot lighting will be on only during operating hours.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval with the condition that the neon lighting be removed.

**Petitioner’s Comments:**

**Petitioner** stated that once the sign was up, it could only be noticed on York Street. He said he was thinking about putting the neon on both sides, if the Board would allow it. He said if that was not acceptable, then he would like for the Board to consider the neon sign for just the Drayton Street side.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the name of the restaurant was Take Out?

**Petitioner** stated no. He said the name of the restaurant was Zunzi’s. He said it would be displayed on the bottom canopy. He said the sign would be 10” X 24” but the neon writing would be smaller, but effective on York Street from both sides (Drayton and Abercorn).

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated if the name of the restaurant was not on the sign and you just have a neon sign that says Take Out. He did not see the purpose of the sign.

**Petitioner** stated the thing about Zunzi’s was that you could come and get hot food to go. He said he felt that was the best way to let people know from the side of the street before they were walking that there was take out at that location.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked what was the purpose of the covered wagon?

**Petitioner** stated on the sign there would be a little plate that would match the wagon. He said it would be spelled out with the letters DODKOS which was Dutch for “food for the road.”

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he felt his purpose would be better served by having a light on both sides of the building to light the whole sign rather than having a neon that said Take Out and having the wagon hanging underneath. He said he felt if he had a light on the building pointing to this sign on both sides you would not only see Take Out, but you would also see the covered wagon with a dutch name on it.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated the petitioner was in a BC-1 zone, therefore neon was not prohibited. However, she said visually she felt it was incompatible. Secondly, what was received had no writing on the sign.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she felt it could not be approved until the graphics were on the sign.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there was an approval process for the name being put on the awning?

**Mr. Webb** stated yes. He said if there were any changes to the awning or if a new awning goes up, it will have to be approved, at Staff level.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF supported Staff's comments especially about the neon. He also reminded the Board that when the Outback sign was approved with one little strip of neon on it, it raised concern. He said it was not the sign, but that particular area at the corner of Bay Street and Drayton Street, it could be seen from a distance. He said in regard to this petition, this sign would also be able to be seen from a distance such as Columbia Square and Green Square.

**Petitioner** stated he would eliminate the Drayton Street side if that would be more acceptable.

**Discussion:**

**Mr. Mitchell** stated either way it would still have to come back before the Board, so they could review the graphics.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated she could not remember how she voted when the Outback came before the Board other than not being happy about it. She said she would not vote for neon again if she in fact did it before.

**Mr. Deering** asked the petitioner if he would like to continue the petition until next month?

**Petitioner** stated yes.

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

\*Mr. Neely left the meeting approximately 3:55 p.m.

**RE: 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
  - b. Add brick façade to Oglethorpe, Hull and Houston Street facades (No Price façade given)
  - c. Install three new windows on Oglethorpe elevation at Houston Street (No photo given)
  - 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 6/6 windows with operable shutters.
  
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 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, 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.

### Comments:

1. Staff requested and received some additional material, however there are many details that are still not clear. These include the following:
  - a. No Price Street elevation was provided.
  - b. The typical store front is 14'-8" wide by 8'-8" high. However, the drawing is not detailed enough to determine materials and dimensions of the transom and base, nor the depth of the window from the face of the new brick.
  - c. A sample was provided of the new brick veneer. It is called Whitehaven (Q) by Pine Hall Brick and is a distressed brick with a white coating to resemble mortar. How will this

- vener brick be attached? It is recommended that an alternate brick be provided that is a plain brick without the distressing and artificial parged look.
- d. One drawing indicates that the metal cornice is about 4' high and other indicates 6'-6". Is this fascia being raised? It is not clear whether there will be room for signage once the awning frame is installed.
  - e. More information is needed on the new "masonry stucco wall City Loft". What is this and how will it be installed?
  - f. Steel doors are being installed on the Houston and Hull street sides. Are these plain? Which are new openings and which are existing?
  - g. More information is needed on the 6/6 windows to be installed on the Hull Street side. Materials, manufacturer, double pane or true divided light etc.
2. Staff recommends an architectural or vegetative screen wall in the planting area between the parking lot and sidewalk on the Oglethorpe Avenue and Price Street sides in order to reestablish some kind of wall of continuity along these streetscapes.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval in concept, but more specific detail is needed in order to recommend final approval.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if he understood that they were going to brick veneer the entire building?

**Mr. Reardon** stated yes.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked where on the elevation did the stucco line and brick line meet?

**Mr. Reardon** stated the stucco ended at the top where there was an existing metal canopy on the building. The brick would come on the underside of that. He said the awning would cover the existing metal canopy.

**Mr. Deering** asked would they also brick veneer the existing masonry building at the corner of Houston and Paulson?

**Mr. Reardon** stated yes.

**Mr. Deering** asked the petitioner if they would consider requesting a continuance until next month so that they could address all of Staff's concerns?

**Mr. Reardon** stated yes. He said they were trying to get approval of the concept, but they realized they would need more detail.

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

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison  
HBR 05-3396-2  
108 East Jones Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to alter a previously approved carriage house to expand the two garage openings from 9'-0" to 10'-0" and to build a flat arch rather than a segmental arch.

**FINDINGS**

The following is a guideline concerning new carriage houses. "Traditional elements of carriage house construction such as ventilation slits, strap hinges, wood doors and arches should be retained in existing structures, and used as details in new construction."

The arched openings are more aesthetically and proportionally pleasing than the rectangular openings that have been cut into the other historic carriage houses. They are also more within the intent of the guideline. However, it is understood that the garage as built by a previous petitioner did not utilize the four foot set back to achieve a wider turning radius on a narrow lane. It is also understood that arched openings can present a parking problem for larger modern cars.

This is not an historic carriage house.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval if there is no other alternative.

**HDBR Action: Mr. Steffen made a motion that and seconded by Mrs. Brownfield, the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the amended petition as submitted based on visual incompatibility. Mrs. Brownfield seconded the motion and it was passed 7 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Meyerhoff.**

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects  
Patrick Phelps  
HBR 05-3397-2  
711 East Broad Street  
Renovations**

Present for the petition was Patrick Phelps.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a one-story addition to an existing non-rated building at 711 East Broad Street.

**FINDINGS**

1. The existing building at the corner of East Broad Street and West Gwinnett Street is a non-rated building in the Historic District. The proposed addition will be to the west of the existing building, off Gwinnett Lane.
2. The addition will be one-story, with a lane frontage width of 20'5". The 34'8" wall on the west elevation will connect to an existing wall of the building. The addition will be lower than the existing building.
3. The 682 square foot addition will have a wood frame with EIFs and CMU veneer exterior. Material and colors samples were provided by the petitioner. The colors will coordinate with the existing colors on the current building.
4. Aluminum storefront windows will be used.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he pulled the petition from the Consent Agenda because he felt whenever there was an addition to a building that it should come before the Board rather than have the Staff approve it.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Deering 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 05-3398-2  
      455 Montgomery Street  
      New Construction**

Continued per Petitioner's Request – July 13, 2005.

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

Present for the petition was Matthew Collins.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate 201 East York Street, including demolishing the non historic connection between the main house and the carriage house and replacing with new infill.

**FINDINGS**

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

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

**DISCUSSION****Rehab Component:  
York Street Façade**

1. On the front façade, facing York Street, the existing front door sash will be replaced with a new sash 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. The Petitioner needs to provide a measured drawing for final Staff approval.
2. On the street level, a new window and door will be installed within the existing openings after removing the existing infill. The new window will match the existing window on the adjacent property to the east in material and proportions.
3. A non-historic brick veneer will be removed from the ground floor level. The original sandstone water table will be restored once the veneer is removed.
4. A new copper canopy will be installed over the restored ground level entry.

**Abercorn Street Façade**

1. On the Abercorn Street façade, an 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 also be removed on the ground floor level on this elevation.
3. A new carriage house door will be installed with a copper canopy over the entry.
4. At the third level, the existing addition will be stuccoed with a 2" corbel to match the existing profile. A new double-hung window will be installed at the third level facing Abercorn Street.

**Connector:**

1. The petitioner is proposing to remove the existing non-historic connector between the historic addition of the main house and the carriage house. There is internal evidence that an open porch had been on the second floor of the historic addition.
2. The new ground level entry and first level balcony are recessed 5' 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, in "Antique White", by Sherwin Williams. New double-hung windows and French style doors will be added. The petitioner needs to confirm that the new windows and doors meet the requirements of the Ordinance.
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 for a third level terrace above the new connector/infill. Staff has requested a section detail of the new balcony showing railings and columns. Petitioner will bring to the Review Board Meeting.

**Carriage House:**

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

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval with clarification of new window information, section detail of the new balcony/porch, and measured drawing of front entry.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** asked if Staff thought that the three story section behind the four story section was original? He said he felt the brick and window openings were original.

**Mr. Webb** stated Staff went inside it.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated Staff was asking for additional information on the windows. He said he would also suggest additional information on the railings and columns.

**Mr. Webb** stated the petitioner brought that information with him today.

**Ms. Brownfield** stated she was looking at two different elevations of the front door. She asked why didn't they draw that in there?

**Mr. Webb** stated that was why Staff wanted a measured drawing to really show what they were putting back.

**Mr. Gay** stated currently there was a wrought iron on the parlor floor and it has been lost on the twin house. He asked if they were proposing to take that off because it was not on the pictures.

**Mr. Webb** stated that was not addressed.

**Mr. Matthew Collins** stated the intent was to restore what was originally there.

**Mr. Deering** stated he believed that the infill piece was built at the same time. He said he would urge them to reconsider cutting that out and putting the columns. He asked if they had checked with the Georgia Historical Society to see if they had any photographs?

**Mr. Collins** stated yes, but they were not able to find any original photographs. However, evidence dictated that was one exterior space. He said what was there now was severely damaged. He said they were hoping to use enough original brick to repair it.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt if it was an addition, it was very early because the dentil work, cornice, and a lot of the masonry work matched. The window openings were altered to accommodate the projecting aluminum awning windows. He said he felt they should strongly reconsider that element. He felt they should align the upper columns and lower columns. He said he understood why they were putting the large windows in the area that they discussed first, but if they could find evidence that there were smaller windows in there like the others in the ground floor he would say put those back in.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the railings were not identified as to detailing wood, metal or otherwise. He said he felt there was not enough information for the Board to pass on this today. He said he would suggest that the petitioner request a continuance.

**Mr. Collins** stated the intent was a simple wood railing, painted white.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it would be both railings?

**Mr. Collins** stated yes. He said all new railings would be white painted with 1 X 1 pickets.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he felt the Board needed a more complete packet, particularly in light of the comments made by Mr. Deering.

**Mr. Collins** stated he did not mind readdressing these issues with the Board in a month because they did not want to put the project on hold. He said it was obvious that the center portion needed to be eliminated. He said in terms of the porch they could address that as well.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she felt the Board was trying to say that it was not complete enough today to pass.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering 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: Staff Reviews**

1. Petition of Samuel Olin  
HBR 05-3385(S)-2  
518 East Harris Street  
Color

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

2. Petition of Michele Sewell  
HBR 05-3386(S)-2  
307 East Gordon Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of SCAD  
Kate Firebaugh  
HBR 05-3387(S)-2  
532 Indian Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of SCAD  
Kate Firebaugh  
HBR 05-3388(S)-2  
217 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
5. Petition of Details Residential Restoration  
Chris Thompson  
HBR 05-3389(S)-2  
117 & 119 Houston Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
6. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
HBR 05-3403(S)-2  
213 West River Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
7. Petition of James T. Welch  
HBR 05-3404(S)-2  
426 Habersham Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Amended Petition of SCAD  
Glenn Wallace  
HBR 04-3202-2  
112 Montgomery Street  
Change of Material

**Mrs. Reiter** stated the petitioner was requesting a material change (stucco). She said the Staff recommended approval.



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

2. Petition of Dirk Hardison  
HBR 04-3190-2  
405 East Liberty Street  
Request for 1-Year Extension

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the request for 1-Year extension. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

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

**Ms. Seiler** stated when she went on Jones Street to look at another project there was a house on the same block that had a neon sign in the house. She asked if the Board had jurisdiction for what people do to the inside of their house.

**Ms. Brownfield** stated she had a note for the same thing, which is Shannon Scott's house. She said Staff has said before that what people do inside, the Board could not do anything about. She said she felt the petitioner today (Zunzi's) could legally put a neon sign inside his window. She said for this house on Jones Street to have this neon sign was really inappropriate.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he felt it was a grey area and what has happened was it has been exposed. He said what the Board may need to do was to address something in that regard.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated you would have to change the ordinance.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated there was a similar issue that went to court years ago and the judge ruled that the Board could not control what happens on the inside. She also said that complaints had gone to City Inspections, and they were aware of the sign.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he liked the fact that this Board was standing up to protecting the Historic District. He said he also appreciated that residents have called or emailed him to make him aware of things that were happening in the district. Mr. Mitchell asked what was the status of the Board's retreat?

**Ms. Seiler** stated the parking lot has been completed at Savannah Electric. She said the Board would be able to hold their retreat in the auditorium at Savannah Electric.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he wanted to proceed to set a date for the retreat as well as a tentative agenda.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** suggested that the Board email Staff with proposed agenda topics. She asked what month did the Board want to have the retreat?

**Ms. Seiler** asked Mr. Webb to call or email her with possible dates so she could check to see if the room was available. She said when she determined the availability of the room, Mr. Webb could email everyone with the dates.

**RE: Minutes**

1. Distribution of Regular Meeting Minutes – May 11, 2005

**RE: Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR:ca