

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

MAY 11, 2005

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

John Mitchell, Chairman  
Dr. Gerald Caplan  
John Deering  
Ned Gay  
Dr. Lester Johnson, Jr.  
\*Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring  
Eric Meyerhoff  
Joseph Steffen

Members Absent:

Dian Brownfield (Excused)  
John Neely (Excused)  
Swann Seiler (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Mitchell called the May 11, 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 Dirk Hardison  
HBR 05-3375-2  
324 East State Street  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Design Reese Architects  
Gray Reese  
HBR 05-3380-2  
412 East York Street  
Renovations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

**RE: Regular Agenda**

**RE: Amended Petition of Poticny Deering Felder, PC  
John Deering  
HBR 03-3144-2  
1 West Jones Street  
Alterations**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting to amend the previously approved Part II: Materials and Design Details for 1 West Jones Street as follows:

1. Change the windows in the second floor of the addition to the historic portion of the building from six-over-six light configuration to nine-over-nine pattern.
2. Change the porch columns on the front portico of the historic 1 West Jones Street from the approved square Greek Doric to round Ionic columns.
3. Change the proportion of the entablature of the front portico on 1 West Jones to what has been constructed on site.

### **FINDINGS**

All of the above items requested as amendments have already occurred during the construction phase of the project. In addition, Staff has determined that the front stairs of 1 West Jones Street have not been constructed as approved by the Historic District Board of Review. The front door also appears to be different from what was approved. The Review Board's approval included changing the front door to a solid door, without glass.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of the change of windows on the second floor addition of the historic portion of the building from six-over-six to nine-over-nine light pattern.

Denial of the amendment to change the porch columns and the entablature on the front stoop. In addition, the front stoop, including the new stairs, must be constructed as approved by the Historic District Board of Review and stamped and signed by the City Preservation Officer. Changes that have occurred to the stairs, front door, and stoop design during the construction phase of the project need to be corrected as approved on October 13, 2004.

### **Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** apologized for the work being changed during the course of construction. The project manager for the developer said that he was out-of-town for a week and the site superintendent was over zealous in accepting columns and windows that were not as per the plans. He said they would like to ask permission to keep the windows in place in the addition. He said they felt that it reflected that it was an addition and not part of the original structure since the window lights were different in this new portion. He said the developer was also amenable to take the pediment and the surround off of the side door and have a simple stucco return. In regard to the entablature and columns, they were happy to change the columns back to the square Doric columns that were initially designed for the project. Also, to increase the depth and width of the entablature so that it had a classical proportion. He said they would also like to ask the Board's approval to leave the stair as constructed and take the railing up and to turn it into the back of the column.

#### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were going to make the pediments and columns as they originally were presented?

**Mr. Deering** stated yes.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they could move the stair over, so that it was away from the building?

**Mr. Deering** stated they could look at that.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF's concerns with the project was basically that this was another case of work being done that was in violation of what was approved at the Review Board. He said they were all tired of hearing that it was easier to ask for forgiveness than permission. He said HSF hoped the Board would stick to what was approved and not allow this to become a way to change things even if they may seem reasonable. He said HSF also felt that what was fueling this concern was that changes were continuing to be done to the building. He said there were at least four decorative urns sitting on the parapet of the rear part of the house. He said that was ornament that did not show in the approval and also was not appropriate to the era of building. He said HSF felt that all changes of this nature needed to be stopped unless they came before the Board.

**Mr. Deering** stated he had already asked the developer to remove the urns from the parapet wall of the back of the building.

#### **Discussion:**

**Mr. Steffen** stated his feelings on this were very similar to what Mr. Hardison stated. He said he felt that Mr. Deering should not have to be before the Board as the architect to explain what the developer did. He said he felt the developer should be here. He said he was inclined that the Board should do all that they could to send a message to them that this type of stuff was not going to go on. He said he felt that included not agreeing to make an amendment on the stair case. He said he tended to agree with Mr. Deering that it did not make that much of a difference, but he felt the Board needed to make a statement, especially if they were continuing to do work that was not what the Board approved.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he concurred with Mr. Steffen and HSF. However, as he understood it from Mr. Deering's presentation, the portico and columns would be changed back to what was presented to the Review Board. The stairs may be moved over, so that the railing would hit the columns. And the door on the Bull Street side would go back to its original design being a window or door. He said then the only thing in question, in spite of the fact that this was all done after-the-fact would be changing the 6/6 windows to 9/9 windows.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he received several phone calls on this matter from the residents in the area who alerted him to the fact that things were being done that were not approved. He said he also concurred with Mr. Steffen. He said the Board also knows that sometimes that some of the projects were not built as they were supposed to be, which was not a good thing. He said asking forgiveness after-the-fact along with the developer not being here did not impress him.

**Mr. Gay** stated that he was concerned with the 9/9 windows and the rhythm because all the other windows were 6/6. He said he understood the petitioner said that this was new, but he felt that it pointed out that it was new.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he felt the Board was all in agreement that this was an ongoing problem that needed to be addressed. He said he felt the only way to address it was to deny the changes. He said if the Board wanted to allow the windows that was not such a terrible thing, but everything else needed to go back like it was.

**Mr. Webb** stated one reason Staff supported the changes, like the 9/9 windows instead of 6/6, was because the Secretary of Standards for Rehabilitation would have encouraged the petitioner to show that the addition was new. He said as you read the building down Bull Street you knew the historic building ended at a certain point because the window configuration would change. However, Staff did not agree with the petitioner making the changes without prior approval of the Board.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the 9/9 windows were just the three windows? He also asked what about the inset behind the columns?

**Mr. Deering** stated they were also 9/9.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition as submitted. The changed items shall be made to conform to the approved permit drawings. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was approved 4 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Dr. Johnson. Mr. Deering recused himself.

**RE: Petition of David Bozzi, For  
Kelvin Davis  
HBR 04-3370-2  
508 East Gordon Street  
Alterations**

Continued per Petitioner's Request.

**RE: Petition of Deborah Boulanger  
HBR 05-3371-2  
311 – 313 West Congress Street  
Sign**

Present for the petition was Deborah Boulanger.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a principal use sign at 311-313 West Congress Street.

**FINDINGS**

1. 311 West Congress Street has a frontage of 25'.
2. The sign will be a hand carved, two-sided, projecting wood sign with a resin buckle in the center.
3. The sign will be painted in shades of blue, gold, and red, with the text "MOLLY MacPHERSON'S Scottish Pub and Grill" in gold. The colors are to match the tartan of the MacPherson clan.
4. The 3'5"x3'5" sign will be attached to the façade of 311-313 West Congress Street in the fascia area above the transom of the storefront and below the cornice, using iron bars. A detail of the iron bars was provided by the petitioner.
5. The sign will be illuminated by two small spot lights directed to each side of the sign.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the sign was the only thing they were changing on the exterior? Or were they planning an awning or repainting?

**Ms. Boulanger** stated the colors of the paint were previously approved by Staff. She said it was a grayish-blue on the cream color. The deep red was the door and the cream color was the trim around the windows.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were proposing an awning?

**Ms. Boulanger** stated no.

**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: Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose' Gonzalez  
HBR 05-3373-2  
220 East Gaston Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Jose Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to remove a wall and roof enclosure and replace with a new 2'-6" stucco wall with cast stone cap. The door opening in the street elevation of the existing front wall would be infilled and extended to the east 1'-8". A window under the east side of the stoop will be changed to a door. All colors will match the existing building.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval, however staff recommends that the petitioner reuse the existing Savannah gray brick with the cast stone cap for the new low wall.

### **Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated they accept the recommendation of Staff to use the Savannah gray on the walls.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the condition that the petitioner reuse the existing Savannah gray brick with the cast stone cap for the new low wall. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Merrill Levy, A.I.A, For  
Dr. Suresh Persad  
HBR 05-3374-2  
704 Abercorn Street  
Demolition & New Construction – Part I  
Height/Mass**

Present for the petition was Merrill Levy.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval for a three story mixed use residential/office structure on the south-west corner of Hall Street and Abercorn Street.

### **FINDINGS**

Application of Standards and Guidelines: See attached table.

The historic buildings on this street are all residential buildings, although some have been adapted for professional uses in whole, or in part, but without altering the residential architecture. The proposed building has the scale of a commercial building. More attention should be given to design characteristics that would be more in keeping with the residential appearance and scale of the neighborhood. Although a Colonial Revival architectural vocabulary has been used, the large scale of the elements used is inappropriate.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Reconsideration of the design to adjust the mass, height and scale of the building to better reflect the mass and height of the surrounding historic properties.

**FINDINGS: The following Ordinance Standards apply:**

Design Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p><b>Section 8-3030 (k) (2) Demolition of historic structures</b>                      a. All requests for demolition of any building within the historic district shall come before the board of review.                      b. Buildings less than fifty years old may be considered for listing on the historic building map if they are found to have achieved exceptional importance</p>	<p>Demolition of 704 Abercorn. 704 Abercorn was built between 1968 and 1979 and is not fifty years old. It is not listed on the historic building map and has not achieved exceptional importance.</p>	<p>This building may be demolished.</p>
<p><b>Section 8-3030 (l) Design standards (l) Height:</b> Residential Buildings – The exterior expression of the height of the first story...shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet.</p>	<p>The exterior expression of the first story plus crawl space is 12 feet. The exterior expression of the next two stories is 10'-4" each.</p>	<p>The floor-to-floor height standards are met, however the height of the roof makes this appear to be a very massive building. The actual height needs to be verified. It is given variously as 43'-6" and 46'-3".</p>
<p><b>Section 8-3030 (l) (2) Street Elevation Type</b> A proposed building on an east-west connecting street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front or on an immediately adjacent...block.</p>	<p>The proposed street elevation type utilizes a three foot crawl space. This block contains historic structures with both high and low stoops. The duplex immediately adjacent to the proposed structure is raised only a small amount.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p><b>Section 8-3030 (l)(3) Setbacks</b>                      Front yards: There shall be no front yard setback except as follows: On Tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.</p>	<p>Historically there were private "dooryard gardens" in front of the structures in this block, in addition to the public tree lawns. The applicant has approximately aligned the proposed construction with the adjacent duplex.</p>	<p>The setback standard has been met.</p>
<p><b>Section 8-3030 (l) (4) Entrances</b>                      c. A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.</p>	<p>All the primary entrances on this block front the street. The proposed residential entrance faces the street with an additional ramped entrance. The Doctor's office entrance is from the rear parking lot.</p>	<p>The entrance to the apartment lobby faces the street.</p>

<p>The following guidelines and Visual Compatibility Factors apply:</p>		
<p><b>Section 8-3030 (k)(5) Nonrated structures</b>                  The construction of a new structure...in the Historic District visible from a public street or lane shall generally be of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, structure material, texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with other structures in the historic district, particularly nearby structures designated as historic...</p>		<p>Staff has concern with the height and mass of the proposed structure in context with the historic structures in the same block. See comments below.</p>
<p><b>Height</b> Height Map: The maximum height for this area is 4 stories.</p>	<p>The proposed project is three stories.</p>	<p>This standard has been met, however see comments regarding roof.</p>
<p><b>Proportion of structure's front façade</b></p>	<p>The proposed building's overall height is given variously as 43'-6" and 46'-3" and the width is given variously as 56' and 58'.</p>	<p>The actual height and width need to be clarified. The main mass of the only other Colonial Revival style building on the block, 220 East Hall Street, built in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, is approximately 39' x 39' by 37' high. It is a concern that the proposed structure utilizes a specific building style but greatly expands the proportions of the typical mass so that it is incongruous with the neighborhood. In addition, 220 East Hall has more green space around it giving it "breathing room". The building east of the proposed structure is also a "box-like" mass, 49' wide by 41'-4" tall, but it is a duplex and its mass is broken down into two semi-attached dwellings.</p>
<p><b>Proportion of openings</b> rectangular windows vertically aligned.</p>	<p>Rectangular windows vertically aligned.</p>	<p>This criteria has been met.</p>
<p><b>Rhythm of solids to voids in front façade</b></p>	<p>The characteristic rhythms in these blocks are three bay (or 6 bay for duplexes) and 5 bay. The proposed structure is 7 bays wide.</p>	<p>The 7 bay rhythm is atypical for this block.</p>

<b>Rhythm of structure on street</b>	The larger structures on this street are buffered by side and front yard green space.	The proposed building is wide with no side buffering.
<b>Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection</b>	Projecting stoops and porches are characteristic of this block.	Drawing three appears to indicate that there is a one story stoop with two columns. Drawing four indicates a bracketed hood and no columns and columns do not appear on sheet I and 2. This needs clarification. Also on every other building on both block fronts the projecting front portion is an open porch (with one exception of the adjacent enclosed vestibule). This solid projecting portion with its massive roof is an anomaly in this block and is not compatible.
<b>Roof shape</b>	The proposed roof is a hip with an intersecting gabled projecting on the front and large gabled vents on the other three sides.	The existing historic hip roof at 220 East Hall is much less massive and has small scale dormers with ornamental windows. The proposed scale is much larger than the historic scale. Aside from the two Mansard roofs (A form not prevalent in Savannah) there is no precedent in this block for such a massive expanse of visible roof.
<b>Walls of continuity</b>	Low copings and walls topped by low fences are characteristic of this neighborhood.	The site plan indicates such a fence is proposed.
<b>Scale</b>	Open porches, broken up volumes, bay windows, deep cornices, small scale dormers are features that break up the scale of the existing historic structures. The proposed structure presents a large unrelieved volume.	The scale appears incongruous with the other buildings on the block front.
<b>Directional Expression</b>	The proposed structure is a box-like with little relief.	While there are other box-like forms used in this block, their overall expression is relieved by open porches, projections and setbacks to create a variety of wall volumes. The proposed structure does not have this relief and appears much greater in scale than its neighbors.

**Board Comments:**

**Dr. Johnson** asked if there was any indication of the width of the space between the building and the (east) property line of this building?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated it appeared to be 4 feet or 5 feet.

**Mr. Gay** stated if you looked at this out of context it looked gigantic, but it was a lot smaller. He said it seemed like the rhythm of the windows was going to be out-of-scale with the building next door.

**Mr. Levy** stated the Board may be aware there was a previous submittal for this project, which was withdrawn. He said this was a new proposal for a different building. He said his client told him that he wanted a small office, his medical practice, and he had to have five living units for rental income. He made a number of visits to the site to picture the existing buildings as well as the building setbacks and parking requirements. He said he looked at the buildings that front on Abercorn Street and took measurements of some buildings. He said he did not think some of the measurements that were quoted were correct. He said he was impressed with the unique character and state of preservation of the Hall Street buildings. Historic Savannah Foundation books stated that all of the buildings except for one were notable. He said there were a variety of architectural styles there including, Gothic, Federal, and classic Greek which all seemed to blend into a harmonious and pleasant manner.

He further stated the plans for this proposed building resulted in a three-story building with a width of 58 feet on Hall Street and a 60 foot front on Abercorn Street. The first floor elevation was 3 feet above the ground, which matched the building next door. He said the finished grade above the roof height was 46'-3" and the comment was 46'-6" which was 3 inches difference. The difference was probably caused by the computer measuring something as opposed to what he measured on his scale. He said after several sketches it was apparent that the dimensions of the building, window placement and the character of those nearby buildings seemed to dictate a Georgian style façade, with either brick or stucco finish to fit with the other buildings. He said in regard to the City Preservation Officer's comments this was a corner lot fronting on Hall and Abercorn Streets. Buildings along Abercorn Street in the two adjoining blocks averaged 57 feet – 60 feet in length, which was a blank wall with scattered windows. He said then there was one on the north side that was also about 50 feet. He said the proportion of the building on Abercorn Street was in compliance with other buildings on Abercorn Street. On the south side of Hall Street, the building next to it (205 & 207) was 50 feet wide and the first floor was 3 feet – 4 feet above the grade, which matched what he did. The building at 213 Hall Street, if you took the projection on the side of it was 59 feet wide and the one at 225 Hall Street had a frontage of 60 feet. He said he felt the problem was in saying that this building was too big was that you were looking at something on a piece of paper. The other buildings you look and see the setbacks and they did not look so massive. He said his building was the same in that it had a 6 foot drop back where the lobby is. He said if you take that into account you did not get the huge front facing you. On the north side at of Hall Street (226) the building was 50 feet in width on Abercorn Street. He said the businesses on Hall Street include bed & breakfast, rental apartments, and professional offices. Along Abercorn Street, in the Hall Street area there is the Mansion Hotel, which is huge as well as professional offices and other buildings. He said he felt Abercorn Street was a business street and did not look residential.

He stated this proposal was based on a Georgian style and seemed to be the most appropriate based on the building dimensions. He said they were willing to discuss any factor of this building with regard to the style, height, roof, and so forth. However, he felt the width of the building was determined because you had two living units side by side. He said you have a 12 foot, 4 foot, and 12 foot room which brought you up to 26 feet and doubled you got 54 feet. He said he felt you could not make your rooms smaller than that. He said if you have to insist that the building be smaller than it would be out of the picture because you could not have two living units on the same floor. He said they were also willing to discuss any number of features, but it had to be an economical, viable building. He said he felt that the fact that the Georgian building

was described as out-of-scale was not true. (Showed a picture of the Davenport House). He said it was a Georgian design and a sloped roof like he proposed. He said he did not see anything wrong with the Davenport House, which was not bigger than his building. He said the Board made a review of a previous submittal where the height/mass was approved. The building that he was submitting was smaller.

**Mr. Gay** stated his concern about the project was what made up the height and mass. He said you look at the buildings next door and felt they were approximately the same size or close to it, but they were two residences. He said the ceilings were much higher and windows larger. He said he felt the proposed project would look like a toy next to it. He said he was trying to get five things into the same space that two houses were in. He said the total mass did not concern him, but the appearance that it was a lot of different units as opposed to what else was on the block.

**Mr. Levy** stated the issue may be if it was practical to think that you could build a two-family house on this street now. He said he was willing to discuss anything that would help Dr. Persad get his building, but he could not change the width and length of the building. He said they had to have parking in the rear and he had to have the width on the front. He said he would be willing to discuss the roof, size and placement of the windows to a certain point. He said he felt he had a problem in that in a two-family house, the kind of house built in 1800's, it would be at least a 15 foot or 20 foot room and you could get two windows in that area with nice spacing. The rooms that they have were 12 feet and you could not put two windows in there with any space between them. He said he felt it became an impossibility to make it look like a two-family house. He said it had to be a little different. He said if the Board did not want the roof they could do a parapet and put a rail around it or something to make it look pretty. He said they could change the windows to Victorian windows with arches over the top. He said this was there thoughts on what was simple and straight forward, which was the Georgian design.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if he understood him to say that he should be allowed a larger building because Abercorn Street was not primarily a residential street?

**Mr. Levy** stated Abercorn Street was not a residential street.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if he was building a residential structure?

**Mr. Levy** stated yes in a way, but it was a commercial street. He said apartments and businesses were permissible and were there. He said what he meant was that a single-family home was not going to be built on Abercorn Street.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if he understood that the income that Dr. Persad had to achieve on this project was not a consideration of the Board?

**Mr. Levy** stated yes. He said that if they have to do certain things which would decrease that it would become an impractical situation for Dr. Persad.

**Mr. Steffen** stated looking at the size these were very high end apartments. He asked if they considered doing something more modest or affordable?

**Mr. Levy** stated they were three-bedroom apartments. The bedrooms were approximately 10 X 12 and each had its own bathroom. He said there was also a small kitchen, dining area, and

living room. He said they measured approximately 26 X 50 feet. He said they had to have three bedrooms and they had to have a bathroom for each one.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he felt that they could build more modest apartments.

**Dr. Caplan** stated the Board appreciated their willingness to make whatever changes necessary and they did not want to design his project. He said he also felt they were going to need to make some changes. He said he did not feel the greatest concern was the Abercorn Street side as it was Hall Street side. On the building next door, which was a duplex, they had two separate entrances which gave the appearance of a smaller unit. He said he felt if he could have two entrances, doing something to make it look not quite so massive with a single entrance.

**Mr. Levy** stated if the Board looked at the plans they would see that there was a lobby area. He said the necessity for that was that they had to have an elevator and handicap access. He said if he had two separate entrances, he would have to have two separate ramps to get there and he did not have enough room for that. He said he would also have to have some way of getting people from each entrance to the elevator. He said he did not know how he could do that and meet fair housing laws.

**Mr. Deering** stated he did not think the mass of the building was out-of-scale with the neighborhood, but how he created the mass. He said having the projecting portion was not in keeping with the rhythm of the mass and the other buildings on the street. He said the three floors compressed into this building height with the high roof did not work on this street. The Georgian style for this building also did not work on this street. He said it looked like a small county courthouse plopped down on Hall Street. He said he felt it was inappropriate. He said the Board was trying to politely tell him to go back and look at the design. He said perhaps he needed to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Levy** stated he was willing to do that. He said the submittal was for height/mass only. He said he did not ask for review of the building itself.

**Mr. Gay** stated he referred to the Davenport as an example and maybe he could use that more as something he could use more for his plans as far as the exterior of the building.

**Mr. Merrill** stated he did not know if he could do that because it had the high roof on it and end parapet walls. However, he could go back to some of the other buildings that were on the street using a parapet around it, taking off the high roof. He said he could put some different kind of French windows if that would be more acceptable. He said he felt he could not decrease the width of the building.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the Board was not asking him to decrease the width of the building. He said there were two entrances to the building. He said he had a lobby. One happened to be hidden on the Abercorn Street side and one was a portico type entrance with a cantilevered balcony. He said this block was one of the most beautiful blocks in the City of Savannah because every building was setback and had landscaping in front. He said every building on this block had a dominating entry. He said he felt there was no reason that he could not revise his plans so that he has the same two entrances. He said it could be architecturally drawn, so that he still use the elevator and stairs because he has the lobby running across the front about 25 feet. He said there were so many things that could be done to reduce the tiny entrance on

this massive façade. He said the Board was not asking him to decrease the dimensions. The Board was asking him to look at the articulation of the architecture of the face of all three sides.

**Mr. Levy** stated he agreed and said that he would be willing to work to change the elevations. He said what he was fighting was the reduction in size as recommended by Staff. He said he felt that was something that he could not do. He said if the Board was willing to give him the width and length of the building and let him work on what it looked like after that then he could go ahead with it.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he felt height/mass included projections and indentations. He said it was not just that it was 55 feet long and 48 feet wide. The height/mass was articulation, indentation, and projection. He said if he was willing to do that then he would suggest that he ask for a continuance, so that he could present to the Board with what he felt would make a better presentation as far as the massive appearance.

**Mr. Levy** stated he was willing to do that.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE:     Petition of Dirk Hardison  
          HBR 05-3376-2  
          539 East Congress Street  
          New Construction – Part I & 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 frame carriage house for 539 East Congress Street on the existing vacant parking area.

### **FINDINGS**

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

1. **Height:** As proposed, the carriage house will be two stories in height and 26'7" tall to the gable roof's peak. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first and second floors will each appear 9' tall.
2. **Width:** The lane façade of the carriage house will have a width of 30'1".
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The garage doors will each be 9' wide. The second floor window openings are 3' wide and 5' tall.
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 vertical directional appearance.

5. **Roof Shapes:** The carriage house will have side gable roof.
6. **Setbacks:** The carriage house will have a zero line setback on East Congress Lane and to the western property line.

### Design Details and Materials

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Standards apply:

#### Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards

- (6) Visual Compatibility Factors
- (g) Relationship of materials, texture, and color.
  1. Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards
  - (8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following:
    - c. Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.
  - (9) Windows
    - a. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.
    - c. Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided however that the windows meet the following standards: the muntins shall be no wider than 7/8", the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.
    - d. "snap-in" or between the glass muntins shall not be used.
    - e. The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.
    - f. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3, provided however, nothing precludes an arched window being used.
    - h. The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows.
    - k. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.
- (14) Lanes and Carriage House.
  - c. New carriage houses may provide up to four-foot setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.
  - d. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.
  - e. Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapets.

### DISCUSSION

1. **Exterior Materials:** The exterior walls will be smooth finish Hardiplank siding with a 5" lap. The side gable roof will be 20 year composition shingle in Charcoal by Timberline.
2. **Windows:** All windows will be double-hung, single-glazed, two-over-two, true-divided lite wood windows. Operable, louvered wood shutters will be used.
3. **Doors:** The garage doors will be 9' wide, overhead doors with traditional wood trim. Wood pedestrian access doors will have glass transoms with metallic gold numbers and

letters on the inside of the glass. One door will provide access to a closet housing the electric meters, the other to stairs to the second floor.

4. **Colors:** No colors were provided. All colors should be submitted for Staff review and approval.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval with colors to be submitted for Staff review and approval.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with colors to be brought to staff for approval. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison  
HBR 05-3377-2  
112 East Jones Street  
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting a one story garage for two cars at 112 East Jones Street. The new building will be 24' x 20' +/- . The materials will be smooth stucco over concrete block. Two flush wood 8' x 8' over head doors are proposed. Colors are to match the existing house.

### **FINDINGS**

The following standards apply:

Section 8-3030 (13) Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.

Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by a parapet.

(I) Design Standards (1) Height: Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

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

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison  
HBR 05-3378-2  
120 West Harris Street  
Alterations & New Construction Part I & 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, and add a side porch on the west elevation of 120 West Harris Street. The proposed side porch had been previously approved in April 2003 by the Review Board, but was never constructed.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Side Porch:**

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:**

1. The lot for 120 West Harris Street is a double lot, measuring 100' in length and 41' 5 ½" in width.
2. The proposed porch would be constructed on the west elevation of the stuccoed house.
3. The porch will be constructed of wood with masonry piers, and using design details from the front stoop.
4. The porch will be recessed from the front edge of the house by approximately 6'4". The dimensions of the porch are 30' in length, 7'4" wide, and 8'9" from the ground to the bottom of the porch. The porch will be 11'6" in height from the floor of the porch to the ridge of the porch roof.
5. A standing seam metal roof, of a red terne color, is proposed for the porch. The roof sloop will be 12 to 1.
6. An existing window will be changed to a door, with the header raised to 8'. The proposed door will be a wood, true-divided light in a 3 X 5 configuration.
7. The wood porch columns and rails will match the front stoop in size and profile. The colors will match the existing building. The petitioner provided porch details.
8. Another existing window on the west elevation will be altered by lowering the header to 8' in height to match, with stucco infilling the lowered area.
9. The north and south elevation porch railings will be wood louvered instead of wood pickets, painted to match.

**Carriage House:**

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

1. **Height:** As proposed, the carriage house will be two stories in height and 22'8" tall. In respect to exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first floor will be 10' and the second floor 9' tall.
2. **Width/Depth:** The lane façade of the carriage house will have a width of 41' 5 1/2", with a depth of 30'. Staff is concerned that the scale of the carriage house is overwhelming to the main house facing West Harris Street. 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 and depth, should be reduced so as not to visually compete with the main house. 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.
3. **Proportion of Openings Within the Facility:** The three garage doors will each be 9' wide. The second floor window openings are 3' wide and 5' tall. Staff would recommend that one auto bay be eliminated to reduce the overall scale of the carriage house.
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 flat roof with parapet.
6. **Setbacks:** The carriage house will have a zero line setback on West Liberty Lane and to the western property line.

**Design Details and Materials**

The following Visual Compatibility Factors and Standards apply:

## Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards

- (6) Visual Compatibility Factors:
  - (g) Relationship of materials, texture, and color.
1. Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards
  - (8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following:
    - c. Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.
  - (9) Windows
    - a. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.

- c. Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided however that the windows meet the following standards: the muntins shall be no wider than 7/8", the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.
- d. "snap-in" or between the glass muntins shall not be used.
- e. The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.
- f. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3, provided however, nothing precludes an arched window being used.
- h. The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows.
- k. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.

(14) Lanes and Carriage House.

- c. New carriage houses may provide up to four-foot setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.
- d. Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.
- e. Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapets.

### **DISCUSSION**

1. **Exterior Materials:** The exterior walls will be smooth finish stucco with 12"x2" scoring, all lintels are expressed with scoring. All downspouts will be metal.
2. **Windows:** All windows will be double-hung, single-glazed, one-over-one, true-divided lite wood windows. Operable, louvered wood shutters will be used.
3. **Doors:** The three garage doors will be 9' wide, flush wood overhead doors. A two panel wood door will provide pedestrian access into the carriage house.
4. **Colors:** No colors were provided. All colors should be submitted for Staff review and approval.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the side porch and reconsideration of carriage house with the condition that the overall mass and scale be reduced significantly, in width and depth.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he disagreed with Staff. He said the 41 feet across the lane did not bother him because the lanes in some instances were lined with carriage houses and you could not tell where one ended and one began. However, he was concerned about looking down the lane from Barnard Street and seeing the 30 foot depth of the carriage house. He said if that could be pushed back that would make it better.

**Mr. Hardison** stated his comments were well taken, but he had not been given a fall back position so he felt it was up or down on the size of the carriage house.

**Mr. Gay** stated in regard to the width it was true that looking from the lane there was a rhythm that you had a hard time distinguishing between carriage houses. He said he felt it may be more of the fact that the house in front was not a 30 foot wide house. He said it was a much narrower house and to have this huge structure behind it, did not seem right.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the ground floor of the carriage house being for cars did not need to have a 10 foot height. He said perhaps the petitioner could delete 1 foot or 1½ feet out of the height.

**Mr. Hardison** stated that included the floor structure for the second floor.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated may be it could be reduced to 8 feet.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if it was one unit or two units?

**Mr. Hardison** stated one unit.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the extra parking space was not being mandated by residency requirement.

**Mr. Hardison** stated no.

\***Mrs. Fortson-Waring** arrived approximately 3:25 p.m.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF concurred with Staff that the mass of the project was too large. He said HSF also felt that the depth needed to be narrower to conform with the typical scale of carriage houses.

**Discussion:**

**Mr. Deering** asked the petitioner if they would consider continuing the petition?

**Mr. Hardison** stated he would like to see the porch approved and a continuance of the other items.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Deering** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the porch alterations and continue the carriage house for height, mass and design details. **Dr. Johnson** seconded the motion it was passed. Abstaining to the motion was **Mrs. Fortson-Waring**.

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

Continued Per Petitioner's Request.

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

Present for the petition was Andy Lynch, Architect.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of the following:

- 1) Demolition of a two-story, non-rated building at 320 Montgomery Street.
- 2) Part I: Height and Mass approval for the new construction of a five-story hotel building at 320 Montgomery Street.

The location for the proposed new hotel along Montgomery Street is an area characterized by new structures, including the Liberty Street parking garage and the Gardens on Jones condominiums.

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Demolition:**

The following language from Section 8-3030 applies to requests for demolition

- (2) *Demolition of historic structures.*

Demolition of historic structures is deemed detrimental to the public interest.

- a. All requests for demolition of any building within the historic district shall come before the board of review.
  - b. Buildings less than fifty years old may be considered for listing on the historic building map if they are found to have achieved exceptional importance.
1. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish an existing building located at 320 Montgomery Street. The existing building was constructed as an automotive repair shop in 1969.
  2. The building is a concrete masonry structure with aluminum storefront glazing on the north elevation. The former garage bays have been infilled with concrete masonry units.
  3. The building is not rated as a contributing structure in the Historic District.
  4. Staff recommends that the request for the demolition of the existing building be approved as it is an unrated structure and do not appear to have achieved exceptional architectural importance.

#### **New Construction: Part I Height and Mass**

The following Standards from Section 8-3030 apply:

(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. The following factors shall be considered in determining the visual compatibility of such a building, structure or appurtenance provided they comply with the specific design standards as set forth in this subsection. These factors shall not be the basis for appeal of an adverse decision. Greater weight shall be given to adjacent historic structures.

- a. *Height.* New construction or additions to existing structures shall be within the height limits as shown on the historic district height map.

The project is located in a 4- story height area.

The petitioner is requesting 5 stories, which would require a variance. The petitioner has provided a narrative discussing their rationale that an additional story be granted and is appropriate in this context.

As detailed in the petitioner's narrative, the adjacent lots to the north and west are in a five-story zone. However, immediately adjacent to the proposed hotel on the same block are historic residential building of two stories in height. While the petitioner argues that a five story building would allow for a transition from buildings on Liberty Street to the four-story zone, Staff feels that the change from five stories to two stories on the same block is somewhat drastic. Staff feels that the recently adopted height map should not be varied from for this project.

The minimum floor-to-floor heights have been met.

- b. *Proportion of structure's front facade.* The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front facade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is visually related.

Montgomery Street Façade: width of 160'.

Jones Street Façade: width of 80'.

Harris Street Façade: width of 110'.

Montgomery Street is transitioning into a street of large commercial and multi-family residential buildings, including the Liberty Street parking garage and the Gardens on Jones Street.

- c. *Proportion of openings.* The relationship of the width of the windows to height of windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.

The overall shape of the voids appears to create large horizontal expanses, but with muntin divisions. Historically, windows in Savannah tend to be more vertical than horizontal. In the design phase, attention needs to be given to the way in which these expanses are divided in order to achieve these groupings of vertical elements. The entry bay on Montgomery Street has a five-story centered window that does have muntin division. The corner bay of Montgomery Street and East Jones Street has window openings that are different from the rest of the hotel.

- d. *Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades.* The relationship of solids to voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.

**The Montgomery Street first level will have the primary entry into the hotel and large expanses of windows. A 24' opening will allow entry into an internal hotel valet parking area.**

- e. *Rhythm of structures on streets.* The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjacent structures shall be visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing structures to which it is visually related.

**The proposed hotel will have almost total lot coverage. No setbacks are required in a BC zone.**

- f. *Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection.* The relationship of entrances, porch projections, and walkways to structures shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are visually related.

- h. *Roof shapes.* The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related.

**The predominant historic roof shape of the commercial buildings in this area is flat with a parapet or cornice. The proposed flat roof with a cornice and parapet is visually compatible.**

- i. *Walls of continuity.* Appurtenances of a structure such as walls, wrought iron, fences shall form consistent walls of enclosure along a street.

**The proposed building forms a consistent wall of enclosure along the street. On the Harris Street elevation, a section of the hotel building will be recessed as it adjoins a two-story, historic residential building.**

- j. *Scale of a building.* The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.

**The final treatment of the infill in the voids will be critical in creating the fine scale that is typical of buildings in Savannah's Historic District.**

- k. *Directional expression of front elevation.* A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures to which it is visually related in its directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character, or nondirectional character.

**As proposed, the hotel will have a horizontal directional appearance.**

- l) *Design standards.* The above visual compatibility factors are further expressed in the following implementing design standards:

2. Commercial buildings:

- (a) The exterior expression of the height of the ground floor shall not be less than 14'-6".
- (b) The exterior expression of the height of the second story shall be not less than 12 feet.
- (c) The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall be not less than 10 feet.

**These standards have been met.**

- (5) *Commercial design standards.* Commercial buildings shall comply with the following:
  - a. The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront.
  - b. The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course (i.e., a projecting horizontal band). 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.
  - c. The height of the first story shall be not less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single story above the first story.
  - d. The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story.
  - e. Retail storefront area glazing shall be not less than 55 percent. Such glazing shall be transparent; provided, however, black glass may be used in the sign area above the storefront window transoms. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18--24-inch base of contrasting material, to the lintel.
  - f. Storefront glazing in subdivided sashes shall be inset a minimum of four inches from the face of the building; provided, however, that continuously glazed storefronts may be flush with the face of the building.
  - g. Entrances shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.

**It appears these standards have been met.**

- 6) *Tall building standards.* Tall buildings shall comply with the following:
  - a. The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide.

**One bay on the Montgomery Street façade has a width of 62'6".**
  - b. Buildings greater than four stories in height shall use window groupings, columns or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width.

**This needs to be addressed in the Part II submittal with dimensions.**
  - c. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched

the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature.

**This standard has been met.**

- d. Buildings less than 60 feet wide located on a corner tithing lot abutting a north-south connecting street shall locate primary entrances on both the east-west and north-south streets unless a corner entrance is utilized. Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances.

**This standard has been met on the East Harris Street elevation.**

(7) *Large scale development.* Large scale development shall comply with the following:

- a. Large scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width.

**Montgomery Street Façade:** The main façade has been designed with an asymmetrical bay rhythm of four primary bays, with a perceived internal bay rhythm of three, three, five, and two, respectively, when viewed looking east. Viewing the Montgomery Street elevation facing east, the bay rhythms are 36'9", 37'6", 62'6", and 20'11", respectively.

**Harris Street Façade:** This elevation will have four bay rhythm of 24'5", 25', 30'9", and 27'6".

**No elevations were submitted for the East Jones Street or rear elevations of the building.**

- b. Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street.

**This standard has been met.**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of Demolition of existing non-rated building at 320 Montgomery Street. Reconsideration of Part 1: Height and Mass, including the following conditions: the four-story height limit is maintained, elevations of the rear and Jones Street elevation are provided, and in the Part II: Design Details and Materials phase, Staff concerns are addressed.

### **Petitioner's Comments:**

**Mr. Lynch** stated they agreed with Staff's comments in regard to the window configuration and bay spacing. He said the most contentious point was the variance for 5 stories they were asking for. He said the site sits surrounded by five story uses on three sides. The City garage is 61 feet at the parapet height and 71'-8" at the highest point. The Courtyard is five stories with a 62 foot parapet and 67 feet at its highest point. Inman Park Properties was also zoned five stories. He said as you move south, The Gardens on Jones project was four stories and that continues in the next project. He said their most troubling areas were the residential components because they had a series of two story buildings on Harris Street and two story on Charlton Street. On the Charlton Street side they were stepping back about 10 feet at the

second floor and then they go to the full 5 story along the Harris Street side. He said when they met with HSF they discussed some options for reducing the height of the two elements on the corners on Harris Street bringing this section down and eliminating two units on the top. Also, on Charlton Street eliminating these two units, so it would be nicer transition down to the two story uses next door.

He further stated the site was the termination point for the I-16 ramp, which they saw as a gateway to the urban core. Therefore, they felt that 5 stories was appropriate. He said they also felt that it would serve more as a buffer to the residential uses as you moved further east. And it would serve to break down the mass of the garage on your approach on I-16. He said if they went to a four story scheme a lot of the rooms that they had located on the fifth floor would have to go to the first floor, which would eliminate some of the public uses that they had planned. He said they also had a fairly large valet parking area that could hold seventeen cars that they were hoping in eliminating some of the parking problems around the site.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** asked if they owned the property when the Board was drawing up the new height map?

**Mr. Lou Tillman, Owner**, stated no. He said he has had several conversations with the previous owner

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated there were a lot of public hearings and the Board made a lot of cuts and exceptions for people who really protested about having their height zoning reduced.

**Mr. Tillman** stated he asked the previous owner if he protested. He said he had also heard that across the street on Montgomery there was consideration to reduce that and there were some objections. However, he was not a part of that dialogue, so he did not know exactly what happened. He said the previous owner did not remember being notified by direct mail. He said he thought the previous owner's preoccupation was moving his business and building a new business on Chatham Parkway. He said they were just trying to ask for a reconsideration.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he felt that he had a much bigger problem than the height variance. He asked in regard to A.3 under the current design if they realized that people were coming off of I-16 having to make a right turn across Montgomery Street to get into the entrance of this hotel?

**Mr. Lynch** stated yes, and they knew that they were going to have to address that.

**Mr. Steffen** stated negotiating across Montgomery Street without an entrance to a major hotel was already problematic. He said he foresee a parking and vehicle traffic nightmare. He said that would be of great concern to him unless the entry was somewhere other than on Montgomery Street.

**Mr. Deering** stated the Board has to stick with things that were within their purview. He said City Traffic Engineering would address the traffic.

**Mr. Lynch** stated he understood his concern, but the only other alternate would be to putting the entry on Harris Street, which they felt was inappropriate.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked the Parliamentarian if the Board could change the height ordinance height ordinance?

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated no. She said the Board could make a recommendation and then it would go before the next body and they would decide.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they consider a continuation and represent this as they wish it to be?

**Mr. Lynch** stated they would, but they would like to get a read from the Board on whether they should pursue the five story scheme.

**Dr. Caplan** stated utilizing a visual compatibility standard he felt strongly that many of them in the room including some of the presenters worked very hard to bring these standards in place. He said he was concerned about the two story buildings immediately adjacent. He said it seemed to him that a better visual compatibility solution would be to reduce to four floors and take down one step down as suggested and have a three story building there, which would then take them to a step down to a two story building.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he was also thinking the same thing.

**Mr. Tillman** stated that would have a direct impact on the room number. He said he felt they needed to go back to their drawing board to address some of these issues. He said he would like to request a continuance.

**Dr. Caplan** stated whatever the public was going to address was going to moot because the petitioner would come back with a different scheme. He said he appreciated the patience of those who had waited, but what they say may not be valid anymore.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Mr. Mark Marshalok** stated some of his issues were addressed by Mr. Deering and Dr. Caplan concerning going from a four story structure and transitioning abruptly down to two story residences. He said he did not see it happening anywhere else in the area. At the Gardens on Jones they kept a free space approximately 20 feet to 50 feet around the existing structure, which he felt worked well. He said he felt there was not a whole lot of thought put into traffic flow, which he knew was not the purview of the Board. But he felt in terms of a better location for an entry area they could consider an open turn around courtyard on the side of the structure similar to what has been done at the Mansion. He suggested that they utilize that area to create an open space that would serve as a buffer between his home and the center of the façade (four story up).

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the Board understood his concerns, but in light of the fact the petitioner had agreed to a continuation and would probably make some changes, he felt those were concerns he could probably address with the petitioner as well.

**Mr. Marshalok** stated he wanted to point out that in the petitioner's description of the adjacent structures these were not three story structures. He said they were two story structures. He said the median was also drawn 20 feet shorter than where it actually ended up. He said he felt that further compounded the problem which was also raised by Mr. Steffen.

**Mr. Paul Morgenthal (309 West Harris Street)** stated he owned the adjacent property at 311 West Harris Street. He said he was concerned about the protection of those properties and he hoped the City was also. He said he would reserve any objections he has since the petitioner has requested a continuance. He said he would also reserve his complaints under the

Americans for Disability Act for another point-in-time to be provided with suitable materials. He said he felt since he was an owner of property next to the proposed site, in all fairness it might be a good move.

**Mr. Francis Hayes (West Charlton and Jefferson Streets)** stated he felt it was a sorry moment they have come when an architect could come before the Board and talk about building a structure in a National Landmark District and talk about prototypical units as if in fact this has to meet a certain standard of a catalogue hotel. He said this was not the first one to present it. Part of the uniqueness of the district was in fact that it did not come out of a catalogue. He further stated that while it was not formal green space the building took away from informal green space that existed there for years. He said the 32 parking spaces now eliminated and on the weekends they were in fact green space for the community. He said there were ways to address that. Also, the nice thing was that the proposed developer has said that they were willing to meet with people in the neighborhood. He said he also felt that the petitioner's residential parking plan, which he did not have because he was going to be using the garage had not been presented to the Board. He said along with that use was in fact going to be a 24-hour parking and the use of those streets for parking for the 120 units. He said he felt that was distinctly a design element that in fact has to be addressed in the plan that was talked about earlier in terms of entering this facility. He said there was also no provision in the plan to show the garbage areas that were proposed for West Charlton Street. He said there was also no indication where the HVAC and mechanical services were going to be.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated the Board understood their concerns, but it was beyond the Board's purview (regarding parking).

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

**RE: Petition of Cale R. Hall & Travis Sawyer  
HBR 05-3384(S)-2  
303 Tattnall Street  
Color/Wall & Sign**

No one was present for the petition.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of the following changes to 303 Tattnall Street:

1. Erect a 6'x3' wood fascia sign on the Liberty Street elevation West end beneath the existing two lights (location of previous sign). Black with green and white copy "Creative Approach". (note banner has been removed).
2. Paint walls Chesapeake Tan with a Hunter Green Stripe.
3. Erect a three foot high wall along Liberty Street between sidewalk and parking lot. Single width wall to be constructed of ballast block pavers 11"x4"x6.5"

**FINDINGS:**

1. More detail is needed as to the structure of the wall and length of the wall. Staff doubts that a single width masonry wall with no piers can be structurally sound. Staff also

questions the suitability of the pavers as a wall material. A sample has been provided. Also, the color of the mortar will need to be provided.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of the sign and color change. Further discussion of the wall.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the sign, color change and deny the wall. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Staff Reviews**

1. Petition of Michael Goldsmith, JN & A, For  
Hyatt Regency  
HBR 05-3367(S)-2  
2 West Bay Street  
Awning

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

2. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jim Morehouse  
HBR 05-3368(S)-2  
15 East Broughton Street  
Awning

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

3. Petition of William Hanrahan  
HBR 05-3369(S)-2  
514 – 516 East Gwinnett Street  
Color Change

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

4. Petition of Diane Berryhill  
HBR 05-3372(S)-2  
318 East Broughton Street  
Color/Minor Alterations

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

5. Petition of Baker Leavitt  
HBR 05-3382(S)-2  
309 – 311 West Huntingdon Street  
Color

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

6. Petition of Lewis Hill  
HBR 05-3383(S)-2  
501 Tattnell Street  
Color

**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

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

1. 514 East State Street

**Mrs. Reiter** stated it was reported that 514 East State Street has deviated from their approved drawings. She said a door was placed in this location with a stoop. She said the stoop that was in this location was made of a column that seemed to be a ribbed column and did not match what was on the approved drawings. She said she sent a letter to the owner requesting that he comes before the Board and explain or defend the changes, but he has not responded to the mailing. She said she will send it to Inspections Department and ask for a Stop Work Order.

**RE: Minutes**

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – April 13, 2005

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of April 13, 2005 as submitted. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Other Business**

**Mr. Mitchell** stated work being done that was not in accordance with what was approved by the Board needed to be added to the list of items for discussion at the upcoming Retreat.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated what if the Board discovered that some work was being done contrary to what was approved by the Board and they notified the building department a stop work order is issued. He said he felt instead of having at the very next meeting the owner or petitioner coming in, that the Board should make a ruling that they would not hear that petition for 45 days. He said that meant instead of it coming up at the next meeting, it would come up at the meeting following, therefore there was a one month delay in construction. He said he felt that within itself was a fine that might sink some teeth into this problem

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that was assuming the Board could stop the work. However, as the Board saw on M.L.K., Jr., when Mr. Gonzalez's building was completely done without any regard to the design, it had to be redone. She said she was sure that was a substantial cost. She said it does take a while, but once the Board finds out that people have deviated from the plan that was approved by the Board they go through the proper procedures and they have to pay to correct the problem.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he felt it was good issue to discuss at the Board's upcoming Retreat.

**RE: Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR:ca