

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

OCTOBER 12, 2005

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

**John Mitchell, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Dr. Caplan
John Deering
Dr. Johnson
John Neely
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring
Eric Meyerhoff
Joseph Steffen**

Members Absent:

Ned Gay (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 October 12, 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: Continued Petition of Dirk Hardison
HBR 05-3378-2
120 West Harris Street
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Greg Parker
HBR 05-3471-2
19 East Gordon Street
Alteration/Garage**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

RE: Petition of Jennifer Lee
HBR 05-3473-2
22 West Oglethorpe Avenue
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

RE: Regular Agenda

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

Present for the petition was Merrill Levy.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design 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.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Approval to demolish existing non-historic office building.
2. Approval of Part I Height and Mass with recommendation that front recess be deepened if possible.
3. Approval of Part II Design with the following conditions:
 - a. Final window and roof material selection be approved by staff. Provide enlarged dimensioned cornice detail.
 - b. Full windows be used on ground floor.
 - c. Window color be white or off white.
 - d. Eliminate shutters on ground floor front and in recess.
 - e. Clarify sill and lintel material
 - f. Clarify tread material and provide detail of tread design
 - g. Clarify texture of dryvit finish coat.
 - h. Eliminate rear wood canopies
 - i. Simplify rear door surrounds by eliminating pilasters
 - j. Relocate HVAC units to rear

FINDINGS: The following Ordinance Standards apply:

Design Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Section 8-3030 (k) (2) Demolition of historic structures 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>Section 8-3030 (l) Design standards (1) Height: Residential Buildings – The exterior expression of the height of raised basements shall not be less than 6'-6" and not higher than 9'-6". The exterior height of the first story, or the second story in the case of a raised basement shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet.</p>	<p>The exterior expression of the first story is 9'-6". The exterior expression of the next two stories is 10' each. The peak of the roof has a total height of 36 feet. The stoop height is 9'-6".</p>	<p>These standards have been met.</p>
<p>Section 8-3030 (l) (2) Street Elevation Type 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 at grade and high stoop entries. 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>Section 8-3030 (l)(3) Setbacks 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>Section 8-3030 (l) (4) Entrances 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. Two stoops are proposed to provide access to the parlor level apartments. A ground floor</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>

	entrance provides access to the fire stair and a rear entrance provides access to the apartment elevators. Two additional rear entrances give access to the doctor's offices.	
The following guidelines and Visual Compatibility Factors apply:		
Section 8-3030 (k)(5) Nonrated structures 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...	The mass of the structure has been broken into two three bay sections with a recessed center connector. The mass appears to be compatible with adjacent historic properties.	This guideline had been addressed.
Height Height Map: The maximum height for this area is 4 stories.	The proposed project is three stories.	This standard has been met.
Proportion of structure's front façade	The proposed building's overall height is 36'-6"and the width is 57'. It is visually broken into two segments. The duplex east of the proposed structure is also a "box-like" mass, 49' wide by 41'-4" tall.	This guideline has been addressed.
Proportion of openings rectangular windows vertically aligned.	Rectangular windows vertically aligned.	This standard has been met.
Rhythm of solids to voids in front facade	The characteristic rhythms in these blocks are three bay (or 6 bay for duplexes) and 5 bay. The proposed structure has used two groups of three bays separated by a 12" deep recessed central bay.	This Guideline has been addressed. If the central recessed bay could be made deeper the effect would be strengthened.
Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection	Projecting stoops and porches are characteristic of this block.	This Guideline has been addressed.
Roof shape	The proposed roof is an intersecting hip.	A hip roof is appropriate for this block
Walls of continuity	Low copings and walls topped by low fences are characteristic of this neighborhood.	The site plan indicates such a fence is proposed.
Scale	Open porches, broken up volumes, bay windows, deep cornices, small scale dormers are features that break up the scale of the existing historic structures.	This Guideline has been addressed.

	The scale has been broken by a central recessed portion.	
Directional Expression	The central recess creates the impression of two vertical masses.	This Guideline has been addressed.

Part II Design Detail

Materials	Walls: Stucco system will be traditional scratch and brown coats of cement plaster with finish coat of Dryvit, textured finish, light tan color (chip supplied)	The use of the finish coat of Dryvit has proven to give a better finish than other systems, however it should not be shiny. Clarify texture of finish.
Windows	Marvin or equal wood clad double hung 6/6 single glazed windows dark green. Operable Atlantic “Manchester” Louvered PVC shutters in black-green. Transom windows with wood panel ground floor.	Final window selection must be approved by Preservation Officer. Staff recommends eliminating the shutters in the recessed section and ground floor front. Staff further recommends using 6/6 windows on the ground floor and interior shutters. Also that the window color be white or off-white. No material is given for the lintels and sills. Cast stone would be appropriate.
Stoops	Masonry stoop with stucco finish; masonry treads. Decorative metal railings. Shed roofed wood portico with wood square columns. Projecting wood canopies over rear doors.	It is not clear what masonry treads are. Provide an enlarged detail of the tread. Cast stone would be appropriate. Staff recommends eliminating the unsupported rear projecting wood canopies and replacing with simple awnings.
Roof	Intersecting hip with dentils; standing seam metal Roof Berridge or equal. 12” spacing between seams, dark green Kynar finish.	Need an enlarged detail of cornice to show design and dimensions.
Doors	Morgan or equal wood, six raised panel with pilasters and side lights for the front doors; pilasters and no sidelights for the rear. Dark Green.	Staff recommends the pilasters be eliminated from the rear doors.
HVAC	The HVAC units are show located behind a 4’ pierced brick enclosure on the front of the building. The trash enclosure is on the lane side of the parking lot.	The front location is inappropriate for the HVAC units. They should be removed to the rear so that they are less visible to the pedestrian.

Ms. Seiler asked Staff in regard to the window and roof materials, what specifically was she talking about?

Mrs. Reiter stated she believed the petitioner had suggested several windows that he was going to put out to bid. She said she was saying that Staff needed to know what the final selection was going to be, so it could be approved.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Levy stated the reason for him not being able to say exactly which window they were going to use was because they would be bid on. He said he could lists three different names and he would select one of those and then come back to ask for approval. Therefore, he submitted a window looked like what they wanted and when they receive a submittal by the contractor they would agree to contact Mrs. Reiter and asks for approval, as well as any other items that may need to be approved, such the stucco finish.

He further asked in regard to the statement that a full window should be used on the ground floor, if they meant on the side elevations as well as the front and rear.

Mrs. Reiter stated it would be the side and rear.

Mr. Levy stated the problem with the side wall was those were examining rooms. He said Dr. Persad would have patients who would be exposed. He said he felt they would not be comfortable with a full window. He said they would be willing to do any thing possible, but not have a full window in the examining rooms. He also stated that they did not have a problem with taking the shutters off. The recess was 1 foot deep. However, if a little more was wanted they could do that as well. He said they could make it 18 inches.

He said the relocation of the HVAC units would cause problems. He said they were hidden behind the steps and there would be a brick wall around them. He said if he had to put them in the rear, he would lose two parking spaces. He said if he put them in the back people would have to go around them to get into the building. He said he felt that nobody would be able to see them in the front because they would be behind the wall with planting around it. He said he would ask the Board to approve them as submitted.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated they faced the same problem of windows in examining rooms with the Curtis Cooper Health Center in the Historic District. He said they put the windows in to match the other windows, but blocked them from the inside.

Mr. Levy stated he supposed there were ways to blank it off, but the question would be if it was that important and did it look that bad. He said it was not a practical solution, and they would like to leave it like it was if that was possible.

Mr. Neely asked if it would be feasible for them to put the air conditioning units on the roof perhaps on the rear of the building?

Mr. Levy stated he felt that would not be a good idea because they would be hard to service and they did not work as well on the roof. He said he would prefer not to do that because they would have to reinforce the roof and put something up there to cover it up.

Mr. Deering stated he would not be able to vote approval for the project if these were left in the front. He suggested that he consider putting them above the walk on the east side of the building on a rack because that would get them off the front lawn.

Mr. Levy stated he would still like to them where they were. He said he knew that there were other solutions and if that was the Board's desire then he would do it. He said he felt that it would not cause any problems visually because you would not be able to see behind the stairs and there would be planting around them.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how many units would there be?

Mr. Levy stated there were 6 units with three on each side of the building.

Mr. Mitchell stated in regard to the issue of the windows and privacy he felt they may want to consider curtains.

Public Comments:

Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF wanted to know if there were going to be expansion joints since it had a stucco façade. If so, where would they be and how would they be designed. Also, on the drawing the newel posts at the bottom of the staircase seemed to be considerably higher than the fence at the top. He asked if that was a proper dimension or were the newel posts lower? He said there was no detail given on the front door design. On the elevation it showed a window in the middle, but on the plan it showed as a doorway going out onto the porch. He asked which was it supposed to be? He said also on the plan there was a fence shown along the front line and there was a profile of it on the elevation, however they had no idea as to what the fence was meant to look like. He asked what would the air conditioning enclosures look like? He said there also was a trash enclosure shown on the lane. He asked what would that look like and how would it be designed? He said HSF would like to suggest that all these issues be brought up with the Preservation Officer and she could decide what the final outcome of all these items should be.

Ms. Seiler stated the Board discussed the examining rooms last month. She said she thought the Board suggested that whatever privacy needed to be discussed that it be handled from the inside out.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Meyerhoff** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the following conditions: (1) that all the comments made by the Preservation Officer in regards to material selection be submitted to Staff for approval; (2) that the HVAC be relocated and approved by Staff; (3) that the window insets on the ground floor that the recess stucco portion of the windows along with its transom be the size of the windows above; (4) the canopies in the rear to be awnings instead of fixed canopies; (5) shutters be as suggested by the PO; (6) that the recess dividing the two sections of the building on the front elevation be recessed 1'6" instead 1". **Dr. Caplan** seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated the petitioner has already indicated that he did not want to do the things outlined in the motion. She said she did not know why the Board would approve a motion

for things that he did not want to do. The Board is supposed to approve things that petitioners agree to do or not approve a petition.

Dr. Caplan stated the Preservation Officer makes recommendations all the time and the Board votes to act on those as presented without having to have the motion turned down and brought back. He said he felt it was a matter of what the Board does. He said the Preservation Officer suggested it and the Board accepted her suggestion and made the motion and approval contingent on those things.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated that was not the petitioner's petition. She said the Board was here to approve or deny petitions with amendments that are agreed to by the petitioner. The petitioner has stated on the record that he does not agree to some of the suggestions. She said the Board was making a motion for approval with comments that he has not agreed to. She said she felt that the petition needed to reflect what the Board was approving and there was a lot going back to Staff or it should be denied.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it would be very simple to ask the petitioner at this point whether or not he agrees with that motion or not and then the Board could alter the motion.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated that would be opening up a can of worms because a petitioner was not supposed to interfere with the Board's motion discussion. She said that would set a terrible precedent. She said it was the Board's job to make the motion to approve or deny. She said the Board could do this, but she was setting forth discussion as to why she was voting against the motion.

Mr. Steffen stated he understood what Mrs. Fortson-Waring was saying and it was an important point. He said his vote probably would be contingent on whether or not the petitioner fully adopts every one of the conditions. He said he felt Mrs. Fortson-Waring was correct when she said if the Board starts throwing out various conditions some of them agreed to and some not that would be a bad precedent. He said then the Board would be getting into deciding what the petition was going to be. He said if Mr. Levy says that he was okay with everything that Mr. Meyerhoff has said then that would be fine, however he did not know if the Board was going to get that answer.

Mr. Levy stated he has worked for a number of agencies where he had to have approval for things. He said they get a submittal from a contractor...

Mr. Mitchell stated that he was out of order.

Mr. Steffen stated Mr. Stube with Historic Savannah Foundation raised some issues that he felt were not before the Board right now, such as fence and waste disposal. He said when and if they are before the Board he felt those were things that the Board should look at.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated everything was before the Board. The petition was for Part I and II. She said it would not come back if the Board approves Part I and II. It would all go to Staff.

Mr. Neely asked Mr. Meyerhoff if he could amend his motion?

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff amended his motion to include that also the trash enclosure be submitted to the Preservation Officer for approval.

Mr. Mitchell called for the vote. The motion was tied 4 – 4. Voting in favor of the motion was Dr. Caplan, Mr. Meyerhoff, Mr. Neely, and Ms. Seiler. Voting against the motion was Mr. Deering, Mrs. Fortson-Waring, Dr. Johnson, and Mr. Steffen. The motion Failed 4 – 5 with Mr. Mitchell voting against the motion.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition as to Part II – Design and approval of Part I – Height/mass with the understanding and agreement of the Petitioner that the front recess be deepened to 1’-6”, as well as approval of the demolition. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed. Abstaining to the motion was Mr. Steffen.

**RE: Continued Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik Puljung
HBR 05-3455-2
342 Drayton Street
Demolition & New Construction – Part I**

Present for the petition was Erik Puljung, Architect and Walter Hartridge, Attorney.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

(Transcription of the meeting tape for this petition)

The applicant is requesting approval for demolition of an historic structure on the City’s Historic Building Map and Part I Height and Mass for three residences and carriage houses. In 1999 the City had an analysis done of 20th century buildings in Savannah and this building was cited by Richard Longstreth, who is a well-known architectural historian in the United States that “This is a fine and now very rare example of its kind and deserves every protection the historic district affords.”

342 Drayton Street was then added to the Historic District Historic Building list in 2002.

It is listed as contributing to the significance of the National Historic Landmark District in the draft update of the National Historic Landmark Nomination dated August 2, 2004 from the United States Department of the Interior National Park Service.

In addition, the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office has determined that 342 Drayton Street is a “rare and outstanding example of this building type (an early 20th century gas filling station) that contributes to the significance of the Savannah Historic District listed in the Georgia and National Register of Historic Places.” They also commented that it was HPD’s opinion that “342 Drayton Street is a contributing building to a National Register listed district and as such, is eligible to participate in the 20% Federal Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credit program, the Georgia Preferential Property Tax Assessment program, and the Georgia State Income Tax Credit program for a rehabilitated historic property.”

It was also listed in a SCAD student’s masters thesis that examined pre- World War II gasoline filling stations and also showed adaptive uses for filling stations throughout Georgia.

Section 8-3030 (k) (1) of our Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “an historic structure and any outbuildings should only be moved, reconstructed, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and architectural features of the historic structure. “A Certificate of

Appropriateness for demolition of a structure rated as historic shall be issued by the Board of Review only when one of the following conditions has been established by clear and convincing evidence pursuant to criteria established herein.” and that is:

- i. The demolition is required to alleviate a threat to public health or public safety; or
- ii. The demolition is required to avoid exceptional practical difficulty or undue hardship upon any owner of any specific property. The determination of economic hardship shall require the applicant to provide evidence sufficient to demonstrate that the application of the standards and regulations of this section deprives the applicant of reasonable economic use or return on the subject property. You did receive all of the items that we listed for submittal in the notebook that you received from the petitioner.

Under the discussion of adaptive reuse of buildings such as this one 222 Drayton Street, Parkers Market has been renovated for retail, office, apartments and a filling station. 112-114 Drayton Street which was built in 1924 for the Standard Oil Company has been adaptively reused for offices and a bank. The filling station at 37th and Bull Street which was known at one time as Pasha’s car wash – we have just approved plans in the Starland district to adaptively reuse as a restaurant and condominiums or apartments to be added behind. So similar structures have been rehabbed throughout the city.

We also received prior to this meeting a petition from the Savannah Young Architect’s Forum Urban Design Committee opposing the demolition. I am passing this around to be entered into the record.

According to the applicant, the property was purchased in 1985 by the current owner. The 1985 City Directory indicates that the structure was still in use as a filling station. By 1987, the next available City Directory here, the structure is no longer listed. The building has stood for 20 years without being put to productive use. At some point the roof was removed which expedited the deterioration of the structure.

Staff is recommending, because of the rarity and importance of 342 Drayton Street that has been established by creditable authority, and that it has been demonstrated that similar buildings have been adaptively reused for residential and commercial purposes – although the condition of the structure over the past 20 years has deteriorated to a point that both the City and the applicant’s engineers stated it is in imminent danger of collapse, that this be absolutely demonstrated because we do not want to recommend the demolition of a rare example of a building of any style and this is an important commercial style from the early 20th century. So we would not recommend approval of demolition unless it is absolutely demonstrated that this building cannot be restored and that it is an imminent danger to the public.

If, however, the Board finds that it should be demolished, then Staff does have comments on the proposed new construction. I do not know whether you want to take these as two separate issues. Talk about the demolition first and then the new construction?

Mr. Steffen: I’ll make a motion that we do divide it into two parts and deal with demolition only first.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: Second.

Mr. Mitchell: All in Favor of the motion. The motion passes. Are there questions of staff?

Mr. Meyerhoff: I have a question. In what capacity are we supposed to acknowledge this Dawson-Wissmach ...

Ms. Reiter: This was presented today by the petitioner as further demonstration of the infeasibility of an economic return on restoring the existing building. That is summarized in the handout. This came today.

Mr. Meyerhoff: (unintelligible)

Ms. Reiter: Eric you are not considering that design. These have figures which show that that design did not ...just the figures.

Mr. Mitchell: Are there further questions of staff? No questions of staff, would the petitioner come forward please?

Mr. Hartridge: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, Walter Hartridge of Bouhan, Williams and Levy. I represent Mr. Carson and my wife who is the immediately adjacent property owner. We are going to be brief. We understand the time constraints Mr. Chairman. With respect to the last question, Mr. Puljung says he submitted this on Monday and it has to do with the financial data and that's about it on the back, Mr. Meyerhoff.

With respect to certain assertions made in the staff report I would like permission to hand out some documents to the Board to rebut some of the statements on the front end, which could be followed as I make a very brief statement before calling upon my next people who will testify on behalf of the applicant. Is that alright Mr. Chairman? And one other question, Mr. Chairman, if after the response from the public I anticipate that there will be some things that might require a brief response, limited to that applicant, if we could have the privilege of rebuttal, because I have no way of knowing exactly what is coming. There has been a petition submitted here today and I see some other people and I don't know exactly what they are going to say. Is that alright sir?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes.

Mr. Hartridge: May I come forward to submit these? I'll just pass them out.

Mr. Mitchell: Beth, we also request that the letter from the Young Architects and the documents from Dawson-Wissmach be entered into the record.

Mr. Hartridge: Now that everyone has one of these I will demonstrate the relevance of this very promptly. We take issue with certain statements laid out in the staff report with respect to the significance of this structure and where it fits into the city plan and what it has to do with the city plan and in that regard I would like to point out just a very brief statement from Nathaniel Alexander Owings in his book The American Aesthetic. I can't hand them out because that would violate the copy write laws, but I can read it. The record would show that in the early 20th century approximately 1916, plans were submitted to put a tire store here with deference to the automobile. There appears in the record references to how many filling stations were up and down Drayton Street. Well, that was in another time when America began to fall victim to the tyranny of the automobile. And as Mr. Owings stated, "again with more concern with expediency than for patience and rationality we have thrust our streets, freeways and highways along courses that suited our immediate convenience and indicated a general lack of concern about broader effects." I would respectfully submit that the historical background is such that in those tough times this property was sold for expediency and Drayton Street became what my

late uncle Walter Hartridge called Gasoline Alley. But now days we are supposed to pay respect to the city plan of the City of Savannah and in a marvelous book by Edmund Bacon of Philadelphia, Design of Cities, in which Savannah is ranked with all the great cities of the world, he makes the statement “It is amazing that a colony struggling against the most elemental problems of survival in a wilderness should be able to produce a plan so exulted that it remains as one of the finest diagrams for city organization and growth in existence.” By the way Mr. Owings spoke to Historic Savannah back when I was president and so did Mr. Bacon. These were our mentors, these were great men. Bacon did Philadelphia. Interestingly his son is Kevin Bacon the actor. In here, he shows how the city grew by accretion. How the city plan originally laid out by Oglethorpe, grew by accretion over time, up until approximately 1860 and with that in mind, with that fact in mind, we will very rapidly look at what has been distributed. First, there is a comment from the City Department of Development Services who stands for the City Engineer that this building is in an unsafe condition. But we have a map of the City of Savannah of 1856 and we see highlighted the lots and I have attached right behind it a copy from an atlas book of Savannah showing Lafayette Ward which was laid out in 1837, Lafayette Square, the Trust Lots and the residential lots, and you can see the subject property stands on lots 16 and 17. My wife’s property, the residence stands on lot 17 and the western ½ of lot 18 (sic) and there is a law firm on the corner on lot 19 (sic).

Across Abercorn Street today we have a streetscape which we are going to see demonstrated by Mr. Puljung. There is a string of properties and the residences of people. In an attempt to pay appropriate deference to the city plan these townhouses would create a reconstruction of what the cityscape was supposed to have looked like. The construction of this tire store and the filling station was an apparition. It was a departure from the city plan. It is not, I respectfully submit, subject to the sort of deference it’s given in this staff report and there should be an opportunity of course to rebut this. I cannot cross examine these people. I don’t know that they ever considered these points.

Now, as to zoning, I have attached the zoning ordinance. I have attached what the zoning is of the properties. In the report it is stated, well, the Parker’s garage is a wonderful adaptive reuse and so is 112-114 Drayton Street, which is also known as a President Street address. Those I respectfully submit are in, as the handout shows you, in BC-1 or Business. That’s the Central Business zoning district. The purpose of this district is to protect and enhance the central business district of the City of Savannah. The subject property is in R-I-P-A Residential Medium Density and the purpose of this district is to protect the residential quality that is compatible with land use patterns within the unique physical environs of old Savannah. This district is established and it lays it out. As you can see we have attached the zoning classifications to the package that I have handed out to you, and we respectfully submit that instances cited by staff of the Parkers garage and the property on President and Drayton are inapposite to this. As you all know the Historic Zoning ordinance recites that both regular use zoning and historic zoning apply and have equal vitality and must be given deference to.

Now, Mr. Eric Puljung is going to give you a brief rundown point by point. We are then going to hear from an engineer who specializes in part in structural analysis, Mr. Hunter Saussy, who will testify categorically that this building is a threat to public safety. We are going to hear from my wife who is the immediately adjacent property owner who is going to make a brief statement about public health issues which she has personally encountered. We are going to ask the across-the-street neighbor, the representative Mrs. Alice Clark, of the Georgia Society of the Colonial Dames to speak and then Mr. Cliff Kennedy has come in, I don’t see him yet, he is the President of EMC Engineering he is also an engineer. He is right across Drayton Street and he has also looked at this piece of property for many, many years. And then we would ask Mrs. Esther Shaver to come forward and make a public comment. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Mr. Puljung...

Mr. Mitchell: In respect to all the individuals you cited who will be coming up we want to limit...we want to make them be brief please.

Mr. Hartridge: They will be sir. My wife has a prepared statement. Mr. Puljung has already prepared this submission. Mr. Saussy has submitted a report. It's going to be brief, but this is a very important matter, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Mitchell: We understand that. Yes?

Mr. Steffen: Mr. Carson, the letter you got from Mr. John Hutton, did he write this in his official capacity for the City or was this something you all asked him to do?

Mr. Hartridge: Mr. Steffen, I am Walter Hartridge, representing Mr. Carson. I'm sorry, I thought we knew each other.

Mr. Steffen: I am reading off my notes

Mr. Hartridge: Okay, this was obtained by Mr. Puljung. He will recite to you exactly how he got it. He went through the procedure and he obtained the letter in an official capacity and I would ask him to address that if that is alright sir?

Mr. Steffen: Mr Hartridge, one other question. You said that the examples of Parkers and some of the other things cited by Mrs. Reiter were inapposite. In what way are they different?

Mr. Hartridge: Because in the BC-1 zone you can have a filling station. This cannot again be a filling station. Those uses are not...this has not been a filling station for 20 years. This is an R-I-P-A zone. It has been an R-I-P-A zone since the late 60's. Those are BC-1 zone buildings. This is in a residential area within Lafayette Ward which was laid out as an extension of the city plan for residential purposes with a central square and lots around for residences.

Mr. Steffen: You are speaking specifically of zoning.

Mr. Hartridge: That would be a matter not before you, but I pointed out to you with respect that you are to consider general zoning rules when you consider these things. Thank you sir.

Eric Puljung: Good Afternoon, Eric Puljung. I will start going through the different pieces of this application here. I believe that you will find that in my application that I submitted a letter in the beginning of the application stating my understanding of the significance of reviewing a building for demolition and appreciating the historic qualities of the structure, but also reiterating the significance of Oglethorpe's plan just as Mr. Hartridge has presented to you. Mr. Steffen, in regard to your question presented about the City Engineer that is part of the application and it was part of my exhibits. I included the letter requesting his comments on that as my exhibit and that is exhibit "H" and my letter requesting it and his response was also included.

I would like to go through just the different questions that are here. This is one of the first times that this is happening. If you don't feel I need to respond to or you don't want to hear it again, I could bypass that with respect to time. The first question that is asked in this application is whether or not the property is listed as a historic building and we have covered that that is. In fact it is an historic structure.

Our client...did the applicant have knowledge of the historic designation of the property at the time of acquisition? Our client, who is under contract to purchase the building, is aware of the historic designation of the property and he reviewed this with Beth Reiter several months

ago. He also understands the designation was given when the entire building envelop was intact. That was when the roof was in place prior to its collapse and removal which we believe happened sometime towards the end of 2003. It was actually a collapse and then a removal.

Number Two: Have there been any attempts to sell, lease or donate the structure, price asked and offers received? In my response you see that there were not any specific attempts to market the property or sell the property. The current owner who is actually Savannah College of Art and Design had been approached by several different people to donate the building or selling the building, but they did not find those monetary offers or solicitations for donations acceptable. Mr. Carson's presentation today was found acceptable.

It also asked for real estate taxes and that information is included in exhibit "A". Exhibit "B" is the real estate appraisal which is requested as part of the demolition application and as you review that you will notice that the zoning is also cited, the R-I-P-A zoning and that the appraiser Johnny Ganem found that there was very minimal value to the existing four walls on the site and suggests that the land is of the highest and best use as vacant land and that the walls be removed.

Part 3: Is the structure creating undue economic hardship since it cannot provide a reasonable economic return? That information is included. Basically I talk about the current owner being the college and I'm sure you have all had time to read that, but I include backup information with Exhibit "C" which is the property tax bill and this is based on what Mr. Carson will be paying for property tax on a \$600,000 acquisition. And "D" is his debt service which will be related to that acquisition price. Those are questions that you asked to be satisfied.

Any economic incentives for preservation available to applicant through federal, state or city programs? As you can see I have reviewed this with many different agencies, Historic Savannah Foundation, Savannah Economic and Development Authority, and each of them has offered some different things. Some of them don't have anything available such as low interest loans for that area. Façade easements are available through Historic Savannah Foundation and all of these things are backed up. The State and the Federal Government or the National Park Service think it would be eligible for tax credits. There still is some hesitation on their part to say how much because it would require a Part I submittal to reasonably determine how much of the renovation would be applicable for that so in looking at this from an economic perspective we are not sure that it would be a full fledged 20 percent of entire renovation costs or not. This question also deals with the economic feasibility of this building and whether or not it is feasible to restore it. And that is where my information which was so kindly provided by Dawson Wissmach, Neil Dawson specifically comes from. His firm evaluated this structure as a potential project and found that it would not actually produce an economic return. I think you will find that all the numbers he used were very reasonable for construction costs and for sales prices and the acquisition costs is actually less than what our client is considering purchasing this property for or is under contract to purchase for.

Have feasible alternative uses...

Mr. Mitchell: Pardon me sir. We have a question for you.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: Before we go into all these numbers I've got a couple of concerns. My first concern is that this is another SCAD building that we are being asked to demolish based on neglect. Another concern is that this building has only been rated I would dare say within the last ten years, maybe less than ten years. So not even three years ago the prior owner could have fought the historic rating of this building, but that person did not do that and now the building has been rated. The next concern that I have is that the argument is not whether the building was anticipated in 1856 as a tithing lot, the argument is that as the City has evolved it has been determined that this building is significant to demonstrate the evolution of the city's

design so, I think it is disingenuous now to come and say that this building cannot make the best economic use that the buyer who took and purchased this building with notice

Mr. Hartridge: Not yet.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: Well if you are taking with notice, I think it is disingenuous for the previous owner to sit there who have let it deteriorate and then say whoops they are not going to be able to make a significant economic profit. And that's my concern.

Mr. Steffen: I want to add something to that that troubles me about it and maybe the attorneys in the room will understand. I'm looking at the demolition ordinance which I haven't really looked at in a long time and I think it is fairly new but I think it is fairly specific and it talks about a hardship on the owner. The owner of this property is currently SCAD and the owner of the property purchased the property at a particular price. That's not relevant to the considerations that we are here for today concerning the prospective owner of the property and so I am concerned that the guidelines that we are required to follow, not that we want to follow or don't want to follow, but the guidelines that we are required to follow, require us to evaluate this in terms of the hardship on the current owner. We are really being asked by the applicant to evaluate the hardship on a prospective owner which is different than what our guidelines tell us to do.

Mr. Neely: Mr. Chairman can I suggest that this is basically Board discussion. We really haven't heard from the petitioner yet, nor the public I feel like we ought to go ahead and hear the whole petition.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: The whole purpose of my comment and to Joe's point is that why would we hear all this economic evaluation on a _____ that doesn't apply.

Mr. Hartridge: Mr. Chairman, can I raise a point of order, Mr. Chairman just to respond to this? What the ordinance provides is that it is all in the alternatives. It is one of the following conditions. Public health, you are going to hear about this, or public safety, it says and/or it is included or, economic hardship. There are three different ways this can go and that's why we are presenting evidence on health, and safety in a minute and we believe Mr. Carson has standing to present that.

Mr. Mitchell: Is Mr. Carson, the owner? I'm sorry I mean the prospective owner?

Mr. Hartridge: Contract. Mr. Carson is here to purchase it ... **(First side of tape ends)**

Mrs. Fortson Waring: ...is an interested party just the way the public is and I for one would think I would ask the chair to restrict any further ...I mean he's been up there for I don't know how long and we have a lot of people to hear from today and I would like to hear from someone else.

Mr. Mitchell: You have some others? You know we stated up front that we wanted to move things along given we've allowed you to kind of go on. Are you ready to tie it up?

Mr. Puljung: Well, I'll be happy to cease talking about all the things I've presented.

Mr. Hartridge: We'd like to call the Engineer that shows us that this is a threat to public safety. As a matter of fact its almost a defacto public and private nuisance, but we would like for you to hear from...

Mr. Mitchell: You are still going back to your issue of standing.

Various comments unintelligible from Board)

Mr. Hartridge: I understand standing and we are entitled to present the record here ...

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: As a member of the public. Sure, as a member of the public he is entitled to make a statement.

Mr. Mitchell: As a member of the public...

Mr. Hartridge: Well, then we call on him to make his...we say he is speaking for Mr. Carson. He is also speaking for my wife who is a property owner next door, who is an aggrieved citizen with standing.

Mr. Steffen: I only add this to make this clear, I'm not talking only about standing. I think standing is a technical issue, and I am not sure what the answer is to that, I am talking about applying the ordinance and this ordinance is difficult to apply especially as it regards to economic hardship if we are not dealing with the actual owner. That's my ----I'm going to listen to this other stuff too – but....

Mr. Hartridge: Mr. Chairman, for the record, this ordinance was revised earlier this year, I believe in February, to remove any period wherein a demolition could take place and the way it reads now is that a property owner's forced to hold it forever, which raises indeed important constitutional issues. I just want to put that on the record.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: Well, just let me put on the record also that in the event that the prospective owner wanted to sue this Board on a decision, they wouldn't be able to because they have no standing. They don't own the property.

Mr. Hartridge: Mr. Chairman, that is one lawyer, member of the Board's opinion. Standing is a question for a court to decide. I think before this administrative body, I am a lawyer, Mrs. Fortson-Waring is a lawyer, Mr. Steffen is a lawyer, but you are presiding here before an administrative body and you are supposed to let the record be complete, I suggest, and let a court decide these issues.

Mr. Mitchell: Oh, we are going to hear from you more than likely as the public, okay. The next person is ready to speak?

Mr. Puljung: I guess as the applicant or the person putting this application in, in reading through these things I didn't see anything specifically that was telling me that this was an incorrect way to move forward. This is referred to as the applicant and the information that I have...

Mr. Mitchell: Well, we simply assumed that he was the owner, and you are telling us now that you come before us that he is not.

Mr. Puljung: It was included in my application. (**unintelligible**.)

Mr. Deering: That is if you read the ordinance. It says that the owner – the economic hardship must fall on the owner and at present the owner is the Savannah College of art and Design.

Mr. Puljung: If we are not considering economic hardship, if we are considering the structure itself. That...

Dr. Caplan: That's the one question...(unintelligible)...getting back, first of all we just got this handout from Dawson Wissmach. I really get upset when it is handed out to us during the course of a meeting, because we do not have the opportunity to study it out

Mr. Puljung: Absolutely, and...

Dr. Caplan: Therefore I am a little confused over one point, on this financial performer here on the back on the return on equity, does it or does it not and I believe it does not include any potential tax credits which you alluded to may be available and so we don't know that the return on equity.

Mr. Puljung: On my review of this I did not see the tax credits applied to this and I think it is also reasonable to state that tax credits don't guarantee economic feasibility either for this particular performer or for anybody else.

Dr. Caplan: Well, it relates to the return on expense which you have as minus 2.4% There may be a plus number we don't know.

Mr. Mitchell: Was there not a 20% tax credit available?

_____Not in that.

Mr. Puljung: You would only know after you submit for Part I approval. So you have to start the application process. Well, I think it's best to call our structural engineer forward. This is Hunter Saussy.

Mr. Saussy: Thank you very much. My name is Hunter Saussy.

Mr. Mitchell: Can you do this in about two or three minutes sir?

Mr. Saussy: No, it will take longer than that.

Mr. Mitchell: Ha ha. Well

Mr. Saussy: This is a very serious matter.

Mr. Hartridge: This is absolutely crucial testimony. We ask that he –he's going to be brief. He's testified in plenty of cases, but he has to have an opportunity to present his testimony. That's due process.

Mr. Mitchell: Let's move it along.

Mr. Saussy: Thank you. I'm a structural engineer having practiced in Savannah since 1951 with local engineering firms and for the last thirty some odd years with my own firm here and in fourteen other states and in three foreign countries. In many of these cases I've had to be involved with critical buildings which have suffered through deterioration or lack of maintenance or storm damage. The potentials of further disruption of its use or its stability because of potential damage from other options that might come along by nature. These occur everywhere from South America to the Bahamas which I am dealing with right now and have been dealing with since Hurricane Floyd to what we are dealing with now in the future and in New Orleans Louisiana and in Texas now. It is a serious, serious problem with some of the buildings.

In this particular case I was brought in to review this building in August of this year and issued a report which I believe you have copies of. The building itself was examined at that time and a report, a short report was written of a visual non-intrusive examination of readily accessible areas of the building to determine from the effects noted its probabilities of safety and continuance in use or reuse or its opportunity to remain as it is or to be incorporated into some other use at that time. A series of 60 some odd photographs was submitted with that and described in the report which I presume you have. And I understood you have. These reports show the building itself which has lost its entire roof structure is not as I would have classified and I never mentioned the word in my report – the word imminent. That doesn't come under engineering. It is potentially in structural compromise to cause by its position an opportunity for collapse under extreme wind or lateral impact conditions that could occur either by vibrations, like came very close to happening to the building at Bay and Whitaker Street several months ago and had to be immediately rescued and was when they were building the hotel and everything is working fine. But it had a roof, it had floors, it had multi-it had redundancies in it to prevent it from moving too fast. This one has none. This building itself which is a series of only – of walls on its perimeter and the front area of the gasoline drive-thru area – the pump area has the only roof in it. The interior areas are seriously cracked and defective to a point that they have actually separated both vertically and horizontally. One of the photographs, particularly there at the east elevation on the rear, Charlton Lane, shows the wall leaning into the property next door. You have those in front of you, refer quickly to photograph 54. Photograph 58 on that same wall has caused a settlement and a depreciation of the quality of existence of the adjacent walls of the property next door amounting to three or four inches. The other walls have separated in parts. They have no actual buttress effects from any interior elements or exterior elements that would prevent it from moving laterally.

When this building was built, the codes were not there. And even later when it was examined a few years ago, the codes were less than we are required now. For instance, the winds on the windows, on the walls of this building, would now have to resist approximately 40 pounds per square foot, not 20 as they were. The building is increasingly at risk and as we have seen recently on every news channel that we go to the problems in the south part of the country along the Gulf have suffered serious damage from wind, not just water. We knew that was going to happen. That was predicted long ago. But from wind damage from those areas in the higher levels of ground. These gust factors that are occurring in the storms that have been hitting us since Floyd have gone up to now 130 to 150 mph as opposed to 110 to 90 mph that we used some years ago. The bridges that were knocked out in the Bahamas which I went down and worked on redesigning them-some of the others have events occurring now that they have never seen before, although they did occur before. I'm not trying to predict something's happening. The buildings that were built many years ago that we have in the city fortunately in masonry and solid masonry construction with roofs, with floors and with neighboring abutment gives a manner of form which creates a safety in it to some extent because of the redundancy of these elements in there to prevent it from falling if just a single wall comes out. But this one has no protection at all. The failure will be sudden whatever cause.

The cracks that are occurring now are a risk to safety of people and persons and properties and, as I wrote in the report, it is recommended that something be done and I have discussed with them, urgently. I'm not saying what. I don't get into that, but it is a risk to safety for the public and property. There was when I went through the properties there, elements on the ground and in the loft area of the front indications of rodent activity, other nestings that you see. Not uncommon in some areas where we see pigeons covering attics. I've even had one architect lose one of his two lungs having gone up there with me when I warned him not to. For some reason I'm protected against those, I don't know why, but he did. The infectious conditions that existed or exist in some of the buildings that are left unattended and to deteriorate as they are now are a risk to the public's health, although I am not an expert on that, I see these now and we are having it occur rapidly in some areas with serious renovations having to take place even as near as our neighbors in Brunswick where an entire hotel is having problems. What we found.

In general I want to state just what I said in my conclusion in the letter. In general there are sufficient and obvious vertical and irregular crackings in that building which the photographs show. I would be glad to respond to any questions on it. Through the brick masonry and on the perimeter walls which are the only things existing, these provide a serious concern and a responsibility I might add to the local officials and others and owners. This concern is serious as to its continued stability and it is my opinion that there exist serious risks to stability in the events associated with severe weather storms such as hurricane wind gusts. These walls now have no roof system or interior supports to provide any bracing and are subject to failure and more or less a sudden collapse, some areas with possible domino effects, compromising other areas and in conclusion it is my professional opinion that these present remains be removed and also any underground storage tanks that may be examined for remnants of fuel such as you had behind the City Hall or behind the News Press building, with the remnants of fuels or other hazardous material be appropriately address by removal. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Mitchell: Thank you very much sir.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: It appears that we don't have a copy of the new demolition ordinance in our books. I was looking and what we have in our book is not current and I just got the new current because City Council just passed a new demolition ordinance and I think if you would ask for a five minute break we all need to take a look because it is substantially different. Because what you read is not correct.

Dr. Caplan: _____ if I'm not mistaken because it was in and out and in and out didn't we state that in these buildings that were ready to collapse that you had to put a roof on them, that you had to maintain these buildings. Was that taken out?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: It was a three page change and I just think that we should all have a current copy of the demolition ordinance.

Mr. Mitchell: We will take a five minute recess in order to do that.

(Recess)

Mr. Hartridge: Mr. Chairman, just a point of order again. In reviewing the revised ordinance I do not find any requirement that the applicant be the owner. It calls for the name and address of the owner of the property and then the applicant's written statement. The way it is written I would respectfully suggest that Mr. Carson has standing. This is the latest addition of this year.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: Which is why I requested the current ordinance.

Mr. Hartridge: I understand Mrs. Fortson-Waring and I thank you for that. With that said I would like to – Mr. Saussy was at the podium if anybody has any questions.

Mr. Saussy: If you have any questions I will try to answer them as briefly as I can.

Dr. Caplan: With your permission Mr. Chairman on Page 7, item 4. It says protective maintenance of historic structures. Lack of maintenance that leads to demolition by neglect shall be considered a negative visual alteration. All buildings in the historic district rated historic under Sec. 8-3030 (c) shall be preserved against decay and deterioration in order to maintain property values, prevent hazards to public safety and rid neighborhoods of negative visual appearances and unsafe conditions. Exterior walls, roof, foundations, doors and windows shall be maintained or secured in a water tight condition to prevent structural decay.

Mr. Mitchell: Just a couple of corrections there. That was 8-3030 (e) for the record.

Mr. Steffen: I do have a question for Mr. Saussy. Mr. Saussy, thank you, I appreciate the thoroughness of your report as well. I wanted to make sure I understood two things about what you said. You said you were an expert on the stability of the structure. You weren't going to give a professional opinion on the health issues.

Mr. Saussy: No, I was not.

Mr. Steffen: The second thing is, if I understood you correctly, you said there is a risk to the stability of this building in a hurricane or an earthquake or some such circumstance such as that.

Mr. Saussy: Absolutely.

Mr. Steffen: You are not giving us an opinion as to the current threat today to public safety?

Mr. Saussy: You mean as of to date today. Well, if an event occurred it's going to be a serious problem or a risk. It takes an activity to cause it.

Mr. Steffen: Yes sir, thank you.

Mr. Mitchell: Yes, Ms. Waring.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: In reviewing, and if I might ask Mr. Hartridge is this the first time you have seen the new version of this ordinance.

Mr. Hartridge: I saw the new version working with Mr. Puljung yesterday.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: And if I could ask if you would consider a continuance because as you can see there are a lot of things that were requested that you all haven't provided as to appraisal, amount paid and so on.

Mr. Hartridge: Yes, we have provided it meticulously.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: O.K. so is it your opinion that you have put everything that was requested in your...ok, I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. Hartridge: If Mr. Puljung has not put it in, it can't be done. He is a very thorough young man.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: Thank you.

Mr. Saussy: Let me respond to one other part of that question. We are in the hurricane season as you know every time you turn on the television. It is not over and we do not know when it is going to be over, but there are other events that can occur throughout the year as I described earlier with construction activities ongoing throughout the city, we are called in constantly to review this problem. Almost in every case the buildings were occupied and to some extent maintained and they improved their maintenance. This one has no redundancy. And basically what I mean by that is there are no secondary walls, rigid frames, bracings or others that would provide bracing in such a lateral event that might occur such as in a hurricane, tornado and that sort.

Mr. Mitchell: May I ask you a question about photo 54?

Mr. Saussy: 54? Yes?

Mr. Mitchell: That's the portion of the wall up there the parapet that you say is leaning. Is it an optical illusion or does it look like the brick at the bottom right of the photo.

Mr. Saussy: The bottom right is a different brick. That's the adjacent property.

Mr. Mitchell: So you've got a common wall between the adjacent property?

Mr. Saussy: Yes, if you will look at photograph 58 if I may ask. You see the wall at that point is at the north end of the adjacent property and it is actually settled, been pulled down by this existing building's wall. And that's generally can be summarized as the result of high moisture content changes, flooding and water that is being entrapped in their for long periods of time in a building that doesn't have a roof any more.

Mr. Mitchell: Are you ready to move along sir? Are you finished? Next person please.

Mrs. Hartridge: I am Cornelia Connie Hartridge and I have been the owner of 119 East Charlton Street since October 1980. It is my purpose to demonstrate that the subject property constitutes a threat to public health and especially to my family. Shortly after acquiring the property I conveyed a historic easement on the façade of my house and the entire garden to Historic Savannah. I am a past board member of Historic Savannah Foundation and I often and regularly open my house to gardens and tours. The garden was a part of the garden expo and numerous house and garden tours. The property to the west of my house has not been in use since 1985 and I personally observed the property for the past 20 years. And I observed its ongoing deterioration culminating in the collapse of the roof in 2000. After the roof collapsed, its remnants and all supporting wooden rafters were removed. I would call the Inspection Department and they would say, oh yes, we are very well aware that this building is falling down. And I would say we've had numerous infestations by rats. On one recent occasion there was a rat snake in my garden and it is well known that rat snakes are so named because they like rats. So I went to Hester and Zipperer and he gave me some sulfur and I put it in the

garden and the rat snake went back next door. But during the course of the removal of the remnants of the roof the supporting wooden beams of the property I observed the man, the construction worker taking the roof down with whom I was in conversation, the rat snake crawled up his legs. It is my position that clearly this structure causes a threat to public health, not to mention the pigeons that are roosting in my roof now which had never happened before. The wall which is leaning, is a wall that will come into my bedroom and I think this is ridiculous that after 20 years that this group of people who are so concerned about this building that something would not have been done.

Mr. Mitchell: Is there someone else or is that the last...

Mr. Puljung: I'm sorry could I just clarify? We had some people that we wanted to talk but they may need to fall under public comment. Are we in public comment right now?

Dr. Caplan: Our procedure manual states that you may address the remarks from the public after the public has finished making their address.

Mr. Puljung: I just wanted to make sure that it was appropriate for public comment right now.

Mrs. Shaver. I had a speech prepared. I'm not going to make you suffer through it. I am Esther Shaver. One thing that hasn't been considered is a vehicle hitting that building. We don't have to wait for a hurricane or a storm. You saw what happened in Troup Square when that vehicle went through and demolished the Armillary. That's a real concern for us as well.

Mr. Bill Stube: Bill Stube Historic Savannah Foundation. The architectural review committee of Historic Savannah Foundation concurs with the recommendation of the City Preservation Officer which suggests denial to demolish the historic filling station structure at 342 Drayton Street. Since the committee concurs with the City Preservation Officer that the building comprises a significant element of the fabric of Savannah's Landmark Historic District, the committee believes that the suggestion that the building be demolished because of economic hardship is not relevant. The current value of the property should reflect what can be done with the existing structure given pertinent zoning and other city ordinances affecting the property. Therefore, the economic value of the property to a buyer should reflect the need to utilize the existing improvements required by the City of Savannah's preservation ordinances, not the potential value that the property would have if it were raw dirt. If the value of unimproved property were used in determining economic hardship, any historic building in the Landmark Historic District could be demolished on the grounds of economic hardship if the structure did not reflect the maximum potential allowed under current zoning laws. While the architectural review committee recognizes that the structure has been allowed to significantly deteriorate, the committee believes that the presence of all four walls of the original structure together with the porte cochiere on Drayton Street leaves a significant amount of the original building to allow for an adaptive reuse which would preserve the essence of the existing building so that future generations might have an understanding of the phase of Savannah's history represented by the subject building. Thank you.

Ms. Seiler: May I ask Mr. Stube a question? Mr. Stube do you know if Historic Savannah made an effort to buy this property or to acquire this property from SCAD?

Mr. Stube: I don't know.

Mr. Michael Brown: Hi. I'm Michael Brown a concerned citizen and developer downtown. I'm not a structural engineer, but I can tell you over the course of 32 years I have restored many buildings in a lot worse condition than this. This is eminently restorable. So that argument to me, as a developer, does not hold much water. Somebody mentioned something about the condition of the property, and I don't know about SCAD, but I know about the owner of property downtown. I get plenty of registered letters from the City from code compliance and there are some pretty strong requirements if I don't comply within a certain period of time. I don't know if that applies to SCAD or not, but I would think that they should be required by code to maintain their properties, and the fact that they don't and they let it go by neglect could be SCAD's liability, not the publics. Mr. Hartridge used a term which I thought was really interesting. He said reconstruction of townhouses there and I think replacing part of Savannah's past with new construction would soon devalue the entire district. If you replaced all the buildings and reconstruct it then you don't have any district left. This building is just as strong a part of the structure and historic past of Savannah as the Davenport House is. It's all a part of the transition of the City of Savannah. I think a good example of that would be the Drayton Towers, built in 1952. You may not like it, but it is part of downtown Savannah and it is part of its history. This predates that and I think it is equally important. And it has enough structural elements left in it that I think they can be maintained and become an economically viable piece of property.

Dr. Caplan mentioned something that I think was really interesting and that's when he showed the pro forma from Mr. Dawson that was for one use. There might be other uses, but just taking that on face value, if you did get the 20% tax credit there is no reference, I don't think, on how much the interest rate was on this mortgage, but I think the most important thing is that the price of the property was listed at \$550,000 dollars. If it is \$450,000 dollars, it does make sense. So it becomes an issue of price, not necessarily economic viability to the asking price. If the price of the property is high enough all the property would be ineligible (sic) for demolition. I think it is the liability of SCAD to maintain the building and there are plenty of developers and I can think of a few right now that would love the opportunity to restore that property and put it back into adaptive use. I think there are a lot of things that can be done with it. The other issue is I just think if we go down that path and use an economic argument, then everything is eligible for demolition. It is sort of like saying the Menendez brothers are pleading for the mercy of the court because they are orphans.

Joe Saseen: I'm Joe Saseen and the last time I appeared before ya'll was to try to save the old Georgia Supply building on MLK if you recall. It's sort of like deja vue. We have a building there with no roof on it and with all due respect and I understand each petition has to stand on its own two feet, but you had no problem tearing down that building and that building to me was in a lot of ways more historical and it fit the area where it was. This building here, even though I am an ardent preservationist just as ya'll are, I do not rise to object to this building being torn down because I feel that the natural plan of Savannah off of the squares, not Smith's Texaco down the street or Parker's down the street...we're talking about a block that bleeds off from a square and I believe that any block in Savannah that bleeds off from a square from Abercorn to Drayton should have homes on it. I think the ambience of Savannah would be more enhanced by having homes on Charlton Street, than the side of a filling station, quite frankly, because it fits the plan. Now, having said that I think Beth may remember this, none of ya'll were on the Board when the old County jail was torn down by a group of investors from I believe Statesboro. Philip Hamilton an attorney at the time, who has now passed away, led that group and they took the roof off the old County jail which is still off today and as a result of that roof being torn off, they lost all their credits and that's why the building did not become a viable business, a venture for them because they had taken down too much of the building. So we do have a road map from the old County jail that the tax credits were lost because the roof was gone. One more thing. I'm not familiar with the City ordinance that well, but I should, hearing just one line that maybe you'd

have to hold that building forever under the new ordinance. I'm not sure now, but if that's what it says there is no question and we have a lawyer, there are lawyers up here that might tell you that would be in my opinion, an inverse condemnation because you in effect would be telling the owner that you can't sell that building and therefore you can't sell it you're condemning it because he can't sell it and number 2two under Georgia law you cannot alienate property. For instance, in your will you cannot say this property can never be sold in your will. It would be void. You cannot alienate property in Georgia so you are looking at two facets of that new statute, ordinance rather, that could have some legal effect. You are not judges and are not here to rule on that, but you might want to look at that and maybe understand what you are looking at and what they are looking at from a legal standpoint forget the aesthetics of a block of homes that would be fitting on a square rather than a building that faces Drayton Street and really disrupts that block.

(Unintelligible)

Cynthia Hunter: I think I had a hand up. Cynthia Hunter, President of Savannah Young Architects Forum. I believe that everybody got to see our petition. I was asked to come here by our committee today to basically show that our committee had a unanimous vote to support and agree with staff's recommendation to deny demolition. On a personal note, because you guys know that I always do that, as a citizen, as a preservationist in Savannah and a graduate architect I think all of the arguments today for demolition are really good arguments to prove demolition by neglect. The solution for this project today should not be demolition by a proposed owner, which I think the ordinance does say that it has to be the owner or any owner of the property to quote that. But not demolition by proposed owner but should be to force the current owner to stabilize the structure so that a potential buyer can save this historic 78 year old automotive building. I believe that it appears that within downtown Savannah, buildings of this typology are kind of systematically being erased if you will. You know that I stood before you in December to ask you not to demolish the Kramer Building which unfortunately, in my opinion, was demolished. I think buildings of this typology deserve the same respect that we show our 19th century buildings. To kind of raise a point that was brought to me yesterday. At one point in time the Victorian District was in this same situation. People did not like Victorian buildings, they didn't want them. They weren't the cute little buildings that we see downtown on Broughton Street and fortunately they did not suffer this fate that seems to be happening to automotive buildings in downtown Savannah. So you know where I stand, thank you.

Walter Carson: I'm Walter Carson and I feel like I'm looking at the wall of unintended consequences here. Let me tell you how I got involved in this project. I knew SCAD owned this property and it had been sitting there for 20 years falling apart. And I thought, you know, if you asked anybody what one of the great residential streets of Savannah is it would be Charlton Street. If you think about it, some of the most elegant residences in the City are on Charlton. The lot is 120 x 90 so we originally looked at this thing to build four 30 foot wide town houses which in downtown Savannah is considered a pretty good size townhouse. A 30 foot width is unusual and desirable. When we talked with the architects about it they said well, you know, one of the problems you have in row houses is that you have problems in getting light to the middle room. Why don't we put side courtyards and only build three townhouses. That increases the land cost per lot, but you have windows on all four sides of the house and I don't know if what you put in your package showed what we were talking about and that's a suggestion. The other thought was that in that particular block the only other two buildings on it, which are the Bergen law firm and the Hartridge House, are both freestanding houses. So three more free standing houses, I thought, was going something very nice over there. So the first thing I did was I talked to Neil Dawson who had at one time tried to make something in the old

building work over there and they tried and tried and they were going to own it and it doesn't work. Going back and trying to get SCAD or whoever owned the building all this time – you command them to put a roof on it, that's just not going to happen. So I see further deterioration no matter what we decide here today and we were trying to make the neighborhood nicer. I am frankly a little surprised at all the opposition to it. We tried.

Mr. Mitchell: Thank you very much. We are going to...were you raising your hand?

Mr. Hartridge: Yes, Mr. Chairman. If that completes the public comments, then we get a very brief rebuttal. It will be very brief. I would like to point out Mr. Michael Brown said he was not a structural engineer so I would respectfully submit that his comments about the structure are not admissible. They are not to be considered. The only evidence that you have from a structural engineer, is from Mr. Saussy on the record. I would respectfully submit that we have carried clear and convincing evidence that this building is a threat to public health and to public safety premitting any issues about economic return on this structure. And the record is totally silent that anyone has ever come forward in 20 years to say they were going to buy it from SCAD or do anything with it. The record does not show that. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Mitchell: Thank you very much. Now that we have heard from ..yes, Ms. Waring.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: I was going to make a motion. I move that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition of HBR 05-3455-2 as to demolition.

Dr. Caplan: Second.

Mr. Mitchell: We have a motion and a second to deny the petition of HBR 05-3455-2 and we have a second. All in favor of the motion?

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: There is discussion.

Mr. Steffen: The fact that Savannah College of Art and Design has allowed this project to deteriorate to the extent that some of the neighbors are affected by it troubles me greatly. Unfortunately we don't have the authority on this Board to deal with that issue of deterioration. It is my hope that someone can. But in looking through this application, I was struck by the advertisement on Page 42 which is date October 17, 1929. And it says Savannah's Master Service Station Open all Night Trained Service Men. It describes a time that is lost. It also describes a time prior to us overcoming our increasingly dangerous addiction to fossil fuels. I would hope that my daughter and her children will learn about where we were at this point in time will learn about automobile cultures by being able to see service stations as they once were. In the same way that I can take her to Charleston and show her the slave market, or I can take her to places where buildings no longer have a current productive use, but buildings which demonstrate a part of our productive history. This is a unique structure. It describes a unique period in our history, and I do not believe that the requirements under the new ordinance which state clear and convincing evidence which was the new provision added to the new ordinance which raises a higher standard in order for you to demolish structures. I don't believe that has anywhere near been met in this case. Now I would say at the same time that I have heard from a number of people in here about the possibilities of renovating and making economic sense out of this property. I would hope that my friend Walter Carson would take a second look at this in such a way that it will preserve the integrity of this building as it once was because I think it is an awfully important part of our history.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring: I would just like to say that as a steward of the ordinance, the ordinance does state that demolition of historic structures is deemed detrimental to the public interest. We have heard some testimony of an opinion of public safety from Mrs. Hartridge. I don't believe that she is a qualified expert but that was the opinion based on mice and snakes and those of us who live in adjacent neighborhoods know that abandoned buildings do have mice and snakes and we all live with that when we live in proximity to an abandoned building. Therefore, I did not see that there was sufficient evidence as to imminent and clear and convincing health threat.

Mr. Mitchell: Thank you very much. Any further discussion? We have a motion and a second on the table. All in favor of the motion say I. All opposed. The motion passes.

For
 Fortson-Waring
 Caplan
 Steffen
 Neely
 Deering
 Meyerhoff

Against
 Seiler
 Johnson

Not voting
 Mitchell

**RE: Continued Petition of Dawson & Wissmach
 Architects
 Neil Dawson
 HBR 05-3458-2
 501 East Bay Street
 New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

Present for the petition was Richard Wissmach.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for Part I Height and Mass for a four story mixed use single office/ one unit residential building at the NE corner of Price and East Bay Street.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Height: The lot is located in a four story height zone.	The proposed structure is four stories. (Three stories and a penthouse). The first story is 13'-6", the second and third are 12' each and the pent house is 11'-6." The overall height has been lowered 1 foot and the height of the stair tower lowered 6'-6".	The first story has been lowered and is consistent with the heights of other commercial structures on Bay Street such as 325 E. Bay Street.
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setbacks except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.	There are no setbacks along Bay. The Board of Appeals has granted 100% lot coverage for this lot.	Historically, masonry buildings on Bay Street occupied 100% of the lot.

Street Elevation Type:	Two to four story historic masonry commercial buildings are found throughout the length of Bay Street.	This standard has been met.
Entrances: North of Broughton Street a corner building located adjacent to a north-south service street shall have an entrance on the service street.	Entrances have been provided on both Bay and Price Streets.	This standard has been met.
Proportion of structures front facade	A commercial design vocabulary has been utilized, ie. Base, middle and top.	Both warehouse and commercial structures are found on Bay Street.

Proportion of openings and Rhythm of solids to voids.	The ground floor reads as a commercial space while a more industrial window is used above. A wide recessed space has been used on Price Street to suggest a main building and a carriage house to transition between Bay Street and the residential district to the south.	Staff recommends that the false openings be blind recesses without the louvers.
Roof shape:	Forms reminiscent of ship forms are proposed.	The use of a penthouse in this case helps reduce the mass of the structure. The reference to the river and shipping is symbolic of the location of the building. The scale of these elements has been reduced.

General comment: The applicant’s proposed building blends historical references of the warehouses and shipping activities of Bay Street into a modern structure. It is a difficult site with its juxtaposition to the Bay and the 19th century residential ward to the south, but traditionally Bay Street has been more of a commercial corridor.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of Part I Height and Mass.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Wissmach stated the height was the main issue last month in relation to the single-family homes on Price Street. He said they looked at each floor level. The first floor being 14’-6” which was submitted last month was reduced to 13’-6”. In reviewing the second and third floors there were other issues that came into play, particularly the height required for the structure, floor slab, HVAC, and ceiling. He said they felt that 12’ was the minimum height in order to deal with the issues of mechanical and electrical. He said the same would apply for the penthouse, which was 11’-6”. He said they reduced the overall height by 1 foot on the base and made adjustments to the elements on the roof. He said one being the elevator shaft and the shower element (pavilion) on the backside of the building, which was also reduced.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he was still concerned about the Price Street elevation with the dual fenestration. He said he felt it could be more cohesive if they showed the brick spandrel between the second and third floors windows.

Mr. Wissmach stated they took that into consideration, but going back to their concept of the transition from Bay Street down Price Street the concept was relating to the residential by the elevation reflecting the traditional residences of the main house; courtyard, garden, and carriage house. He said they studied that and felt that there was too much lost and less of a transition if they were to make it more similar to punched openings they had on the carriage house.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he agreed. However, he felt there would be a better cohesiveness between what he did on the South side of the building to the north if the spandrel instead of being a panel were brick.

Mr. Deering he felt the garage doors on the lane elevation were residential and did not suit the building. He said when they come back for details they may want to have restudied that element.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I – Height/mass as submitted. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Elaine Berk
 HBR 05-3469-2
 616 Price Street
 Renovations**

Present for the petition was Elaine Berk.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for a rehabilitation of 616 Price Street, a 2-unit residential dwelling. This proposal includes a partial demolition of two rear additions, the rear porch, the front porch and a reconstruction of these elements.

FINDINGS

This two-story historic residence was constructed prior to 1898 (Sanborn Map Co. 1898). Historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps indicate that the building originally featured a one-story porch on the front of the building. In 1898, there was a two-story and a one-story addition on the rear. In 1916, the second story addition was noted as a porch. All of this was enclosed and extended by 1955. Additional porches were added even later.

RECOMMENDATION

The rehabilitation of this historic building and preservation of the historic fabric is encouraged. The removal of the stucco exterior and repair/replacement of historic wood siding is appropriate and staff recommends approval. Due to a lack of information regarding the structural integrity of the existing additions and incomplete plans for the proposed additions, staff is recommending a continuation until further information can be provided that supports demolition. The application is not clear in indicating what is existing and what is proposed. The reconstruction of the front

porch is appropriate for the building and staff recommends approval with conditions also detailed in the following report. There is not enough information regarding the existing roof structure and the proposed roof to recommend approval. In addition, staff recommends denial of the wholesale replacement of the windows and doors which should be repaired if possible.

Rehabilitation/Additions

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: 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.	The lot is 50' wide by 51' deep or 2,550 square feet. The proposed footprint is approximately 1,604 square feet for a 63% building lot coverage.	The site plan does not delineate the width of the new front or rear porches. Clarify the encroachment.
Building Height: The building is located in a 2 1/2 story zone. The exterior expression of the height of the first story, or the second story in the case of a raised basement shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second story shall not be less than 10 feet.	The existing structure is a 2-story residence. Dimensions are not indicated on the drawings provided.	The proposed additions do not exceed the 2.5-story height limit; however it is unclear what the proposed height dimension of the building is. Existing and proposed dimensions should be noted on the drawings.
Demolition/Additions		
Partial Demolition of Rear Additions: The demolition is required to alleviate a threat to public health or public safety; and/or the demolition is required to avoid exceptional practical difficulty or undue hardship upon any owner of any specific property. The determination of economic hardship shall require the applicant to provide evidence sufficient to demonstrate that the application of the standards and regulations of this section deprives the applicant of reasonable economic use or return on the subject property.	Demolish 2 additions (18') including 2-story rear wood porch and metal stairs. The two additions have been structurally failing. There is a +/- 8" angled drop in the floor and roof line from the rear of the original portion of the building to the rear of the additions. Jacking up the entire rear section was considered, but it is questionable whether the result would produce a sound structure.	The additions on the rear of the building and the interior chimneys are historic (Sanborn Map Co. 1955) and should be retained if possible. Economic Hardship has not been fully demonstrated. Although the placement of a 2-story porch on the rear of the building is historically accurate, the existing porch no longer retains its historic integrity, as all of the historic fabric has been replaced. Therefore, the rear porch is not worthy of preservation.
Proposed Rear Addition: Additions that are equal to or exceed the size of the existing structure shall be treated as new construction which shall be connected in such a way that visually separates the new construction from the existing structure. Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.	Construct wood frame addition (20' deep x 30'-5" wide) and 1-story porch (3'-8' deep x no dimension given) on rear of 24'-6" deep x 30'-5" wide main portion of building. Distinguish rear addition with vertical wood member, indicating false corner board.	The proposed plans for the addition incorporate a false corner board to distinguish old from new. This could be further executed within the foundation, perhaps with new rear foundation stuccoed. The proposed plans for the new porch lack dimensions, roof materials, and floor materials.

<p>Demolish Front Porch:</p>	<p>Demolish 2-story concrete and wood front porch. It is in poor condition and the concrete and brick foundation has been compromised by a recent car crash and the porch may be collapsing as a result. It has not yet been determined whether or not it is feasible to restore and reuse the existing columns, or if they are original to the house. Other porches in the vicinity feature square posts and balusters; therefore, it is assumed that these materials and porch designs are original.</p>	<p>Historically, the front porch was only 1-story in height and 1 bay wide (Sanborn Map Co. 1955), indicating that the existing 2-story porch is not historic. Staff recommends approval to replace the front porch with conditions. The wood columns do appear to be historic and should be retained if possible.</p>
<p>Front Porch Addition: Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material at the foundation wall facing the street. Infill between foundation piers shall be recessed so that the piers are expressed. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate. 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 4". The height of the railing shall not exceed 36".</p>	<p>Replace with 2-story wood frame front porch on brick piers; size and location to match the existing porch.</p>	<p>The proposed brick base of the porch appears to be consistent with the foundation of the main building. Historic bricks should be reused when possible. Verify that the proposed balustrade is composed of individual 2" posts. Noted materials and/or dimensions for porch details of balustrade and stairs is incomplete.</p>
<p><i>Exterior Alterations</i></p>		
<p>Exterior Walls: On lots less than 60' in width, the front façade shall be constructed so as to form a continuous plane parallel to the street. Bays and porches attached to such elevation may project streetward of the plane.</p>	<p>The existing building forms a parallel plane along Price Street. The proposed porch extends from the west elevation streetward of the plane.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
<p>Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.</p>	<p>Remove non-historic stucco exterior and replace with 6" wood clapboard siding. Rear of building reveals historic 6" clapboard wood siding.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Windows: Historic windows, frames, sashes and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented that they have deteriorated beyond repair.</p>	<p>Remove existing windows and replace with 8 windows on the north and south elevations, 4 windows on the west elevation, and 2 windows on the east</p>	<p>Staff does not recommend the whole sale replacement of historic windows. They should be repaired if possible. Staff does not recommend the</p>

Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material. Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction only.	elevation. New windows to be 6/6 DHS, double pane TDL, wood frame (as on cut sheet provided). Application states that all existing windows are inoperable and/or broken. New window sizes to match existing window sizes. A majority of the new windows will be placed in new openings and the historic openings will be enclosed.	relocation of historic openings, altering the fenestration of the exterior. Demonstrate that the proposed windows meet the standards, i.e. TDL.
Door Replacement:	Remove 4 entrance doors and replace with 2 new wood doors (as specified on cut sheet provided). Design of door to match original.	Staff does not recommend the whole sale replacement of historic doors. The proposed doors do not match the historic entrance doors but replicate Craftsman style doors from a later period than the building dates.
	Drawing indicates wood door with TDL in 3x5 arrangement on the second floor west elevation.	Are the existing doors being repaired or replaced with new doors?
	Drawing indicates "new wood door with TDL" on rear.	There is not enough information to review these doors. Submit materials and colors. Surround does not appear to be accurate.
Paint Colors:	Siding: BM #HC-4 Hawthorne Yellow Trim: BM #0-6 White Dove	Submit paint chip or sample. No color indicated for doors.
Roof: Gable and hip roofs in excess of 8:12 pitch are permitted only where a similar historic building roof pitch exists with in the same block front. Roofs visible from the street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles.	Remove existing hip roof and replace with new hip roof. Composition shingles to be installed.	The proposed drawings appear to have a steeper pitch roof than is apparent in the photographs of the existing design. The pitch should remain as it is currently with some compensation for sag. Dimensions and existing roof material are not indicated.
Wood Lattice	Install wood lattice between porch piers.	Infill material is appropriate, but a horizontal/vertical orientation is more appropriate in an urban context.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Ms. Berk stated she met with Chuck Fisher, Building Inspector and Tom Hoffman, Engineer to discuss the building. She said in regard to the structural integrity of the building, the existing roof has collapsed. The north, south, and rear east exterior walls were leaning outward especially around the chimneys. She said they did not know the extent of the damage of the wood siding or the wood studs until they remove all the stucco. However, they did go inside and removed the wall in one area and around one of the windows. She said the ones that they took a look at were all rotten. In regard to the windows, she has not looked at all of them. However,

she has yet to find one window that had an original piece of glass. The front porch was also collapsing and it was recommended by the building inspector that she either remove it or repair it as soon as possible because it was considered unsafe. Overall, the consensus was for all of the floors, ceilings, roof, front, and rear porches needed to be replaced. She said it was most likely that the wood studs of the rear exterior walls may have to be replaced as well, but she won't know until she removes the stucco and start working on the house what the condition really is.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he concurred with Staff's comments about not enough information. He said her sections and elevations did not differentiate between what was new and what was existing. The sections did not give any vertical height, so they really could not determine where the eave line was currently in relation to the eave line of the new building. He said she showed a 4 X 12 slope on the roof, but the drawings were lacking to a great degree what she was going to save and what she was going to add.

Ms. Berk stated she felt she met the submittal criteria. She said the length and dimensions of the porch were remaining the same. She said she thought as long as it was remaining the same that she did not have to indicate what the dimensions were going to be. The height of the building was also remaining the same.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it was not clear on her plans that she submitted.

Ms. Berk stated she was not changing the height of the building. She said the porch that she was rebuilding was the same size as the porch that was there now. She said she showed on the site plan that the original structure was 24'-6" and that the 18' was the existing additions. She said maybe it was not carried over to the elevation drawings. She said if the Board wanted her to include it on the elevation drawings, she would.

Mr. Deering stated compared to some applications there was plenty of information submitted, especially if the petitioner is replacing everything in-kind. He said he felt there were some things that might come back to Staff, like the windows if she notices that they have to be completely replaced.

Ms. Berk stated there were some things she would not know until she tears off the stucco. She said did not mind going back to Staff with everything.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness with the condition that the original windows are to be repaired. If the windows need to be replaced, a new application will be reviewed by staff. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Wayne Chambers
 HBR 05-3470-2
 108 West Taylor Street
 Alterations**

Present for the petition was Wayne Chambers.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting to add a wood frame shed roof surfaced in asphalt shingles over a balcony at the rear of his residence. The shed roof, located above the rear entrance, cantilevers 6'-6" over the balcony and is 10'-2" wide. The shed extension features a 4:12 slope and will be placed 10'-1 $\frac{3}{4}$ " on the wall above the first floor. The existing light fixture will be removed to install the new roof structure.

FINDINGS

The application is unclear on how the shed roof is going to tie into the main building. In addition, the applicant stated that the roof is needed to protect against a leak. Staff anticipates that the proposed extension could lead to additional water damage due to run-off onto the first floor. Further information regarding the justification for installing the shed roof would be helpful.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the applicant reduce the size of the shed extension and investigate using a more tensile structure, like an awning. Removal of the non-historic light fixture is recommended by staff.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Chambers stated he would like to have a roof because he currently has a leak in his gallery. He said he has worked on the whole back of his house replacing window sashes. He said now it was one leak in one corner, which was in the corner of the roof that he would like to build. He said it was also suggested that he use an awning. However, he felt that would only be a temporary solution.

Board Comments:

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated an alternative would be to talk to an architect or an engineer and submit something that would be more visually compatible with the buildings in the area.

Mr. Deering stated working in the design field and on historic structures he did not think that this was visually incompatible. He said there were a lot of houses along these lanes that have shed roof additions on the back and he felt it was compatible. He said he felt if the petitioner added columns to it, it would be fluffing it up and he did not think that he needed to do that.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring asked what about Staff's question about the attachment to the building.

Mr. Chambers stated he has a professional carpenter working with him to build that. He said the joists and everything will be done the proper way.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring asked what about Staff's comments that it should be smaller?

Mr. Chambers stated the problem would not be addressed. He said he felt it needed to come all the way out. He said what he did on the porch, he would have to use concrete because he tried to seal it and tilt it but the water still pours down the corner and is coming into his gallery.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated his carpenter probably will also tell him that he needs a deeper fascia at the edge of the roof. He said he will probably go to an 8” or 10” which would make it look better.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the application for a certificate of appropriateness. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Petition of John Cronk
HBR 05-3472-2
542 East Harris Street
New Construction

Mrs. Reiter stated the petitioner has requested in writing a continuance.

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

RE: Petition of Mara Dennis
HBR 5-3474(S)-2
416 West Broughton Street
Alterations/Sign

Present for the petition was Mara Dennis.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for the following items:

1. Paint the existing awning and trim black, as per paint sample.
2. Install a sign on the existing awning.
3. Attach decorative elements to the exterior of the building, surrounding the main window.

FINDINGS

1. The awning exists above the entrance doors to the business and the commercial storefront window. The applicant proposes to apply gesso to the existing awning and paint it black. Staff has concerns about the longevity of prolonged exposure to the southern climate but it appears to be visually compatible.
2. The proposed signage consists of:
 - A) a 3' x 3' painted image on the awning above the door. The standard states: 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 one square foot per linear foot of awning, or maximum of 20 square feet. Verify dimensions of awning.
 - B) Text on the awning “Two Pale Josephines” to be 3' x 1'. Font submitted is script; verify paint color. The standard states: individual letters or symbols not to exceed 6” indicating use, address, or an exit or entrance, painted, stenciled or otherwise applied directly to any awnings or canopy within the Broughton Street district, shall be exempt from this provision. Staff recommends that the applicant reduce the size of the letters from 1' in height to 6” or less.

3. The proposed decorative elements consist of attaching a metal garland (see sample submitted) to the front of the building surrounding the storefront window and side window. The applicant requests to either attach the garland to a metal trellis that extends from the sidewalk to the top of the window, 90", or place large urns (21") on the sidewalk at the base of the window and have the metal garland coming out of them and attaching to the building directly. This second option is simplified and seems more visually compatible; however, the Historic Board of Review does not have jurisdiction over free standing objects on the sidewalk.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Staff recommends approval of painting the awning black, but advises the applicant of its possible deterioration.
2. Staff recommends approval of the 3' x 3' image on the awning upon verification of the awning's dimensions. It must be at least 3 linear feet, which it appears to be.
3. Staff recommends approval of the text on the awning with the condition that the size of the letters is reduced to 6" or less and paint colors are submitted.
4. Staff recommends approval of exterior alterations to attach a metal garland around the window in a way that will not damage the historic storefront without introducing the additional trellis element if possible.

Mr. Deering asked if they knew of any other examples where awnings have been painted in the district?

Ms. Ward stated no.

Mr. Mitchell stated he looked at it and it looked like it was vinyl. He said he also knew that you could get vinyl spray paint.

Petitioner's Comment:

Ms. Dennis stated they were open to the suggestions made by Staff. She said they initially said that the script in their sign was going to be 1 foot tall and it was recommended that it be 6". She said that was fine with them. It was also recommended that they not use a trellis and just put the ironwork around the window, which they would also do.

Mr. Deering stated he was concerned about painting the awning because he felt it was not going to look great. He said he also felt it would look worse as time goes on. He asked if the piece of ironwork that was on the submittal a piece of the ironwork out of the catalog submitted?

Ms. Dennis stated yes.

Mr. Deering stated he felt it was inappropriate for the exterior use on a building. He said he felt that it was not visually compatible with the other ironwork along Broughton Street or within a reasonable area of their store. He said he also felt someone would take it. He said he would suggest that within their storefront that they put it on the interior.

Ms. Dennis asked if they used something heavier, like a iron scrollwork if that would be acceptable?

Mr. Deering stated he felt they would have to really design it. He said it was one of those situations that if they did not do something like the Marshall House Hotel and just put pieces of metal ironwork on the building it was not going to look right.

Mr. Mitchell asked if that was a vinyl awning there now?

Ms. Dennis stated yes.

Mr. Mitchell stated they will have to be careful with the kind of paint they choose. He said if they go to somewhere that sells automobile upholstery that was a different mixture of paint.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the lettering on the awning not exceed 6” in height. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed 4 – 3. Opposed to the motion were Mr. Deering, Dr. Johnson, and Mrs. Fortson-Waring.

**RE: Petition of Bloomquist Construction
David Bloomquist
HBR 05-3476-2
42 Factors Walk
Alterations**

Present for the petition was David Bloomquist.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of exterior alterations to the commercial building located at 42 Factors Walk. Alterations consist of replacing the non-historic entrance door and window facing Factors Walk with new door and window. The applicant is also requesting to replace the windows facing River Street with double French doors to provide access to the balcony.

FINDINGS

The historic building at 42 Factors Walk was constructed in 1859 and is part of the larger building which makes up 12-42 East Bay Street. The building is comprised of several individual units, which 42 Factors Walk being one of them with a presence on both Factors Walk and River Street. The bottom two floors contain retail establishments, with residential and private office space above.

1. The primary entrance along Factors Walk is not historic and not original to the building. The existing configuration is not in keeping with the historic character of the building and a rehabilitation of the entry is worthy of study. The proposed alterations consist of installing a 10-light, TDL, wood frame French door with side lights on either side and a single glazed transom above. A wrought iron gate spanning the arched opening is also proposed. The gate consists of vertical bars connected by two horizontal members on hinges and maintains no decorative elements.
2. The applicant requests approval to remove a pair of ca. 1920s windows from the River Street elevation and replace with TDL, wood frame French doors with a single pane transom above. Although the existing windows are historic, they are not original to the building and are not in keeping with historic warehouse character of the area. The

installation of TDL, wood frame French doors is visually compatible and will allow the occupant access to the existing balcony.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Staff recommends denial of the exterior alterations to replace the existing Factors Walk door and window. The proposed wrought iron gate is not visually compatible; it creates a prison-bar effect. Staff encourages the applicant to investigate a solid exterior door similar to what is found on other River Front warehouses.
2. Staff recommends approval of replacing the windows facing River Street with double French doors with verification of hardware materials.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Bloomquist stated the sketch that staff showed was the door only without the iron gate for Factor's Walk. The doors for the River Street balcony were proposed to be double doors. He said in regard to the security gate for the front entry there was a similar condition at 214 West Factors Walk that was approved by the Board. He said it was based on that, that he submitted what was being proposed.

Mr. Deering asked if he could consider doing something more decorative with the iron?

Mr. Bloomquist stated yes. He said he was trying to keep it simple because he thought it would draw less attention to itself in a simpler format, however he was open to suggestions as long as the intent could be honored.

Mr. Deering asked if it had to be closely spaced?

Mr. Bloomquist stated no. He said he felt there was a way to provide security with a little more generous rhythm to the iron.

Mr. Deering asked if he would mind continuing that portion?

Mr. Bloomquist stated no.

Mr. Neely stated maybe that was detail that could be referred to Staff.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the application with the condition that the iron gate be resubmitted for staff review. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Dawson Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson
HBR 05-3477-2
100 West Bay Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Andy Lynch.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. Replace all non-historic windows on the third, fourth and fifth floors with Kolbe Heritage true-divided light, doubled glazed double hung windows with transoms in the long openings.
2. Remove infill from storefronts on Bay Street and install new custom wood storefronts.
3. Add metal balconies with wood floors and metal brackets on the fourth and fifth stories on the River Street elevation.
4. Relocate exhaust ducts to the interior of the building.
5. Replace roof and add standing seam roof extensions behind existing parapet.

Colors: Windows – Benjamin Moore Wild Heron; Storefront and cornice – Benjamin Moore midnight; Standing seam dark bronze.

FINDINGS

1. The use of a 4/4 configuration for the window lights is substantiated by historic photographs.
2. Balcony projection is 4'-0".

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering asked what were the rectangular sections on the roof?

Mr. Lynch stated on the upper floor they were proposing some wall spaces.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely 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 Dawson Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson
HBR 05-3478-2
318 East Liberty Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Josh Ward.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting after the fact approval for alterations as follows:

Extend brick piers from existing brick wall to support the roof of a hip porch projection on the west elevation rear of 318 East Liberty Street. Brick and mortar to match color of existing brick.

FINDINGS

All work except the piers has been completed.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval. Only the roof is readily visible from Liberty Street.

Public Comments:

Ms. Cynthia Hunter stated she stood before the Board in March 2005 and expressed her opinion that she thought the rules and laws of this Board should be upheld. She said in March it was 641 Indian Street, which was a deck. She said Staff recommended approval of the deck and denial of the color. She said she believed the Board's decision was that the deck was to be torn down because it was done without the Board's approval. She said this was the same instance and in this instance the builder or the owner of the building is aware of the rules and laws. She said she was afraid that people would continue to build things if the Board did not take an action which would lessen the opinion and value of the Board.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring asked if she felt that it was not visually compatible?

Ms. Hunter stated she felt the hip roof was not. She said she felt it was a short parapet and a flat roof with scuppers to drain the water off it would be more compatible with the building. She said as far as what was around it, she was not sure because she just saw the drawings yesterday. However, in any instance, she felt that they did it without permission.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated for her benefit it was more helpful to hear why she thought it was not visually compatible then the fact you are not following precedent.

Ms. Hunter stated she will remember that for next time.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion Failed 2- 4. Opposed to the motion were Mr. Deering, Mr. Meyerhoff, Ms. Seiler, and Mrs. Fortson-Waring. Abstaining to the motion was Mr. Steffen.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition based on it was not visually compatible. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion. The motion Passed 4- 2. Opposed to the motion were Dr. Johnson and Mr. Neely. Abstaining to the motion was Mr. Steffen.

RE: Petition of Linda Ramsay
HBR 05-3479-2
302 East Huntingdon Street
New Construction – Part I & II

Present for the petition was Linda Ramsay.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction, Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design, of a one-story garage to be built in the place of an existing one-story non-historic concrete block building located at 302 E. Huntingdon Street. The applicant is also requesting

approval of a screened porch addition on the rear of 302 E. Huntingdon Street and the installation of burglar bars on the ground floor of the residence.

FINDINGS

The Italianate style residence located at 302 and 304 East Huntingdon Street was constructed in 1888. The residence was designed as a duplex, containing two units. The existing concrete block garage at the rear of the property is not historic and does not appear on the 1955 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval for the construction of the proposed one-story garage with the condition that dimensions noted in the following report will be verified on the drawings and colors will be submitted to staff for approval. The new design will be encompassing the site of a one-story concrete block building of the same general height and mass while adding to the design of the building. Located on the lane behind the house, the proposed garage is visually compatible within the area in Stephens Ward. Staff recommends approval of the proposed screened porch addition with the conditions that materials and dimensions will be verified and colors will be reviewed by staff. Staff also recommends approval of exterior alterations consisting of the proposed window grills to be added to the ground level window openings.

New Construction of Garage on Lane

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setback except on titling 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.	The lot is 30.1' wide by 142' deep or 4,260 square feet. The proposed footprint, including the addition and garage, is approximately 2,904 square feet for a 68% building lot coverage.	This standard is met.
Location: 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 garage is at the rear of the property facing the lane. The design proposes two overhead garage doors facing the lane which resemble carriage house doors.	The standard is met.
Height: The proposed garage is located in a 4-story zone. Buildings through the Historic District shall be at least 2-stories, except for secondary structures which front a lane. Secondary structures which front a land shall be no taller than 2-stories. The exterior expression of the height of the first story shall be not less than 11'.	The proposed garage is one-story tall. The exterior expression of the building is 10'-9" to the eaves and 14'-2 1/2" to the ridge of the roof.	Although the exterior expression of the lane facing elevation is 3" less than the standard, the height is comparable to neighboring structures on the lane. The height is visually compatible.
Proportion of structure's front façade:	The width is approximately 30' while the height is 10'-9" to the	The proportion of the façade is visually compatible.

	eaves and 14'-2 1/2" to the ridge of the roof.	
Openings: garage openings shall not exceed 12' in width	2" thick 24-gauge steel overhead garage doors are proposed with blue ridge handles as noted on the cut sheet provided. The doors are 9' wide and 8' tall.	The standard is met. Verify dimensions on drawing.
Roof shapes: Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet. Pitched roof parallel to the street with less than 4:12 pitch shall have an overhang and be bracketed or otherwise projecting eave detail, or be screened from the street by a parapet wall.	A 3:12 side gable roof is proposed with a stepped parapet on the east and west elevations.	Although the low pitched gable roof will be visible from the lane, the applicant has incorporated a parapet and the street elevation is visually compatible.
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 side of the building between 1 and 1 1/2' from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum 2" overhang.	A stepped parapet is proposed for the east and west elevations. The top of the parapet maintains a coping of unknown dimensions.	Verify the dimensions of the stepped parapet and the material (scored stucco).
Roofs visible from the street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles.	The gable roof will be surfaced in standing seam metal roofing.	The roofing material meets the standard.
Exterior Walls: Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.	Stucco is proposed for the exterior finish.	The standard is met.
Colors	Paint colors to be coordinated with staff.	Paint chips/color samples to be submitted.

Screened Porch Addition

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Location: 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 as such that it is clearly as appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.	The proposed screened porch is located at the rear of the structure adjacent to an existing non-historic screened porch. The addition is to be wood frame with screens and a shed metal roof.	This standard is met. The wood frame addition is clearly distinguishable from the masonry residence. Verify materials and dimensions on drawings.
Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to	The proposed addition is sited adjacent to a non-historic screened porch addition with minimal contact to the main historic building.	This standard is met. The addition appears to be almost freestanding of the historic building. Verify how addition ties into main building.

the historic building		
Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.	The exterior expression of the addition is 2-stories in height. The main residence is 3-stories, including a raised basement.	The standard is met.
Designs for additions may be either contemporary or reference design motifs of the historic building. The addition shall be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible.	The design incorporates traditional elements including an entablature and turned columns.	The standard is met. The main building references the Italianate style and is clearly differentiated from the proposed Classically influenced design.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Colors	Paint colors to be coordinated with staff.	Paint chips/color samples to be submitted.
Exterior Alterations		
Window Grills	Metal window grills to be installed on ground floor windows. Vertical bars are 5/8" in diameter and horizontal members are 1 ¼" deep by 3/8" tall. Decorative finials, 7" tall, will be at the top of the bars. Collars located within the vertical elements will be 5 1/8" tall by 1 ½" wide. To be painted Savannah Green.	Staff recommends approval. The bars will only be placed on the ground floor windows and decorative elements will be incorporated. Horizontal elements should try to align with window muntins if possible. The color is typical of bars throughout Savannah.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated it was a nice building, but felt the shed coming out 21 feet was not appropriate.

Ms. Ramsay stated the problem was the drainage on the neighbor's yard.

Mr. Deering stated not on the neighbor's but on 302's property. He said from the street that you would see a constant cornice here and the roof would slope this direction as well as towards the garage.

Ms. Ramsay stated she drew that, but it looked odd from the rear.

Mr. Deering stated he felt it would look odd in two dimensions, but in three dimensions it would look better.

Ms. Ramsay stated it looked strange from the lane elevation having the half triangle stick up there on the roof.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with color details deferred to staff. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was passed. Abstaining to the motion was Mr. Deering.

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Lee Meyer, A.I.A
HBR 05-3460(S)-2
39 Montgomery Street
Window Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Lyndall H. Stanley
HBR 05-3461(S)-2
23 West Gordon Street
Minor Alterations/Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Anthony Davis
HBR 05-3462(S)-2
510 & 512 Oglethorpe Avenue
Roof Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Dirk Hardison, For
Christ Church Savannah
HBR 05-3463(S)-2
18 Abercorn Street
Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Coastal Canvas
HBR 05-3464(S)-2
537 East Charlton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Randall Seabolt
HBR 05-3465(S)-2
122 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Color/Shutters & Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Dimitri Chami
HBR 05-3466(S)-2
104 West Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Petition of Coastal Canvas
HBR 05-3467(S)-2
148 Abercorn Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

9. Petition of Deidrick Cody
HBR 05-3468(S)-2
422 – 426 Price Street
Color / Roof Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

10. Petition of New Life Restoration
Jeffrey Screen
HBR 05-3480(S)-2
41 – East Broad Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

11. Petition of Joseph Bergen
HBR 05-3481(S)-2
123 East Charlton Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

1. Petition of Cowart Coleman Group
Gerry Cowart
HBR 05-3475-2
134 Whitaker Street
Alterations
Request for comments on design concept

Present for the proposed project was Paul McKiever.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting the Board's comments as to the design direction for alterations to a non rated structure at 134 Whitaker Street. The proposal is to install retail windows in the first floor bays; add balconies and doors on the corner bay; add stucco pilasters and parapet; residential penthouse story on roof and enlarged mechanical penthouse on roof.

FINDINGS

134 Whitaker Street is a three story International Style brick office building constructed for the Southern Bell Telephone Company in 1951. It has a steel frame with concrete floor and brick curtain walls.

The building is 54 years old. It is divided into three 20' bays on the York Street elevation and four bays on the Whitaker Street elevation. The vertical members are broken by a white band above the second floor windows. The style is very similar to the automotive showroom structure on Drayton and Liberty Streets. International style buildings are characterized by their lack of exterior ornament, block forms, flat roofs, and use of glass and masonry within a steel frame.

Previously, the Board has protected the architectural features of the Broughton Street Municipal Building, a building deemed eligible for listing on the Historic Building map. Two other

structures were allowed to be altered. The Penny's building alteration has received criticism in academic circles however, the St. John's Sunday School building was not deemed eligible and was significantly altered. The office building of the Temple Mickve Israel was also not rated and was significantly altered. It is staff's opinion that this building may be eligible to be listed on the Historic Building's map as an example of an International Style office building and alterations should take that into consideration. The installation of storefronts into the bays does not appear to significantly alter the appearance of the structure would extend its use, however the addition of the balconies may make the project ineligible for tax credits as balcony additions are frequently not in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Balcony additions would not necessarily affect local design review. The addition of the pilasters and parapet does appear to have an adverse visual impact on the design of the building by creating a false sense of history and altering the horizontal lines of the structure.

Mr. McKiever stated the modern architectural movement has allowed us to make cheap efficient buildings. In respect to the staff's declaration of the style of this building, they believed that it was not an international style building. He said their design approach was to take the building and make it more harmonious with its surroundings. He stated that Phillip Johnson defined the International Style in his 1932 book named The International Style, giving new emphasis to the expression of structure, the lightening of the mass, and the enclosure of dynamic spaces. The two examples that the Columbia University press cited as being the most important examples were the Villa Savoy, by Le Corbousier, and Bauhaus building by Walter Gropius. He said these two buildings displayed an expression of structure and the lightness of mass. He said in his opinion, there were two examples in Savannah that were International Style buildings: Drayton Towers and the Broughton Street Municipal building.

Mr. Deering stated he did not know that the Board was interested in an architectural history lesson on what is International Style and what is not. He said for the sake of argument let's accept that it is mid century modern and that they want to alter it. He said from that they could give the Board reasons why they wanted to turn it into what they have shown in sketches.

Mr. McKiever stated their approach to this was that this building was a detriment to the urban fabric. He said they believed this because it has been continuously unoccupied. It started out as a telephone company, than at some point it was a bank, and a few other businesses. He said he has only been in Savannah for five years and he knew that it has not been occupied since he has been here. He said they believed it has been because it was designed as a cheap efficient building and out of harmony with its surroundings. He said they would like to treat this project as new construction and take the existing building and use it as a recycled core in which to come up with a new design. He said there was one example that was similar to this in Savannah where this has been done which was the St. John Sunday school building. He said with this there was major change in the program of the building so there was also a major change in the architecture of the building. He said what they were proposing to do was similar to this.

He further stated there were three aspects of what they wanted to use as their design approach. The first was to establish a sense of corner (York and Whitaker Streets). He said they added balconies to the apartments above and have a hierarchy that moved from being having more articulation at the corner and less and less as you went towards the lane. He said the second part of their design approach was to establish a sense of base, middle, and top to the building. He said to do this at the ground floor they added the storefront. He said this would change the program from a 1950's office building. It would be a mixed-use retail and residential development. On the upper floors they wanted to express that they were going to be

residences. He said they decided to articulate the windows and add the balconies. On the top of the building they added a cornice. He said they felt they have come up with a design that was more in the rhythm and harmony of the surrounding buildings. He said they felt they had three options in which they could go with this building. He said they could preserve it in its original state, falsify it by trying to somehow make it more modern or turn it into something that was more international style, or take the building as a recycled core and turn it into a new building with a new use.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring asked what was the time period that they were looking at to present to the Board?

Mr. McKiever stated they would like to submit next month.

Mr. Mitchell stated at the top was a photograph and what they have done at the bottom where they put up what appeared to be columns symmetrically spaced, he did not see where they were going to be able to do that. He said what they have drawn was not what they were going to actually get.

Mr. McKiever stated it was a preliminary design and they understood that the dimensions were off.

Mr. Mitchell stated where they have the three windows up top they were not going to get the same spacing for those columns like they have on the bottom.

Mr. McKiever stated he understood his point.

Ms. Seiler stated she felt it was one of the most unattractive buildings left downtown. She said there was no parking near it. She said regarding the petitioner's design she saw something that she liked. She said she also agreed with the comments made by Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Deering stated he commended them for putting storefront on the first floor of the building. He asked if the storefront was also going to be on York Street?

Mr. McKiever stated yes.

Mr. Deering stated he felt that would help it a lot because it would open it up to the street which he felt has been a part of the problem all the long. He said he did not disagree with Ms. Seiler in that it was a pretty unattractive building. He said although he has done what Mrs. Reiter has talked about in making mid-century buildings look older, he was not really in favor of it, but it's what his clients ask for. He said he did not think they should do that with this building. He said he felt they should try to improve it in a way that showed the time that it was improved within (early 21st Century), which was what the National Park Service would also say. He said he felt if they wanted to make it look better and more appealing then work within today's vernacular mixed-use building ideology.

Mr. McKiever asked if he felt there was a problem with the pilasters making it look too historic?

Mr. Deering stated he felt it did make it look like late 19th Century architecture. He said he also felt their window choice also led in that direction or early 20th Century, like the Kress building which he felt that was taking it backwards.

Mr. Steffen stated he agreed with Mr. Deering. He said he felt if they tried to put it in the surroundings of the architecture of the surrounding buildings they would have to be schizophrenic or it's impossible because there was no way the architecture around it which was about five different types. He said he felt Mr. Deering was correct in that they try to make it the best as they could within the period it exists.

Mr. Neely stated he liked the ground floor retail.

Mr. McKiever thanked the Board for their comments.

2. Georgia Association of Preservation Commissions

Mrs. Reiter stated the Georgia Association of Preservation Commissions was having commission training in Decatur, Georgia in November. She said she had one slot available for a Board member that was being paid by MPC. She said she would also be attending the training.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated that was one of the things that she found out at the Trust meeting she attended. She said you can apply to SHPO for additional funding for scholarships.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he and Mrs. Fortson-Waring attended some of the previous trainings and he felt more people on the Board needed to attend. He said for members who have never attended there were some things the Board needed to know. For instance, the presentation that Mrs. Fortson-Waring gave at the Board's retreat in July about how to keep from being sued was very interesting.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she has attended the trainings at her own expense for the last three years. She said she would encourage somebody to at least take advantage of the free one being paid MPC.

Mr. Steffen stated he was interested. He said he will check to see if he could arrange his schedule so he could go.

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated he was flattered by the trust the Board put in him last month for allowing the carriage house on 304 Huntingdon Street to go through. However, he would ask that the Board not to do that again. He said they were missing information in the petition. He said he would ask the Board to make sure the sections, materials are there. He said he felt it would come out the way the Board wanted, but it could have been a real mess.

Mr. Mitchell welcomed Sarah Ward, Interim Preservation Specialist.

Mr. Mitchell stated he would like to acknowledge the death of Carol Lynn McDonald who was Mark McDonald's wife. He said she died Monday night. The funeral will be tomorrow (Thursday), at St. Paul which is on 34th and Abercorn Streets at 2:00 p.m.

**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 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca