

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

SEPTEMBER 14, 2005

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

John Neely (Excused)
Dr. Lester Johnson (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Mitchell called the September 14, 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: Amended Petition of Rudd M. Long
HBR 05-3348-2
517 East Congress Street
Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of The Gastonian
Melanie Bliss
HBR 05-3449-2
220 East Gaston Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Terrance McKenna
HBR 05-3451-2
313 East Jones Street
Renovation**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik Puljung
HBR 05-3454-2
701 Whitaker Street
Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Lott & Barber Architects
Forrest Lott
HBR 05-3456-2
120 Drayton Street
Renovations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison
HBR 05-3457-2
440 Price Street
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

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

RE: Regular Agenda

**RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay
Patrick Shay
HBR 03-3007-2
Between – Barnard Street & Howard Street
New Construction – Part II**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was Mugure Mbugua.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The Petitioner is requesting Part II: Materials and Design Details approval for the new construction of two buildings in this phased complex. The Part I: Height and Mass approval was previously approved by the Historic District Board of Review in May 2003. The height and

massing is the same at that previously approved. The remainder of this complex has been approved and is under construction.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Standard:	Proposed Development:	Comment:
Submission requirements – Dimensioned site plan showing parking areas, fences, roof or ground mounted equipment.	Provided.	
Elevations showing height and width relationships to existing adjacent buildings, Dimensioned sections of projecting details	Provided.	
Section through the building and a mass model.	Provided.	
<p>Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards (6) Visual Compatibility Factors:</p> <p>(g) Relationship of materials, texture, and color.</p> <p>1. Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards (8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following:</p> <p>c. Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.</p>	<p>The exterior will be horizontal siding on the second and third floors, with bracketed eaves and wood trim.</p> <p>The first floor will be scored stucco.</p> <p>Colors were provided as follows:</p> <p>Horizontal siding: Hazelwood Bracketed Eaves and wood trim: Vapor Bahama Shutters and porch railings: Canyon Standing seam metal roof: silver gray Rooftop mechanical screen: Colonial white.</p>	This standard has been met.
<p>(9) Windows</p> <p>a. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.</p> <p>d. “snap-in” or between the glass muntins shall not be used.</p> <p>f. All windows facing a street, exclusive of</p>	<p>Windows are aluminum clad , two-over-two, true divided light double hung windows. The windows are manufactured by Weathershield. All window trim will be white.</p> <p>The windows will be inset not less than 3” from the façade of</p>	This standard has been met.

<p>storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular</p> <p>g. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.</p> <p>h. The distance between the windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided, the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.</p> <p>k. In new residential construction windows of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>the buildings.</p>	
<p>(10) Roofs: Roofs shall comply with the following:</p> <p>b. Pitched roofs 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.</p> <p>g. Roofs visible from the street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile, or asphalt shingles.</p>	<p>The two building will have shallow pitched standing seam metal hipped roofs, with wood brackets.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>(11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches:</p> <p>c. Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Infill between foundation piers shall be recessed so that the piers are expressed.</p>	<p>Each of the buildings will have one front stoop and one side stoop.</p> <p>Details and sections of the stoops were provided and meet the requirements of the ordinance.</p> <p>Side porches will be located</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>

<p>d. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate.</p> <p>e. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The columns capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.</p> <p>f. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four inches.</p> <p>g. Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood unless the proposed material matches other façade details on the same building.</p> <p>h. Stoop heights shall be visually comparable to other historic stoops to which they are visually related and shall not exceed 9'6",</p>	<p>on all levels and will have Bahamas shutters. Porch details were provided.</p>	
<p>(14) Lanes and carriage house:</p> <p>d. Garage opening shall not exceed 12 feet in width.</p>	<p>On the first floor, each building will have one garage door opening facing Howard Street and two garage door opening fronting the private drive.</p> <p>Howard Street is characterized by garage door openings from carriage house structures serving properties that face Whitaker Street.</p> <p>The garage openings are less than 12 feet in width.</p> <p>The garage doors will be panel doors painted to match trim.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>(15) Utilities and Refuse:</p> <p>a. Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communication devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from the street.</p>	<p>Mechanical roof top units will be screened by a louvered rooftop enclosure.</p> <p>Electrical meters will be located on the secondary side elevations.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>

<p>b. HVAC units shall be screened from public right of way.</p>	<p>Garage containers will be stored under the stoop stairs.</p>	
<p>d. Refuse areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.</p>		

RECOMMENDATION

Approval.

Board Comments:

Dr. Caplan asked if the garbage containers were concealed?

Ms. Mbugua stated yes, and that they were concealed by some 2 X 4 wood as shown on the side elevation.

Public Comments:

Mr. Erwin Bartsch (108 Gwinnett Street) stated since the owner of the property inherited the rights to the whole project, the current owners of the five standing dwellings have no say as to what goes on behind them. He said this may not be the right forum, but he would like to bring up some of the issues. He said in regard to the green space as far as he could tell in the plans there was no designated green space to soften the wall.

Mr. Mitchell stated he understood, however that was not within the Board's purview in regard to the green space.

Mr. Bartsch stated in regard to the traffic, he talked with the other owners and under the initial plans that were passed in 2003 it called for five dwellings to be built each having one garage in the back of their properties, which would be a total of 10 garages. The new plans called for up to 16 vehicles to come thru. Also, on the original plan a drive-thru lane would be created between Barnard and Howard Streets. He said at the moment there was only one entrance to Howard Street. He said his property was on the end and he would have 16 vehicles coming and going through one gate directly behind his property.

Mr. Deering stated the site planning and traffic within the site and how it entered and exited onto the street was not within the Board's purview. The purpose of the Board was to review the architectural only.

Mr. Bartsch stated in the associated documents that he was given when he purchased the house it was stated that no PVC shutters would be allowed on the outside. He said he noticed on Phase II that PVC siding was going to be used. He said he would ask that the developer relax the association rules to allow the current owners to use PVC shutters on the outside.

Mr. Deering stated the Board has approved PVC shutters on certain new construction projects. The Board typically did not approve PVC on historic properties. He said he felt that was something that he would have to take up with his association board.

Mr. Bartsch stated in regard to the trashcans, at the moment the five current tenants stored their trashcans underneath the front porch on Phase II. He said he knew the issue was raised by the Board as to what would happen with the trashcans of the current dwellings and proposed dwellings. He said there was not enough space for all five of the existing and would ask that the developer come up with an alternate plan.

Mr. Deering stated he was probably right in regard to the trashcans, but he would probably need to talk with his association board and have them to address the developer of this property. He said may be they could come up with a solution architecturally and bring it back to the Review Board.

Mr. Bartsch stated the last issue of the Bahama shutters being on all the porches and decks on the frontage. He said he had no objection to it, but it was something that offered the future inhabitants privacy from the outside yet it exposed all the current dwellings. He said he was asking for this to be recorded and an opportunity that the current association document be relaxed so that the current owners could put up something to give themselves privacy.

Mr. Deering stated if he in the row on Gwinnett Street wanted to put up privacy screening devices on their properties they would have to individually bring them before the Review Board.

Mr. Steffen stated he felt there was a place within the purview of the Board in regard to green space where that issue gets wrapped into another issue, which was lot coverage although it did not specifically address green space that was probably a part of the consideration. He said this was Part II review and the Board quite some time ago addressed Part I and reviewed that the lot coverage was not over the guidelines, so it was appropriate. He said he wanted to convey that green space was a potential concern, but it was an issue that was passed by the Board a long time ago on this particular project.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was passed 5 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Ms. Seiler. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.**

**RE: Continued Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik Puljung
HBR 05-3363-2
416 East Bryan Street
Alteration/Addition**

Present for the petition was Erik Puljung.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The Petitioner is requesting approval of a one-story Savannah Grey brick addition, new fencing/walls, and an automobile gate and trash enclosure for 416 East Bryan Street.

FINDINGS

Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
<p>Section 8-3030 Additions: c. Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.</p>	<p>The proposed addition is located on the rear of the existing historic main structure and is connected to the main structure by a porch "hyphen." It is distinguishable from the main house in terms of height and material.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>d. Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, and brackets. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building.</p>	<p>The new addition uses the footprint of the existing screened porch so there little to no change to the historic fabric of the main building.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
<p>e. Additions, including multiple additions to structures, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.</p>	<p>The addition is subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>f. Designs for additions may be either contemporary or reference design motifs of the historic building. However, the addition shall be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible as set forth in the visual compatibility factors.</p>	<p>The addition suggests a carriage house with infilled carriage opening. It is clearly differentiated from the main building.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>Visual Compatibility Factors: Height, Materials, Roof shape</p>	<p>Height: The adjacent garages are one-story in height.</p> <p>Materials, textures, colors: Savannah Grey brick is proposed with wood gates. The main historic house is stucco over brick on the front and sides and wood on the rear. It is situated between two wood houses. There are brick structures across the lane. There is a precedent for brick ancillary structures in the vicinity of wood buildings on Broughton Lane at Habersham Street.</p> <p>The gate to the trash enclosure is wood and is 8' tall.</p>	<p>These factors have been met and are visually compatible.</p>

	The roof shape is gabled and reflects the gable roof of the main structure.	
Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
Section 8-3030: (13) Fences and garden walls. b. Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.	The new wall/fence is Savannah Grey brick and is a total of 8' tall.	
Section 8-3030: (14) Lanes and carriage houses: d. Garage openings shall not exceed twelve feet in width.	The proposed automatic sliding auto gate is wood with 6" wide tongue and groove boards painted Charleston Green and is a total of 9' wide.	This standard has been met.
Section 8-3030: (15) Utilities and refuse. b. HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way. d. Refuse storage areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.	New and relocated HVAC units and garage can are contained and screened from the public streets. Submitted site plans indicate the location.	These standards have been met.
Other:	On the addition's elevation facing East Bryan Street, a wood door with have a standing seam copper roof portico with wood brackets is proposed The wood will be painted Charleston Green.	This is visually compatible.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

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

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

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 approval for a three story mixed use residential/office structure on the south-west corner of Hall Street and Abercorn Street.

FINDINGS

Application of Standards and Guidelines: See attached table.

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

RECOMMENDATION

The direction to divide the overall mass into two semidetached units will help the structure to blend into the block, but further work is necessary to make it compatible. The stoops need to be moved closer to the center, perhaps even connected under one roof with a much simplified stair entrance under the porch or between. This will allow room for additional windows to help break down the mass of the structure and to give it a symmetrical rhythm.

FINDINGS: The following Ordinance Standards apply:

Design Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Section 8-3030 (k) (2) Demolition of historic structures</p> <p>a. All requests for demolition of any building within the historic district shall come before the board of review.</p> <p>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 11 feet. The exterior expression of the next two stories is 10'-2" each. There is another 5'-2" to the peak of the roof for a total height of 36'-6"</p>	<p>The floor-to-floor height standards are not met. The stoop is too high requiring an incompatible break in the run.</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>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 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.</p>	<p>The central ground floor entrances to the stair and elevator need to have much less emphasis.</p>

<p>The following guidelines and Visual Compatibility Factors apply:</p>		
<p>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...</p>		
<p>Height Height Map: The maximum height for this area is 4 stories.</p>	<p>The proposed project is three stories.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>Proportion of structure's front façade</p>	<p>The proposed building's overall height is 36'-6"and the width is 57'.</p>	<p>The building east of the proposed structure is also a “box-like” mass, 49' wide by 41'-4” tall, but it is a duplex and its mass is broken down into two semi-attached dwellings.</p>

		The proposed design attempts to do the same, but fails due to the strong central ground floor entrance, the central gable in the roof and the asymmetrical rhythm of solids to voids.
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 is 5 bays wide.	Since the building is trying to look like a duplex the five bay rhythm negates the effect. A symmetrical number of windows should be used in each half of the duplex. The strong central ground floor entrances over dominate the front and rear facades. There is too much wall for the number of voids and no windows are on the ground floor.
Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection	Projecting stoops and porches are characteristic of this block.	The proposed stoops are too tall and have an uncharacteristic landing.
Roof shape	The proposed roof is a hip with a gable located on the front center.	A hip roof is appropriate for this block, however the front facing gable portion is incongruous and defeats the attempt to create a the duplex appearance.
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.	The direction to create a duplex look begins to break down the large scale of the proposed building, but the scale of the elements (discussed above) negates the overall effect. Further work is needed.
Directional Expression	The proposed structure is a box-like with little relief.	While there are other box-like forms used in this block, their overall expression is relieved by open porches, projections and setbacks, numerous window openings to create a variety of wall volumes. Further work on solids and voids needs to be done to achieve an appearance of a duplex.

Part II Design Detail

It is not clear if Part II Design Detail was intended to be a part of this submittal. The following comments are given to give design direction.

Materials	Walls: Stucco	
Colors	Stucco: light tan Trim: black-green Shutters: black-green	Need window color; need actual color samples.
Windows	Clad double hung 6/6 Wood shutters Transom windows with wood panel	Need full specifications and manufacturer and style of window. Clarify that windows match specifications in ordinance. Clarify that shutters will be hinged and sized to fit the windows. A stucco blind recess below the transom windows would be preferable to a wood panel.
Stoops	Masonry and stucco stoops. Elevation indicates wood posts at entry level.	Clarify materials of various elements of the stoop including stair treads. Stoop pier should be same material as basement wall (stuccoed masonry). Simplify piers. Revisit proportions of stoop and stoop roof. A flatter roof would be more appropriate.
Roof	Gable with bracketed eave	Need a section through cornice to show design and dimensions including brackets.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Levy stated he did not receive Staff’s comments until Tuesday afternoon. He said in the spirit of cooperation Dr. Persad said that they will listen to Staff’s comments and try to make changes. He said previous comments had been that the building was too big. He said he did not get a chance to do everything that he wanted to, but he revised the elevation. The central portion has been recessed and the roof line has been changed to reflect a duplex. The stairs were circular which was more appropriate according to Staff’s comments. The front entrance was deemphasized to be less significant and now resembled a duplex with a connecting link between them.

He further stated the spacing of the windows were dependent on the rooms that were in the building. He said they could not put a single family residence on that block on the corner. Therefore, he had to put windows where they belonged in rooms. He said they were willing to move the entrances around and put windows at the appropriate locations. He said he would ask that the Board look at the windows on that street in which you would find a variety of spacing and sizes. He said he did not think that this window location was all that much different from the ones that were there on the street. He said he did not think there was a building on that street that met every guideline because they were different styles, such as Victorian and so forth. He said if this was an isolated lot they could do that, but it was not. He said Abercorn and Hall Streets was a very commercial area except for further down. The building across the street was the Mansion, which was a huge building. The building to the north of it was commercial

and the buildings south of it behind the lane were also commercial. He said they could not put a single family residence. He said he could go as far as he could to make it look like a duplex, but he could not make it look like a single family which would give the window placements.

Mr. Gay asked if he could draw the two high stoops together?

Mr. Levy stated the elevation that was proposed did not have that central part in it and did look like one building. He said he had two separate entrances because that was what Staff and the Board recommended.

Dr. Caplan asked what height was the first floor lowered?

Mr. Levy stated he had an office on one side and an apartment on the other. In order to meet the building next door which has a 3 foot high stoop they raised it up and those were comments that he received from Staff and others which gave him the off-set. He said they also had a ramp to get to the front door of the apartment because of the ADA requirements. Now, they have two offices and everything was down on the first floor and he did not have that problem.

Dr. Caplan asked what were the measurements?

Mr. Levy stated the height from the ground to the top of the stoop was 9'-6".

Dr. Caplan stated Staff recommended that perhaps some windows or something on the first floor. He asked if they had given that suggestion some consideration?

Mr. Levy stated this was the first time that he has seen Staff's comments, therefore he has not had a chance to address that. However, they were willing to work with Staff any way they could. He asked if there was a way the Board could tell him to go ahead with the project because they were going in the right direction and work with Staff. He said they would like to have an understanding that they agree that may be this was okay, but some adjustments were needed that they could work with Staff.

Dr. Caplan asked if his project was Part I or Part II?

Mr. Levy stated he was not sure. He said he assumed that they were beyond height and mass. He said they were talking about windows and locations, so he was not sure where they were in the process.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how deep was the recess that he showed in the center?

Mr. Levy stated he could move it back approximately 2 feet and it would make a significant break.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated this was much closer to Staff's recommendation than what was received in the packet and felt this was the way to go. He said he felt the recess should be at least 1 foot. He said he also felt that would be better if he had shutters on the center windows.

Mr. Levy stated okay.

Ms. Waring stated the Board could design his project for him. She said it would be helpful for him to take pictures of comparable buildings and bring them rather than have the Board to try

and go find the buildings to which he was referring. She said she regret that he had to come back and forth but that was the Board's job. She said the Board's job was not to design, but interpret. She said he may want to request a continuance and meet with Staff because the Board was still going to have to get some detail as to the drawing that he was showing now.

Mr. Levy stated he submitted a number of photos in the beginning of different buildings on the street. He said he felt Ms. Reiter had that information and if not he had copies. He said he felt the Board would find that there was a variety of styles, but they could not duplicate those buildings. He said they could make something that was compatible, which was all that he was asking.

Mr. Steffen stated he noticed that he attempted to address some of the issues that Staff raised. He asked why did he still maintain there not be any windows on the first floor?

Mr. Levy stated there were doctor's offices there with small rooms. He said he could put some windows in there, but you could not put them in back of the stairs. He said they also had a porch that stuck out 4 feet, which he could put a window in there but it would be into a bathroom. He said there was the front entrance which was a wide staircase. He said there really was no room for windows that he could see. He said the first floor on the front you would not see. It was under the stair, porch, and then you have a door.

Ms. Waring stated that she felt he needed to look at Staff's comments. She said she felt the biggest thing that seemed to have been met was the floor to floor height standard with the new drawing. She asked in regard to Part I height/mass if there were any other issues other than the floor to floor heights?

Mrs. Reiter stated she discussed the rhythm of windows and suggested that there be three bays of windows on each side of the implied duplex. She said three bays were what you saw on the street on a double building. She said she felt there was a way to do it. She said it may mean shifting the stoop a little bit, but it could be done.

Mr. Mitchell asked the petitioner if he was interested in a continuance, so he could consult with Staff.

Mr. Levy stated he said that they were willing to comply with everything that was asked for and thought they had come close to that. He said the addition of a window was not previously mentioned. He said it was something about the rhythm of the windows which was a nebulous way to describe whether you had too much space between windows. He said he did not want to keep coming back again and again.

Ms. Waring stated she had less concern with the rhythm. She said if you looked at what was there now this was an improvement. She said she would suggest that he take the continuance, take the Staff's comments and perhaps comments made by the public and work on it and bring it back to the Board. She said she did not feel that his building had to look like a single family structure. But if you looked at the others they looked like single family structures.

Ms. Brownfield asked with the improvements that he has made if the floor-to-floor height standards were now met?

Mr. Webb stated yes.

Ms. Brownfield stated with the recess of 2 feet it sounded like he was working on the void issue. She said it looked to her that he was very close to a project being completed that would be acceptable by the Board.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff with the revised drawing that he has presented, if she still had a concern about the void on the ground floor?

Mr. Levy stated that he would like to point out a difference that was on the sketch. He said this was a masonry structure now and was more stable support for the porch. He said that was the difference that he felt was more appropriate than the columns.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Board was seeing this for the first time. He said he felt it was a great step forward in what Staff recommended. He asked if he was going to do this on the rear elevation?

Mr. Levy stated he really did not want to do that on the back. He said he had a elevator that was in the middle and two doors to doctors offices which would make it difficult.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated even if he projected it that would help break up that 57 feet into two or three vertical elements. He said since the Board was seeing this for the first time that he continue his project. He said redraw this in the manner that he has showed today and present it back to the Board because the Board could not make a motion saying that they approve what they saw on the screen.

Mr. Mitchell asked if he would like a continuance?

Mr. Levy stated yes.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of Dawson Wissmach
Architects
Neil Dawson
HBR 05-3398-2
455 Montgomery Street
New Construction – Part II (Design)**

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of Part II Design. Part I was approved August 10, 2005.

FINDINGS

The following substantive changes have been made based on Board comments.

1. The top of the bays have been lowered so that the parapet is continuous. Panels have been removed from the parapet.

2. The bracket treatment under the bays has been simplified.
3. All ironwork designs have been changed.
4. The first floor windows under the bays have been elongated with a lower panel treatment, emphasizing the bay rhythm more.
5. A solid wall has been added to the northern and western side of the project instead of the open ironwork.
6. Arched openings have been added to the recessed parking on the west side.

The following Part II standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Materials:	Bays: Horizontal Butt Board Main walls: Portland stucco Windows: Anderson Aluminum Clad Simulated Divided light Doors: Anderson inward swinging French doors. Decorative metal by Southwest Metalsmiths Inc.	
Colors:	Parapet: Benjamin Moore HC-27 Monterey White Butt board – Benjamin Moore HC-128 Clearspring Green Base: Benjamin Moore HC-99 Abington Putty	Need color of the windows and doors; metalwork; bay brackets.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval to demolish non-historic structures on site and approval of Part II Design details pending color clarification.

Petitioner Comments:

Mr. Dawson stated he had some renderings that may make it easier to understand the structure. In terms of changes from last month, the response was based on Board’s comments. He said they eliminated the curved roof at the corner. He said they also addressed isolating the parking with a masonry wall. Also, in accordance with several Board members comments that felt the brackets and base needed to be accentuated. He said they simplified the brackets at the base and the iron work.

Mr. Deering stated on the rendering he had double brackets in certain locations under the projecting bays.

Mr. Dawson stated yes. He said this has been sort of an evolution because the rendering has come later. He said they felt like that was a stronger treatment than the larger single bracket which looked kind of bulky. He said they also had colors and the only color that was not submitted was the color for the windows and iron work. He said they would request that the Board grant them the ability to go back to Staff and modify.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended for double brackets under the bays and colors to be submitted to staff. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik Puljung
HBR 05-3423-2
9 & 11 East Macon Street
New Construction – Part II (Design)**

Present for the petition was Erik Puljung.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of Part II design for two new townhouses.

FINDINGS

Part I was approved July 13, 2005 with the exception of the bay windows and stoops.

The following standards apply

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Bay window: Bay windows are not permitted on structures over three stories in height. Bay windows shall extend to the ground unless they are oriel, beveled or are supported by brackets. Windows: Double glazed simulated divided light windows are permitted. The muntin shall be no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails. Windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>A two story oriel bay window is proposed for each unit at the second and third floors. Kolbe and Kolbe aluminum clad wood sdl windows with 7/8" putty profile muntins and a spacer bar are proposed 6/6. Brick jack arches and cast stone sills.</p>	<p>Ground supported and oriel bay windows are extremely rare on 4 story buildings in the Historic District. Most of those that exist were later additions. The standards prohibit bay windows on four story buildings. Additionally, these structures are only 22' – 6" wide. The mass of the bay crowds the façade and impacts the stair (see below).</p>
<p>Stoops: Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Front stair treads shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate. Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood unless the proposed material matches other façade details on the same building.</p>	<p>Two brick stoops with brick porches are proposed. 12" diameter cast stone columns support a wood roof with custom iron railing.</p>	<p>A plan has been provided, however none of the side views show clearly how the steps relate to the bay windows. Traditionally, steps in the Historic District are the width of the stoop or if a bay is present they curve to avoid the bay. In order to avoid the bay the steps are only a part of the width of the stoop. In addition, the majority of double stoops are attached, not detached.</p>

Materials	Light Beige cast stone; light beige mortar; Brick – Carolina Ceramics Provincial Collection Monaco (beige); Trim and window color Abalone (White) Bay window – copper clad. Step tread material not specified.	Need more information on the center post on the rear porch.
Colors	See materials	
Section details Windows Porticos Parapets	Provided	
Doors:	Custom overhead garage doors with vertical T&G 1x6 “V” groove. Exterior front door custom mahogany.	Need material of garage door and design of front door.
Penthouse: Penthouses used solely to enclose stairways or elevator machinery, ventilation or air conditioning apparatus shall not count as a story. An enclosed roofed structure above the roof of a building, containing habitable space for occupancy, shall be construed as a story.	A penthouse enclosing stairs and an elevator is proposed.	What is the material and height of the roof privacy wall between units?

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate the bay windows in order to comply with the ordinance. Combine the front stoops and reconfigure steps. Provide additional clarification as requested above.

Board Comments:

Ms. Waring stated she was concern about her comment about the stoops. She said because it was a new building and new construction would it not be better to keep them separate so that it clearly defined that it was new construction and not a mere mimicking.

Mrs. Reiter stated

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how would someone coming up the stairs avoid not hitting the oriel? He asked if the stairs were that far away from the building.

Mr. Puljung stated yes. He said there was 4 inches between the oriel window and handrail of the staircase.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how far away was the stairway from the building face?

Mr. Puljung stated 2’-4”. He said the façade of the building was pushed back from the property line, so the front of the oriel window was actually on the property line.

Ms. Waring asked if he contended that a bay window was not an oriel?

Mr. Puljung stated he felt they were two different architectural features. He said in the guidelines and the ordinance it defined a bay window as something that goes to the ground. He said an oriel window was a different architectural feature, but they were similar in shape.

Ms. Waring stated Staff had the standard cited on the front page of the Staff report. It says – “bay windows are not permitted on structures over 3 story in height. Bay windows shall extend to the ground unless bay are oriel.” She said bay windows could be oriels, therefore oriels would not be allowed on three story.

Mr. Puljung stated he was still interpreting it as an oriel as an different architectural feature than a bay.

Mr. Deering stated he also felt in architectural definition that this was an oriel window.

Mr. Steffen stated he also was reading the standard the way that Mr. Deering was reading it.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked the petitioner what was their feelings to the staff recommendation of combining the two entry stoops as one.

Mr. Puljung stated he recognized that they do exists in the Historic District as combined stoops, but he felt that the individual identity of each of these homes and each one should have its own stoop as opposed to a shared stoop.

Dr. Caplan asked what did he think about staff’s recommendation about the stairs being separated from the building to avoid the oriel?

Mr. Puljung stated he believed that has been addressed with the building façade being setback from the property line (2 feet). He said the width of their stairs there was really not that much different from the width of a standard staircase in the district. He said their stoop was a little larger because they were 4 feet into the City right-of-way and 2 feet on their property line.

Dr. Caplan stated he has seen homes where the stairs extended all the way to the building and the oriel projects into the staircase. He said he kind of agreed with the petitioner, although it may not be exactly what you would see in the rest he felt it was a good solution to a problem.

Ms. Brownfield asked what was the material of the garage door and front door?

Mr. Puljung stated wooden and painted. He said the front doors were mahogany and were a simple two panel door that were very similar to the existing Madison Row homes.

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

Ms. Waring stated she felt this was something that needed to be addressed in the ordinance and that it is revised in regard to bay windows and oriels. She said she felt the Board was saying today that bay windows were not oriels and that the intent of the ordinance was not to prevent oriels from being on structures that were over 3 feet.

Mr. Mitchell stated the Board could discuss it further at the end of the meeting.

**RE: Continued Petition of Jerry Lominack
HBR 05-3435-2
37 Whitaker Street
Renovations**

Present for the petition was Kevin Rose.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to remove the current non-historic storefront and canopy and install a new clear finish aluminum storefront glazing system with transoms and recessed center entry bay. The center pilasters will be covered with new aluminum covers unless decorative pilasters are uncovered. If decorative pilasters exist they will be repaired in lieu of covers. Also to install a new steel C channel canopy with wire hang ties and turnbuckles and clear finish aluminum soffit. The existing windows will be repaired or replaced in-kind. The existing sign cabinet is to be reused with new graphics “Hang Fire” in red and gray on white background.

FINDINGS

37 Whitaker Street was built before 1884 as an Italianate style commercial structure. Although altered, remnants of the cast iron storefront remain and the second story details are intact. Additional details may be found when the later additions are removed.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed Action	Comment
Section 8-3030 (1) (5) Commercial design standards		
The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront.		
The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course.	A canopy is proposed that returns to be wall. It appears that this is to be used to separate the first story from the upper course.	
Retail storefront area glazing shall not be less than 55%. Such glazing shall be transparent; provided, however, black glass may be used in the sign area above the storefront window transoms. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18-24” base of contrasting material to the lintel.	A storefront system with transoms is proposed that extends from the sill.	.
Entrances shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.		This standard has been met.
Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as a part of a glazed storefront system; bronze, glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront.	The proposed storefront is aluminum.	This standard is met.
Sign: One principle use sign;	A nine square foot sign is proposed.	The sign meets the standard however

<p>projecting sign maximum square footage of 45 square feet. Outer edge of sign not to project more than 6 feet from the building;</p>		<p>it is not clear if the sign is to be internally illuminated. Internally lighted signs are permitted in business districts in the Historic District, but reversed silhouette or cut-out letters are encouraged on opaque backgrounds to reduce glare or the “milk bottle” look where back lighting is applied.</p>
<p>Colors</p>	<p>New trim color: Sherwin Williams “Ocatillo” (SW2378); Pilasters and capitals Sherwin Williams “English Ivy” (SW 2935)</p>	

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with clarification as to lighting of the sign. If internally illuminated only the letters should glow against an opaque background.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Kevin Rose stated when they got into the demolition of the façade from the backside they were hoping that they were going to find things that were not there, which was why they proposed this change. He said they needed a low wall there to deal with some of the idiosyncrasies between the side wall and other things. In regard to the signage, they talked with their client and they would like to wait on making a decision.

Mr. Deering asked the soffit where the doors recessed, what was the material under there?

Mr. Rose stated they have not thought about it and they did not know what was there. He said may be that could be something that they bring back to Staff.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what was the tile under the windows?

Mr. Rose stated it was a glass tile.

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended to reflect a glass mosaic tile base beneath the storefront, a glass mosaic tile floor in the recessed opening; the soffit material in the recessed opening to be brought to staff and signage to be continued. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
John Deering
HBR 05-3438-2
Corner of Jefferson & West Hall Lane
New Construction – Part II (Design)**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part II: Materials and Design Details for the new construction of a single-family residence at the corner of Jefferson Street and West Hall Lane.

FINDINGS

The project site is in a neighborhood of the Historic District composed of mixed building types and empty lots. Adjacent to the site to the north is a stucco one-story church. To the south is a used car lot with a six foot tall wood fence. To the west (the rear of the site) is a new clapboard carriage house under construction. Across the street are four vacant lots.

The following standards apply:

Standard:	Proposed Development:	Comment:
Submission requirements – Dimensioned site plan showing parking areas, fences, roof or ground mounted equipment.	Provided.	
Elevations showing height and width relationships to existing adjacent buildings, Dimensioned sections of projecting details	Provided.	
Section through the building and a mass model.	Provided.	

Standard:	Proposed Development:	Comment:
Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards (6) Visual Compatibility Factors: (g) Relationship of materials, texture, and color. 1. Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards (8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following: c. Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.	The exterior walls will have a sand finish Portland cement stucco. The color will be submitted for a Staff review and approval. A 8” tall stringcourse at the parapet with a 2” tall trim at the top will run the entire distance around the building. The entrance door will be vertical wood board, painted. The color will be submitted at a later date for Staff review and approval. The downspouts, gutter, and leader heads are to be mill finish aluminum.	This standard has been met.
(9) a. Windows Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung,	Windows are aluminum clad awning type and fixed to resemble double-hung windows but have a modern expression.	This project is a contemporary residential building. As such, the proposed placement and scale of the windows is consistent with

<p>d. casement or Palladian. “snap-in” or between the glass muntins shall not be used.</p> <p>f. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular.</p> <p>g. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.</p>	<p>The windows will be manufactured by Weathershield.</p> <p>Windows on the lane at the second floor are squared, with one set stacked.</p> <p>The windows will be inset not less than 3” from the façade of the stucco building.</p>	<p>the intent of the ordinance and is visually compatible.</p>
--	---	--

Standard:	Proposed Development:	Comment:
<p>h. The distance between the windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided, the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.</p> <p>k. In new residential construction windows of wood or wood clad.</p>		
<p>(10) Roofs: Roofs shall comply with the following:</p> <p>c. Parapets shall have a string course not less than six inches in depth and extending at least four inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the between one and one-half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum of two-inch overhang.</p>	<p>The project will have a flat roof with parapet.</p> <p>There is an 8” tall stringcourse at the parapet with a 2” tall trim at the top that will extend around the entire building.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>(11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos and side porches</p>	<p>On the north elevation facing the courtyard, will be a two-story covered porch/veranda supported by 6” diameter steel columns.</p>	<p>The side porch is compatible in a contemporary expression.</p>

Standard:	Proposed Development:	Comment:
	<p>The beams soffits, fascia and ceilings are to be painted wood. Colors will be submitted at a later date for Staff review and approval.</p> <p>The second level of the porch will have a 36” tall, metal railing with steel mesh between metal tubes facing the courtyard. Facing the front elevation, the privacy railing will be pressure treated wood with beveled cedar cap and bottom rails. Rail sections were provided.</p>	
<p>(13) Fences and garden walls: a. Walls and fences shall not extend beyond the façade of the front elevation... b. Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; however, iron fencing may be used with masonry structure.</p>	<p>The front and side garden fencing as proposed will be painted wood, 6’ tall.</p>	<p>The proposed wood fencing does not meet the requirement of the ordinance for a masonry structure.</p> <p>The fence or wall should be changed to meet the requirements of the ordinance and be resubmitted for review and approval.</p>
<p>(14) Lanes and carriage house: d. Garage opening shall not exceed 12 feet in width.</p>	<p>The garage door will be opening will be 12’ wide to accommodate a 10’ x7’ overhead steel garage door. The color of the door will be submitted at a later date for Staff level review and approval.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>

Standard:	Proposed Development:	Comment:
<p>(15) Utilities and Refuse: a. Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communication devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from the street. b. HVAC units shall be screened from public right of way. d. Refuse areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.</p>	<p>Trash containers and HVAC units will be contained within the rear courtyard area and screened from the public right of way.</p> <p>One HVAC unit will be located on the roof but screened behind the parapet wall.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with the condition that the privacy wall be changed to masonry instead of wood and all colors submitted for Staff level review and approval.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Deering stated they did the fence out of a different material because there were in the neighborhood several stucco houses that had wooden fences. He said they were simply just trying to follow that pattern and would like for the Board to consider the wooden fence with a stucco house.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of Chris Norman, For
Capers Martin
HBR 05-3441-2
315 West Lorch Street
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Chris Norman.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The Petitioner is requesting both Part I: Height and Mass and Part II: Materials and Design Details for the new construction of a building on a vacant lot at 315 West Lorch Street.

FINDINGS

FINDINGS: The following Ordinance Standards apply:

Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
Section 8-3030 (1) Design standards (1) Height: Residential Buildings – 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 shall not be less than 10 feet.	The building is proposed to be three stories in height with a total height of 34’7”. The area is in a three-story height zone. The exterior expression of the first story is 11’ 3”. The exterior expression of the next two stories is 11’- each. ”	While the three story height is allowable under the height map, the overall height of the building is substantially taller than the adjacent structures. The height of the building to the west is approximately 22’6”. The overall height should be reconsidered to keep the project visually compatible to the adjacent historic structures.
Section 8-3030 (1) (2) Street Elevation Type A proposed building on an east-west connecting street shall utilize an existing historic	The proposed street elevation type is a three story structure with street level entrance.	The adjacent properties both have entrances off a full length front porch with several stairs from the street level.

building street elevation type located within the existing block front or on an immediately adjacent...block.		
Section 8-3030 (1)(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.		The setback standard has been met.
Section 8-3030 (1) (4) Entrances c. A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.	All the primary entrances on this block front the street.	The main entrance to the building is a front door with a covered stoop.

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...		
Height Height Map: The maximum height for this area is 3 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 34'7" and the width is 26'6". The building has a vertical directional expression.	The adjacent structures are also more vertically directed.
Proportion of openings	Rectangular windows vertically aligned. However, the front windows appear to be rather large in scale for this façade.	This standard has been met.
Rhythm of solids to voids in front facade	The characteristic rhythm in this block is three bay. The proposed structure is 3 bays wide.	The proposed three bay rhythm is visually compatible; however, the scale of the voids (i.e. the front windows) is too large for this façade and gives the perception of more void than solid. The voids must be reduced to be compatible to the adjacent historic structures.

Rhythm of entrance and/or porch	Front stoops and porches are	The proposed stoop is compatible.
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------------

projection	characteristic of this block.	
Roof shape	The proposed roof is flat with a parapet.	The adjacent properties have low pitched hipped roofs.
Walls of continuity	A wood fence with wood gates is proposed for the front on the property, while the rear with have 10’ tall masonry walls on the sides.	Fences are characteristic of defining space in the area.
Directional Expression	The proposed structure has a vertical directional expression.	This is visually compatible.
Scale	The overall height and size of voids are not compatible to the adjacent historic properties. The building is utilizing a classical, historic design vocabulary, however, the proportion of the solids to voids is not typical in classical design.	The overall height and the relationship of solids to voids, primarily the size of the front windows needs to be restudied, with attempts to be reduced highly recommended in order to bring the project into visual compatibility.

Part II Design Detail

The following standards apply:

Standard:	Proposed Development:	Comment:
<p>Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards (6) Visual Compatibility Factors: (g) Relationship of materials, texture, and color.</p> <p>1. Section 8-3030 (l) Design Standards (8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following: c. Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.</p>	<p>The exterior will be true stucco with scoring.</p> <p>A sample and colors were provided.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>(9) Windows a. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. d. “snap-in” or between the glass muntins shall not be used. f. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular g. Window sashes shall be inset</p>	<p>Windows are aluminum clad , two-over-two, true divided light double hung windows. The windows are manufactured by Marvin Ultimate. The window units will be Charleston Green.</p> <p>The windows will be inset not less than 3” from the façade of the buildings.</p> <p>The size of the windows are 8’6” tall with a width of 4’3”.</p>	<p>This standard has been met, however, the size of the window openings appears out of scale with the front façade.</p>

<p>not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.</p> <p>h. The distance between the windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided, the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.</p> <p>k. In new residential construction windows of wood or wood clad.</p>		
<p>(10) Roofs: Roofs shall comply with the following:</p> <p>b. Pitched roofs 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.</p> <p>g. Roofs visible from the street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile, or asphalt shingles.</p>	<p>The building will have a slightly pitched roof hidden behind a parapet. The roof material will be standing seam metal, with interior gutters.</p> <p>The roof will have a parapet with a string course not less than 6” in depth and extends at least 4” from the face of the building, running the full width of the building.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>(11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches</p> <p>d. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone, or slate.</p> <p>e. Wood porticos post shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.</p> <p>f. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four inches. For one and two family dwellings the height of the railing shall not exceed 36”.</p>	<p>The building will have a low front stoop supported by columns, infill between piers shall be recessed, with masonry stairs and risers. The wood portico has columns with base and cap moldings and the proper balusters at the handrail.</p> <p>The rear will have a similar porch.</p> <p>Sections and details of the porches were provided.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>

<p>g. Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood unless the proposed material matches other façade details on the same building, such as terra cotta or wrought iron.</p>		
<p>(13) Fences and garden walls.</p>	<p>The front will have wood fences with wood gates flushed with the front facade and the sides will have 10' tall stucco walls to screen rear parking area on the east and west sides.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>(15) Utilities and Refuse: a. Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communication devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from the street. b. HVAC units shall be screened from public right of way. d. Refuse areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.</p>	<p>Not provided.</p>	<p>Location of HVAC units and garbage containers needs to be provided.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

Restudy of Part I Height and Mass with recommendation that height be reduced and ratio of solids to voids be changed. The Part II proposal appears to meet the Standards.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Norman stated in regard to the windows they were willing to change the scale and proportion of the windows. He said they would like to request to do that as a Staff review if possible.

Mr. Deering stated he felt the building was out-of-scale for this neighborhood. He said Lorch Street traditionally, a street of small to midsize framed houses and this house does not suit the street. He said he felt they should reconsider the scale of the project (height and depth).

Mr. Norman stated existing on that side of the street was already a house that would be rhythmically on a streetscape at the height of what they were proposing. He said there were nine residential structures that was on this street, but at least five of them were at that height or greater.

Mr. Deering stated the three story house on this street was an anomaly. He said at some time in history there were one story cottages across the street. In the Board’s trying to uphold the ordinance and the intent of the guidelines they were supposed to be concerned with the historic

structures and not necessarily the new structures, which was what he was basing his comment on.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if they said they would consider some of the comments from the staff.

Mr. Norman stated yes, in regard to the windows. He said they would also take into consideration staff's comments regarding the HVAC units and trashcans. He said as far as the height they would like to stay with the proposed height.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if that is the case, he may need to request a continuance rather than going back to Staff because he felt the Board would like to see the changes.

Mr. Steffen stated he would also have to agree with Mr. Deering in regard to the height/mass.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF supports Staff's concerns with the scale, height/mass, as well as the oversized windows and the too wide front stoop. He said HSF would like to suggest to help mitigate a three story building is to its neighbor might be the insertion of a double gallery on the front. The other three story building in the pictures even had a two story stoop. He said that could probably go a long way towards getting the petitioner what he wanted and also bring the building in line with the streetscape.

Mr. Norman asked how would it suit the Board if it stayed at this height with a raised stoop?

Mr. Deering stated he felt the street was not a very high toned street. He said what he has designed seemed to be considered a nice townhouse for Savannah and this street was never really that sort of thing. He said may want to think about materials and those sorts of things.

Mr. Norman stated may be something clapboard.

Mr. Deering stated something like that.

Ms. Seiler stated the neighbors houses did not seem in total disrepair. She said she felt as proposed it would stick out like a sore thumb.

Mr. Norman stated there were also empty lots across the street and he felt that it could not be said what was really going to happen with those. He said as far as scale on either side of the project they had two that were lower. However, the house that would be next to the house that was to the east, that house was going to be almost exactly the same height. He said when you took into account the streetscape rhythm the rhythm of that would be equal. He said that would also leave it open for what could happen at the end of the block where there was an empty lot.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Board's concern was that it was not compatible with the existing buildings there now. If the Board granted this project, he felt they would be setting a precedent for all the empty lots on the block. He said the scale that Mr. Deering referred to was what was there now and they would like for him to restudy it and get closer to that scale.

Mr. Norman stated the scale that he was referring to it seemed directly as to the scale of what was on either side of it directly and not taking into account anything else on the block.

Mr. Deering stated he was not saying that he should not take into account the three story high stoop house. He said his concern was that this looked like a really high toned Savannah townhouse that was built between the 1850's – 1870's. He said he did not feel it was appropriate for that street. He said he felt if they did something that was similar to the three story house that was one house away it would be more successful.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until the next meeting as submitted with colors to be brought to staff. Mrs. Forson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Joe & Cindy Celento
HBR 05-3450-2
304 East Huntingdon Street
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was Joe Celento.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The Petitioners are requesting approval to construct a two-story stucco carriage house for 304 East Huntingdon Street.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
Visual Compatibility Factors: Height Width Proportion of Openings within the Facility Rhythm of solids to voids in front facades/directional expression of front façade Roof shapes Setbacks	The carriage house will be two stories in height and 24' to the flat roof. In respect to the exterior expression of floor-to-floor heights, the first floor will appear 11' tall and the second floor 9' tall. The width of the carriage house facing the lane will be 30'. The three garage door openings will each be 8' wide. Second floor windows will be centered over each garage door.	These factors have been met.

Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
	The lane façade of the carriage house will have a three-bay rhythm, with the windows and doors aligned vertically. The building will have a horizontal	

	<p>directional expression. The roof will be flat with a cornice and parapet.</p> <p>The carriage house will have a zero line setback on the lane.</p>	
<p>Section 8-3030 (k) Development Standards:</p> <p>(6) (g) Relationship of materials, textures, and color.</p> <p>(8) Exterior walls: Exterior walls shall comply with the following:</p> <p>Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.</p>	<p>The carriage house will be stucco to match the main house. All colors will match existing colors on main house.</p> <p>The roof detailing will match the main house at a 60-75% reduced scale of eaves, soffit, brackets, and dentil course.</p>	<p>This standard has been met and is visually compatible.</p>
<p>(9) Windows:</p> <p>a. Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement, or Palladian.</p>	<p>All windows on the new carriage house will be two-over-two, true divided light, double-hung wood windows to match the main house.</p> <p>All shutter will be operable, wood louvered shutters to match the existing on main house.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>

Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
<p>c. Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction; provided however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntins shall be no wider than 7/8", the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing, the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails, extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding.</p> <p>d. Snap in or between the glass muntins shall not be used.</p> <p>e. The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.</p> <p>f. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts,</p>		

<p>basement and top story windows shall be rectangular and shall not have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3, provided however, nothing precludes an arched window being used.</p> <p>h. The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows.</p> <p>k. In new residential construction windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>		
---	--	--

Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
<p>(14) Lanes and carriage house</p> <p>d. Garage door openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.</p> <p>e. Roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.</p>	<p>The garage door openings are less than 12 feet in width and will accommodate doors that are 8'x8'.</p> <p>The roof is flat with parapet.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends Approval.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated he was not concerned about the design from the public right-of-way and felt it suited his house well. However, with this sort of thing the Board typically asks for sections through the eave and the detail work of the project so the Board knows that it was constructed the way it was presented, which he did not see in his packet. He said he felt whatever the Board decided to do they should asks that he submit these details to Staff.

Mr. Celento stated okay.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was concerned that there were large bracketed eaves on this building, but it was a parapeted building with a flat roof behind it. Essentially, the roof was missing off of an Italianate house as these are copied from the situation on the main house, but because it was built lot line to lot line you could not have the hipped roof or it would dump water onto the neighbor's property. Also, because it was built lot line to lot line, the eaves hung over the neighbor's property which would require him to draw the building sides back approximately 1 foot onto his property. He said he talked with the petitioner earlier and the solution HSF suggested was for a low pitched gable roof so that the building could go up to lot line lot line and still leave the heavier cornice on the front and back of the building, so that it related to the house in the manner in which the petitioner desired.

Mr. Deering stated he felt may be the Board needed to look at approving height/mass and if acceptable to the petitioner let him come back with details. He asked the petitioner if he would accept a continuance until he worked the other things out?

Mr. Celento stated they run a Bed and Breakfast and they were trying to get into the construction phase during the slow season. He said since they have retained Mr. Hardison, if they could make the changes to the roof and get a Staff review and approval of that. He said then he could hopefully get approval on Part I and II from the Board today.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt the Board needed to see it again instead of Staff review.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if they felt comfortable with reviewing the roof and details at staff level?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

Mr. Gay stated in essence they would just be eliminating the brackets on the side.

HDBR Action: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the following conditions: (1) Provide a section through the eave to staff; (2) Remove the side brackets; and (3) Use a gable roof. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it was passed 6 – 2. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Deering and Mr. Meyerhoff.

**RE: Petition of D & D Signs
Gary Ray
HBR 05-3452-2
Corner of Houston & Oglethorpe Avenue
Sign**

Present for the petition was Gary Ray.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of an two sided, monument style, internally illuminated directory sign at the corner of Price Street and Oglethorpe Avenue. The dimensions of the sign are 8'-8" tall by 8'-1" wide or 70 square feet. It sits on a base that makes the overall height 11'-8". Black background with translucent white letters.

FINDINGS

The sign is located within a P-B-G-2 zone in the Landmark Historic District.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Directory Sign		There is no provision for directory signs within the Historic District Sign Ordinance.
Principal Use Signs: One principal use sign per business per street frontage is permitted.		Since this is a corner lot, the Zoning Administrator has agreed that the second principal use

<p>The maximum sign area for a freestanding sign is 30 square feet. Up to an additional 17.5 square feet may be added based on the store frontage facing Oglethorpe Avenue for a total of 47.5 square feet. The maximum width of the sign is 6’.</p>		<p>signs allowed may be grouped together not to exceed the maximum allowed size for a principal use sign. The sign will need to be reduced from 70 square feet to no more than 47.5 square feet and no more than 6 feet in width.</p>
<p>Lighting: Internally lighted signs are permitted in nonresidential zoning districts. Such signs shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures. The use of reversed silhouette or cut out letters is encouraged...</p>		<p>As long as the background is opaque this standard is met.</p>
<p>Height: The maximum height for a free standing sign in a residential area and in a B-C or BC-1 zone in the Historic District is 20 feet. In heavy commercial and industrial zones it is 40 feet.</p>		<p>This area is surrounded by RIPA residential zones. The heavy commercial zoning at this location is an anomaly and 40 feet or even 20 feet would be out of character. It is staff’s opinion that 11’-8” is too tall for this urban location and recommends that it be no taller than 10’ counting the base.</p>
<p>Location: The sign appears on the plan to be oriented to Oglethorpe Avenue. The photos however seem to each locate it in a different location than that shown on the plan.</p>		<p>Please provide an accurate to scale location map for the sign.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with the condition that the sign be redesigned to meet the size standards of the ordinance and lowered to blend in more with the historic residential character of the neighborhood. A new site plan and revised elevation needs to be submitted for final approval.

Board Comments:

Ms. Seiler asked Staff if they had any concerns about the type face?

Mrs. Reiter stated no, because she did not know what the stores were going to be.

Ms. Seiler stated if the signage is approved as presented “Crawford Square Plaza” underneath the tenant panels, were they going to allow individual type face for individual logos for each store.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated there were similar signs like this on the River front.

Mrs. Reiter stated there was a provision for a directory sign on the River front. She said what they were doing here was allowing the grouping of principal use signs. She said she felt they could be uniformed lettering if that was what the Board desired. She also stated that because they were on a corner they could have signs over their doors with Board approval if they were over 3 square feet.

Ms. Seiler stated she was concerned that this could possibly be multi logos, as well as the possibility of multi logos on top of each of the different plaza stores.

Mr. Deering stated he felt the Board had to allow them to do what was in accordance with the ordinance.

Ms. Seiler stated the Board has denied signs before.

Mr. Steffen stated if the sign is too small then people will not be able to read it, which could pose a traffic hazard at the intersections.

Petitioner Comments:

Mr. Gary Ray stated he made changes to the sign as recommended in the staff report, so that it was not more than 10 feet. He said there concern was the building setback a good way from the street. He said if you have a 3 square foot sign setback as far as these were going to be they would not be able to be read from the street. He said his client wanted a sign that they could put near the street so people would know. He said he felt that his client also would not have a problem with the different logos and color being uniform (plain white lettering and no logos by the street). He said they also reduced the panels to a 7¼ " X 32" and felt they could not go much smaller than that.

Ms. Brownfield stated she was not sure that people needed to read it other than "Crawford Square Plaza." She said she applaud what they were doing on the corner, but it sometimes get to be jumbled the smaller it gets and becomes less clear.

Mr. Ray stated there were a lot of businesses there that people may not know were in Crawford Square Plaza.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated with a 10 foot high sign people who were going south on Price Street and east on Oglethorpe Avenue will not see the building because the sign will block it.

Mr. Mitchell stated it may be that this type of sign just won't fly in the Historic District.

Mr. Steffen stated when the Board approved this building to be redone and essentially as it was to be used as commercial development, he did not want to see the Board handicapping the people who were going to do business in the community and people not being able to find them. He said he felt the petitioner met the recommendations that Staff suggested. He said he felt if they went smaller with their signage people would not be able to see it and it becomes a traffic problem as well as a business problem. He said the Board could decide no sign, but he felt it would be incongruous to do that when at least the phase I design of this building. He said he would urge that the Board adopt what the petitioner has changed and presented before the Board.

Mr. Deering stated he disagreed. He said he could not think of anywhere in the Historic District where this sort of sign exists. He said he felt it was incompatible and felt that it should not be allowed. He said people when they are looking for a business location in the Historic District are not your traditional south side, suburban, Hilton Head going shopping sort of people. Typically, they are going to a destination and know where they are going. He said if they simply had a sign that said Crawford Square and they found it they would know that they were there. He said it was a different environment.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she agreed with Mr. Steffen.

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was concerned about the sign and not happy that anything would be altered to allow such a sign that says American, suburban when we are anything but that and work tirelessly all the time to keep from becoming that. He said HSF said they had no problem with seeing Crawford Square Plaza and there will be individual signage opportunities on the building.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review deny the petition as submitted. Ms. Brownfield seconded the motion and it was passed 6 – 2. Opposed to the motion were Mrs. Fortson-Waring and Mr. Steffen.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
Brian Felder
HBR 05-3453-2
19 West Gordon Street
Alteration**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was Ivy Stroud.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The Petitioner is requesting approval of a two-story covered porch with wrought iron railings and supports for the southwest, rear corner of 19 West Gordon Street. An auto gate to the lane is also proposed.

FINDINGS

Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
<p>Section 8-3030 (11): Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches:</p> <p>f. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between the balusters shall not exceed four inches. For one and two family dwellings, the height of the railings shall not exceed 36”.</p>	<p>The proposed covered-two-story porch will be located on the southwest rear corner of the property, adjacent to the existing rear addition.</p> <p>The existing rear fire stair and rear covered porch will be removed.</p>	<p>The standard has been met and the proposed two-story covered porch is visually compatible.</p>

Standard:	Proposed:	Comment:
	<p>The porch will have a metal roof and each deck will be tongue and groove wood. The columns and rails will be iron. Column and rail details and sections were provided. A curving stair will allow access to the parlor level porch from the rear courtyard, however, the stair will be visible from the lane.</p> <p>New custom made double doors will be installed within existing window openings to allow access to the proposed porch areas.</p>	
<p>Other:</p>	<p>A new triple, double-hung wood window will be installed within the existing opening on the top floor of the rear elevation.</p> <p>New double doors will be installed on the rear elevations on the second and third floors within existing openings.</p> <p>The remainder of the work appears to be in-kind repairs.</p>	<p>These items are visually compatible.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended to lower the roof so that it is under the soffit. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

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

Continued per Petitioner’s request.

**RE: Petition of Dawson & Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson**

**HBR 05-3458-2
501 East Bay Street
New Construction – Part I**

Present for the petition was Richard Wissmach.

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 14’-6”, the second and third are 12’ each and the pent house is 11’-6.”	The height meets the commercial floor to floor heights. See visual compatibility comments below.
Setbacks: 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.
		Although the proposed building meets the height standards for number of stories, it is visually related to small scale 19 th century frame residential structures. The height of 50 feet and one element at 58’ seem out of scale with the adjacent historic properties. The base seems too high for the location. Staff recommends exploration of alternative heights for the stories and if visually successful that a variance be granted to reduce the required heights given the context.
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. As stated in the height comment, perhaps the emphasis on the base

		can be lessened as a transition to the residential.
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.	The rendering suggests a deep recess for the windows. The depth of window openings on a small structures needs to be carefully considered. 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, but case needs to be taken with the scale of the elements.

General comment: The applicant’s proposed building blends historical references to 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.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the approach, but with some further reconsideration to see if there are ways to reduce the scale to transition more effectively into the residential zone beyond.

Petitioner Comments:

Mr. Wissmach stated the site was an existing garage adjacent to it was two high story structure. He said their concern was the value of these adjacent properties and over time would it remain a parking structure and will the house that has already been replaced there be removed as well. The issue of dealing with commercial to private to residential, the attempt to address that was dealing with the fenestration on that façade. And in a more abstract way dealing with the typical residential garden carriage house component and the scale as you move down Price Street addressed that in the fenestration with the larger openings on the front portion. A division in the building as you moved back down Price Street and then smaller punched openings which were effectively the carriage house. He said that was the gesture to deal with that immediate commercial to residential transition as you move down Price Street.

Mr. Deering asked if they considered Staff’s comments about getting a variance to lower the floor-to-floor heights on this commercial structure so that it better suits?

Mr. Wissmach stated they were open to that. He said their concern was as adjacent properties are developed will they be limited or asked to meet that same standard.

Mr. Deering stated the Board was not considering that now, because they did not know what was going to happen. He said this end of Bay Street was always residential and most of the commercial buildings that were at this end of Bay Street were two story brick or stuccoed structures that were really a smaller scale than what was proposed.

Ms. Seiler stated the two houses that were on Price Street were reproductions the yellow one that used to be grey. She said the houses on Bryan Street were not and were historic. The Bryan Street properties and those that were on Washington Square and Warren Square were

going to be enveloped by the shadow of this new structure. She said the same problem will be faced when the hotel is being built on Habersham Street. She said this was an entirely different look. She said the Bryan Street corridor with the colored houses and tiny cottages were an entirely different look. She said this will impact that entire residential neighborhood in an entirely different way. She said it will also block their view and sunlight.

Mr. Wissmach stated they were willing to look at the floor-to-floor heights, not just on the lower level but at the upper level as well to bring the scale down.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated Bay Street is commercial and allows four story buildings. Price Street for the two blocks on Bay Street going south was residential. He said he was concerned that they took the height and they flaunted it in making the windows indent two story with the spandrel being part of the window rather than what they did at the south end of the building. He said the roof structure, while they set it back you have these contemporary shapes up there that call attention to themselves. He said somehow to integrate this odd juxtaposition as presented it needed more study.

Mr. Wissmach stated the fenestration was trying to address Bay Street, verticality, and a taller structure and then scaling it down.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated while they have done this on the west elevation in part perhaps the west elevation should be more considered as you turn the south end of the building. He said as he saw it, the commercial aspect of the appearance of this building was more predominant than the relationship to the scale of the residence.

Dr. Caplan stated he felt this was a difficult situation, but he also felt that the petitioner's explanation of it and solution was a rather masterful one. He said on the commercial side a commercial appearing building and then you transition by changing the window size to residential. He said he felt he could also address much of this utilizing the same solution to address the height of the building.

Mr. Wissmach asked in terms of transition to the residential if the punched openings and how they addressed that suitable?

Mr. Gay stated the way he separated the two was fine.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt considering toning down the fourth floor.

Mr. Wissmach stated as they have studied it further since the submittal it was over scaled. He said in meeting with the client there was a sense that could be reduced down. He said he felt it would help with the impact of the top floor with the overall building.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated making the spandrels between the second and third floors be part of the face of the building rather than creating a two story indentation.

Mr. Wissmach asked if they make the suggestions as a part II in terms of the reduced height bringing the scale down.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated also in part II they needed to explain the windows themselves. He said they looked like commercial casement windows, which he presumed they were not going to be that.

Mr. Wissmach stated they were going to be steel windows, to have more of the industrial aesthetic to it as opposed to a wood window.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the comments from HSF was basically positive about the project. He said there was some concern that maybe there could be a little more done as Staff suggested to transition to the older neighborhood the small scale framed houses. He said he personally felt that if the petitioner were to show some graphics as what the project looked like coming from that area instead of looking into that area where it was sitting in the forefront it might alleviate some of the anxieties that some of the people have of what it would actually look like from the surrounding wards.

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until next month. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 05-3442(S)-2
206 East Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of Doug Bean Sign
HBR 05-3443(S)-2
324 East Bryan Street
Color/Replacement Fence
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Eric Meyerhoff
HBR 05-3444(S)-2
425 East President Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
4. Petition of Davis Cohen
HBR 05-3445(S)-2
221 East York Street
Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
5. Petition of SCAD
Kate Firebaugh
HBR 05-3447(S)-2
318 East Liberty Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 05-3448(S)-2
504 East Bay Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
7. Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith
Craig Clements
HBR 05-3459(S)-2
107 West Broughton Street
Window Replacement/Minor Repairs
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes - July 13, 2005
2. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes - August 10, 2005

HDBR Action: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of July 13, 2005 as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

Dr. Caplan stated he had corrections for the August 10, 2005 minutes. He said on page 20 where it says “of *them* ...project”, **it should read** “of *their*...project.” On page 23, under Board Comments where it says “was an entity *on to* ... neighborhood,” should read “was an entity ***unto*** ... neighborhood.” On page 28, in the middle of the page where it says “He said some how ... *impath*,” **it should read** “He said ***somehow*** ... ***impasse***.” Also, on page 29, where it says “stated on number ... structures,” **it should read** “stated on number ... structures.”

RE: Other Business

1. Letter – RE: 22 Habersham Decision

Mrs. Reiter stated she received a written complaint from Mr. & Mrs. Brooks regarding the approval of the Board of the carriage house at 22 Habersham Street. She said there were probably eight separate parts of the complaint, most of which had actually been covered in the meeting. She said she addressed these in the letter with John Mitchell’s signature. The letter explains that there were no procedural issues were violated and that some of the other issues were not in the purview of the Board and that there was no reason to rehear this petition.

Mr. Mitchell stated for clarity purposes of the letter please show his name as *W. John Mitchell*.

The Board agreed the letter was fine.

Mrs. Reiter stated she also received an email from Mr. & Mrs. Hill saying that the height/mass was being violated of what was approved at 1 West Jones Street. She said Lee took the drawings over there and they met again with the contractor and there was no violation. The project is not finished and it was as it was approved in the drawings.

Mrs. Reiter also stated in regard to the Board wanting letters written to John Hutton about 421 East Congress Street where they felt the wall was too high. She said they went back and measured and she has since talked with John Hutton the wall measured 8 inches higher than what was approved and there were four other small deviations from the plan. She said what John suggested the Board do, which is how the letter is written is to outline the deviations, tell Mr. Wilson he needs to come back to the Board and ask for an amendment for approval of these changes. She said Mr. Hutton said that was how they would handle it at Inspections.

She further stated there was an issue with regard to the gentlemen who removed all the wood siding from the Habersham Street house and put up hardi plank. She said he has removed the hardi plank and put the wood siding back. She said she also talked to John Hutton about how they might avoid some of this in the future. She said he suggested that they make another stamp and that stamp which would go on the permit drawings would say *“an onsite preconstruction meeting between the contractor and the Preservation Officer is required.”* She said it will be on the permit drawing and they will not be able to start construction until they meet with the PO.

Mr. Mitchell stated he wanted to read a letter addressed to Mayor Otis Johnson, September 14, 2005.

“It is with great regret that I must resign my position as a member of the Historic District Board of Review for the City. My service on this Board has been a wonderful experience for me and I will be forever grateful for the opportunity I had in helping the Landmark District to maintain its status through the Board’s interpretation of the City’s architectural guidelines.

I must resign because I am moving to Wilmington Island and will no longer be eligible to serve. When we moved to Savannah in 1995, I wanted to be of service to the City. As a result I became an active member of the Downtown Neighborhood Association, the Historic Savannah Foundation, the Downtown Garden Club, and eventually my appointment to the Review Board. It has been a privilege for me to serve in the various capacities in each of these organizations. I will continue to serve on the DNA Board as past President during this upcoming year and will maintain our membership to Historic Savannah Foundation. I hope that you and other Council members will continue to call on me if I can be of service to the City.

Thank you again for your inspirational leadership and for giving me a unique opportunity to serve on the Historic District Board of Review. It has been a service of great joy. Sincerely,
Dian Brownfield.

Mrs. Waring stated somebody put up a Georgia doghouse on Broughton Street. She said they needed to make sure that they do not do that again. She said it was in front of the storefront and it was the size of the store window. She said she felt they needed to be mindful that if these people are doing it every time Georgia has a game they have to find out whose doing it. She also stated that on November 18 – 19, the Georgia Alliance of Preservation Commissions is having its Fall training in Decatur, Georgia. She said for those who have never been to a preservation commission training it is a wonderful opportunity.

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

Mrs. Reiter stated she stated them earlier.

Dr. Caplan stated it was with great regret that they had Dian's resignation. He said her wonderful letter reflected the lady that she is. He said she will be missed.

Mr. Mitchell stated that Dian has been a sweetheart. He said she was a class act and she will definitely be missed.

Mr. Bedi stated it was with great regret that Lee Webb who has been with MPC for the last 3 years has accepted another opportunity in Alexandria, VA. He said his last date with MPC will be September 30, 2005.

Mr. Webb stated it was a great career move and an opportunity that he could not say no to. He said the last 3 years have been incredible at MPC and working with Beth has been a highlight of his young career.

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca