

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

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

MARCH 9, 2005

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

W. John Mitchell, Chairman
Swann Seiler
Dian Brownfield
Dr. Gerald Caplan
John Deering
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring
Eric Meyerhoff
John Neely
Joseph Steffen

Members Absent:

Ned Gay (Excused)
Dr. Lester Johnson, Jr. (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Mitchell called the March 9, 2005 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 p.m.

RE: Sign Posting

Dr. Caplan asked if anyone saw a sign for 109 West Gordon Street?

Mrs. Reiter stated originally that was a staff review, but she felt it needed to come before the Board.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Petition of Lynwood Willis
HBR 05-3341-2
530 – 532 East Broughton Street
New Construction – Part I & II

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Teresa Sutton
HBR 05-3342-2
104 East Broughton Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Christopher & Anne Acker
HBR 05-3343-2
220 East Bay Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Speedi Sign
Flint North
HBR 05-3344-2
201 East Broughton Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Rudd Long
HBR 05-3348-2
517 East Congress Street
Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Mrs. Brownfield requested that the Petition of Lynwood Willis, HBR 05-3341-2 be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

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

RE: Welcome

Mr. Mitchell welcomed guests visiting from Indonesia to the City of Savannah. He said they were from the Cities of Jogjakarta and Bukittinggi.

RE: Regular Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Kathy Ledvina
HBR 04-3218-2
226 East Bryan Street
Alteration

Present for the petition was Kathy Ledvina.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of an amendment to a previously approved petition to replace a canvas awning with a copper awning at the ground level retail side entrance on Lincoln Street. The awning has already been installed.

FINDINGS

The standing seam copper awning is 6'-6" wide with a projection of 2'. It is a reversible treatment that does not adversely affect the historic fabric of the structure.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay
Patrick Shay
HBR 04-3293-2
15 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting amendments to previously approved design as follows:

1. West elevation: Change the width of the recessed stucco area. The recessed area contains windows that face the zero lot line setback side of the building.
2. South (Bryan Street) elevation: Change width of openings to motor court arrival. Center portion is a pedestrian opening. Add a metal awning at the southeast corner and a door to the bar area.
3. North elevation: Change bay spacing from 3-2-4-2-3 to 3-2-5-2-2. Two openings and the overhead garage door that opened onto the easement have been eliminated.

FINDINGS

1. West Elevation: It is not clear why the center brick section needs to be recessed and made stucco. The windows were in the previously recessed stucco section. Were more rooms added that required additional windows?
2. The change on the South elevation significantly alters the scale and rhythm of this façade. The visual balance has been adversely affected. The windows on either side of the central bay are now not centered. The East and West projecting sections of the façade are too thin. No notations were given such as turning radius to justify the

change. Staff recommends no change, however if it is a demonstrated problem then perhaps the addition space could be achieved inside the court.

The proposed new awning for the new Bryan Street door is visually inconsistent with the formal design of the building. The petitioner should explore other alternatives including cloth awning or smaller rendition of the front canopy.

Also, the proposed drawing indicates that the garage opening has been reduced from 25' +/- to 20' +/- . This reduction in the opening (not the whole projecting wing) is a great improvement on this important Bryan Street elevation.

3. The changes on the rear do not appear to have significant impact on what is seen from MLK. It is assumed that a building will be built on the Bay Street lot in the near future.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the west elevation changes only if it is demonstrated that the plan has changed with additional rooms that require window openings on that elevation to justify setting the wall back.

Approval of the new door on the Bryan Street side.

Denial of the widening of the center section based on incompatible rhythm of structure on street; imbalance of rhythm of solids and voids; incompatible width to height in the end projecting bays.

Approval to reduce the garage opening width only.

Reconsideration of the new awning design.

Approval of the north elevation changes.

Reconsideration of the previous request that the stucco panels above and below the windows on the Bryan Street side, M.L.K, and the first three bays of the north elevation be brick rather than stucco.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Shay stated they would delete the metal awning. He said the reason for the increase in the width was to facilitate a better turning radius for cars. He said the changes in the elevation were necessitated by the owner's decision to reduce the number of suites in the hotel. He said this was also the driving force for the elevation change on the north side of the building.

He stated in regard to the stucco above and below the windows that he felt the building needed something other than pure brick. He stated that having the stucco made the pattern of verticality stronger.

Public Comments:

Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF also endorsed the idea of eliminating the stucco over the windows. However, HSF was very concerned about the quality of the windows that were going to be used in the building. The plan showed aluminum windows and HSF wondered if the specific windows had been approved by Staff. He said the Marriott

Hotel on Liberty had handsome windows and grillwork. He said there was a new hotel being built on Bay Street which had a much lesser quality of window and grillwork that substantially detracted from the appearance of the building. He said HSF hoped that the new project on M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. would have windows of the substance of quality of the Marriott.

Mr. Michael Brown showed a photo of the Marriott and stated he felt this example was well executed. He said (the Bay Street Hotel) was also approved by the Board but he could not imagine how that could be considered in the spirit of the Board's decision. He said he felt this was a serious problem. He said (the Bay Street) window was purely done as an economic issue. He said he felt the Board's decision should not have anything to do with economics. If these were the kind of windows that were acceptable, then he felt basically the Board's decisions were irrelevant because anybody could do what they wanted.

Mr. Shay stated they were willing to bring back the final window so the Board could see.

Discussion:

Mrs. Brownfield stated she agreed with Staff in regard to the change on the south elevation. She said she also felt the stucco should be eliminated.

Mr. Mitchell asked the petitioner if he said that he was amenable from the change of stucco to brick?

Mr. Shay stated no.

Dr. Caplan asked what were the windows that he was putting in?

Mr. Shay stated that had not been determined, but, they would be windows were in keeping with the standards.

Mr. Neely stated he could not make up his mind about the south façade. He said he could see the functional reason why he had to widen the openings. He said he did not see that much difference.

Mr. Steffen stated he also had the same feeling.

Mr. Neely stated he agreed on the verticality issue in having something to break the brick up. He said he was unsure about the south façade. Basically, there was not that much difference to necessarily be concerned.

Mr. Deering stated one thing that was nice that was brought up by Mrs. Reiter was the garage opening on the left was smaller. He said if you were going to make the other two portals larger then it was nice that the other garage door was smaller.

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended to delete an awning over the new Bryan Street door and with the conditions that the window and awning design be brought to staff for approval. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was passed 5 – 2. Mrs. Brownfield and Ms. Fortson-Waring cast nay votes.

**RE: Continued Petition of Daniel Snyder, For
Steven & Marianne Brower
HBR 04-3294-2
320 East Jones Street
New Construction – Part II Design**

Present for the petition was Daniel Snyder.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part 2: Design Details and Materials for the new construction of a single-family, detached residence and carriage house at 320 East Jones Street. The petitioner received approval of Part 1: Height and Mass in November 2004. Since the Part 1 approval, the petitioner has made the following revisions to the project:

- 1) The length of the main house has been reduced from 64' to 61'6".
- 2) The length of the connector between the main house and the carriage house has been increased from 16' to 16'6".
- 3) The depth of the garage has been increased from 20' to 22'.
- 4) The width of the carriage house has been increased from 27' to 28'.
- 5) The length of the porch has been increased from 37'6" to 48'8".
- 6) The width of the trash/utility area has been decreased from 13'6" to 9'6".
- 7) A section of the garden wall on the lane has been changed to a roofed, storage structure and the length increased from 20' to 23'.
- 8) As suggested by the Review Board at the November meeting, the connector between the main house and the carriage house has been altered to break the expanse of brick by changing the material and the roof shape to a vaulted roof.
- 9) The exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights has been changed as follows: first floor-from 13' to 12'; second floor-from 9' to 10'. The height of the parapet has been changed from 21' to 22'. The carriage house has been revised: second floor- from 9' to 10'. The height of the parapet has been increased from 21' to 22'.
- 10) Elevation changes to the project include:

East Jones Street Elevation: changed window and door spacing from a four bay rhythm to a three bay rhythm. A balcony overhang has been added to serve as a canopy over the front entrance.

Habersham Street Elevation: Five windows have been deleted. The connector between the main house and the carriage house has been revised to have a vaulted roof with a dormer window. A second floor window has been changed from a rectangular shape to a square. A ground floor entrance has been added in the connecting section. A large

window grouping has been added towards the connecting section and steel integrated as a material.

East Charlton Lane Elevation: An entrance door has been relocated from the north elevation of the garage to the west elevation. The garden wall has been altered to a storage structure with a roof. A door has been added.

West/Courtyard Elevation: The window placement, arrangement, and size in the carriage house have been changed. The porch has been lengthened to run the entire wall of glass facing the courtyard.

11) HVAC units will still be placed on the roof, and screened by the parapet.

FINDINGS and DISCUSSION

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Standards apply for Part 2: 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 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.

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 walls will be finished in brick. The type, color, and bond of the brick and mortar have not been determined at this time by the petitioner. On the Habersham Street elevation, a perforated metal screen will be located next to the large window grouping at the elevation transitions to the connector. On the west/courtyard elevation, the connecting element will have a flush wood siding exterior.
2. **Foundation:** The foundation will be finished brick, yet to be determined. The crawl space vents will have decorative steel.
3. **Windows:** The windows will be clad, manufactured by Marvin Windows and Doors, using the “Storm Plus” model. The color of the window trim has not been determined. The two large windows on the revised Habersham Street elevation and the six large windows on the west/courtyard elevation will meet the DP requirements of the International Building Code. Due to the hurricane requirements of the building code, the petitioner has found it difficult to locate double hung windows large enough to be appropriate to this project. As proposed, two awning windows have been grouped and arranged to appear as a double-hung window. Smaller windows are also stacked awning windows for consistency. With the exception of the large window groups on Habersham Street, all windows meet the vertical to horizontal ratio of 5:3. All window sashes will be inset a minimum of 3” from the façade of the masonry. The new large, squared windows on the connector resemble the decreasing of the mass of typical buildings as it transitions from the street to the lane. In this contemporary language, the placement and scale of the windows is consistent with glass-enclosed side porches. The petitioner will provide final window information once selected.
4. **Doors:** The front door will be a custom-made entrance with etched glass in the door and transom, in a steel frame, with fiber optic lighting in the jamb. The design and materials have not been finalized by the petitioner. The side door will be metal screen within a steel frame. The petitioner will submit final design information on these elements at a later date. The garage, carriage house, and storage structure doors will be metal painted to match the window trim.

5. **Roof:** The roof of the main house and carriage house is flat with a contemporary interpretation of a parapet. Since this project is clearly a contemporary building, the traditional string course and parapet usually required is inappropriate for this specific project. The petitioner has proposed stepping back the brick panels of the façade to create a cornice on the street facing elevations. As part of the cornice, there is a brick parapet on the same two elevations. This treatment steps back as it approaches the lane and courtyard.

The roof on the new connecting section between the main house and the carriage house will be vaulted with a dormer window. The roof material will be standing seam metal. The new storage structure off the lane will also have a standing seam metal roof.

6. **Front balcony:** The side balcony facing the courtyard has been revised to extend 3' over the front entrance creating a canopy and front balcony. It is supported by cantilevered steel channels and has steel handrails and perforated metal panels.
7. **Side porch/balcony:** The side balcony on the west elevation will be screened by a punched brick façade integrated into the main structure. The porch/balcony material components include steel and perforated metal screens. The metal screens are galvanized perforated metal, with a round hole pattern of 1" diameter holes and 1 ¼" staggered centers.
8. **Garden Walls/Fences:** The garden wall on East Jones Street will be 6' tall. The garden wall on the lane elevation has been altered to include a storage structure that is now 9' tall. The wall will be constructed of the same brick as the primary building.
9. **Colors:** No colors have been proposed by the petitioner in this submittal.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of revisions to Part 1: Height and Mass and approval of Part 2: Design Details and Materials with the condition that all undetermined design elements, including brick, mortar, colors, front entrance design, and final window selection, be submitted for Review Board approval once determined.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Snyder stated the illustrations they had today in terms of color, materiality were for illustration purposes only. He said they have not decided on colors, brick, mortar, or bond. He said they also have not decided on the custom front entrance. While there may be a color up there, he just wanted the Board to see that more as a mass. He said they have decided on some of the materials as outlined in staff's report. He said he could show some of them today, such as the roofing material which was galvulum (galvanized metal roof). He also showed the materials for the spandrels of the guard rail and deck. He stated they have used galvanized metal in the past in the Historic District and it worked out well. He said in regard to the standing seam metal roof it was not like a standing seam that would be on McDonalds. It was an historic standing seam.

He stated the strategy for the project was to try to make the prominent street side (East Jones Street) the one that was the most contextual. Then, as it goes down Habersham Street and the courtyard towards the lane the order begins to become enriched and not quite so ordered. He

said this would include the fenestration as well. He said Historic Savannah Foundation allowed them to present to their Architectural Review Committee. He said HSF's concern was the perceived mass of the building on Habersham Street. He said he felt when the Board looked at the elevations originally received in their packet which were primarily to describe in detail what was happening, it looked massive. He said it was important to them to have it quiet in relationship to what was happening on the other side of the building. He said there was concern that it might be too stark. He said the house on this lot was one that showed from square to lane with a slight setback on the lane. He said that in the Historic District generally you have a main building, a wall, and then the carriage house in the back. They created an entrance that has transparency, so that the (East) elevation was not unrelieved.

He showed photos of similar streetscapes in the District. He said at the corner of Jones and Habersham there was an oak tree as well as another tree at the back at the lane. He said that (these trees) did not appear in the sketches. From the rendering as opposed to what you see in the elevation, one could also see that there was a lot of activity. He said he felt one could also see that it was not a stark or harsh elevation. He said they carefully analyzed the proportions. The house was cubic in the sense of 30 feet wide and 30 feet tall. The void of the courtyard was 30 feet wide and 30 feet tall. The diagonal line illustrated the proportion of the space. He said they reiterated the proportion of the windows and the other diagonal was a golden section and that was what was informing the shape of this void. He said the same occurred on the Habersham Street façade where it was square and the carriage house itself was also square. On the elevation itself was a golden section and a number of the windows through out were squares. He said they did the same on the courtyard elevation as well as on the windows beyond, so that even though it was quiet and not heavily ornamented, it was nonetheless carefully proportioned.

He further stated that from the lane one would not be able to see that much of this. He said they felt it would not be nearly as strong as the illustration would indicate. He said they knew there was some concern about building a contemporary building in the Historic District. He said for him and his clients this was an important site and it was in an extraordinary place in the Historic District, which was a rare opportunity.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated he felt they have done a really good job in interpreting what is Savannah's typical rectangular block of a house in a 21st century idiom. It really suited the context and neighborhood. He said he felt the Historic District would benefit from a structure like this. The only concern he had was the vaulted roof over the connector.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he applauded them for their attempt at a powerful, contemporary building. He said he liked the articulation on all facades with the exception of the Habersham Street façade. He said while they have made some changes, he felt sorry for the little window on the second floor of the garage. He said he felt it needed some more articulation. He said every sample he showed the Board had a strong horizontal effect by having either a rowlock or strong parapet. He said while the Habersham Street elevation broke itself up into units, the east side of the garage with a single window with no strong horizontal or vertical identification either at the parapet, or a rowlock line separating the floors bothered him. He said he felt a little bit more consideration there would enhance what was already a nice building. He asked in regard to the roof, how reflective was it?

Mr. Snyder stated when it is new there was a certain reflectivity, but that it dulls very quickly.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she was also concerned about the Habersham Street side. She said she also agreed with the comments made by Mr. Deering.

Dr. Caplan stated he felt he had a wonderful looking building. He said he was also concerned about the Habersham Street side. He said in terms of traffic he felt this was the significant side. He said if they looked at the building across the street although they were not trying to emulate it, it was also a contemporary building with some very significant architecturally important detail to it. He said he appreciated his explanation of why they had the building on this side as it was. But it seemed to lack a little something architecturally. He said he felt it needed to be broken up some how. He said he felt the vaulted roof helped. He said it was a large expanse over a long area on a very significant side of a building. He said he wondered if he might consider something such as suggested by Mr. Meyerhoff to make that side of the building a little more significant.

Mr. Deering stated this was a typical townhouse and carriage house assembly similar to any historic masonry structure in town. He said the side wall is always that blank and many do not have that many windows. The garden wall is usually connected to the carriage house. He said he felt that he could find a carriage house with one window on the end of it in probably three different situations downtown. He said he felt keeping it simple and as referred to by the petitioner, quiet, really helped this modern structure suit the context. He said he felt if the petitioner added more to it, it would make it a worse project.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he was not speaking of balcony projections. He said he was speaking of a rowlock lin the brick or something.

Public Comments:

Ms. Cynthia Hunter stated she loved the design and did not think that one window should be added or moved. She said she appreciated the quietness of the Habersham Street elevation. She said she felt if it had any more ornamentation that it would cause conflict between what was across the street on Habersham. She said she felt it respected the site as well as gave the owners their own identity by having the west side be contemporary.

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF did meet with the petitioner. He said HSF came away with one basic concern which was that they hoped the Board would take into consideration the pedestrian experience along the Habersham Street façade and what it would be like to walk along that street. He further stated his personal opinion was this was the first masonry residential building that he has seen in a long time that respected the understated restraint and simplicity that was indicative of Jones Street in particular, and the Historic District in total.

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the conditions that remaining materials be brought back to the Board for final approval. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Amended Petition of Ted Carellas, III
HBR 05-3324-2
111 East Broad Street
Alterations

Present for the petition was Ted Carellas.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to add a stoop to the front entry of 111 East Broad Street.

FINDINGS

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

- (1) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District: An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenances related thereto visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include, but not limited to the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors, and signs.
- (6) Visual Compatibility Factors: New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the Historic District which are moved, reconstructed, materially altered, repaired, or changed in color shall be visually compatible with structures, squares, and places to which they are visually related.
- (11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches.
 - 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. The new stoop will use the existing brick steps and wrought iron railing. The wrought iron railing will be altered to accommodate the new support columns. Two, 4" painted wood square columns will support a standing seam metal, hipped roof. The columns have cap and base moldings. The color of the columns will match the existing trim. The metal roof will have silver color.
2. The new stoop will be 12' tall from the sidewalk and will be attached to the façade above the existing front door transom.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was concerned about the columns because they appeared to be 4 X 4, which they felt were too narrow visually for the building. He said HSF felt that 6 X 6 should be the minimum size for the post if not the exact size. HSF was also concerned that there was no close up detail. It could be offered as a generic stoop relationship. In particular, the column as in the petition was completely pushed under. He said HSF felt the capital or moulding should extend beyond this plane and the plane should line up with the face of the column.

Mr. Carellas stated he had no problem with HSF's suggestion.

HDBR Action: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the following conditions: a larger column will be used and the capital shall extend beyond the fascia with the fascia aligning with the column shaft. Drawings of these changes shall be presented to staff for final approval. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Dirk Hardison
HBR 05-3330-2
500 Block of East Charlton Street
New Construction – Part II Design**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting a Part 2- Design Details approval for the new construction of a three unit row house and a six-car one-story garage. The Part 1-Height and Mass was approved in February with conditions. The Part 2 submittal has been revised to reflect the condition of approval by lowering the pitch of the hipped roof. Also, a side porch has been added on the East Broad Street elevation. Three entry stoops are located on the East Charlton Street façade, as proposed in the Part 1 submittal; however, there location has been changed.

FINDINGS

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Standards apply for Part 2: 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 a smooth finished "Hardi-plank" siding, with a 5" lap width. 6" wide corner board will be wood.
2. **Foundation:** The foundation is Savannah Grey brick manufactured by Old Carolina Brick Company. 8x16 metal vents will be placed within the foundation, painted to match the roof color.
3. **Windows and Doors:** The windows will be wood, double-hung, one-over-one, manufactured by MW Windows and Doors. All windows will be framed with painted 4"

trim. The front doors will be six-panel wood doors by Jeld Wen, from the “Traditional Series.” All doors will be framed with painted 4” trim. The side and rear doors are also manufactured by Jeld Wen, but will have an upper glass half-lite. On the East Broad Street elevation, a “fixed” window will be located on the second floor and windows within the new proposed porch will be the same size as the second floor windows.

4. **Roof:** As required for Part 1: Height and Mass approval, the pitch of the roof has been lowered. The hipped roof will be a standing seam metal roof by McElroy in red. Metal half-round gutters and downspouts will be placed at the roof eave.
5. **Front stoops:** The front entry stoops will have standing seam metal roofs, wood posts, and wood pickets and rails. The petitioner provided a front stoop sections with details. The new side porch on East Broad Street will have the same design details as the front stoops but without any stair access.
6. **Garden Walls/Fences:** A painted, 6’ tall, wood plank fence will shield the courtyard area from view on the East Broad Street side of the project. The fence will be painted “Delicate White” by Olympic Paints, which matches the trim on the project. A sample was provided by the petitioner. The petitioner provided details of the fence.
7. **Colors:** Colors samples by Olympic Paints were provided by the petitioner. The proposed colors are as follows: Main body-east unit “Sunbeam”, center unit- “Hidden Spring,” and west unit- “Ship’s Harbor”; all trim-“Delicate White.”
8. **Garage details:** A “shuttered” wood window detail has been added to the East Broad Street elevation on the garage. The garage doors will be 9’ wide wood overhead doors with traditional carriage house trim.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated that after looking at garage doors all around town including the new rows of garages, was there anything they could do to change the door design in multiples of two? For example, maybe fixed lights at the top of them or a more arts-and-crafts design. He said if he owned or lived in one of them (little lane cottages) it would disturb him to have to go by six garage doors to get to his house.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she agreed with Mr. Deering's comments.

Mr. Hardison stated this was a lane and lanes were for service. He said there were some cottages that have ended up on lanes, but they were still lanes. He said one of the reasons you have not seen as many rows of garage doors in the last 20 or 30 years was because a lot of them were demolished. He said if the lanes were filled back up with their carriage houses and their little auto garages as you see on the Sanborn maps before 1955 this would not look out of place.

Mr. Neely stated he felt they needed to be broke up. He said may be they could make it into three different two-garage door sections.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the condition that the garage doors be revised and brought back to the Board for final approval. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder
John Deering
HBR 05-3333-2
Corner of Tattnall Street & West Gaston Street
New Construction – Part I & II**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was Pete Callejas.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval and Part II Design for a single family house.

FINDINGS

The following Standards apply:

1. Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards (5) nonrated structures: The construction of a new structure...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...
2. Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setback except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front. *All the historic properties in this vicinity appear to have 0 lot line setbacks. The proposed construction has no setback. This standard has been met.*
3. Dwelling unit type: *There are detached single family houses adjacent to and across the street from the proposed site. The proposed dwelling appears to be within the 75% building coverage requirement. This standard has been met.*
4. Street Elevation type: *The proposed type is a three story high stoop detached townhouse. Three story high stoop attached townhouses are found on Barnard Street one block away. The house next door to the proposed site is a detached three story high stoop house. Given the flooding problems in this area, a high stoop is a practical solution. This standard has been met.*
5. Entrances: *One of the previous structures on this site fronted Tattnall. The proposed entrance is consistent with this.*
6. Height: *The proposed lot is in a three story height zone. The proposed construction is a 3 story house. The overall height has been reduced 7'-3". Floor-to-floor height. The exterior expression of raised basements shall be not less than 6'-6" and not higher than*

9'-6". The second story shall not be less than 11 feet. The height of each story above shall not be less than 10 feet. The proposed stoop is 9'-6" above grade. The exterior expression of the second and third floors is 11 and 10' respectively. There is about another 10 feet for the gable roof.

7. Visual Compatibility Factors

Proportion of structures front façade: The height is taller than surrounding property due to the use of a gable roof on a full three stories. However, the property is located north of Gaston Street adjacent to a ward in which there are some 3½ and 4 story buildings. Gaston Street is one of the entries to the Historic District from I-16. The structure functions as a focal point for this area.

Proportion of openings: The proportion of the openings at 3:5 is consistent with historic window sizes in the area. The proposed windows are 6/6 Kolbe and Kolbe Ultra wood clad double hung windows. These windows have been approved on previous projects and will be inset the proper distance. The shutters are operable, wood, louvered, sized to fit the opening, by Timberlane. The lintels and sills will be cast stone.

Rhythm of Solids to Voids: There is a three bay rhythm on the front (Tattnall Street) façade and the windows have a 3:5 proportion and are aligned vertically. The windows are aligned vertically on the Gaston Street elevation. The rhythms are typical of the surrounding historic structures. This meets the standards. The front door has a 4 light transom above a solid paneled door. The garage doors are barn style overhead with a segmental brick jack arch. There is an iron garden gate.

Rhythm of structure on the street. There were two smaller dwellings previously on this lot. The proposed structure is oriented in the same direction as one of the former residences. This corner lot certainly can support a prominent structure.

Porch projections: There is a high stoop. These are found in the surrounding neighborhoods. The stoop is wood with brick piers. The porch columns have cap and base mouldings. The columns are Hartmann Sanders composite.

Roof Shapes: The proposed roof is an intersecting gable. There are gable roofs in the vicinity. The pitch is 7:12. The roof is a 5V crimp in Gilbralter Forest Green.

Walls of continuity: The streetscape is defined by the facades of the proposed structure and garden wall.

Scale: The site would appear to accept the scale of this building as an anchor on this end of Gaston Street. It is North of Gaston and more related to the structures to the north than to those on the south side of Gaston.

Directional Expression: The directional expression is vertical. See "Scale".

8. The HVAC equipment will be placed behind the garden wall.
9. The exterior brick will be Old Carolina Georgetown with Lafarge Ivory Buff mortar.
10. Porch and stoop trim, columns and railings will be painted Benjamin Moore Linen White; the color of the window sashes is Abalone by Kolbe and Kolbe; the shutters will be Benjamin Moore Black Forest Green.

The petitioner has provided a design explanation using the standards and all required details and sections. The comments of staff and the board have been taken into consideration.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Public Comments:

Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was concerned about the unbroken 70 foot expanse that ran along Gaston Street. He said HSF would like to see some sort of relief perhaps with an entrance door into the garage space or maybe a break in the line of the wall.

Mr. Callejas stated they did not have a problem with adding a door on Gaston Street as an entrance. Also, they felt if they brought the chimneys up a little that it would break up the façade.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Meyerhoff** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended with the new door being at the discretion of the petitioner. **Mrs. Fortson-Waring** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed. **Mr. Deering** recused himself.

**RE: Petition of Jacqueline Somesso
HBR 05-3340-2
641 Indian Street
Alterations**

No one was present for the petition.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for the construction of an unpainted wood deck and color change at 641 Indian Street.

FINDINGS

1. 641 Indian Street is not an historic structure.
2. The deck is located in front of the business and is 29' wide by 22'-5" deep. The total height is 5'-9" (2'-2" from ground to floor and 3'-7" from floor to top of railing.)
3. The previous color of the building was white. It was repainted green. The petitioner does not know the name of the color.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the deck as built. Denial of the green color as painted. Petitioner needs to provide a color chip for a less intense color.

Board Comments:

Mr. Mitchell stated suppose the deck was built and it was not correct. He asked what would be the Board's options?

Mrs. Reiter stated the Board could tell them to tear it down.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what was the petitioner's reaction to Staff's comments?

Mrs. Reiter stated she has not heard from the petitioner.

Public Comments:

Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF questioned how this wooden deck was in any way compatible with the neighboring properties.

Ms. Cynthia Hunter asked if there was a penalty for people who break the rules?

Mrs. Reiter stated they are charged a double fee by the Inspections Department.

Mr. Steffen stated he felt the Board needed the authority to address situations like this and he was going to continue to urge his elected representatives to give the Board that authority.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it was his understanding that you have to have a building permit for these things. It was also his understanding that the building department will not review any project that comes before them unless it has been before the Historic Review Board. He said the petitioner not only violated coming to the Review Board, but may be they did not get a building permit.

Mrs. Reiter stated they did not get a building permit.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated then it would be in the hands of the City building department to make the petitioner tear it down.

Mr. Deering stated this street and this area was full of commercial and light industrial buildings that were stone, concrete block, brick and things like that. This building had a loading dock on the front of it with a simple iron railing and it was made out of CMU and steel. He said to answer HSF, he did not think it was appropriate or visually compatible with anything in the neighborhood. He said he felt the Board should vote to deny it. He said he did not feel it fit the context.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that Savannah Historic Board of Review deny petition as submitted because it was noncompliant and visually incompatible. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Lynwood Willis
HBR 05-3341-2
530 – 532 East Broughton Street
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Lynwood Willis.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design approval for a two car frame garage behind 532 E. Broughton Street.

FINDINGS

1. The footprint is 21' x 21'. The height to the peak of the roof is 16'. There are two wood flush panel overhead garage doors in 8' openings. The siding will be painted to match the main house.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Board Comments:

Mrs. Brownfield stated she asked for this petition to be moved to the Regular Agenda. She said she felt it looked like a monopoly house, especially on the lane. She said she felt it needed to be two stories.

Mrs. Reiter stated there were other one story garages that were approved. For example, Jose' Gonzalez and Ted Kleisner's on Bryan Street, which is around the corner from this.

Mrs. Brownfield asked if the scale was the same?

Mrs. Reiter stated it had Price Street and a parking pad adjacent to them. She said there was a two story carriage house structure in the next block of Bryan Street.

Mr. Deering stated there again as was pointed out in a previous petition the Sanborn Map shows one story garage buildings all through this area before the 1950's. He said he did not think it was inappropriate at all.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Willis stated he felt the project fitted in and echoed exactly what was in front of it. He said it would have a copper standing seam roof. He said he would like to add another door on the side facing 530 East Broughton. The door would not be seen from Congress Lane.

Public Comments:

Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was concerned that the one-story gable roof structure was not visually compatible with the neighboring structure, which was two stories. He said HSF would prefer to see a two-story carriage house built that would be more visually compatible with the neighboring building.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended for the door with an optional standing seam copper roof. **Mrs. Fortson-Waring** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: **Petition of Jacqueline Somesso**
HBR 05-3340-2
641 Indian Street
Alterations

Mrs. Reiter asked if they could have clarification for Inspections Department on the motion for the Petition of Jacqueline Somesso, HBR 05-3340-2. She asked if the Board wanted to add a time frame for the removal of the deck? If so, how much time?

Mr. Tiras Petrea (City Inspections Department) stated this case would be presented in court on Monday. He said it was continued from the previous court date so that the Board could make a decision. He said if the Board does not want a deadline then he will work with the Judge to put a deadline on it for the removal of the deck.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated procedurally she suggested that the Board move to reconsider the motion for denial and amend it.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review reconsider the motion. Mrs. Brownfield seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt the motion denied the approval, but should also reflect that the paint and deck should be removed, so it is clear. Also, that any new paint colors and additions should be brought back to the Board, which makes the motion cleaner. She also stated that the removal of the paint and deck should be within 15 days of receipt of the order from the Board.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition as submitted and further request that the deck be removed within 15 days of the receipt of the decision and resubmit an alternate building color to staff for approval.

Mr. Neely stated he felt the paint color could go to Staff.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring agreed.

Dr. Caplan stated the petitioner was going to remove a structure that may take a little while to remove. He said he felt 15 days was a short interval. He suggested that the Board give the petitioner 30 days to remove the paint and deck.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff amended the motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition as submitted and further request that the deck be removed within 30 days of the receipt of the decision and resubmit an alternate building color to staff for approval. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Petition of William Lee
HBR 05-3346-2
21 East McDonough Street
Alterations

Present for the petition was Joe Kessler.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate the existing two story structure and adding a third story in the location of a previous third story indicated in a historic photograph and which existed at least as late as 1953.

FINDINGS

1. The following standards apply:

Section 8-3030 (k) (1) Preservation of historic structures within the historic district. An historic structure...visible from a public street or lane...shall only be...altered...in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure...For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include but not be 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. 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.

The structure is located in a four story height zone.

2. The addition is 22'-6" on Perry Street by 33'-8" +/- in a north-south direction. The height above the parapet is 9'. The historic footprint appears to have been approximately 18' x 25'. The room will house an elevator, stair and machine room with access through new true divided light wood French doors to the existing roof. The addition will be stuccoed to match the existing building. Two wood one over one windows will be installed on the Perry Street side of the addition to match the existing wood windows. The existing windows will be rebuilt.
3. The non-historic ground floor windows will be removed and replaced with custom wood multi-pane windows. The windows will be similar to those at the Six Pence pub on Bull Street. A shop drawing is being prepared.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

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

**RE: Petition Kathy Ledvina
HBR 05-3347-2
109 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.
Alterations**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was Michael Brown.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to make material changes and repairs for 109 MLK, Jr. Blvd, the Greyhound Bus Station.

FINDINGS

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

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

DISCUSSION

1. 109 MLK, Jr. Blvd, the old Greyhound Bus Station, is an example of the Art Moderne style. Originally, the design was characterized by its horizontal, streamlined exterior appearance of white and blue Vitrolite architectural glass. Unfortunately, the glass panels were removed and replaced with a stucco finish.
2. The petitioner is proposing to remove the stucco finish and install new fabricated pigmented structural glass panels to match the original location, size, depth, and color (white and blue Pantone 289C) of the original Vitrolite. The petitioner provided a copy of a historic photograph.
3. The historic photograph also shows the original signage, which shows the sign integrated in the design of the front entrance canopy. The horizontal portion and structure of the canopy remain on the building and the materials will be repaired.
4. However, the original vertical portion of the canopy over the entrance has been removed, although the structural steel support remains. The petitioner is proposing to return the vertical portion of the canopy to match the original appearance.
5. The canopy will be made of 16 gauged sheet metal finished with a cobalt blue powder coat, which is similar to porcelain enamel.
6. The greyhound dog logo on top will be fabricated from ¼ inch stainless steel plate.
7. The dimensions of the vertical portion of the canopy, based on the existing curve drawings, are three feet wide and 22 feet tall, including the greyhound image.
8. Neon lighting will be added to the perimeter to match the existing lighting on the horizontal canopy.
9. Once a tenant for the space is secured, the petitioner will re-submit for signage approval, in keeping with the style of the building.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he did not see how Staff could approve an elevation that did not show what was new, existing, or how far up the canopy would go. He said he felt it was incomplete. He said all the wording was there, but the drawing did not show what was going to be done.

Mr. Webb stated when Mr. Meyerhoff brought this to Staff's attention on Friday they notified the petitioner. He said Ms. Ledvina came by and they told her that you were requesting that information, but Staff received nothing further that they could provide to the Board.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Brown stated the intent of the project was to go back with exactly the same design with the same materials. He said they were going to restore the ones that were existing. He said some were missing and some were in storage in the building. He said he had samples of the original pieces. He said the parts that were missing were being remanufactured with the same gauge and material that will go up the whole distance. Also, the existing struts were still in place.

Mr. Steffen asked the petitioner if he had contacted Greyhound to get a license to use their dog?

Mr. Brown stated yes.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated what the Board hears and what was worded was great. He said what he intended to do was great. But the Board had guidelines for submittal that clearly state the drawings submitted must show what was going to be done, what is different from what is existing. He said the drawings that the Board had did not show that. In essence, what he was going to do to restore the façade was wonderful, but nothing on the drawings said that. He said there was not a word on them, other than dimensions. He said it was not a question of seeing samples of the material. It was a question of saying where you were going to replace the material and which materials that were there you were going to keep.

Mr. Brown stated these were glass panels that were existing and this is the aluminum strip that holds it in place. He said anything that is left as original was being retained. He said he was doing this for tax credits, so everything that was there was being retained. He said the drawings the Board had showed the dimensions of the original vitrolite glass panels. The glass panels that were there that they have they were going to keep. The other glass panels were going to be manufactured in Hungary the original crème color, cobalt blue and crème because they had original color samples of the color.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he was merely pointing out that this did not meet the requirements of submittal. He said while the concept that Mr. Brown wants to do there is fine with him, it was a submittal problem that he was pointing out.

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

**RE: Petition of Jonathan & Carmen Kurdys
HBR 05-3349(S)-2
109 West Gordon Street
Color**

Present for the petition was Jonathan Kurdys.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting a color change as follows: Window sash, trim and ironwork Benjamin Moore Black; Front door Benjamin Moore Country Redwood.

FINDINGS

1. 109 West Gordon Street is the fifth unit to the west of Whitaker Street in Gordon Row. Gordon Row is a Greek Revival row built in 1853. Half the row is stucco and half is now exposed brick. The subject unit is a beige color stucco.
2. The Material Treatment Guidelines for Rehabilitation in Savannah's Historic District states regarding window sash and trim that for older structures in Colonial, Federal or classical styles, sashes should be white or a light neutral shade. The sashes in the stucco end of the row are all white or pale off white. The sashes in the red-brown brick section of the row have been painted a variety of colors.
3. Two of the examples given by the petitioner are late 19th century Italianate semi attached townhouses, therefore the Benjamin Moore Forrest Green used is more acceptable. The black stoop and trim used on 23 West Gordon would not be recommended today.
4. Visual continuity in row houses is very important in Savannah. To have one unit with black sashes and black door surround would be extremely contrasting and visually incompatible with the cream stucco color. The petitioner has stated by phone that one of the reasons for asking for black is to hide mildew. This problem can be treated by including a mildicide in the paint.

RECOMMENDATION

Denial of the black sashes and black door surround; approval of the red door and black ironwork.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Jonathan Kurdys stated over the past six months they have been renovating the interior of the building. He said they were now looking forward to enhancing the exterior appearance of the building. He said they chose their color scheme by referencing a variety of other homes in the Historic District and focused specifically on Greek Revival homes of the same period as their row house. After some deliberation they decided to go with the Benjamin Moore Black and Country Red Wood, which were modeled off of two homes that they felt were successful and aesthetically pleasing color scheme and also stayed within the historical context. For example, 326 Bull Street, E. Shavers Booksellers. He said she also has black window sashes. He said they got the Country Red Wood from 305 East Charlton Street, which was another Greek Revival that was built in 1855. He referenced the Material Treatment Guidelines for Rehabilitation for Savannah's Historic District in regard to "Special Cases" – "that the body of all units should be painted the same color in order to preserve the visual integrity structure. It is acceptable to vary blind, door, and trim colors within the row."

Mr. Deering stated it may cite that in there, but it was the purview of the Board to look at these issues on a case by case basis. He said if Mrs. Shavers house was painted again today it probably would not be painted that way. He said even if it were repainted in-kind with the dark black green color it was a stand alone house. He said if the Charlton Street house he referred to were painted again today the Board probably would not let the window sashes and frames be painted that dark green color as well. He said in his row, he felt that it truly stands out too much. He said there was already so much off-white window sash and frame color that it really stood out too much. He said he felt it was incongruous in the row.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the situation here was that he was a part of a group of row houses, which were all stucco. He said every one of them had a white door frame door and white sashes. He said as a member of the Board he felt it was incompatible to go with a dark color that was singular within a row house. He said he felt for compatibility purposes it should match all the door entrances. However, the color of the door was a different story. But he felt the color of the door frame should be the same (white).

Mr. Kurdys stated half of the row was brick and half stucco.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he was not considering the brick row houses even though they were part of the block and even though at one time it was all stucco. He said he was considering the stucco part. The seven units of the stucco should be compatible.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she did not feel there was anything that was compatible with any of the seven townhouses. She said she did not see how the Board could single out this one because the whole row was not compatible. She said the row was a multitude of colors.

Ms. Seiler stated she agreed with Mrs. Fortson-Waring. She said she felt there was no way to ever get this row under control. She said she felt what the petitioner was doing was reasonable. She said she also felt in context with the row, it looked nice.

Mr. Steffen asked the petitioner what was his attachment to the color that he has chosen as opposed to asking the Board or Staff to give him some guidance on what would be more appropriate?

Mr. Kurdys stated they started off trying to find a color that worked well with the brownstone and stucco. He said what was very confusing with this particular section was that even though their house was historically stucco, there was one next to them that was painted mauve and another painted yellow. He said even the sash colors were various shades of white or off-white and some were yellow, peach, etc. He said from their perspective they like the way these colors looked with other buildings in the Historic District that were already painted this way. He said they felt it was an aesthetically pleasing way to blend in.

Public Comments:

Ms. Cynthia Hunter stated she felt color was a personal thing reflecting personality and style. She said as the Board could see in the picture there were lots of different color doors. She said she did not feel a door color was much different than a window color. She said she felt the colors the petitioner were proposing should be approved.

Discussion:

Mr. Deering stated one does not buy one of fifteen row houses for your own personality and style. He said you buy it for the appearance of the block or range.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated this was a series of row houses with different shades of light color and each of the seven doorways had a light color frame and a dark color door, whatever the color may be. The key word to what the Board does was compatibility. He said to take one out of seven and say okay let's put a dark color on this frame, even though the other six were light color defeated what they were doing. He said it has to do with compatibility. He said even though some have shutters and some do not, he was talking about every doorway of these seven row houses has a light frame color.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if there was a suggestion made to Mr. Kurdys as far as a color that would be compatible with the row that would allow them to express their individuality?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition because it was visually compatible with the visually incompatible colors that were present. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion. The motion failed.

HDBR Action: **Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the request to paint the metal black and the door red; deny the black door surround and window sash with an alternate color sample to be presented to staff for approval. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 05-3337(S)-2
300 West Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of Susan & Rick Evans
HBR 05-3338(S)-2
215, 217, 219 West Taylor Street
Color/Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Lynne McSweeney
HBR 05-3339(S)-2
216 East State Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: DENIED

4. Petition of Laurita Taylor, for
Greenbriar Children's Center
HBR 05-3345(S)-2
429 Tattnall Street
Gate
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Ken & Brenda Erickson
HBR 05-3350(S)-2
101 West Taylor Street
Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Carol Letcher
HBR 05-3351(S)-2
315 East Charlton Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder
Linn Gresham
HBR 05-3352(S)-2
411 East Liberty Street
Color/Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Petition of Baskets, Bears, & T's
HBR 05-3353(S)-2
305 East River Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: Other Business

Mrs. Cherie Restler stated they were working with Dirk Hardison on developing the property at Charlton and East Broad. She said she had a question about the garages. She said they wanted to increase the vitality of the neighborhood. She said they felt by creating garages that would be more aesthetic than having a gravel parking pad. She said they could not break up the garages because they did not have enough space. She said they could either do what they have drawn, or do no garages.

Mr. Deering stated the Board suggested to change the garage door types. It wasn't to not build or alter the garage. He said it was just to vary the style of the doors.

Mrs. Restler stated okay.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated something to break up the rhythm of six equally spaced doors.

Dr. Caplan stated when the Board did away with the Details Committee it was with a clear understanding that submissions from Staff be a complete presentation of the project. He said he felt what was done for the Greyhound was a very incomplete submission. He said they have

always said, which was discussed with Tom Thomson that if Staff did not do it, the Board would let them know and maybe bring the Details Committee back. He said the Greyhound petition was an incomplete submittal with only a small picture of a front elevation. He agreed with Mr. Meyerhoff that presentation to the Board was incomplete. He hoped in the future the Board does not have that.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the day he received the package and looked at it, he called Staff and told them that he felt what was submitted was incomplete. He said it did not indicate what was existing and what would be replaced. The only thing it had on it was dimensions with no indication of materials. He said it should have been denied since Staff called the owner and asked for the additional information. He said all the Board got was samples of materials today and no new drawing. He said he was also opposed to the Board receiving new drawings once they start the meeting. He said it should come to Staff prior to their meeting.

Dr. Caplan stated the problem was the Board made other people do it. He said he felt the Board had to be consistent.

Mr. Mitchell stated he thought it was going to be denied based on it being an incomplete submittal.

Mr. Webb stated the Board could have denied it, but they did not. He said Staff was appreciative that Mr. Meyerhoff called immediately. In turn, Staff contacted the petitioner (Ms. Ledvina) and she came in on Friday. He said Staff took exactly what Mr. Meyerhoff had stated and told her to get the information as soon as possible, so it could be distributed to the Board, which Staff never received.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated it was not up to Staff not to submit a petition. She said Staff's position is to present it as they have it, and it's up to the Board to deny it. She said the Board did not feel it was necessary to deny it

Dr. Caplan stated it was up to Staff to make sure a submission was complete. He said that was the understanding.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated you can not make a person bring in a piece of paper. She said you can make a suggestion, but if they do not accept the suggestion then it was incumbent upon the Board to reject it or accept it.

Dr. Caplan stated the rules state specifically on the application that if it was not a complete application, that it would not be presented. He said that was the way it was, and that was the understanding with MPC and Staff.

Mr. Mitchell also stated that Staff recommended approval it.

Mrs. Brownfield stated when she looked at the project she felt it was more of an in-kind thing they were doing. She said they were going right back to the original. In her opinion, she had no questions about what it was going to look like because they were going back to what was the original.

Mr. Webb stated Staff also felt, like Mrs. Brownfield, that they understood exactly what was being stated on the drawings and that it was an in-kind repair.

Mr. Mitchell asked what was the status on the Retreat in terms of dates?

Ms. Seiler stated she did not have dates because the parking lot was not finished at SEPCO.

Mr. Mitchell stated he would really like to do the Retreat as soon as possible.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated they could look at may be doing the Retreat at SDRA and use their conference room. She said the Board could chip in and do may be a continental breakfast and also have someone to bring in lunch.

Mr. Mitchell stated the last time the Board had their Retreat it was rather secluded. He said he felt SDRA would be very open. He asked if that would be a problem?

Ms. Seiler asked if the Board wanted the Mayor to come?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt the Board should invite him as well as Michael Brown, City Manager.

Mr. Mitchell stated if the Board establishes a date, he felt the Board would more likely get Michael Brown than the Mayor because he is so busy and the Retreat may conflict with his time.

Mr. Webb stated if the Board decides to move it to SDRA they would need to find out what their availability is. He said if the Board want to use SDRA then Staff could make the contact with Brigitte Lidy.

Mr. Mitchell stated he felt they needed to contact the Mayor first to see what his availability was and then plan the Retreat around that. He asked Staff to get the Mayor's secretary to give the Board a couple of dates to work around.

Ms. Seiler asked Staff to also check with her as well to see if the parking lot is completed.

Mr. Deering stated he heard that New Orleans' commission levies heavy fines if someone does something out-of-line. He asked Staff if they could call them and get some information from them about it.

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

RE: Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – January 12, 2005

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of January 12, 2005 as submitted. 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 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca