

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

NOVEMBER 9, 2005

2:00 P.M.

**MINUTES**

**Members Present:**

John Mitchell, Chairman  
Dr. Caplan  
John Deering  
Ned Gay  
John Neely  
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring  
Eric Meyerhoff  
Joseph Steffen

**Members Absent:**

Dr. Johnson (Excused)  
Swann Seiler (Excused)

**MPC Staff Present:**

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

**RE: Call to Order**

Mr. Mitchell called the November 9, 2005 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:05 p.m.

**RE: Sign Posting**

All signs were properly posted.

**RE: Consent Agenda**

**RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose Gonzalez  
HBR 03-2963-2  
305 East Bay Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Amended Petition of Dawson + Wissmach  
Architects  
Neil Dawson  
HBR 04-3225-2 (Amended)  
112 West Gaston Street  
Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
Keith Howington  
HBR 05-3492-2  
110 – 120 Jefferson Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Dawson Wissmach Architects  
Neil Dawson  
HBR 05-3493-2  
318 East Liberty Street  
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Michael Taylor  
HBR 05-3498(S)-2  
403 East Gordon Street  
Alteration**

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. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Regular Agenda**

**RE: Amended Petition of City of Savannah  
Thomas Perdue  
HBR 04-3179-2 (Amended)  
Corner of Drayton & Hall Streets, Fort Structure  
Forsyth Park  
Alteration**

Present for the petition was Thomas Perdue.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of an eight foot-eight inch tall dumpster and electrical service enclosure at the Forsyth Park fort visitor's center/restaurant location. It is proposed to be located on the north side of the parking lot off Drayton Street for ease of access and proximity to the main electrical feed to the park.

**FINDINGS**

Two schemes have been submitted. The first scheme uses details to match the new portico previously approved for the fort structure. These include half round pre-fabricated pilasters and

corner posts per sheet 4 of 6. These columns have a vertical groove. The CMU wall with stucco and elastomeric finish will match the fort in finish and color. A steel gate with an opaque mesh screen attached to the backside of the gate, color Shipyard Grey. Stepped base trim and cornice detail match the existing fort structure.

The alternate scheme mimics the original pilasters on the fort structure.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the alternate scheme using columns to mimic the original fort.

**HDBR Action:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the alternate proposal which mimics the original pilasters on the fort structure. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed. Mrs. Fortson-Waring abstained.

**RE: Continued Petition of Merrill Levy, A.I.A, for  
Dr. Suresh Persad  
HBR 05-3374-2  
704 Abercorn Street  
New Construction – Part II/Design**

Present for the petition was Merrill Levy.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part II Design approval for a three story mixed use residential/office structure on the south-east corner of Hall Street and Abercorn Street.

### **FINDINGS**

A number of conditions were discussed in the October meeting. The following revisions reflect those discussions.

1. A dimensioned section of the cornice has been provided.
2. Wood clad, double hung and fixed, single glazed windows with mullions by Marvin or equal are proposed. Final window selection to be approved by staff prior to ordering.
3. Full windows will be used on ground floor. Window color will be white or off-white.
4. Shutters have been eliminated in recess and ground floor front.
5. Window header and sill to be cast stone. A detail has been provided.
6. Steps are to be stucco with cast stone tread. Detail provided.
7. Stucco is to be traditional scratch and brown coat of cement plaster with finish coat of dryvit, textured finish, light tan color.
8. Rear canopies are proposed to be seamed metal.
9. Roof is to be standing seam with 12 inch spacing between seams, concealed hold down clips, Kynar painted dark green finish. Exposed edges to be folded down to conceal open end gaps.
10. Six panel rear doors, no pilasters.
11. HVAC units to be located at rear of building, next to building on the west side of the property (away from the adjacent residence).
12. Front decorative fence detail has been provided.
13. Recess is at 1 foot 6 inches on front.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of amended application with one detail, that the roof of the front stoop be hip rather than shed.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Neely** asked what was decided about the wall and screening the parking on the rear facing Abercorn? He said he thought he saw a 24" low wall.

**Mr. Levy** stated with regard to the wall along Abercorn Street there was a note on the site plan that said 24" brick wall.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if that would be around the condensing units?

**Mr. Levy** stated no, it would have to be higher than that to hide it. He said it would probably be about 3 feet or 4 feet.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it would be the same material?

**Mr. Levy** stated yes.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance required a minimum 3 foot high masonry barrier to a parking lot.

**Mr. Levy** stated he would amend the petition to be 36" high rather than 24".

**Mr. Neely** stated he did not know if the Board saw a design detail of it other than what he described.

**Mr. Levy** stated it would not be anything fancy. It will be a brick wall with a brick cap.

**Mr. Neely** stated he felt may be that detail needed to come back to Staff for final approval.

**Mr. Levy** stated in previous meetings they did not discuss the canopy. He said it has been a shed roof since they started the project. He said he looked at the buildings along the street and the only one that had a pediment was the one next door. He said if the Board looked at the picture they would see the problem was that if it was made of any height from the plans it would be false and they had a fence behind it. The reason for that was the height gets into the window sills.

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt Staff was recommending that he do a hip roof and not a pedimented gable. He said it could be a low slope like a 1:12 slope.

**Mr. Levy** stated he would agree to work with Staff on that detail as well.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that and seconded by Mr. Neely, the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended with the following conditions: (1) The fence to be at least 36" high and the design brought back to staff for

approval; and (2) The roof of the front portico to be a low hip rather than a shed and design to be brought back to staff for final approval.

**RE: Petition of L & W Development Co., LLC  
Walter Evans  
HBR 05-3486-2  
462 – 470 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.  
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Haroun Homayun.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design approval for a five story mixed use structure on the Northeast corner of Gaston and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard. A similar structure was approved for the lot across Gaston Street on June 8, 2005. The design intent is to create a pair of buildings to form a gateway at Gaston Street.

**FINDINGS**

The following Design Standards apply:

<b>Design Standard</b>	<b>Proposed Development</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Height	A five story building is proposed. The height of the first story is 16 feet; the height of the second story is 14 feet; floors three and four are 11 feet and floor five is 12 feet.	
The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront.	This is a mixed use building, but the first story has been designed as a storefront.	This standard has been met.
The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course. Such architectural feature may be placed at the top of the second story when the first and second stories have the visual appearance of a separate exterior expression.	On the MLK side the first and second stories have a separate exterior expression from the upper stories through the window groupings. The first story is separated from the upper stories on the MLK and Gaston Street elevations by the strong expression of the metal awning.	The intent of this standard has been met.
The height of the first story shall not be less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single story above the first story.	In this case the first and second stories on the MLK elevation read as a separate exterior expression.	The intent of this standard has been met.
The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story.		
Retail storefront area glazing shall be not less than 55 percent.	The amount of glass exceeds 55 percent and is clear. It extends	This standard has been met.

<p>Such glazing shall be transparent. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18-24" base of contrasting material.</p>	<p>from a brick soldier course base.</p>	
<p>Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system; bronze, glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront.</p>	<p>A wood storefront system is proposed with a brick base.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>The Centerline of windows and doors shall align vertically.</p>	<p>Windows and doors are aligned vertically.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>On the MLK side wood casement windows by Andersen and stained wood doors with sidelights by Andersen are proposed. Catalog cuts have been provided. On the Gaston Street elevation a curtain wall system is proposed with casement windows. Circular accent windows are proposed in the stairwell.</p>	<p>The intent of this standard has been met.</p>
<p>Parapets shall have a string course of not less than six inches and extending at least four inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and 1 ½ feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two-inch overhang.</p>	<p>The roof is flat with a metal coping. A metal canopy and soffit is a modern expression of a stringcourse. The tops of the projecting bays are flared.</p>	<p>The intent of this standard is met with a modern interpretation.</p>
<p>Balconies, Porticoes, stairs</p>	<p>A corner entry is proposed with entries also on MLK and Gaston. These are treated with wood and glass doors and sidelights and a metal awning. The stair tower becomes a corner focal point. Balconies project on the MLK elevation at the third level and above with metal railings and posts.</p>	<p>The use of balconies, porticoes and stairs is in a modern, yet compatible form.</p>
<p>Materials, textures, colors</p>	<p>A brown-red face brick and matching mortar has been chosen. The texture of the projecting bays is accented with a projecting brick pattern.</p> <p>Gray metal will be used for the canopies, soffits and expanded metal panels.</p> <p>All exterior wood windows and frames will be white.</p>	<p>The material and color scheme is compatible.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he understood they were trying create a gateway. However, he felt the buildings were too similar and it would look like a development. He said he felt it was too similar. He said if the color were slightly different or some of the stronger details were different it would be better. He said as it was now, there would be three rounded corner tower elements which he felt detracted from the two that they were trying to create. He said he felt there needed to be an effort made to blend the building to the adjacent two story townhouses to make it step up more so that it is not such a glaring difference between the two story houses and the five story new building. He said he felt more thought needed to go into the east elevation as well because it was really blank.

**Mr. Hodayun** stated the buildings were more different than the Board could see looking at a model of that scale. He said some massing details were really different. He said the last project had three towers that broke up the massing in the front. With regard to the rounded corners he was trying to be sensitive to the Civil Rights Museum and did not want to have a 90 degree corner.

**Mr. Deering** stated rather than having this massive design feature if there could be some tie that complemented the adjacent buildings rather than this block against it. He said he felt the townhouses needed to be acknowledged architecturally. He said this reminded him of New York or Boston where you have something really historic and then all of a sudden there was a big new block next to it.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated his concern was with the circle and half circle being such a major contrast to what was there. He said they could extend the eave line of the two story building in some sort of a parapet or projection across the entry and still have the concept of being different.

**Mr. Hodayun** stated he felt he had tried hard to be conventional and in line with a lot of Savannah features. He said he was a keen observer of the old Savannah architecture and tried to employ it as much as he could. He said he felt the buildings were pretty traditional.

**Mr. Neely** asked regarding the east wall, if you could not put in windows at all?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated you could with fire protection.

**Mr. Neely** stated that was a huge blank wall that dwarfed the little building. He felt windows would improve the project.

**Mr. Thomas Perdue (City Architect)** stated there was glass today (ceramic) that cost about \$225 square foot that you could use that was fire rated. He said there were other possibilities such as sprinkler heads on the outside.

**Mr. Deering** stated there was also the opportunity to step it off the property line 3½ feet or 4 feet and then they could do more with the window openings.

**Mr. Hodayun** stated 5 feet.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the elevator lobby could be inset may be 1' – 1½' and that they create some sort of design on that elevation rather than the full length.

**Public Comments:**

**Ms. Danielle Swift** stated while she felt there was success in creating variety on the upper floors, there was approximately 93 feet between the two entrances on the first floor. She said it was very similar to the Sun Trust Bank building where there is an entrance on the corner and an entrance about 95 feet away with a horizontal band of glass between the two entrances providing no other activity for the pedestrian between those two entrances. She said also considering that there was a building next to it that was the same that provided the same number of entrances into it and was also about 100 feet in length. Therefore, you would have two solid blocks that were lacking in providing activity on the street. She said if this was to be a gateway at Gaston Street and you were coming off the highway she would think that you would want to see people or activity there.

**Mr. Thomas Perdue** expressed a concern about the width of Gaston Street and whether it would become a two way street when the overpass is removed.

**Discussion:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated since the architect has chosen to make an entrance to Gaston Street with the two rounded corners, he felt to honor the Civil Right Museum on Alice Street that they might want to look at the north west corner of the building and instead of rounding it replicate the angle that the Civil Rights Museum has.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated she agreed. She said she felt the building overpowered the Civil Rights Museum and the townhouses.

**Mr. Neely** stated he felt there have been some thoughtful comments. He said he wondered if the petitioner would be interested in a continuance so they could come back with details that addressed the comments heard today.

**Mr. Hodayun** stated they did not have a problem with a continuance except that they would like to know what they needed to focus on.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated they needed to focus on (1) Alice Street and Martin Luther King, Jr. corner treatment, (2) the use of additional entrances along MLK, (3) additional articulation on the East wall, and (4) revisions to the Gaston Street entrance to reflect the massing of the adjacent historic row.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Neely** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition to December 14, 2005 in order to address the Board's concerns as listed above. **Mr. Deering** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.



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

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

**FINDINGS**

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

NOTE: The proposed new construction exceeds the maximum percentage of lot coverage allowed and a variance from Zoning Board of Appeals will be required.

The following standards apply:

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Setbacks:</b> There shall be no front yard setback except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided. There is a maximum 75% building lot coverage. New carriage houses may provide up to a 4’ setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.	The lot is 1,800 square feet. The proposed footprint, including the existing building and garage, is approximately 1,317 square feet for a 76.7% building lot coverage. There are no rear setbacks for the proposed garage.	The lot coverage is exceeded by 1.7% and a variance from Zoning Board of Appeals will be required.
<b>Height</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(1) Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.	A two-story carriage house, 22’-4” tall is proposed.	The standard is met.
<b>Scale</b> Sec. 8-3030 (k)(6) The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.		The carriage house appears to be equal in height, or slightly less than the main residence. Staff recommends restudy of the height to show relationship between the subordinate carriage house and the contributing residence.
<b>Lanes and Carriage Houses</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(14):		
<b>Site:</b> Carriage houses, garages, and auxiliary structures must be located to the rear of the	The proposed carriage house is at the rear of the property facing the lane. The overhead garage	The standard is met.

property. Overhead garage doors shall not be used on street fronts, adjacent to sidewalk, unless they are detailed to resemble gates.	doors front the land and not a street. The design is for custom built doors with an arched top panel.	
<b>Openings:</b> Garage openings shall not exceed 12' in width.	Garage openings are to be 10' wide.	The standard is met.
<b>Roofs:</b> Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.	A shed roof is proposed. A parapet on the south elevations obscures the shed roof. There is no parapet on the north, east, and west elevations.	Staff recommends that the parapet extend around the north, east and west elevations to obscure the shed roof. The height of the parapet should be reduced from the proposed 4'. The drawings are to an unknown scale and the dimensions of the parapet and coping are not labeled.
Roofs visible from the street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles.	Pre-finished metal roof is proposed and is visible on the east and west elevations.	Staff recommends to shield the roof by a parapet, but if it is visible, verify material configuration (i.e. standing seam, galvanized, v-crimp, etc.)
<b>Exterior Walls:</b> Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.	A rough finish stucco is proposed for the exterior finish. Scoring to resemble a building on the same lane is proposed.	Staff recommends a smooth sand finish true stucco and that the scoring not be highlighted and should be painted to match the exterior stucco.
<b>Windows</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(9) Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on nonhistoric facades and on new construction, provided, however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.	The windows will be true divided light double-hung windows.	Verify materials and muntin profile.
The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.	The outer window and door openings align vertically. The interior windows do not align over the garage doors below and are not equally spaced within the upper story.	Staff recommends restudy of upper story window placement to align over door openings on the first floor.
All windows facing a street, exclusive of top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3; provided however, nothing in this section	The window openings are 32" by 60" and feature a raised stucco arched jack arch to correspond to the main building.	The standard is met. Staff recommends simplification of the jack arch detail to a flat header. The jack arches on the main building are part of the brickwork within the opening and are

precludes an arched window being used.		simplistic in nature. These appear more decorative than the main house.
Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3" from the façade of a masonry building.		Verify dimensions.
<b>Shutters</b> Sec. 8-3030 (I)(9): Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window. Shutters shall be constructed of durable wood. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials.	Shutters will be operable wood louvered shutters with hinges and stops on the lane elevation. The south elevation, facing the house will have false shutters on the ground floor; however this will not be visible from the public right of way.	The standard is met.
<b>Lighting:</b>	Two light fixtures are proposed by the garage and pedestrian entrance. They will be mounted on a outdoor wall bracket and will be 6½" wide by 15½" tall and extend 8" from the façade wall. They are constructed on deep cast aluminum in black. A standard 75 watt bulb is specified.	This fixture appears visually compatible with the area.
<b>Colors:</b>	Body: Grey stucco finish Trim: White stucco finish Shutters: Evening Emerald PPG 401-6	Staff approves, the colors are visually compatible.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends a continuance for Part I Height and Mass pending board discussion and continuance for Part II Design to restudy the placement of windows, header detail, stucco finish, and restudy parapet.

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

Present for the petition was Albert Faragalli.

Mrs. Ward addressed the above-mentioned petitions at the same time.

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

**FINDINGS**

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

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>Setbacks:</b> There shall be no front yard setback except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided. There is a maximum 75% building lot coverage. New carriage houses may provide up to a 4’ setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.	The lot is 1,800 square feet. The proposed footprint, including the existing building and garage, is approximately 1,317 square feet for a 73% building lot coverage. There are no rear setbacks for the proposed garage.	The standard is met
<b>Height</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(1) Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.	A two-story carriage house, 22’-4” tall is proposed.	The standard is met.
<b>Scale</b> Sec. 8-3030 (k)(6) The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.		The carriage house appears to be equal in height, or slightly less than the main residence. Staff recommends restudy of the height to show relationship between the subordinate carriage house and the contributing residence.
<b>Lanes and Carriage Houses</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(14):		
<b>Site:</b> Carriage houses, garages, and auxiliary structures must be located to the rear of the property. Overhead garage doors shall not be used on street fronts, adjacent to sidewalk, unless they are detailed to resemble gates.	The proposed carriage house is at the rear of the property facing the lane. The overhead garage doors front the land and not a street. The design is for custom built doors with an arched top panel.	The standard is met.
<b>Openings:</b> Garage openings shall not exceed 12’ in width.	Garage openings are to be 10’ wide.	The standard is met.
<b>Roofs:</b> Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.	A shed roof is proposed. A parapet on the south elevations obscures the shed roof. There is no parapet on the north, east, and west elevations.	Staff recommends that the parapet extend around the north, east and west elevations to obscure the shed roof. The height of the parapet should be reduced from the proposed 4’. The drawings are to an unknown scale and the dimensions of the

		parapet and coping are not labeled.
Roofs visible from the street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles.	Pre-finished metal roof is proposed and is visible on the east and west elevations.	Staff recommends to shield the roof by a parapet, but if it is visible, verify material configuration (i.e. standing seam, galvanized, v-crimp, etc.)
<b>Exterior Walls:</b> Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.	A rough finish stucco is proposed for the exterior finish. Scoring to resemble a building on the same lane is proposed.	Staff recommends a smooth sand finish true stucco and that the scoring not be highlighted and should be painted to match the exterior stucco.
<b>Windows</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(9) Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on nonhistoric facades and on new construction, provided, however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.	The windows will be true divided light double-hung windows.	Verify materials and muntin profile.
The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.	The outer window and door openings align vertically. The interior windows do not align over the garage doors below and are not equally spaced within the upper story.	Staff recommends restudy of upper story window placement to align over door openings on the first floor.
All windows facing a street, exclusive of top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3; provided however, nothing in this section precludes an arched window being used.	The window openings are 32" by 60" and feature a raised stucco arched jack arch to correspond to the main building.	The standard is met. Staff recommends simplification of the jack arch detail to a flat header. The jack arches on the main building are part of the brickwork within the opening and are simplistic in nature. These appear more decorative than the main house.
Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3" from the façade of a masonry building.		Verify dimensions.
<b>Shutters</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(9): Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window. Shutters shall be constructed of	Shutters will be operable wood louvered shutters with hinges and stops on the lane elevation. The south elevation, facing the house will have false shutters on the ground floor; however this will not be visible from the public right of way.	The standard is met.

<p> durable wood. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials.</p>		
<p><b>Lighting:</b></p>	<p>Two light fixtures are proposed by the garage and pedestrian entrance. They will be mounted on a outdoor wall bracket and will be 6½" wide by 15½" tall and extend 8" from the façade wall. They are constructed on deep cast aluminum in black. A standard 75 watt bulb is specified.</p>	<p>This fixture appears visually compatible with the area.</p>
<p><b>Colors:</b></p>	<p>Body: Grey stucco finish Trim: White stucco finish Shutters: Evening Emerald PPG 401-6</p>	<p>Staff approves, the colors are visually compatible.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends a continuance for Part I Height and Mass pending board discussion and continuance for Part II Design to restudy the placement of windows, header detail, stucco finish, and restudy parapet.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Neely** asked how would they make this subordinate any other way than making it simply a single story?

**Mrs. Ward** stated she would like to see the cross section through the entire lot showing the main building and the carriage house to see how they related. She said she felt if the petitioner stepped the roof down it would reduce the height about 4½ feet. Otherwise, they could simply do a 1 story building which was also common.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the building in the photograph to the far left was his carriage house and he remembered going through this process and dealing with the exact same issues. He said what they did to subordinate that building was it was only 20 feet deep and it took up a lot less of the lot than these did. He said the Board would also note on the photo at the bottom left corner in this picture (418, 416, 414 or 412, and 422) were all identical structures on the front. He said they had a different façade and a different composition of the construction material, but they all related to one another in exact size and dimension. He said he felt the design that has been presented was okay, but it probably should relate to the one that was on his property.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated if the petitioner accepts the continuance as recommended by Staff it would give him a chance to check with the building department whether or not they exceeded the 75 percent lot coverage. He said they also showed a gas fireplace and any fireplace would have to have a flue and chimney which was not shown on the drawings. It would have to be above the parapet wall and roof by a certain distance. He said he felt that needed to be address because it would make the center portion higher.

**Mr. Faragalli** stated they probably could do a ventless fireplace because it would not be needed for heat. He said it was mostly for visual affect.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated ventless fireplace some times goes out on you because of no circulation in the winter time when you have all the windows close.

**Mr. Deering** stated he agreed with Staff and Mr. Steffen. He said he felt the building was too deep. He said they have tried to discourage others from doing carriage houses that deep. Historically, they were 14 feet, 16 feet, or 18 feet deep. He said you now have people such as his client wanting a 26 foot deep carriage house. He said as mentioned by Mr. Steffen like the houses that were built across the lane those were bigger and more substantial houses on the front side. He said he felt that the proposed carriage houses needed to be reduced in scale and detail in order for them to be compatible with the smaller row.

**Mr. Faragalli** stated one of the things that would get this down to 20 feet could be an exterior stair leading up to the outside which would reduce the length of the roof and massing. Also, with regards to the lot coverage the existing structure on 418 already was 1.7 percent over. He said he did not know if that would be grandfathered in because they were tearing down the existing and putting up a new in the same place.

**Mr. Deering** stated if they reduced the parapet height 2 feet they were there.

**Mr. Faragalli** stated he agreed. He said it was a matter of where they could run the water.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he felt that he may need to request a continuance because he has already solved his own problem and just needed to bring it back.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petitions (HBR 05-3487-2 and HBR 05-3488-2) for Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design as submitted until the next meeting. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Ramsay Sherrill Architects  
Sandra Sherrill  
HBR 05-3489-2  
537 East Congress Street  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Sandra Sherrill.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval for a rehabilitation of the residence at 537 E. Congress Street and a porch addition on the rear. Alterations consist of the following:

1. Replace asbestos shingle side on the west elevation with wood siding to match the existing wood siding on the north and south elevations.
2. Replace narrow cornerboards with 1" x 6" cornerboards. Install 1" x 10" wood trim at fascia.

3. The first floor metal post porch supports will be cased in 1'-4" tapered wood columns upon pier expressions which have a 4" exposure from the foundation.
4. The non-historic metal balustrade will be replaced with 3'-6" high balustrade with wooden post banisters.
5. Non-historic aluminum frame windows will be replaced with double-hung sash, wood frame (2'-8" x 5'), true-divided light (6 over 6) windows. Two windows on the rear (south) have smaller window openings and will be replaced with wood frame, TDL, awning windows.
6. Install composite Atlantic shutters to be dark green (Rockwood Shutter Green by Sherwin Williams).
7. Install new ogee gutter and downspout with cast iron boot.
8. Install new 4'-10" by 3' wood louvered gate on rear privacy wall replacing non-historic metal gate.
9. Removal of non-historic metal fire escape on south elevation. Replace second floor door opening with window to match existing in size. Remove all miscellaneous conduit, piping and light fixtures that are also not historic.
10. Construct porch addition on rear (south) elevation.
11. Construct new (double wyth) brick wall infill at rear of site to match existing brick wall.
12. Paint color change as follows (samples submitted):
  - a. Siding/Trim/Columns: Spare White – Sherwin Williams
  - b. Shutters – Rookwood Shutter Green - Sherwin Williams
  - c. Porch floor and foundation – Westchester Gray – Sherwin Williams
  - d. Porch Ceilings – Burma Jade – Sherwin Williams
13. General repairs including repairs to wood siding and trim, replacement of roof shingles with new asphalt shingles.

**FINDINGS**

537 E. Congress Street is a rated building within Savannah’s Historic District. Prior renovations made to the building have incorporated new materials and designs not in keeping with the original appearance of the structure. The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density).

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p><b>Windows</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(9): Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material.</p>	<p>Double-hung sash, wood frame (2'-8" x 5'), true-divided light (6 over 6) windows to replace non-historic aluminum frame windows. Two windows on the rear (south) have smaller window openings and will be replaced with wood frame, TDL, awning windows. On the north elevation, a window will replace a current door opening and on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the south elevation a window will also replace a door opening.</p>	<p>The existing windows are not historic. The proposed windows are more in keeping with the historic character of the building and are appropriate. The door openings that will be replaced with windows are not original to the building and the return of windows will be more in keeping with the historic character of the building.</p>
<p><b>Front door:</b></p>	<p>The existing door frame will be replaced with a taller frame including a 3-light transom above</p>	<p>Staff recommends a restudy of this element by reducing the height of the transom.</p>



	(wood, true divided light).	
<b>Shutters</b> Sec. 8-3030 (I)(9): Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window. Shutters shall be constructed of durable wood. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible.	Composite Atlantic shutters to be dark green (Rockwood Shutter Green by Sherwin Williams).	The Atlantic Shutter, made of PVC material has proven to be a compatible material within the historic district. Verify that this is the Manchester style shutter.
<b>Porticos and porches</b> Sec. 8-3030 (I)(11): wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four inches.	The first floor metal post porch supports will be cased in 1'-4" tapered wood columns upon pier expressions which have a 4" exposure from the foundation. The non-historic metal balustrade will be replaced with 1" square wooden post banisters in a 3'-6" high balustrade.	The standard has been met.
Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood unless the proposed material matches other façade details.	The non-historic iron balustrade will be replaced with wood and the iron posts will be cased in wood.	The standard has been met.
<b>Rear Porch addition</b> Sec. 8-3030 (I)(11): Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly as appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure. Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building.	The proposed porch is sited at the rear of the building and has a simple design in keeping with the historic building. It will replace a non-historic entryway that currently exists.	The standard is met.
Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four inches.	The flat roof porch is supported by 6" square wood supports (wrap on 4" pipe) with a cap and base. Engaged columns to match are located on the building within the portico. The wood balustrade is comprised of 1" square pickets spaced 3" apart between an upper and lower rail.	The standard is met.
<b>Privacy Wall</b>	A brick infill wall is proposed at the southwest corner at the 0' lot line. The wall will match the existing brick wall in height at	Staff recommends approval.

	detail.	
--	---------	--

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation with restudy of the entranceway to be submitted to staff.

**Petitioner’s Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** asked what was the diameter of the columns on the front porch?

**Ms. Sherrill** stated 4 inches and they taper. She also said they were willing to work with Staff to look at the transom height.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Deering made a motion that Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the proposed transom and entry be restudied and submitted to staff for review. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Diversified Designs  
Sean Roach  
HBR 05-3490-2  
111 West Congress Street  
Alteration/Addition**

No one was present for the petition.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and construction of a two-story addition to the existing building at 111 West Congress Street. Alterations consist of a new store front and awning on the existing building. A two-story addition is proposed on the west side of the building fronting Congress Street, creating the appearance of a new building along the street with a commercial storefront.

**FINDINGS**

The commercial building at 111 West Congress Street is not a rated building within Savannah’s Historic District. The property is zoned B-C-1 and although it was originally constructed ca. 1900, non-historic alterations and a fire have resulted in a loss of historic integrity.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>Addition</b>		
<b>Height</b> Section 8-3030 (k)(6)a: New construction or additions to existing structures shall be within the height limits as shown on the historic district height map. Sec. 8-3030 (l)(1): Buildings	The proposed addition is 2-stories tall, measuring 24’-2”.	The property is within a 4-story maximum height limit. The standard is met.

throughout the Historic District shall be at least two stories		
Commercial building height, Sec. 8-3030 (l)(1)(h)2: The exterior expression of the height of the ground floor shall not be less than 14'-6"; the exterior expression of the height of the second story shall not be less than 12'.	The exterior expression of the first floor is 12'-4" and the exterior expression of the second floor is 11'-10". These dimensions correspond to the adjacent non-rated building.	Although the floor height expressions do not meet the standard they are visually compatible with the adjacent building on the east, which this is an addition to. A vacant lot is adjacent on the west.
<b>Street elevation type</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(2): A proposed building located on an east-west through street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.	The main façade faces Congress Street and incorporated traditional design elements from neighboring buildings within the block and across the street.	The standard is met.
<b>Setbacks</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(3): There shall be no front yard setbacks except on a tithing lot where there is a historic setback along a particular block front.	A one foot setback is incorporated into the design which corresponds to the historic brickwork in the adjacent building. When the adjacent structure was remodeled a new brick veneer façade was introduced, extending its placement out into the sidewalk.	There are no historic setbacks along this particular street. The proposed 1' setback appears visually compatible with the buildings along the block and corresponds to the historic brickwork remaining at the adjacent building.
<b>Entrances</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(4): A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.	The primary entrance fronts Congress Street.	The standard is met.
<b>Commercial design standards</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(5): The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront. The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by architectural features such as a string course.	A storefront has been incorporated into the first floor design. No architectural features distinguish the first floor from the second, only an awning.	Since this addition responds to the non-rated building that it is part of, an architectural element between the first and second floors would act to further disrupt the rhythm of the historic buildings along Congress Street.
<b>Storefront:</b> Glazing shall be not less than 55% and shall be transparent, extending from the sill or from an 18-24" base of contrasting material to the lintel. Storefront glazing in subdivided sashes shall be inset a minimum of 4" from the face of the building; however, continuously glazed storefronts may be flush with the face of the building. Entrances shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.	The storefront windows cover over 55% of the bottom floor and extending from a pre-cast concrete sill approximately 1'-4" from grade. The glazing is setback 3" from the face of the building but is continuously glazed due to the narrow size of the façade. The entrance is recessed and centered within the addition.	The standard is met.
Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system.	A white steel (Trifab 400) framing system is proposed for the storefront.	The standard is met.

<p><b>Exterior Walls</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(8): On lots less than 60' in width, the front faced shall be constructed so as to form a continuous plane parallel to the street.</p>	<p>A conventional stucco material is proposed for the exterior.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Color:</b></p>	<p>Exterior color to be Sunbeam Yellow (Sherwin Williams 0078), sample submitted. The trim is Arcade White (Sherwin Williams 7100). Window sills and headers are "Thickened stucco" painted white.</p>	
<p><b>Windows</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(9): Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided that 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, and extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.</p>	<p>Wood frame Marvin Ultimate windows with 7/8" muntin are proposed for the upper floors of the addition.</p>	<p>Verify if these are one-over-one (indicated on notes) or two-over-two true divided lights (indicated on drawings).</p>
<p>Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3" from the façade of a masonry building. The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than 2x the width of the windows.</p>		<p>Verify depth of the window sash within the façade and side elevations. Their placement within the façade and side elevation are compatible with surrounding historic buildings.</p>
<p><b>Roofs</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(10): Parapets shall have a string course of not less than 6" in depth and extending at least 4" from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between 1' and 1½' from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum 2" overhang.</p>	<p>A metal cornice is proposed at the top of the parapet. It is 1' in height and extends 6" to 1' from the face of the building and runs the entire width of the addition.</p>	<p>Staff recommends simplification of the cornice detail and relocation to align with the actual roof height and to introduce a coping at the top of the parapet.</p>
<p><b>Utilities and refuse</b> Sec. 8-3030 (l)(15): HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way.</p>	<p>The proposed condenser unit is located on the roof at the rear of the already existing structure and will not be visible from the public right-of-way</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Awning:</b></p>	<p>The proposed awning has a 7' clearance. It extends 3'-6" from the building face and it is 3'-3" in height and 13'-6" wide. The color is Shamrock (green) and material is canvas.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the lettering on the valance not to exceed 6".</p>
<p><b>Rehab of storefront</b></p>		
<p><b>Storefront:</b> Glazing shall be not</p>	<p>The storefront windows cover</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

<p>less than 55% and shall be transparent, extending from the sill or from an 18-24" base of contrasting material to the lintel. Storefront glazing in subdivided sashes shall be inset a minimum of 4" from the face of the building; however, continuously glazed storefronts may be flush with the face of the building. Entrances shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.</p>	<p>over 55% of the bottom floor and extending from a "rowlock" sill approximately 1' from grade. The glazing is setback 3" from the face of the building but is continuously glazed due to the narrow size of the façade. The entrance is recessed and centered within the facade.</p>	
<p>Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system.</p>	<p>A steel framing system is proposed for the storefront to match the color of the existing windows.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Awning:</b></p>	<p>The proposed awning has a 7' clearance. It extends 3'-6" from the building face and it 3'-3" in height and 16'-6" wide. The name for the business will be placed within the valance. The color is Deep Maroon and the material is canvas.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the condition that the letters be no larger than 6" in height.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval for the addition with the condition that the cornice be restudied and submitted to staff, clarification of the window light pattern and position within the wall, and that the letters on the awning be a maximum of 6" in height. Staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation of the storefront on the existing non-rated building with the condition that the letters on the awning be a maximum of 6" in height.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated they have a 34 foot lot that had a 19 foot building on it and for the remaining 14 feet they were going to change what was masonry on one side to stucco. He said they were going to change the windows to 2/2, change the parapet cornice detail, and put awnings on the north side of a building that never gets any sun. He said he did not understand why they needed to do all that on one lot.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was the Board's job to review what was put in front of them.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated what was before the Board was different than what was on the other side, which was what he was referring to.

**Mr. Deering** agreed.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF was concerned that you have an addition which was attempting to look older than the original building. He said HSF hoped

the Board would follow Staff’s suggestions in restudying the cornice. In addition, the second story windows may need to also be 1/1 instead of 2/2.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition in the absence of the applicant. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Rebecca Lynch  
HBR 05-3491-2  
205 East Hall Street  
Alteration/Addition**

Present for the petition was Rebecca Lynch.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations and additions as follows:

1. Replace existing vinyl sided addition with a new Savannah Grey brick addition and wood rear porch.
2. Add outer pair of louvered doors to front door.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Section 8-3030 (k)(1) Preservation of historic structures within the historic district. An historic structure...shall only be...altered in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure...	An addition and a porch is proposed which is subordinate to and maintains the historic features of the main structure.	This standard has been met.
Sec. 8-3030 (l)(12) c. Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure. D. Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including, but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, brackets. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building. e.	The additions are located in the rear and are beneath the eaves and brackets of the main structure. Unpainted Savannah grey brick is proposed. The additions are reversible.	These standards have been met.

Additions, including multiple additions to structures, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.		
(l) (9) Double glazed (SDL) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided, however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8 inch; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.	Kolbe and Kolbe cutlite wood true divided light windows with insulated glazing, factory finished white.	These windows have been previously approved in the District.
Colors:	Benjamin Moore Van Deusen Blue (HC-156) for the shutters to match existing.	Matches existing colors.
Doors:	A pair of stained mahogany wood louvered doors are proposed at the entrance.	This is a correct historical feature which allows privacy and light and air.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval.

**Public Comments:**

**Ms. Cassie DeLuckie (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the shutters did not fit the second floor window and should be deleted.

**Ms. Lynch** stated they were double acting shutters.

**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 Dawson Wissmach Architects  
Neil Dawson  
HBR 05-3494-2  
100 – Block West Bay Street  
New Construction & Alterations**

Present for the petition was Andy Lynch.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval as follows:

Building A: (Mansard roofed building on Whitaker Street)

1. Construct cupola similar to one which previously existed. Cupola is 24'-3" high, by 13' by 14'-4". It has a pressed metal shingle roof to match proposed mansard roof shingles on main building. Clear anodized aluminum storefront windows at deck; true divided light wood windows at roof level. Install a painted steel handrail.
2. Replace mansard roof covering with fish scale metal shingles by Berridge.
3. Install a glass skylight behind cupola (to the West).
4. Replace windows with True Divided light wood windows
5. Replace ground floor divided light windows (Not historic sashes) with butt-glazed storefront system recessed 2 feet behind existing openings and columns creating an arcade effect. Three windows will be lengthened to the ground and some converted to doors and Handicapped entrances. Sequence to be door – W-W-D-D-W-W-D.
6. On Lane elevation, remove fire stair.
7. Remove infill from closed windows. Convert 8 windows to doors for balconies.
8. Install 8 painted steel balconies at new doors, Balconies to have 1 ½" steel pipe handrail, ½" diameter steel horizontal pickets, on 6" steel channel supports. Color black.

#### Building B:

1. Replace Bay Street first floor doors with wood doors. Restore horizontal lintel over westernmost pair of doors. Restore rectangular window above.
2. Replace all windows with wood, double glazed, true divided light 9/9 windows by Kolbe and Kolbe Heritage Ultra series.
3. Add steel and polycarbonate canopy over Whitaker Street door first floor. The product is Moderna courier, random pattern
4. On Whitaker Street elevation install new enlarged window and transom to replace original rectangular window openings. Extend sidelights to the ground.
5. Existing painted brick to be repainted; color to be submitted later to staff.

#### Building C: (Old News Press Building) (penthouse story approved April 13, 2005)

1. Add a 10'-2" tall penthouse (5<sup>th</sup> story) with linear metal panels, Benjamin Moore Desert Twilight and clear anodized aluminum storefront. Flat roof.
2. Add new steel and glass canopies over Bay Street entry door and roll-up door. Metal canopies historically were in these locations.
3. Install a steel roll-up door in existing Bay Street large opening.
4. Refinish and reglaze existing steel windows.
5. On rear (lane) elevation, Add painted steel handrail at parapet.
6. Remove infill at third floor level and add new steel windows to match existing.
7. Install overhead steel door in ground floor easternmost opening.
8. On West wall (exposed by adjacent demolition) return Bay street elevation with new façade, entries and balconies (new street wall at lot to be submitted later will be recessed).
9. Create new brick (Acme Garnet) west façade with pilasters, rectangular window openings with cast stone lintels; balconies (gun metal grey) per elevation. Windows have clear anodized storefront. Ground floor to be cast stone.

#### BUILDING E: NEW CONSTRUCTION: (Demolition of existing building and Part I Height and Mass approved April 13, 2005)

1. New six story building with cast stone base and cornice, brick body (Acme Garnet with Acme "Red Sunset" accent bands and panels under window and entire sixth floor); lead coated copper cornices and details at oriel.
2. Oriel window at sixth level.
3. Clear anodized aluminum storefront at street level with two recessed entries.



4. East Elevation balconies with painted steel handrails and metal clad trellis beam and column canopies. At first floor level recessed entries with exterior clear anodized aluminum roll up door and fabric awning.

**BUILDING F:** (Penthouse story approved April 13, 2005)

1. Replace all windows with Kolbe and Kolbe Heritage series double glazed wood true divided light windows.
2. Fourth story penthouse to be clad in metal panels and 4" vertical cedar boards with polycarbonate on tube steel canopy.
3. Replace existing doors on Bay Street elevation in existing opening.
4. On Barnard Street elevation remove infill from window openings and replace with Kolbe and Kolbe windows. Add six decorative cast iron balconies.

**FINDINGS**

Windows: The existing windows in building A (Mansard roof) are not original. The Board approved replacement windows about twelve years ago. Nine of the windows on building F no longer exist. The floors in this building were removed for press equipment. The replacement of the windows in these buildings under these circumstances appears compatible. The removal of two ground floor windows on the Whitaker Street elevation of the 1820 building B is incompatible and removed original architectural detail and creates an adverse impact on the historic structure.

The roll down aluminum doors on the courtyard side of the new construction building appear incompatible. Please explain why these are proposed.

The placement of a glass wall two feet behind the street elevation on the Whitaker Street side of Building A is incongruous with the architecture and does not maintain the continuous street wall. Explain the purpose of this design.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval of the Part 2 design for the new construction with the exception of the roll down doors on the courtyard side.

Approval of the renovations with the exception of the change to the two historic window openings and removal of historic fabric on the Whitaker Street side of building B. The change to these openings for storefront windows is recommended for denial. The recessed butt glass wall for building A is not recommended by staff. Further explanation is requested.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Neely** stated he did not recuse himself like he had on other applications relating to this project because the transaction had closed and he no longer had an interest.

**Petitioner Comments:**

**Mr. Lynch** stated they have decreased the scale a little bit to lessen the impact visually from around the block. He said they also added a small terrace that would serve the penthouse on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor and skylight, which would not be visible from the street. He said they also felt the railing would not be visible from the street. The material for the cupola would be something

similar to the penthouse, probably an insulated metal panel system with an anodized aluminum storefront. He said the roofing material will be same as the roofing material they used on the lower mansard roof.

He said with regard to the butt-glazed storefront system on the first floor, there were nonhistoric replacement windows all the way across the Whitaker Street elevation. He said they were proposing removing those windows similar to the opening that was on the far end and creating a butt-glaze storefront behind it to give it a more contemporary look. Also, they felt it would emphasize the existing openings.

He said the last change they made was the addition of the balconies on the courtyard side. Originally, those balconies were going to be punched openings. He said they thought it would be better to break down a little bit into more of a porch style arrangement that would depict the Savannah side porch on a greater scale. The bottom of it was cast stone with the roll up doors. He said they were originally supposed to be restaurant tenants that wanted to be able to open those onto the courtyard. The owner has since decided to change that to a retail space.

### **Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** asked if there was a way to reduce the busyness of the side balconies on the new building? He said he liked the façade that faced Bay Street and how they responded to the existing block. However, the side seemed a little busy compared to the front and other larger buildings in Savannah. He said he would like to see some reduction in the number of balconies.

**Mr. Lynch** agreed. He said they have talked about making them a little smaller. He said they also talked about going to white instead of a brown color and even taking away one of them and making it a single post.

**Mr. Deering** stated where the balcony projects past the last porch on the north side it reminded him again of motel construction where the balconies always extended further than the vertical supports. He said he felt it took away from the Bay Street façade.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he would like to reiterate what Mr. Deering said about the balconies. He said he felt they were intrusive. He said he did not know if it was the whiteness of them, but certainly the size of them. He said he did not feel that it did justice to the wonderful job they have done on other parts of the building. He said if they could scale that back it would look better.

**Mr. Neely** asked if each of the buildings fronting on Bay Street had at least one major entrance?

**Mr. Lynch** stated yes, the east and west building.

**Mr. Neely** asked if the three story building would have an entrance?

**Mr. Lynch** stated on the first floor they would all have their own independent entries for retail spaces, but all the residential units would be served from that one entry.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked regarding the courtyard if the stairs would be as they appear on the plans or if they would have some greenery and landscaping?

**Mr. Lynch** stated they will submit separately for the courtyard and courtyard wall. He said there would probably be a water feature and some greenery. He said when they do the courtyard submission they would also render the hotel.

**Public Comments:**

**Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated regarding building A with the mansard roof, that HSF was concerned that a historic structure was not the proper place to make a contemporary statement and agreed with Staff on the butt jointed glass wall on the first level. Also, the setback created an arcade which was prohibited in new construction based on the ordinance. He said HSF was also concerned with the contemporary design of the balconies over the lanes which may need to be more neutral. He said HSF felt building E (new construction) had the most satisfying façade they had seen presented for a building on Bay Street. It was contemporary and decorative, but did not go overboard. He said HSF felt a five tier porch was overwhelming and the guidelines suggested that balconies or porches be subordinate to the structure to which they are attached. In this case, they were overwhelming especially as seen from the courtyard side. He said of major concern to HSF was the courtyard, particularly the screen wall. He said HSF felt that it was important that the Part II design not be approved for this project until a screen of sufficient height, solidity, and little or no setback is presented for approval as promised by the developers. It was important that this screen be designed in concert with the other architectural elements and presented to the Board as an integral part of the whole.

**Discussion:**

**Mr. Steffen** stated he felt a motion could be crafted approving Part II and leaving the balcony porch elements to be revisited with Staff. But, he did not have a particular problem as far as compatibility with the butt glass wall because this was one project with four or five buildings being tied into one. He said he felt the intent seemed to be to try and bring together historic elements with new elements. He said he felt the elements did that in the one building, therefore he was not as offended by it as some of the comments were. In the same way he would not agree with the recommendation from HSF in the sense that what has been described as the gap tooth element of the opening which he felt was one of the attractive features of the project. He said he found both of the elements to be attractive and historically compatible.

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part II with the understanding that the balcony/porch elements of Building E be revisited and that the east elevation be resubmitted. Mr. Deering seconded the motion.**

**Mr. Neely** stated he agreed with the comment regarding the screen along Bay Street. He said he would like to see that at the same time because he felt it would affect the balconies (design).

**Mr. Lynch** stated they will submit the balconies at the same time that they do the courtyard wall.

**HDBR Action:** **The motion was unanimously passed.**

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

Present for the petition was Thomas Perdue.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff report.

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

**FINDINGS**

This property is part of a larger rated building within the historic district which consumes the entire block. The original sign and entrance for the business was located on St. Julian Street; however, due to the street closure in front of this elevation, the applicant is relocating the primary entrance to the Congress Street elevation.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>Historic Sign District</b>		
<b>Principal Use Requirements</b> Section 8-3121 (B) (11): For each nonresidential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. For nonresidential zoning districts the maximum size area for projecting signs is 30 square feet. The maximum projection of outer sign edge for projecting signs is 6 feet in nonresidential districts.	The proposed sign is 16'-6" tall and varying widths of approximately 2' wide. The overall square footage for the projecting principal use sign is 26 SF. The maximum projection of the sign from the building is 2'-8½".	The standard is met.
<b>Clearance</b> Sec. 8-3121 (B)(2): Adequate sign clearance shall be provided to assure that pedestrian or vehicular traffic movements and safety are not adversely affected. Minimum clearance shall not be less than 10' above pedestrianways.	The proposed projecting sign is located 15'-7" above the pedestrian sidewalk.	This standard has been met.
<b>Location</b> Sec. 8-3121 (B)(2)(a): Projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the structure and shall not project over the roofline or parapet wall elevation of the structure.	The sign will be located on the primary entrance elevation, is 16'-6" in height and does not extend to the top of the roofline or parapet wall	These standards have been met.
<b>Lighted signs</b> Sec. 8-3121 (B) (3): Lighted signs of an enclosed lamp, neon or exposed	Neon is proposed for the lettering and border over the painted sign. The property is zoned B-C-1 and	The proposed neon sign is compatible with the surrounding commercial neighborhood.

<p>fluorescent design are not permitted within any “R” zoning district. However, such lighted signs, are permitted within the nonresidential zoning districts. Such signs shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open spaces.</p>	<p>is surrounded by commercial establishments. The neon will be “Neo Blue” when lit and clear during the day.</p>	<p>Another historic neon sign is located at the western end of the block.</p>
<p><b>Design</b></p>	<p>The sign is aluminum and attached to the building with metal brackets having a stainless steel finish. The ground will be “Polo Blue” – Benjamin Moore #2062-10 and the lettering will be “Stonington Gray” – Benjamin Moore #HC-170. A pinstripe border will be “Wickham Gray” – Benjamin Moore #HC-171. The individual letters are 10” to 12” tall.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval</p>
<p><b>Awning sign</b> Sec. 8-3121 (B)(11)(a): within nonresidential zoning districts, in addition to the permitted principal use sign, one canopy or awning principal use sign shall be permitted for each entrance providing public access. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than 1 SF of sign face per linear foot of canopy or awning, or a maximum of 20 SF; provided however, that the aggregate total principal use sign area for the subject use is not exceeded along that street frontage. Individual letters not to exceed 6”...shall be exempt from this provision.</p>	<p>A 20’ wide awning sign is proposed to extend the width of the Congress Street elevation. It will be located above the entrance and commercial store front and the valance will contain 6” letters with the name of the business. The awning is to be navy blue (sample submitted) with white lettering.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Awnings</b> Sec. 8-3030 (f)(1)e: A Certificate of Appropriateness is required for addition of awnings.</p>	<p>Six navy blue awnings are proposed for the six 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> story window openings to mask the existing brickwork which does not match the historic brick exterior.</p>	<p>Currently, there are no upper story awnings on this entire block or in the nearby vicinity. The installation of awnings can be used to enhance the streetscape, but in this case they would detract from the continuous rhythm of the larger masonry structure that this property belongs to.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the neon projecting principal use sign and awning sign upon verification of the neon letter size and font. Staff recommends denial of the additional awnings on the upper floors.

**Petitioner Comments:**

**Mr. Thomas Perdue** stated he took issue with the upper awnings because awnings were allowed on the ground floor. He said if the Board looked at all the previous projects that they have looked at today what was on most of the ground floor were metal canopies. He said the sun did not go east and west which was part of the reasoning for the awnings. He said awnings were used upstairs on upper floors.

**Board Comments:**

**Mr. Deering** stated he felt the sign was really tall and projected from the building a great deal. He said the fish sign has been there and was a Savannah landmark. He said you only drive one way on Congress Street so you would see the fish sign and then the Sapphire sign. If you walked the other direction you would see the fish sign and this sign would obscure and compete with the fish sign. He said he did not know why they needed a sign this big. He said it did not have to project in the same manner. He said he also agreed with Staff and felt that there should not be any upper floor awnings.

**Public Comments:**

**Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated HSF with the Board's guidance that this very important commercial block has finally begun to heal. However, this petition reverses that trend by applying another large neon sign. He said the sign could not be seen from the west due to the historic sign and it blocked the historic sign from the east. He said HSF felt that it should be handled in a more traditional manner. He said in regards to the awnings as long as they were fitted within the windows the way they would have historically been HSF did not have a problem with that. But if they are used to mask anything that was wrong with the building or architecture HSF would be opposed to it.

**Discussion:**

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** asked the petitioner if they would consider putting them inside the window?

**Mr. Perdue** stated yes.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he was not as concerned with the awnings as much as he was with the signage.

**Mr. Perdue** stated the sign was patterned after the bar. He said they did not have a problem with reducing the size of the sign. He said they probably could reduce it to 12 feet. He said the design of it was their logo. He said if there was an issue with that, he could look at it.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated if it projects out at 12 feet if you were coming from the east going west the three awnings would block it. He said if you were coming from the west going east and you were a block away the fish sign would block it. He said he felt that a projecting 12 foot high sign identified the Sapphire.

**Mr. Perdue** stated that would be if you were walking down the side of the street. He said you look at things in perspective and not elevation.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated she would like to see the sign redesigned and reduced. She said she did not have a problem with the awnings that fit into the windows as opposed to masking the outside. She asked the petitioner if they would consent to a continuance?

**Mr. Perdue** stated yes.

**HDBR Action:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition to restudy the size of the sign and placement of the awnings. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Staff Reviews**

1. Petition of William Haegelin  
HBR 05-3482(S)-2  
506 – 508 East Oglethorpe Avenue  
Color & Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jim Morehouse  
HBR 05-3483(S)-2  
13 West Bay Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Matthew Schivere  
HBR 05-3484(S)-2  
20 East Macon Street  
Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of Richfield Atlantic  
HBR 05-3485(S)-2  
415 East Gordon Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
5. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jim Morehouse  
HBR 05-3496(S)-2  
21 East McDonough Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
6. Petition of Leah Mischler  
HBR 05-3497(S)-2  
511 East Gordon Street  
Color  
**WITHDRAWN**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if there was a precedent when nobody is here representing the petitioner that the Board denies the petition?

**Mr. Deering** stated some times the Board does not hear it.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated if the petitioner is here they have the right to have a continuance. She said the Board could not move for a continuance if the petitioner is here and they do not want one because sometimes they just want a vote up or down. She said there was no such thing as a precedent and it was not illegal if the motion and it was properly voted upon and passed. She said the Board could have just denied it or approved it without comments.

**Mr. Steffen** stated because the petitioner was not here they did not have much standing to object to it if they did not like the fact to the continuance.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he remembered times when if the petitioner was here the petition was not heard.

**RE: Minutes**

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – September 14, 2005
2. Distribution of Regular Meeting Minutes – October 12, 2005

**HDBR Action:** **Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of September 14, 2005 as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Other Business**

1. Nominating Committee

**Mr. Mitchell** appointed Mr. Steffen, Mr. Deering, and Mrs. Fortson-Waring to the Nominating Committee to elect officers for 2006.

2. Patrick Shay - Letter

**Mrs. Reiter** stated the subject of the letter was the project at Price and Congress Streets and it essentially explained that the courtyard wall shown at 8 feet on the drawing was built at 8'-8" because the street slopes down. She said two of the changes were requested by the Board in its decision and also the garage door design modified by the Board. She said they eliminated the louvered fence and gate to accommodate the City.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if he was just setting the record straight?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated yes.

3. HBR 04-3302-2  
400 Block of East McDonough  
New Construction – Bracket Change

**Mrs. Reiter** stated she made a mistake. She said the Board specifically approved wooden brackets under the canopies for the doors. She said the petitioner talked to her and said that he



had iron brackets and she forgot that was stipulated in the decision, so she told him that would be okay because they matched the gate. She said the petitioner ordered them and she later realized that it should have been wood. She said she was asking if the Board would approve the iron.

**HDBR Action:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended for a bracket change. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated the Petition of Hansen Architects, 342 Drayton Street request for demolition has been appealed to City Council. She said when the Board changed the ordinance it was done so that the City would take the appeals on demolition.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the Board is asked to attend the meeting so they could justify their decision?

**Mrs. Reiter** stated she also has asked the question. She said she did not know if they were going to treat it like Board of Appeals where there is usually no new discussion.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he felt it would be in the Board's interest to at least have the ability to explain or defend their decision. He said the Board does not have to debate it with them, but at least be able to bring it to them and say here is why we did what we did.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated it may be better to have a meeting with Mr. Blackburn since he also attends the meetings. She said they could have Mr. Blackburn because he would represent the Board's decision and let him communicate to the City their feelings. She said it may be a little more appropriate.

**RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**RE: ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR:ca