

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

APRIL 12, 2006

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Ned Gay (Excused)  
Gene Hutchinson (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

Harmit Bedi, Deputy Executive Director  
Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer  
Sarah Ward, Preservation Specialist  
Janine Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Steffen called the April 12, 2006, meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 p.m.

RE: REFLECTION

RE: ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Steffen introduced Savannah College of Arts and Design (SCAD) Professor Bob Allen and his Preservation in the Economics of Downtown Revitalization, SCAD Professor Brad Robinson and his Preservation Rehab Class; and Johann Reitzel, a Building Conservationist from Stockholm, Sweden.

RE: SIGN POSTING

Mr. Mitchell stated that HDBR 06-3507-2 had a discrepancy in the file number on the application.

Mr. Steffen stated that the file number HDBR 06-3570-2 as listed on the agenda is the correct number.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
Gretchen Ogg  
H 05-3417-2  
102 East Liberty Street  
Alteration

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Amended Petition of Carole Merick Luffborough  
H 05-3457-2  
440 Price Street  
Alteration

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
Gretchen Ogg  
H 06-3563-2  
409 – 410 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard  
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Dr. Lewis Steinfeld  
H 06-3567-2  
101 West Broughton  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Carol Devine  
H 06-3569-2  
305 East River Street /  
308 East Lower Factor's Walk  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Ray Morrison  
H 06-3571-2  
410 East Broughton  
Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Deering recused himself from the Petitions of Poticny Deering Felder, HDBR 06-3417-2 and HDBR 06-3563-2.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of Dawson + Wissmach  
 H 05-3364-2  
 100 Block of West Bay Street  
 New Construction - Part II Design

Present for the petition was Andy Lynch.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part II Design approval for a six-story office building to be located on the eastern 60 feet of Bryan Street at Whitaker Street. It is located over the primary vehicular entrance to the subterranean parking garage associated with the Ellis Square development project. Part I Height and Mass was approved April 13, 2005. The Height and Mass have changed slightly in the following areas:

- The former two bay-wide garage entrances are now three bays on Whitaker Street.
- The rhythm of solids to voids has changed on both the Bryan Street and Whitaker Street elevations

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Windows and doors</p> <p>North of Broughton Street, a corner building located adjacent to a service street shall have an entrance on the service street.</p> <p>The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top.</p> <p>Storefronts shall be constructed of...aluminum...as part of a glazed storefront system.</p>	<p>Clear anodized aluminum storefronts are proposed at street level on the Bryan and Whitaker Street sides.</p> <p>Clear anodized aluminum storefront windows with anodized spandrel panels are proposed for floors 2-5. The top floor has more vertical anodized aluminum windows separated with anodized metal panels.</p> <p>On the Whitaker Street north half of the building the windows reflect the verticality of the sixth floor. The sixth floor here is set back 10 feet with a screen wall of storefront windows.</p> <p>The lobby entry on Bryan Street is a glass curtain wall</p>	<p>The first floor has been designed as retail space with storefront entries on both streets.</p> <p>The tall building standards have been met by changes in rhythm and size of fenestration.</p> <p>See comment on entry under "stairs" below.</p>
Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Roof</p> <p>Tall building roofs shall be flat with parapets.</p>	<p>An aluminum sun louver is used between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> floors. The brick parapet is capped with a cast stone</p>	<p>It is not clear how much of the mechanical rooms will be visible, but the roof shape seems to celebrate this feature more than is necessary</p>

	<p>coping. A cast stone and zinc cornice is proposed below the parapet. The roof of the mechanical rooms consists of zinc roof panels.</p>	<p>for a utilitarian function. The main roof standard has been met.</p>
Balconies, stairs stoops	<p>A solid cast stone stair tower (exit for the hotel) is next to the recessed curtain wall entry on Bryan Street.</p>	<p>The solid stair tower creates an awkward rhythm on the Bryan Street side and dominates the recessed entry. Staff suggests consideration of bringing the curtain wall entry flush with the Bryan Street façade and making the stair tower transparent. This will serve to separate the office from the hotel and add light to the street at night and vitality to the street during the day when people could be seen on the stairs and perhaps colorful banners hung inside. The entry might also have a zinc canopy with building signage similar to the parking garage entry on Whitaker Street.</p>
Fences	<p>Not applicable</p>	
Materials colors	<p>The body of the building is a topaz colored brick running bond. (The rendering is more yellow than the sample). Slightly darker brick accents are proposed. Cream-colored cast stone is proposed for base and accents.</p>	<p>It is not clear where the brick accents are proposed. The materials and colors are compatible with nearby structures.</p>
Awnings	<p>Awnings are proposed over the storefront. A zinc canopy is proposed over the garage entries.</p>	<p>The material and colors of the storefront awnings were not submitted.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with the conditions that the stair tower and entry system on Bryan Street and the roof on the mechanical penthouse be revisited. Awning materials and colors to be brought to staff for approval.**

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Lynch** reviewed the changes from the Part I submittal. More emphasis has been given to the corner. The section over the garage has been setback. On the second through fifth floors, they have larger expanses glass; broke the fifth to the sixth floor with a translucent sun louver; and more punch window openings on top floor. The garage had to be larger by the City’s codes. He changed the brick color at the base and carried through the accents on the window lintel and on the corner. The Bryan Street elevation indicates a change on the corner stair tower. The lobby area has more glazing. He stated that he tried to accentuate the solidness of the stairwell by giving the windows more depth setting them back 12 inches. He stated that the main problem with a more transparent material is that it sits on the property line and the fire

rating must extend four feet from the property line. Fire-rated glass has to be impact-resistant and is very expensive. The top penthouse is a stairwell in the front section, and an elevator shaft.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the sunscreen doesn't seem to be compatible and the vertically of the columns through the building would be better without the sunscreen

**Mr. Lynch** stated that there was a very strong cornice line on the News Press building, which projects out two feet, and he was primarily trying to pick-up that element and reinforce it along the Whitaker Street elevation.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that a sunscreen on two sides doesn't have a function other than an architectural projection; otherwise, they should be put over all the windows.

**Mr. Deering** agreed with both the petitioner and Mr. Meyerhoff that a cornice at that level would be nice, but that it did not necessarily have to be a sunscreen. The transparency of it makes it seem unimportant.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if this was the same element used in the courtyards off Bay Street frontage.

**Mr. Lynch** stated that it was similar but a little more contemporary.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Bill Steube (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated his concern about the size of the windows, the amount of glass in relationship to the walls, stating that in the Historic District windows represent a small percentage of the total surface area of the wall. The guidelines state that the distance between windows should not be less than for adjacent historic buildings. On adjacent historic buildings, you can see that there is an equal amount of wall mass between two windows.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Lynch** stated that the plans have been broken down from the Part I submittal, which has much more glass. He stated that he tried to reduce the amount of glass by introducing panels. He stated that he was trying to emulate some of the buildings on Johnson Square. He stated that there were at least two or three buildings that have the same glass to solid relationship.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the condition that the awning colors and materials be submitted to staff for review. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Meyerhoff cast a nay vote.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he felt it was a more successful submittal than the first one. He stated that it respects the intent of the guidelines, although the glass area is larger. He said the way that it was broken definitely suited the district and the surrounding historic structures.

RE: Amended Petition of D & D Signs  
 Gary Ray  
 H 05-3452-2  
 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue  
 Sign

Present for the petition was Mr. Gary Wright.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff Report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for a monument sign at the southeast corner of Price Street and Oglethorpe Avenue for “Crawford Plaza” located at 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue. In addition, principal use signs are proposed over the entrance (on the parapet) to each unit.

**Monument Sign:** The proposed double-sided sign is 6-inches tall, 8 feet wide and 11-inches deep. The sign has been amended from the previously application submitted in September 2005 as follows:

- 1) The overall size of the sign has been reduced from 70 square feet to 48 square feet. The individual occupants have been removed from the sign and the name of the development “Crawford Square Plaza” which is approximately 3 feet tall and 8 feet wide is the only text on the sign.
- 2) The materials include a 3-foot extruded aluminum sign cabinet, painted black with translucent white lettering on both sides. The base is brick to match the building.
- 3) The proposed lighting will be internal fluorescent backlit lights to illuminate through the translucent lettering.

**Principal Use Fascia Signs:** Individual signs indicating each business/occupant within the development will be located above the entrance into such establishment. The proposed signs are as follows:

- 1) Mounted on a 2-foot – 6-inch tall by 6-foot – 6-inch wide backing finished in a Hunter Green to match the storefront color.
- 2) Sandblasted sign is 2 feet tall by 6 feet wide.

**FINDINGS:**

The property is located within a P-B-G-2, Planned General-Business, Transition 2, zone in the Landmark Historic District. The building to which the signs relate is not historic.

The following standards from the Historic Sign District Ordinance (Section 8-3121) apply:

MONUMENT SIGN		
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Principal Use Signs: For each nonresidential use, one principal use sign per	The proposed freestanding monument sign is 8’ wide by 6’ tall comprising 48 square feet	Staff recommends eliminating the monument sign from the proposal. The sign is directed toward an

<p>business per street frontage is permitted. The maximum sign area for a freestanding sign is 30 square feet, provided that no portion of a sign shall be erected within 2' of a curbline. 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>and appears to be 11" deep. The sign area is approximately 24 square feet. It is setback 10' from the west and north property lines.</p>	<p>automotive audience and is indicative of businesses along major automotive routes and highways not pedestrian oriented downtowns or the historic district. The sign appears out of character for the district. The building itself and the proposed individual fascia signs define the commercial entity and staff feels that no additional signage is necessary.</p> <p>To meet the standards, the sign will need to be reduced to no more than 47.5 square feet and no more than 6 feet in width.</p>
<p>Height: The maximum height for a freestanding 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>The proposed height is 6'.</p>	<p>The standard is met. 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.</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>The text for the sign is on an extruded aluminum sign cabinet featuring a non-translucent black background and translucent white lettering on both sides with an internal fluorescent lamp.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Location: The sign appears on the plan to be oriented to Oglethorpe Avenue.</p>	<p>A site plan was provided to indicate where the sign is to be located. Verify depth of sign.</p>	<p>Verify depth of sign.</p>
<p><b>FASCIA SIGNS</b></p>		
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
<p>Principal Use Sign: For each nonresidential use, one principal use sign, not to exceed more than one square foot of sign area per linear foot of frontage along a given street is permitted.</p>	<p>The proposed fascia signs are 2'-6" tall by 6'-6" wide, comprising 16.25 square feet. Linear footage of each use (unit) was not provided. Information on lettering and design within the center of the sign has not yet been determined.</p>	<p>The number of signs and linear footage of each unit to be provided to staff pending final approval. Verify materials.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval of location and size of individual signs with conditions; denial of monument sign.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if each individual business would have the same sign size with different letters (30 by 78 inches).

**Ms. Ward** answered that he was correct and added that it would be on the same material with the same color border around it.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if there would be any projecting signage.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that the developer would like some recognition of his development. He asked if there was any place where he can identify his development in Crawford Square Park.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she was unclear of the number of individual fascia signs that they are requesting for the establishment since there is also a central entrance to the rental office of the development. She stated that the office would be a good location to place the sign.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if the sign were removed, would there be no identification of the name of the plaza.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes; that there were no other development identification sign other than the monument sign.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Gary Wright** stated that the tenant's signage trim would match the green around the doors and the windows, but with a lighter off-white color. He stated that he could not say what the size of the letters would be because he did not know who the tenants would be. The monument sign support was removed and the top part was taken off. He stated that he was trying to give identification to Crawford Plaza on Oglethorpe.

**Mr. Gay** asked if the sign would be lit up from the inside.

**Mr. Wright** answered that it would be a black sign with white lettering.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he agreed with Staff that a monument identification sign was not necessary.

**Mr. Wright** stated that the sign material was not wood but a synthetic material. He stated that there was a question about the number of stores. He stated that there are 16 stores. There are ten stores that will have some frontage, and there are six that are actually in the lobby area. He stated that they have proposed to put two signs over the lobby to list the businesses in the area. He stated that they would be the same size

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he would divide the motion into two separate issues. The first would be the approval of location and size for the individual sign, with the condition that the actual lettering come back to Staff.

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition for sixteen fascia signs with the condition that the individual designs for each sign be submitted to staff for final approval. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it passed. Mrs. Fortson-Waring was opposed.



Mr. Steffen stated that the second issue was whether or not the Board would allow the monument sign. He stated that the petitioner had agreed to reduce the sign to put it in compliance with the Sign Ordinance.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the request for the freestanding monument sign, as it does not meet the Historic Sign District Standards (Section 8-3121) and is not visually compatible with the historic district. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Dr. Caplan stated that the motion does not preclude the petitioner’s returning with some type of identification for the project if the petitioner can come up with an alternate sign other than the monument.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
H 05-3503-2  
544 East Liberty Street  
New Construction - Part I Height / Mass**

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass for a four-story mixed-use structure at the northeast corner of Liberty Street and Houston Street.

**FINDINGS:**

At the March meeting of the Board of Appeals, an 82 percent lot coverage was approved for the site.

Other substantive changes from the previous submittal include:

- Widening the entrance court on Liberty Street from 16 feet to 30 feet.
- Stepping back the rear massing to create roof terraces on Perry Lane. The main Houston and Liberty Street facades still retain four stories.
- Two smaller parking entrances have been provided on the lane.
- Garbage collection area is inside the building on the lane side.
- Materials have been limited to brick, cast stone and stucco.
- The width of the project has been reduced by 11 feet.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Section 8-3030 (l) (1)Height The exterior expression of the height of residential raised basements shall not be less than 6'-6" and not higher than 9'-6". The exterior expression of the height of the ground floor of a commercial building shall not	The building now has a total footprint of 140 feet by 90 feet. The general parapet height is at 46 feet. The interior block portion is designed to resemble two attached 24' wide high stoop townhouses. The stoop is at 9 feet. The second floor at 13	It was suggested that this structure be looked at as a residential structure because of its location regarding required first floor heights. Thus the corner is able to be reduced in height from 14'-6".

be less than 14'-6".	feet and the remaining two floors at 10 feet each.	
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Section 8-3030 (l)(2) Street Elevation Type. A proposed building on an east-west through street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.	A mixed use condominium structure is proposed provides retail at ground level to add vitality to the street and a courtyard entrance to the residential. This is related to other historic apartment buildings such as the DeRenne Apartments and the apartment building at State and Abercorn Street.	High stoops are found within this ward.
Entrances	A recessed entrance with a courtyard has been proposed along Liberty as well as two high stoop entrances. Also, several retail entrances are proposed along both street frontages.	There is one discrepancy between plan and elevation. It is assumed that a door is planned into the retail on Liberty Street.
Garage entrance	Two garage entrances are proposed, one nearer Houston Street.	The width of the garage openings has not been given.

**FINDINGS:**

The applicant has responded to comments by the Board and public in a number of ways. The only other recommendations by staff regarding Part I would be 1) the consideration of bringing the portion between the corner element and element with the cast stone base forward, eliminating the ground supported balconies (perhaps using bracketed balconies) in order to unify the cast stone base with the stucco corner piece. This would also give more usable space to the retail and condominiums above and give a more balanced rhythm to the Liberty Street façade. If this upsets the lot coverage ratio approval, perhaps the pedimented entry portico could be eliminated to balance it out. 2) In the original submission, the height of the “townhouse” element was 42 feet – 4 inches. Later this was increased to 46 feet due to higher parlor floor (13 feet vs. 11 feet) and a taller parapet. Can this be reduced, and thereby reduce the larger than normal gap between the second and third floor windows?

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with consideration of Staff findings in Part II.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

Mr. Patrick Shay introduced T.J Hollis who represented Jonathan Hart, and the developer Cord Wilson to make the presentation. Mr. Shay stated that the garage entrances would be 12 feet wide. He stated that one of the drawings was hand drawn and that he had done more exhibits that are more to scale. He stated that one of the things that he did was to move the building

over ten feet from the existing building. He stated that the drawing does not show that there is a gate so that people couldn't pass between the buildings. He stated that he restudied the materials for fenestration for the corner element and that he felt that it would be more unified with predominant materials (brick); the fenestration pattern that was used is repeated in the center section so there are subtle differences between the two. The consideration for bringing the plane forward in the massing is something that he would like to study. He stated that he was at the point where they were inserting kitchens and bathrooms and doing the actual room layout for the interior condominiums. He stated that it looked like they were cramped for space and would like to study bringing it forward. He stated that he would like to come back with detailed designs that raise the head of the windows eliminating the gap between the floors. He stated that the reason that the floors aligned was that it became necessary for the upper floors to be at the same level because there are flats in the back. He stated that there are two-story townhouse type units that are accessible from the front doors. He stated that on the lane side there are flats and he needed them to be at the same level wherever possible so that the public did not have to go up and down the stairs after getting in and out of the elevator. He stated that he was trying to make all of the units ADA accessible, and that they kept the height at four stories on the facade that faces Houston Street. He stated that it is one block and one street away from the old City jail, which is also on the same street, and it is taller than what is proposed. He stated that this was a way to have roof gardens or private decks facing the northern side. He stated that the revised drawings for the lane side reflect that. The mass on the lane side is recessed by some distance.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** recused himself.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he would like the corner tower changed to brick to unify it. He stated that the corner tower should have doors. He stated that on the elevation the capstone section adjacent to the courtyard shows doors on the plan, and asked whether they would be reflected in the elevation

**Mr. Shay** stated that there should be doors on the elevation. He stated that what they wanted to do was to create as many openings as possible and it showed a window instead of a door

**Mr. Steffen** complimented them for making substantial changes and that they addressed several concerns, particularly the large courtyard on the front of the elevation.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ken Barthouse (535 East Perry Street)** stated that he lived directly behind the proposed development, and said that he read in the Chadbourne Guidelines, "That new construction should be visually compatible with existing historic structures to which they are visually related to in terms of Height and Mass." He argues that this property isn't. He showed a picture of the corner of Perry and Houston, which is one-half block from the proposed development and two-story historic townhouses. He showed a picture of new development on Perry Street directly behind the proposed building; which was built to mesh with the neighborhood, and he pointed out that the height from the top of the parapet of the deck to the ground is 26 feet 8 inches. He showed a historic house near Crawford's Square that is two-stories. He showed a picture of a typical townhouse on Liberty Street that is one-half block from the proposed development that is two-stories (approximately 20 feet tall). He showed a picture of a one-story and a two-story home one block away from the proposed development. He showed a picture of historic townhouses on Perry Lane that are 22 feet high and are 147 feet from the proposed development. He showed a picture of a house next to the proposed development that the tallest

structure on the north side of Liberty Street between East Broad and Habersham, which he stated would be dwarfed by the proposed development. He showed a picture of the corner of Liberty and East Broad that is 40 feet from the development with another two-story historic building. He stated that he had heard in previous discussions that the lane is extraordinarily wide for this part of the Historic District; so he measured the lane between the utility pole and the electric utility box and it measured 22 feet and 3 inches. He stated that the pictures are misleading in Mr. Shay's pictures that make the buildings on Perry look larger than they really are.

**Mrs. Carmen Redmond (537 East Perry Street)** stated that she lived directly in front of the project and one of her garages was in the lane. She stated that she had questions about the drawings, and that Mr. Shay had answered some of the questions. However, she stated that she had some things that were not addressed. She asked if the structures on the top of the roof were going to be accessed to the roof by the elevator and the stairwell going up. She stated that there were no dimensions given. She asked if they were going to do more rooftop gardens, and if not, could they specify. She stated that this building is not appropriate for a small-scale residential ward and that she hopes more changes could be made.

**Mrs. Laura Potts-Wert (543 East Perry Street)** stated that she and her husband finished the rowhouse project at 543 through 547 East Perry. She stated that she had a copy of the guidelines and ordinances and they respected them and felt they are in place to protect the Historic District. She stated that at the last meeting that there were four stories on lane and she walked throughout the ward and didn't find any examples of four stories on the lane. She stated that what would be directly behind the project would be two stories on the lane. She stated that the ordinance states that there should be multiple small openings on the lane. She stated that it is not visually compatible with what is proposed because there are only going to be two 12-foot-wide openings and no multiple small openings. She stated that it is three stories on the lane, and the inset for the rooftop deck is approximately 14 feet. She stated that it still gives the appearance of big mass, even though they have taken it down three feet, they have added the wall on the top and it's only 14 feet deep. She stated that the fourth floor is still there and is massive. She stated that if you walk down Perry Lane, you see two story houses on the lane, and very historic two-story townhouses on the lane. The SCAD building on the lane with a shop in the front on Liberty Street and residential above that is two stories on the lane. She stated that it does not give the appearance of three or four stories. She stated that she just wanted to point out the obvious incompatibilities because one of the strong points of Height and Mass is visual compatibility for what is nearby and for the ward. She stated that it is a very huge structure. One other thing that she stated was that the Beach Institute neighborhood is directly across the street and it must be visually compatible with what is on the other side of Liberty Street. She stated that everyone knows that the Beach Institute is very small in Height and mass. That only two and one-half stories were allowed, and the proposed project is directly across the street. She stated that there is a chance that the land could be redeveloped but it can only go to two stories. She stated that it was a huge massive four-story building in a ward that is already smaller area in Height and Mass and that the building is too massive.

**Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association Board)** stated that the DNA Board concurred with the comments that had been made regarding Height and Mass that this project was totally inappropriate with the neighborhood. He stated that with the existing two- and three-story houses made the project visually incompatible with the neighborhood. He stated that should the project be approved that he would strongly suggest that the Staff's recommendation be followed and that the townhouse buildings be lowered to the height that they were originally so that the project does step down to better meet the project next door.

**Mr. Larry Lee (Downtown Neighborhood Association Board President)** stated that Mr. Stuebe was correct that his Board opposes the massive quality of structure. He stated that it was a massive work that was being imposed on the neighborhood, and they felt that it was obvious that it was not compatible. He stated that compatibility can't mean just the right size, the right texture, or the right color. He stated that what could happen is that huge number of people would be brought to the neighborhood. He stated that the lane behind the building is dirty, dusty, and sandy. There will be a lot of traffic, many more people, and a parking problem. He stated that the building would be there a long time and that everyone needed to get it right.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the Downtown Neighborhood Association was whom Mr. Lee was speaking for and if the members had voted on this.

**Mr. Lee** stated yes, that the Board of Directors allowed Mr. Stuebe and Mr. Lee to speak for the group.

**Ms. Laura Swanner (Perry Lane)** stated that she lived on Perry Lane 140 feet from the proposed building. She stated that the Chadbourne Guidelines state that, "Large-scale development shall comply with the following standards; it shall be designed in a varying height and width such that no walls claim exceed 60 feet in width." She stated that unless she misunderstood what that means, everything is the same height. She stated that the guidelines say that he must vary the height and the width to be broken up at least 60 feet. She stated that he lost any variance of height when he took the three stories back up to four stories on the end. She stated that her house is 20 feet high and the proposed building is 46 feet high. She stated that it was an enormous structure, and they are trying to shove this apartment building and shopping complex into the back yard where there is nothing over three stories.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Savannah Historic Foundation)** stated that he wanted to thank the architect for the amendments that were made to the project. He stated that he would like to ask them to make more amendments and encouraged the Board to direct them to make more changes. He stated that the real problem is the tension between the four-story height, which is the maximum for this site, and the two- and three stories within the neighborhood. He stated that it is tension that is creating a lot of problems, and the obvious solution is to vary the height and to step the building down so that it transitions to the surrounding neighborhood. He stated that the drawings are clear and the model demonstrates. He stated that someone already stated what the guidelines and the ordinance say about the Height and Mass of the building being compatible with the existing buildings in the ward and that these are not.

**Mr. Pierre (507 McDonough)** stated that he was concerned about the environment and that any development in neighborhood should enhance the historical character of the neighborhood. He stated that there were a lot of vacant lots that had a lot of potential for development. He stated that they want it to be attractive for tourists and passersby, and he was concerned regarding the proportion and Mass of the new proposal. He stated that the Chadbourne Guidelines say, "A secondary structure which front Lane should not be no more than two stories." He stated that unless he does not understand, that it means that the Perry Lane side should not be more than two stories. He stated that it is inconsistent with the existing structures, which are close. He stated that he took the liberty to draft a plan that would be consistent with the existing structures. He stated that he suggested the building be scaled-down one-story, and that it would be more of a consistent rhythm with the environment. He stated that a setback was proposed from a two-story height to 24 up to 48 feet, and he stated that it was just a suggestion.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he would answer the questions raised. He stated that the Chadbourne Guidelines are old and that he didn't know if they gave the definition to what a secondary structure means. He stated that traditionally it has been interpreted to mean that a carriage house or a detached structure from the regular structure in the front. He stated that as an attorney that people will argue it a different way, but that the guidelines were done at a time long past and that we have to do our best to try to interpret what they were trying to tell us.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that it was still in the ordinance in the Historic section.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that if they were talking about the ordinance itself then there was a definition for secondary structures and it was as he described as a detached structure like a carriage house or something separate.

**Mr. Tom Wert (543 East Perry Street)** stated that he was against this project because of the Height and Mass consideration. He stated that he lives in the neighborhood by choice because of the environment.

**Ms. Beatrice Archer (231 Houston Street)** stated that she also read the Chadbourne Guidelines that states that, "New construction; existing buildings which are altered shall be visually compatible with existing historic structures to which they are visually .", and that everyone knows that. She stated that Crawford Square on East McDonough Street had a pleasant height. She stated that another house stands alone and is big and massive with no neighbors guiding it somewhere. She states that the guidelines also say that, "The visual compass in the design standards which defines them are setforth herein to aid the designer of today to see the relationships more clearly." She stated that when no one is watching when things happen.

**Mr. Steffen** stated to Ms. Archer that the pictures that she was showing were not doing anything to address the issues that were being discussed today. He stated that pictures of the neighborhood have been seen; that they have walked pass the project site and that they are well aware of the fact that there are other examples in the Historic Districts where other people have made mistakes. He stated that they were trying to get this project right.

**Ms. Archer** stated that the building was too big and that it was too high.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the frontage on Liberty Street was four stories with two and one-half stories in the lane. He stated that it did not extend into the Crawford Ward, and the ordinance states that four stories are permitted in this area. He stated that in regard to the height relation, that the graphic height of the building that faces Crawford Square is 38 to 39 feet high. He stated that what he is proposing as it relates to the edge of Houston Street is about 46 feet high. He stated that the difference is not as great as has been presented. He stated that his building faces onto Houston and Liberty Streets, and does not face onto the Square. He stated that in response to the remarks to step the mass back down to three stories, in the lane there would be an even closer relationship between the existing buildings and a non-historic building that has been referred to as historic. He stated that in the previous submittals, the first submittal, had commercial building heights for the building on the corner. He stated that since it is retail that he would be restrained to have the heights at 15 feet 12 inches. He stated that the building on the corner was always four stories and was never proposed as a three-story building. He stated that what happened was the mass came down to a difference of three feet, and the height of top of building is varied but not varied in terms of the stories. He stated that the same has been done throughout the Historic District and articulated the guidelines, because the setbacks are

relatively transparent being railings instead of building elements. He stated that in reference to the large-scale development standards that it is not a five-story building, and felt that the large-scale development standards were totally relevant. He stated that it has been broken up so that there are no wall planes that are wider than 60 feet as the guidelines state. He stated that he concurred with Mr. Steffen's comments in reference to secondary structures. He stated that the reason for that is that the Chadbourne Guidelines knew that there were going to be structures that were large footprint and primary structures for the entire distance from the street to the lane.

### **DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Steffen** stated about a question concerning the elevator structure on the top.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he intended to have a flat roof deck on the center portion of the roof; which would not be visible from the street. He stated that there is an elevator penthouse that would allow access to the roof, and the stair tower that reaches up to the roof, which is a building code requirement.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if that access was for people who do maintenance on the roof and for people who maintain the elevators.

**Mr. Shay** stated that was correct and that they have to be able to access the roof without going through someone else's apartment to get there.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if he lowered the first floor elevation height.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he lowered it with the concurrence of the Board, and they thought it was a good idea to 12, 10, 10, and 10 so the floor-to-floor height is just a little bit taller recognizing that the area is additional floor height set aside for potential retail development.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if the floor had been lowered as much as it can.

**Mr. Shay** stated that if it was squeezed more it would be out of character with the residential development.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that her concern was when the Height and Mass was developed and the ordinance was passed, and that it does say that, "Maximum height on the height map shall be permitted provided..." She stated that the provisos' are on the following pages and not on the previous pages. She stated that Mr. Shay has been very considerate and that if you look at the commercial building sections, he was committed to those original heights and they have been reduced. She stated that under the commercial building provision, that those are minimum and he should have a minimum 14 feet 6 inches first floor and reduced it to the residential standpoint. She stated that sometimes we have to make unpopular decisions, but our charge is to interpret the ordinance and to apply the ordinance. She stated that the ordinance is real clear. She stated as to the secondary structure those also apply to carriage houses.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they did change the height ordinance to allow for set development height within neighborhoods. He stated that it did not mean that the mass of the building could not be stepped down to the neighborhood to be visually compatible. He wanted the Board to

understand that this building was still not visually compatible, that it did not address the neighborhood, and that the whole site did not have to be four stories except for a 14-foot section in the back.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he wanted to address the issue to the Board before discussing what they would do. He stated that the Chadbourne Guidelines are old guidelines that were developed in Savannah for the development of the Historic District, and since that time, the City has codified a lot of it, have passed ordinances, have tried to interpret and refine the guidelines. He stated that the issue that Ms. Fortson-Waring was referring to were specific guidelines that were passed concerning heights in particular neighborhoods in the Historic District. He stated that there was an argument to be made as to how those guidelines relate exactly to the Height and Mass and Visual Compatibility guidelines. He stated that he didn't feel that anyone in the discussion was necessarily wrong, and that there was a tension between those things. He stated that it was their charge to try and interpret what the guidelines mean, that their charge was to apply the compatibility guidelines, to apply Height and Mass, and to apply visual compatibility guidelines, and their charge was to follow the City Ordinance at the same time. He stated that there was a tension between those, and respectfully, there were Board members who might disagree as to how they were interpreted.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that Mr. Steffen was getting the guidelines confused with the ordinance. She stated that the Board had an ordinance to follow, but then the guidelines gave the Board some leeway. She stated that Mr. Steffen told the public that they were guidelines, which is incorrect. She stated that it was an ordinance and that there was a difference between the Ordinance and the Guidelines

**Mr. Steffen** agreed that there was a difference between the guidelines and the ordinance.

**Mr. Neely** stated he would like to see the project be predominately a three-story building with perhaps some four-story elements closer to the corner.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the ordinance uses the word shall, and that shall does not carry the same force as will.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that in legal vernacular that the word shall is the highest. He stated that the question that they are wrestling with is when the City says shall comply with these height guidelines, how does that relate to the Visual Compatibility Guidelines that the Board must also follow. He stated that there are two separate sets of regulations that they have to follow at the same time. He stated that sometimes it can be argued that they are inconsistent with one another.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that when they were developing the height map, it was clearly understood at that time that four stories would be the maximum that it didn't have to necessarily be four stories, that it could be less than four stories. He stated that Visual Compatibility factors were in effect.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that the property owners only agreed to not protest the Height and Mass if they could build up to the maximum and that is why the "shall" was put in there to appease the property owners whose property height was being reduced.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it was predominately developers of big sites left in the Historic District not individual homeowners.



**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that is why it was put in, right or wrong, that was the intent because the residents were not going to go along with it unless they were given the assurance, in the “shall”, that they would be allowed to build to the maximum. She stated that the City and the City’s lawyers put it in the ordinance and not in the guidelines. She stated that the guidelines are up to the Board’s interpretation, and that the ordinance sets forth what the Board should and should not do.

**Mr. Neely** stated that he personally would deny the project for approval and recommend a continuance again. He stated that he would hope that the petitioner would take the comments of both the public and the Board more to heart.

**Mr. Neely** asked the petitioner if he wanted a continuance.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he did not want a continuance.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the petition for Height and Mass based on it being incompatible with the Visual Compatibility Factors. Mr. Deering seconded the motion. Voting against the motion were Mr. Hutchinson, Dr. Caplan, Ms. Fortson-Waring, and Mr. Steffen. The motion Failed 3 to 4. Mr. Mitchell abstained.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Fortson Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition for Height and Mass with the understanding that the petitioner will restudy for Part II submittal bringing forward the recessed section, raising the heads of the parlor floor windows, fenestration, and brick. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and Mr. Mitchell abstained. The motion passed with the Chairman casting a tie breaking vote in favor of the motion.

**RE: Amended Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose Gonzalez  
H-06-3550-2  
304 East Bryan Street  
New Construction - Part I Height / Mass**

Present for the petition was Jose Gonzalez

Ms. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval of a proposed four-story extended stay hotel on the lots between 304 East Bryan Street and 324 East Bryan Street.

**FINDINGS:**

The site is zoned Residential-Business-Commercial (R-B-C) and adjoins a Residential-Institutional-Professional-Amended (R-I-P-A) zone in Warren Ward. An existing one-story historic building at the corner of Bryan and Lincoln Streets is also to be renovated.

The development has a footprint of over 11,000 square feet and, therefore, meets the definition of large-scale development. The footprint of the two buildings is 170 x 90 feet. The Chadbourne guidelines state, "Today's office buildings, hotels, retail centers and apartment houses seek larger footprints. The consequence is that assemblage, not subdivision, is the rule and a spate of buildings has been built that ignores the 60-foot module and are changing the scale of the city. At issue is not whether assemblage is allowed, but whether buildings can be made that are good neighbors. The guidelines seek to restore traditional massing to large scale developments."

Staff met with the applicant on-site prior to the first submittal and urged that the design provide pedestrian access to Bryan Street and respect the residential character of Warren Ward. The following standards apply: "The construction of a new structure in the Historic District, visible from a public street or lane shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, structure, material, texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with...nearby structures designated as historic." Almost all of the nearby historic structures are wooden residences.

While some of the changes from the previous submission have helped to bring the massing of the building into better proportion with the neighborhood, compatibility has not yet been achieved. It still reads as an overwhelming mass. The rhythm and spacing of the windows in the Eastern brick portion facing Bryan Street is still out-of-scale, and there are too many sizes File Number H 06-3550-2 and types of openings. The square windows do not meet the Historic District Design Standards. A four-bay rhythm on this section would be more appropriate. The tops of the doors to the balcony should be at the level of the tops of the windows.

Parking is proposed for the ground floor level spanning the majority of the building. Staff believes that this parking proposal creates a "dead" zone at street level since there will be almost no coming and going from Bryan Street into the garage. The applicant compared this level to the raised basement level of the private townhouses nearby, but townhouses are separated by gardens and gates etc., at an entirely different scale. In addition, the square openings and rusticated base are not compatible with the neighborhood.

Staff suggests that the applicant consider reversing the midsection of the building. Currently, the pool deck is facing the lane with rooms overlooking the pool. If this were reversed so that the pool deck opened to the front (Bryan Street side) rather than the lane with balconied rooms overlooking it several things would be achieved. There would be animation on the Bryan Street side. The apparent mass of the building would be greatly reduced and a court appearance (although raised one-story) would be achieved. The raised stoop on a 60-foot-wide brick building would be deleted.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**The Preservation Officer recommends a continuance for further massing study.**

#### **PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Jose Gonzalez** stated that the windows, the treatment of the base, etc., could be dealt with in the second phase of the project. He stated that he was most concerned with the discussion he had in the last meeting in settling the issue of massing. He stated that regarding Ms. Reiter's proposal to reverse the project, he had wanted to do that except that after talking with Hunter McLean there was no intent to ever get rid of the parking lot. He stated that he showed

photographs at the last meeting and it is not a particularly good view. He stated that as a result of that, the courtyard faces inward so that all of the rooms face the courtyard. He stated that this project is also related to the hotel project on Bay Street. He stated that as a result that those rooms on the lane will have a view of pool area. He stated that they are more concerned in dealing with the issue of mass. He stated that they pulled back the center section because there is a significant Oak tree there. He stated that they spoke to the neighbors who expressed a concern that the current structure on the property line has vines growing along the entire wall. He stated that their concern was to save the wall and leave the vines. He stated that if there was any way to save the wall that it would be reinforced and the wall would remain. He stated that if they didn't, they could only assure that they would build back a legal wall, at whatever height the Board would deem appropriate, so that the vines could grow again and maintain what the neighbors currently enjoy as the end of their garden.

### **DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he goes along with Staff's objection to the stairs on the Bryan Street elevation where they are trying to make a 60-foot-wide building look like the Davenport house or the Owens-Thomas house with the stairs going up on the outside, when in fact, the two buildings are sitting on top of a garage. He stated that the height doesn't bother him as much as the massing does. He stated that the buildings nearby have 20- to 30-foot rhythms, and it puts the buildings out-of-scale to have the outside stairwell going up eight to nine feet. He stated that he finds that the massing is not compatible.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that as he pointed out the last time in regard to the stoop access, that most of the homes along the street have very similar stairwells, and that the only difference is that it is asymmetrical because of the large face, and the others are single stair. He stated that in terms of the height, scale that they are almost identical to what occurs for the next two blocks, and that it is not at all unusual in terms of the scale and rhythm that has been created along that entire street. He stated that he lives a block and one-half further up and this is something that he walks through all of the time, so it is not something that he felt was in any way unusual or peculiar. He stated that in terms of the rhythm of 60 feet, that the lots in Savannah are 60 feet, it has defined a rhythm with permutations off the 60 feet throughout the entire city. He stated that you will see variations, you'll see full 60's, you'll see two 30's, you'll see 20's and variations all off the module, and that they have not in any way varied from that. He asked the Board to bear in mind that this is one structure.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that as one structure that there is too much going on in with the stairs and setbacks, that the massing is out-of-scale with a typical Savannah block.

**Mr. Deering** stated that Mr. Meyerhoff is on the right path when he stated that the vertical expressions are not working, and that Mr. Gonzalez was correct in stating that the 60-foot lot module can be subdivided down. He stated that sometimes there will be a 27-foot wide townhouse or a 24-foot wide townhouse with the little alley ways. He stated with that in mind, that working from the east looking at the Bryan Street elevation, what he has expressed is a 40-foot-wide townhouse element, which is an anomaly in Savannah. He stated that a single side hall townhouse is what it's beginning to look like, but it is too wide and it doesn't suit the development pattern. Then there is a narrow, but not narrow enough alley way, a 60-foot wide element in the center, which Staff said is too wide. He stated that he disagreed with Staff concerning the high stoop and that he agreed with the petitioner, but that it should read as two separate townhouses, because there are pairs of 30-foot-wide, four-story townhouses. He stated that concerning visual compatibility on the Lincoln Street elevation, the one story building

that is there is odd, but right behind it on the lane is four-story building and that it really reads bad. He stated that it looks like the building on the corner was left there and asked if there was any way to step the buildings down on Lincoln Street to work better with the historic element of the Staybridge Suites just beyond the lane to the north. He stated that the massing is not there.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that in regard to the stucco issue that it is not the issue, but it is really how the building is expressed and they can deal with that. He stated that in regard to the lots to the right, that there is a 10-foot setback on the property line, and they can go to two 30-foot townhouse treatments along the 60-foot, but that they would be encroaching on the setback. He stated that the neighbors wouldn't mind because they prefer to have a wall. He stated that it if it is an agreeable item. He would need a variance for that, but from a design point if it is felt that it would be a better solution.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he wasn't suggesting that what is expressed as a 40-foot-wide townhouse go back to another double townhouse. He stated that what he was suggesting that they narrowing the element.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that they could certainly narrow it and make one part wider so that it reads clearly.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it would actually start reading as true-house proportions because that is what this neighborhood is predominately made of until you get to the commercial buildings that were built in the 50's and 60's in the next block.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated to take the center 60-foot element, have it with two entrances, and make it look like two units. He stated that it makes a strong identification of two 30-foot units.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that the tree actually splits it and asked if they had any objections to the entrances flanking the tree.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he could put the stoops at the opposite ends and have the stair go down the middle, which is a common feature.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that it would follow the rhythm of the eastern building by doing that.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that everything that was requested is certainly doable. He stated that the last issue concerning the Lincoln Street side with regard to the old historic warehouse, that he will bring back something that addresses more that ties the scale of the original 1850's warehouse better to Lincoln Street so that it transitions better along the elevation.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that staff said that the design should respect the residential character of the ward, and when large-scale hotel-like structures like this are in an area where all of the historic houses are wooden , that is not going to be achieved in the first place because it is a tough act. He stated that is probably why they are having a hard time trying to reach compatibility with the project, and that the massing is overwhelming.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that the comments, when addressed, will significantly make the massing of each building as you move along Bryan Street, be more residential in character.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if Mr. Gonzalez would accept a continuance.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that he would accept a continuance and that he would request a continuance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that before the Board votes that he didn't know if Mr. Gonzalez has had a project since their last retreat, that one of the things that they agreed upon as a Board was that Height and Mass is the shrink-wrapping of the project. He stated that Mr. Gonzalez made reference to some things that could come later in the design elements, and that anything that involves in terms of shrink-wrapping the project, that the Board wants to deal with it in Height and Mass.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that he agreed with the comments that he heard from the Board, and to remind them that Warren Square does contain some of the earliest buildings in the City, primarily wooden structures, most of which are freestanding, are intricately detailed which is a very important part of those buildings. He stated that the proposal is one structure and that was its problem. He stated that it could be a building unsuited for the ward, but the designer needs to try to do his best to break it up so that it doesn't look like one massive building masquerading behind the false fronts.

**Mr. Joe Saseen** stated that the block has been vacant for quite some time, the developer wants to put a hotel there, that nothing is going there except something commercial, and that no one is going to build a home on that block. He stated that nobody is going to build a home facing the parking garage and that it will be commercial, and there is someone who is wanting to put up a commercial building, a hotel and not to run him away.

**Mr. Larry Lee (Downtown Neighborhood Association)** stated that they were concerned about the number of large buildings coming into the district and that no one is building little individual buildings that had such charm and character. He asked that the Board be concerned about this as the footprint of the Historic District does change, and that they see more of the mega buildings that are not called for or covered in the rules and regulations yet. He stated that they are concerned and hopes that the Board is concerned as well.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the item until May 10, 2006. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

\*(Mr. Ned Gay left at approximately 4:25 p.m.)

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
Amy Moxley  
H-06-3559-2  
18 East Macon  
Alteration**

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff report.

**Mr. Deering recused himself from the Petition of Poticny Deering Felder, HDBR 06-3559-2.**

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for selected demolition of an existing non-historic entry stoop and reconstruction of the stoop to be more in keeping with the original design of the residence. The requested alterations consist of the following:

- 1) removal of the existing brick stoop;
- 2) reconstruction of the stoop within the same approximate footprint and same sidewalk encroachment, extending 5 feet – 4 inches from the face of the building. Stairs and base will be made of brick to match the existing residence and pier height and height of stoop will correspond to the neighboring properties which are part of this same brick rowhouse;
- 3) proposed stoop to be 7 feet – 9 inches tall topped by a 3-foot tall metal handrail and 1-inch square pickets with cast iron decorative elements;
- 4) The rectangular opening within the base wall will be capped with a cast concrete lintel to be consistent with adjacent structures.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic residence at 18 East Macon Street is part of a brick rowhouse, constructed from 1855 to 1856, and is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. The property is zoned RIP-A, Residential, Medium-Density, and is currently a private residence.

The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
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.	The stoop base walls and piers will be constructed of concrete and surfaced in brick to match the existing historic residence. The base wall is recessed 1” between foundation piers.  The proposed stoop is 6’-6” wide at the entrance. It appears to be offset from the centerline of the entrance.	The standard is met.  Staff recommends aligning the stoop with the center of the main entrance if this is consistent with neighboring structures within the row.
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, pre-cast stone, marble, sandstone or slate.	Proposed stairs are surfaced in brick to match the existing residence.	The standard is met.
Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed 4”. For one and two family dwellings the height of the railing shall not exceed 36”.	A 3’ metal balustrade is proposed with 1” square metal pickets spaced 4” apart.	The standard is met.
Stoop heights shall be visually comparable to other historic	The proposed stoop is 7’-9” tall topped by a 3’ tall metal	The standard is met.

<p>stoops to which they are visually related and shall not exceed 9'-6".</p>	<p>handrail, which is comparable to adjacent brick structures within the row.</p>	
<p>Openings: The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically.</p>	<p>The existing entrance door and the proposed opening in the base of the stoop are slightly off center.</p> <p>A cast concrete lintel will be located at the top of the proposed opening in the base wall. It will be screened with a metal gate.</p>	<p>Staff recommends aligning these openings vertically if this is consistent with the adjacent structures in the rowhouse.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions of verification of location of neighboring stoops with respect to the centerline of the main entrance.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

Mr. Deering stated that there are three other stoops on the block exactly like the one that they are proposing. He stated that this particular owner’s house was not altered in the same way because it was not able to be purchased by the same developer in the early 70’s. He stated that this owner wants to bring it into compliance because it is a very uniform row. He stated that none of the openings align with the doors above at present on the other three units, and they have simply copied the other stoops.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Mr. Stuebe (Landmark Historic District) stated that he applauds the property owner for taking on the project and the kind of care that’s going into this project, and that he hopes other architects, developers, and property owners in the Historic District would begin to emulate this project.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of David Gardner  
H-06-3560-2  
625 Tattnall  
Fence

Present for the petition was David Gardner.

Ms. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to erect a 7-foot – 6-inch high wood fence in the side yard of 625 Tattnall Street. The fence will be constructed of 1 by 6 boards with a 2 by 6 cap.

**FINDINGS:**

The main house is not historic. It was built as an infill house. It is stucco over wood frame.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Fences shall not extend beyond the façade of the front elevation.	The fence does not extend in front of the house.	This standard has been met.
Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; provided, however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.	The proposed fence is a wood board fence with cap detail. The petitioner wishes a solid fence for privacy. It is to be built on city property under an encroachment agreement and there will be room for planting on the outside next to the sidewalk. There is currently a wood fence in the rear yard.	The question is whether the use of a wood Board fence in conjunction with stucco over wood frame construction for the main house is within the intent of the ordinance. There are wood houses and wood fences in this neighborhood.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. David Gardner** stated that the two reasons for wanting a wood fence is that because of the encroachment on City property. He stated that one of the stipulations was that if the City ever came told him to take the fence down, if he had an eight-foot-high concrete block wall that it becomes much more difficult to remove it than if it were a wood fence. He stated that in this neighborhood virtually every masonry building has a wood fence. He stated that the existing row that he is in has a wood fence now that extends behind the building, that there are two brick double homes next to him with wood fences in the back of the building, and also on Jefferson Street. He stated that they don’t back up to a lane but that they back up to Jefferson Street.

**Mr. Deering** asked if Mr. Gardner could explain the encroachment in the sidewalk.

**Mr. Gardner** stated that when he bought the property that the sidewalk on the side of the building was 14 feet wide and that it was all torn up. He stated that he had talked to the City and they came and tore up the old sidewalk and reconstructed a five-foot sidewalk that was compatible with other sides of the block. He stated that his lot comes out 14 feet and that it is actually 20 feet to the sidewalk so he requested permission to fence all the way to the sidewalk with a foot or more for planting near the edge of the fence.



**Mr. Mitchell** stated that on the issue of whether the building is actually wood or concrete and for the fence to match, maybe a compromise of a wood fence with fig vine.

**Mr. Gardner** stated that possibly doing an actual wood fence with stucco over it would be one option as well. He stated that there will definitely be plantings around the fence; fig vine or something to soften the fence.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if Mr. Gardner would meet them part of the way by having a masonry base for one- or two feet to keep the wood from touching the ground and rotting quicker, and stuccoing it there.

**Mr. Gardner** stated the only issue with that would be that on the City right-of-way that it is a much more permanent structure, and if the City were to come and tell him to take it down, it becomes a problem.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Justin Godchaux  
H-06-3564-2  
9 West York Street  
Addition**

Present for the petition was Justin Godchaux.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to construct a one-story 200-square-foot rooftop addition to the building at 21 West York Street. The applicant owns the condominium units 3.7 and 3.8 at 9 West York Street and claims to possess the property rights to construct an addition atop the adjacent structure.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building at 17-21 West York Street was constructed in 1890 and is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. The property is zoned B-C-1, Central-Business, and consists of mixed-use residential and commercial spaces. The proposed third-story addition will be setback approximately 36-feet from the face of the building and will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Height: Additions to existing structures shall be within the height limits as shown on the historic district height map.	A third-story addition is proposed within a four-story height limit zone.	The standard is met.
Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure of the most	The addition is setback 36’ from York Street and 20’ from	Staff recommends approval. The addition will be minimally

<p>inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly as appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.</p>	<p>Whitaker Street. It is approximately 13' above the roof and 10' above the parapet of the floor below and will be minimally visible from the west side of Whitaker Street. Its design is taken from the existing historic building, consisting of brick exterior walls to match the existing building and two-over-two windows with a modified metal cornice to match the neighboring building.</p>	<p>visible from the public right-of-way and although it is similar in design to the adjacent structure, it is clearly an appendage due to its placement within the building.</p>
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
<p>Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including, but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, brackets. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building. Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.</p>	<p>The addition is sited below the neighboring cornice along York Street. The building to the rear is not a rated structure within the historic district. The room is 19' wide by 12' deep and is subordinate to the rest of the building.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Windows: Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on new construction, provided that the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8", the profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing, the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails, and extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. Windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>Rectangular window openings maintain a brick arch header similar to the existing adjacent structure. Two-over-two Marvin Wood Ultimate, double-hung sash windows are proposed and will be painted to match the existing neighboring building.</p> <p>The entry door is to be Marvin Wood Ultimate French door with single-light and transom above. The frame is to match the existing window frames.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The Marvin Ultimate windows have been previously approved in the historic district for new construction and additions. Although the window casings are more decorative than on typical additions, this addition will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way and setback a good distance from the neighboring structure.</p>
<p>Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3" from the façade of a masonry building.</p>	<p>The section plan indicates that the sashes will be inset within the window frame.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions that the applicant maintain the legal right to construct an addition atop of the adjacent structure.**

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board doesn't have the authority to deal with those types of issues whether their building permit is legal ownership, and no one should ever assume from the purpose of getting an approval for a historic renovation. He stated that we are making a

judgment as to whether you own the property, have the right to build on the property, or whether the building permits are proper. He stated that it would be well- warned to check with other agencies if there are any questions.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Justin Godchaux** stated that he planned a part of a condominium project that will be done in the space in the rear, and there is a sunroom that can be used year-round that is 200 square feet. He stated that it would be tucked back and it would be as unobtrusive as he could possible make it.

**Mr. Deering** stated that the Department of Interior's Standards for historic preservation in regard to rooftop additions encourage people that want to add to their building to make it different from the original structure. He stated that Mr. Godchaux stated that the corners would be exactly the same, the windows be the same, the brick detail in the lintel above be the same, and he suggested in following the guidelines that he simplify it. He stated that it should just be brick and that he doesn't have to have a cornice because it is so far back that it won't be seen from the pedestrian right-of-way.

**Mr. Godchaux** stated that this was the first of three hurdles. He stated that the second hurdle was going to be with the State Preservation and the tax people.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they would probably encourage him do the same thing because they have to follow the guidelines.

**Mr. Godchaux** stated that on the exterior that he is totally flexible and willing to work with Staff, with that staff, and with the building people to do it so that he can get it going.

**Mr. Neely** asked if there was any comment on the legality of building over the top of another building.

**Mr. Godchaux** stated that the building is part of the same project of the Wright Square Café project, and that he has permission of the owner in his sales contract to do a roof garden by trying to make into a more useable space.

**HDBR ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with amendments that the metal cornice, the brick window lentils, and the windows not mimic the historic structure; and that they come back to Staff. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Petition of Barnard Architects  
John Clegg  
H-06-3565-2  
301 East Harris Street  
Stoop**

Present for the petition was John Clegg.

Ms. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. Shift existing garage opening southward 12 inches. Replace existing iron door with sectional metal door sheathed with treated wood trim and beadboard to simulate a pair of swinging doors. Paint Devoe Lodge Green 2C19-6.
2. On north elevation, remove existing non-historic metal awning and replace parlor floor window with a four raised panel wood door and transom, painted Devoe Lodge Green. Add new wood steps and covered stoop per drawings. Skip-brick infill is proposed under the stairs. Paint porch trim Devoe Crockery White 1W19-1.
3. The rear first floor door and gate alterations are behind the garden fence.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The Historic District ordinance standards prohibit brick lattice on high stoops. This detail should be eliminated.
2. The petitioner may want to work with staff to slightly refine the proportion and detailing of the stoop canopy to better reflect the proportions and details of the Tuscan order.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions of the deletion of the brick lattice and reconsideration of some of the details of the stoop canopy.**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the petitioner had indicated on the Lincoln Street elevation what the entry to the yard next to the garage door is.

**Mrs. Reiter** stated that it was an existing gate and asked the petitioner if he was changing it.

**Mr. Clegg** stated that he was not, but that it was an existing metal gate that will remain.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. John Clegg** stated that he would be willing to work with staff on the details. He stated that Ms. Reiter mentioned that he did send a revised detail of the cornice, and other details. He stated that the brick lattice would be eliminated and asked if there was another material to be used for the solid brick wall under the stair.

**Mr. Deering** stated that the Board has, in the past, approved the heavy-gauge wood lattice, but that was all. He stated that when doing a wooden stoop that it is appropriate to do something that is a lighter material than brick.

**Mr. Clegg** asked if that would be something that the Board would allow him to work out with Staff that he would appreciate it.

**Mr. Deering** stated that there was one approval on west Harris Street where there were solid wood boards.

Mr. Clegg stated that he was flexible on that.

Mr. Mitchell stated that it was not a large-scale project, but that the sample of materials leave a bit to be desired.

Mr. Clegg asked if it was the colors.

Mr. Clegg apologized and stated that the color copiers do not pick-up the colors, but that he did bring along actual samples. He stated that the off-white is very white and that the dark green is very dark.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the deletion of the brick work under the stair and any new material to be approved by Staff. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects  
Patrick Shay  
H-06-3566-2  
14 - 22 West Liberty  
New Construction - Part I Height / Mass**

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

**Mr. Meyerhoff recused**

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval of a five-story mixed-use (hotel, condo, retail) building on the northeast corner of Whitaker and Liberty Streets.

**FINDINGS:**

The development falls within the definition of tall building and large-scale development. The following Standards apply:

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setbacks except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.	It is proposed to build to the 0 lot line on all four sides.	The standard has been met. There is a 75% maximum lot coverage requirement for this lot. A variance from the Board of Appeals is required.
Dwelling unit type		The standards do not address specifically a mixed use building such as a hotel-condo-retail building.
Street Elevation type: A proposed building located on an East-West through street shall	It is proposed to build a building with ground level retail and lobby entrance.	This is a compatible commercial street elevation type.

<p>utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward. Where the aforementioned condition cannot be met, the proposed building shall meet the Visual Compatibility Factors.</p>		
<p>Tall Building and Large Scale Development: The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections of no more than 60 feet in width</p>	<p>The building is divided into sections less than 60 feet with contrasting materials. The building is broken into segments vertically, however the perceived bays vary in width.</p>	<p>The bay spacing appears to be driven by the size of a hotel room, which is less than the 15 foot minimum width. The fenestration does not correspond to the uses within the building. For instance,</p>
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
<p>with each section taller than it is wide.  Buildings greater than four stories in height shall use window groupings, columns or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width.  Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang.</p>	<p>The roof is flat behind various parapets (open and solid) punctuated with bracketed hip roofs.</p>	<p>more glass on the ground floor for the retail which would also differentiate the “base”, windows on floors 2-4 to reflect the hotel use (“shaft”) and then a different window treatment on the fifth floor for the condos (perhaps more glass) to suggest a “cap”.  As presented, there are four different bay treatments on the Liberty Street side and four on the Whitaker Street side. There are also four different parapet treatments proposed on the Liberty Street side and three on the Whitaker Street side. Staff suggests that the applicant explore using fewer changes of materials to divide the building vertically, and use the fenestration more to divide it horizontally, perhaps emphasizing the lobby entrance on Liberty Street. The applied bracketed hip roofs on the cornice are visually different from the main style of the building. If deleted, and replaced with a more consistent cornice, the building could be lowered in height somewhat (see height below)</p>
<p>Height: The site is located within a five story zone.</p>	<p>The building is five stories. Each story exceeds the minimum floor to floor height for a total height of 70'-8" to the top of the applied bracketed elements on the cornice.</p>	<p>The large footprint buildings nearby are approximately 62' for First Baptist, 68' for First Baptist Annex, 52' for the parking garage across the street. Staff recommends that the applicant</p>

		explore reducing the overall height of the proposed structure by reconsidering the first floor height and cornice height.
Porch projections/balconies	There are recessed and projecting balconies on the Liberty Street side and recessed on the Whitaker Street side.	The recessed balconies are reflective of the treatment on the DeRenne Apartments two blocks away.

While there are examples of 100 percent lot coverage historically in this area, the scale of the buildings were smaller (less width and height). Staff recommends that the applicant give consideration to the comments above to help give consistency and balance to the proposed structure. The structure backs up to historic single-family residences. The site plans does not indicate how the trash will be handled. Staff recommends that it be handled internally rather than have compactors and dumpsters in a residential lane. In addition, the location of piping, utility meters etc. is of concern.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**The Preservation Officer recommends approval of five stories; with reconsideration given to Staff comments.**

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that it is 14 feet 6 inches for the first floor and 12 feet, and then 10 feet as minimums. She asked how the heights exceed.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that those are minimums but this exceeds the minimum. If it did not exceed the minimum it could be brought down into a range of some of the other larger buildings within the neighborhood.

**Mr. Deering** stated that there was five or six feet that could be taken out of the building height by going with the minimums.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Shay** stated that he was representing Eddie DeLoach, his partner in the development, and Tim Womsley from Hunter McLean who was standing in for their attorney Harold Yellin. He stated that they received the Staff comments, that they are receptive, and that the points are well made. He stated that because they didn’t have a lot of time to study them they didn’t have the opportunity to completely react, that they have tried some modifications, and that he was not completely happy with them. He stated that for starters they looked at a much simplified cornice and one that didn’t poke up so high above the parapet. He stated that they were also receptive to the idea of having more glass although he was not satisfied that this was the answer. He stated the idea of a different window treatment on the fifth floor is something that he is not convinced that it will work. He stated in regard to reducing the overall height he is receptive to that and stated that they have 15 and 12 which are only 6 inches above the minimum, and then 12, 12, and 12. He stated that the place that they would like to hang onto in the story height is on the top level and that it is going to be spectacular condominiums with great views. He stated that in the middle they could look at reducing it to as little as ten feet, although, he didn’t know if the Board was comfortable with reducing one story a minimum of 12 and whether or not it could

be reduced to 11, 11, 11 or 10, 10, 12 in order to pull another three feet off the building. He stated that concerning the trash and the meters that they are not that far down the road in their studies and that the trash will be handled internally to the building, and the meters will be located on the lane.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Deering** asked if there was any way to reduce the lot coverage.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it probably could not be done and retain the financial feasibility of the project, but at this point they are looking at paying close to \$150 a square-foot for the land itself and they need the floor area ratio. He stated that when they give up lot coverage they give it up five stories high. He stated that he wants to hang onto it to do the outside of the building in masonry and cast stone or even stone, and if they had to give up much then it will cheapen the exterior considerably.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they hoped to make the entrance lobby appropriate for pictures and memorabilia about the synagogue constructed on the site in 1820.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it would be nice to see it in the design somewhere and to see it commemorated.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Bonnie Retsis (12 West Liberty Street)** thanked Mr. Shay for dropping off the plans and that she thinks that the plans are gorgeous and that the property is going to be a wonderful addition to Downtown. However, she does have concerns about the lot coverage and the closeness of the construction to her building. She stated that from the plan it looked like there was a two-foot-side yard setback, and that no one can fit in between the buildings. She stated that the area has become filled with debris, it's hazardous, that it's impossible to keep clean, that it is a fire hazard, and that her building has historical value. She stated that the entire length of the building would be lost; all of the windows, the sun, and she would have no place for the dumpster once the building is erected.

**Mr. Gaylord Hansen (Perry Lane and Perry Street)** stated that he wished Mr. Meyerhoff had called him and spoken to him about this project earlier. He thanked the Staff regarding taking up some of the concerns regarding meters and garbage pick-up. He stated that he is not an opponent of the construction. He stated that one of the things that he would like to point out is there is across the street another pending project, and that he does not know how it will impact what is now being called the Liberty Street corridor or commercial corridor. He stated that it will reduce historic properties to a buffer, and that it is massive. The lane is approximately 21 feet, that it is brick over dirt, that there is a turn of the century major storm water sewer built in the 1870's that is a five-foot brick circular handmade structure. He stated that it is a major storm water sewer for the City, that it has collapsed once, and that the sewers were relocated because they used to be connected to the storm water sewer and it created backup problems. He stated that it was the most expensive sewer relocation in the City in approximately 2000 – 2001. He stated that if it is impacted or if it collapses that its replacement, repair, and the rerouting expenses would be monumental in expense. He stated that it would be impacted by construction and that it should be taken into consideration. He stated that the brick lanes are a historic element that is supposed to be protected or that some consideration is to be taken for them. There is a four-story house that was originally located nearby and will give the scale of



what the neighborhood looked like years ago. He stated that there are some other structures along Chippewa Square that are tall structures, but there are some intermediate height structures that are split up. He stated that the development over the business in the area has been remarkable with coffee houses, law offices, churches, bars. That everybody is accommodated in that area and everything has stayed within scale. He felt that it is possible to maintain that type of environment and hated to see two mega-structures opposing each other, then the three and one-half or four-story structures become a buffer zone in the way they use trees in Hilton Head. He asked that the consideration for the project be withheld pending the project across the street.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he cannot do that. That he has no idea whether anything else is coming and that it wouldn't matter if they did.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that the other departments within the City would handle it and that is where Mr. Hansen should pursue it.

**Mr. Neely** asked what is the height map in the area.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it is five along Liberty Street.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Savannah Historic Foundation)** stated that the project is out-of-scale with the surrounding neighborhood and would like to ask the Board about its policy concerning applications where the petition exceeds the lot coverage maximums. He asked if it was a maximum of 75 percent as stated in the Staff report, and it is a 100 percent lot coverage application. He stated that as a legal matter that the Board does not have the authority to grant approval that doesn't meet legal requirements, and that it exceeds what is allowed under the City's Zoning Ordinance.

**Mrs. Helen Downing (15 West Perry)** stated that the property has always been a concern to her because it is across from the back of her, and that her husband and she had worked with Historic Savannah to get the house moved that was referred to earlier on Perry and Whitaker. She stated that she is concerned about the lot coverage and the parking, that she agrees that it is out of scale, and will make the area a more difficult place to live.

**Mrs. Ed. T. Brennan** stated that she is in favor of people taking interest in the two square miles of the Historic District, but that it's too big, it's too wide, and it's too high. She stated that the 100 percent space on the lot wouldn't let the Soho Café have ventilation or any light. She stated that there is little space between the restaurant and the house that she represents, and that they have a terrible time keeping the area clean and that rodents love it. She stated that if there is the same thing on the other side, that the Board should have a personal opinion about the two square miles of the Historic District. She stated that she is not against having a nice condominium or a nice building, but not something so huge and big.

**Mr. Edward Brennan** stated that the Board is being asked to approve the Height and Mass of a building that covers 100 percent of the lot and the law doesn't permit 100 percent coverage of the site.

**Mr. Steffen** addressed the issue of lot coverage by stating that they faced that issue approximately two months ago on a project that was approved earlier, and that they never really approved it because it was continued, and the lot coverage issue was resolved by the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). He stated that they do not have the specific authority to address whether someone complies with the lot coverage requirements. However, Height and Mass by

its nature and definition deals with the issue of whether or not the whole lot is covered. He stated that if the Board attempted to give final approval of a project that does not comply with the lot coverage that two things happen. 1) That the person who received the approval from the Board runs the risk of having the approval nullified by the BZA if they decide not to give them the lot coverage. 2) If the Board grants approval of something that's not in compliance with the lot coverage before the BZA acts, that they don't want to send a message to the BZA saying that the Board is all right with it. He stated that they need to give an opinion as to whether Height and Mass is appropriate or not, and that he would suggest to the Board that it is part of the Mass consideration. He stated there may be instances where there is 100 percent lot coverage and it is appropriate, but it is within the Board's consideration to decide whether it affects the Height and Mass issue that they are charged with deciding. He stated that he invites the fellow Board members to jump in on the issue and asked Ms. Reiter if she had any direction on it. He stated that it was not the Board's final decision on the issue

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the petition should not even be considered until the Board has a variance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it's within the Board's purview to say that they can or can't, but he is suggesting that there are implications if they take that path.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that they have come across this situation before and that the Board has been concerned that if the project is approved, whether their approval of the areas that the Board does have purview over will affect the decisions over those that they don't. However, she stated that they have made decisions, findings, and facts.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that Ms. Fortson-Waring is correct and that the Board has the power to make those decisions, but the question is whether they should, and secondly, whether the petitioner would want the approval when they know that they still have to get approval from another agency that will directly affect the issue.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he could not think of a time that there was approval with 100 percent of the lot coverage. He stated that they have approved it without minor variations like 82 percent or 77 or 78, but in six years he cannot recall one instance where they have approved 100 percent lot coverage without having a variance.

**Mr. Deering** stated that his firm has petitioned the Board in the past, and every time that his structure is five percent over the allowed lot coverage this Board brings it up and puts it back out. He stated that it is not a vindictive thing but that the standards should be applied to everybody.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that if the building takes up 100 percent lot coverage it needs to be addressed.

**Mr. Deering** stated that in the ordinance (K)( 6)( J), that the scale of the building is not compatible with the historic structures around it. He stated that if you look at the model and look at 10 West Liberty, all of the houses on Perry Street which are visibly related to this structure, the ones on the other side of Whitaker further down, and the ones diagonally on Whitaker that are historic, this structure is not visually compatible. Even to the Knights of Columbus building that was a house at one time, it is not visually compatible. He stated that the mass is not visibly compatible.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that she would like to know if the petition would consider going to the BZA and continue the project until there is a determination of the lot coverage.

**Mr. Shay** stated that his plan was to proceed from here, and submitting the petition for Height and Mass approval and not final approval. He stated that they would proceed from here directly to the BZA. That they will make their case at the BZA why this particular location is worthy of higher lot coverage, and at that time they can address the issues of parking and other issues that were discussed today. He stated that they have entered into negotiations for a contract to lease parking spaces in another building, that the spaces for the luxury condominiums in the top are in the footprint of the projected building which can be seen in the plans with four garages. He stated that the spaces for the lower three floors they are in the negotiations to lease those spaces across Liberty Street at the existing Liberty Street parking garage. He wanted to ask for some feedback, but he wanted to go to the BZA next, would not come back to the Board for a final approval until they have something from the BZA, and that it's a little bit of a catch 22. He stated that the BZA may say that they will grant the variance subject to the approval of the HDRB, and that the Board can say the same thing of approving the Height and Mass subject to the BZA and leave them in a lurch. He stated that he would like to get some feedback today, and that if he has spent several months of wasted time that he would like to know that now. He stated in regard to some of the other issues with the SOHO Café he feels that they can look at spacing further away and deal with those as they move forward with design detail.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he was sensing or hearing from the Board members that they are preferring for the petition to be continued to allow the applicant to go to BZA and come back to the Board, and if he was in agreement to do this.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition until there has been a determination of the variance by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously

**RE: Petition of Tobias Properties LLC  
George Cohen  
H-06-3568-2  
532 – 534 East Gaston  
Alterations**

Present for the petition was George Cohen.

Ms. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to alter an existing non-historic structure as follows:

1. Remove existing masonite siding and replace with smooth finish Hardie-Board. Paint main body Valspar Grand Hotel Mackinac Blue 5007-9 with Valspar Belle Grove Spruce 5003-6; Doors and accent color Valspar La Fonda Geranium Red 1010-4 and spiral stairs Valspar Oatlands Shutter Green.
2. Change front roof from double-gable with to a hip.

3. Rebuild front porch to extend the complete length between the front bays; add 8 inches square wood columns and a deck with balustrade. Alter two, second floor front windows to six-panel doors with transom. Change location of downstairs doors and add transoms.
4. Add spiral stairs and two new windows to rear elevation. Replace deck openings with double-door system with transoms (4).
5. Replace wood fence with five-foot high board fence.

**FINDINGS:**

Further information is needed:

1. Why are the front doors being changed? The first and second floor doors should be aligned vertically or as close to vertically as possible.
2. The new fence should be stained to match or complement the house.
3. Staff recommends that the roof not be changed. The change appears visually incompatible with the bays. The building is not historic. The porch changes, in Staff's opinion, are enough to help the building fit into the block face.
4. Staff recommends that the new porch not extend from bay to bay. The bays should "read". The porch section in 1/PG5 is acceptable. The rendering appears to have a number of incompatible details on the porch which may be due to the computer program.
5. Staff recommends reconsideration of the basic color scheme including using white or off white on the porches and window trim rather than the dark bluegreen and mixture of white and bluegreen.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions of the discussion and consideration of design issues raised by Staff.**

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. George Cohen** stated that he had met with Staff and is in agreement with everything that has been said. He stated that the problem with the cricket in the front, and it's not the entire roof becomes mansard, it's just the first eight or ten feet at the front, is if you look where the gutter is the water pours off into the front and onto the new front porch. He stated that it is the reason why they are going back into the type of roof and letting it drain with a gutter to the side. He stated that the cricket creates a huge problem and that it was a bad design, and that he is in agreement to let the protrusions' read, reduce the length of the two porches so that the two dormers read, and an approval today of that redrawing.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if he was in agreement with the Staff's recommendations in total.

Mr. Cohen stated in everything except the color. He stated that if the Board does not approve that they are amenable to do an off-white on the trim or something agreeable with Staff. He stated that he went by the paint store that morning to pick up some alternates and that he is happy to work with Ms. Reiter to get satisfaction on the colors, even though what he used were historic approved colors.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the colors going back to Staff; and that the new porch not extend from bay-to-bay on the Gaston Street façade. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Roy D. Ogletree  
H-06-3570-2  
543 – 547 McDonough Street  
New Construction - Part I Height / Mass**

Present for the petition was Roy Ogletree.

Ms. Ward gave the following Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass, of 10 four-story single-family townhomes.

**FINDINGS**

The vacant southeast Trust Lot on Crawford Square is zoned RIP-A, Residential, Medium-Density.

The following standards apply for Part I Height and Mass:

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<i>Building Coverage:</i> Maximum lot coverage of 75%	The applicant is proposing 10 single-family townhomes on 10 lots. They maintain building lot coverages ranging from 66% to 75%.	The standard is met. Verify that the subdivision plat has been recorded.
<i>Height:</i> New construction shall be within the height limits as shown on the historic district height map (4 stories).	10 four-story townhomes are proposed. They are 43'-2¼" tall on the west elevation (facing Crawford Square) and the east elevation (facing E. Broad Street). The interior townhomes are 44' -¼" tall.	The standard is met. The funeral home on the northeast Trust Lot is 44' tall and the new townhomes on E. Perry Street are 38' tall.
<i>Residential buildings:</i> Raised basements shall be not less than 6'-6" and not higher than 9'6". The first story or second story, in the case of a raised basement, shall be not less than 11', and each story above shall be not less than	The ground floor on the Houston Street and E. Broad Street Elevations is 10'. The second floor exterior expression is 11' and the floors above are 10' and 10'.  The interior townhomes have a	Staff recommends reducing the height of the ground floor to no more than 9'-6".  Staff recommends approval, as

10'.	10'-11" first floor, 11'-5" second floor and 10' third and fourth floors.	elevating the first floor would add to the height of the building.
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<i>Proportion of structure's front façade:</i> The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front façade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is visually related.	The Houston Street and E. Broad Street elevations are 4-story masonry duplex buildings with a high stoop entrance. The 6 interior townhouses are three bays wide and four stories tall with a ground level stoop. The verticality is broken up by horizontal balconies and string courses.	The standard is met
<i>Proportion of Openings:</i> The relationship of the width of the windows to the height of the windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which the structure is related.	The proposed buildings will consume the entire block. Openings are comparable to neighboring buildings on Perry and McDonough Streets which feature duplexes (both masonry and wood frame) with high and ground level stoops.	The standard is met. The height of openings on buildings over three stories generally decreases on the top floor. Staff recommends restudying the size of the fourth floor openings during the Part II submittal.
<i>Rhythm of structures on streets:</i> The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjacent structures shall be visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing structures to which it is visually related.	The townhouses are separated by 11' to 18' of open space to be used as courtyards and for off-street parking. A majority of the buildings within the immediate vicinity are adjacent to one another or are separated by 5' to 10' of open space.	Staff recommends approval. The courtyard space, while not typical of the area, breaks up the overall massing of the project while still allowing for green space and a series of residential townhomes. The garden wall connecting the townhomes provides a wall of continuity along the street level.
<i>Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection:</i> The relationship of entrances, porch projections, and walkways to structures shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are visually related.	The Houston and E. Broad elevations both maintain high stoop entrances indicating their prominence within the block (facing a square and a major boulevard). The interior townhomes feature ground level stoops beside garage entrances.	Staff recommends reducing the number of garage-type entrances along Perry Street to balance the need for pedestrian and automotive doorways. The McDonough Street elevation of the western townhome facing E. Broad Street only features garage doors at the ground level. Staff recommends a restudy of this elevation in the design phase to offset the number of automotive entrances.
<i>Roof Shapes:</i> The roof shape shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related.	A flat roof with a simplified cornice is proposed. This is appropriate for a masonry building of this type and can be found in this ward.	The standard is met.

<p><i>Street Elevation Type:</i> 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 tithing or trust block.</p>	<p>The masonry townhomes on Perry and McDonough feature ground level stoop entrances which are common in the ward.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
<p>A proposed building located on a trust block which fronts another trust block shall utilize a historic buildings street elevation type from the same trust block.</p>	<p>A four-story masonry duplex with a high stoop entrance and a rusticated base is proposed to face Crawford Square. Each duplex is symmetrical with three bays. The neighboring masonry building on the north east Trust Lot is four stories with high central covered stoop and had 5 bays. High stoop duplexes and rowhouses are found throughout the ward.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p><i>Setbacks:</i> There shall be no front yard setbacks except on a trust lot fronting a square, proposed buildings may establish a front yard setback not to exceed 20’.</p> <p>A side yard setback is not required for buildings facing a square. Where a side yard setback is established, such side yard shall not exceed 20’ nor be less than 5’.</p>	<p>The proposed building on the square will be setback from the street 12’ to provide a sidewalk and street yard. This space is public right-of-way.</p> <p>The interior townhomes have a 15’ setback on the north. This is actually public right-of-way and will be used for off street parking and some streetscape improvements which can be found in similar wards.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The front yard setback is consistent with the historic building on the northeast trust lot.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p><i>Entrances:</i> A building on a trust lot facing a square shall locate its primary entrance to front the square.</p> <p>A building on a trust lot not facing a square shall locate its primary entrance so that it fronts the same street as the other historic buildings on the same block.</p>	<p>A high-stoop entrance is proposed for each unit in the center of the building.</p> <p>The interior townhomes front both McDonough and Perry Streets.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p> <p>The standard is met.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval for Part I Height and Mass, with the consideration for Staff comments to be made in Part II Design Details.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Neely** stated that it would be hard for the petitioner to reduce the amount of car park entrances except in the east and west building.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the courtyard spaces in between are very similar to the same design for the automotive entrances, that they will be able to be used for cars if they differentiate the doors to not look the same, and that they would be nice automotive entrances but that they shouldn't read the same.

**Mr. Neely** asked if they would use the courtyards for car parking

**Ms. Ward** stated that it was their intention to use the courtyard.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there were other examples, in that ward or in the Historic District, of townhomes that are that high that are spaced in the way that these are.

**Ms. Ward** stated that there is none with the large amount of open space in between. She stated that typically, the amount of open space is five to ten feet, and these are 11 to 18 feet which are a lot wider.

**Mr. Deering** asked how they ascertained it because the plans that were given don't have any dimensions. He stated that they are supposed to be dimensioned floor plans to scale, and that the scale that is written is not correct.

**Ms. Ward** stated that historic building maps and that she has a larger set of plans.

**Mr. Deering** asked how she got the scale because there is nothing there in the plans, that there is nothing there that he can see, and that he looked through the whole submittal where there is anything that is dimensioned.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she has a larger set of plans that she tried to put up on the screen but they would not fit, and that she also used historic building maps to determine open space in neighboring buildings.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

Mr. Roy Ogletree apologized for not having adequate dimensions on the drawings. He stated that the drawings are to a scale, but the drawings that the Board received are half-size drawings, so it says quarter scale or eighth-inch drawings. He stated that the intent of the project is to follow the original Oglethorpe plan for the City so that they follow the property lines with the building facades. He stated that there are actually ten townhomes that abut each other; five facing Perry Street and five facing McDonough having a common. He stated that the trust lots are intended to be the primary in a hierarchy of three different lot sizes. Directly across McDonough is the 1854 residence that is now a funeral home, and that they are matching the height and scale of the building fronting the square in order to contain the square as it was



intended to be. He stated that on the remaining part of the lot, they are following through with the same height of the buildings at four stories, separating them with courtyards for the enjoyment of the owners, and along East Broad they are defining the site by having the building abut the property line which creates a consistent streetscape along east Broad. He stated that this ward is very piecemeal, in that over the years buildings have been torn down, and the consistency has been broken up. He stated that with the parking that the Staff has recommended eliminating some of the door openings, that he is not in disagreement with that in concept, but that they are trying to be responsible about how they create buildings in the Historic District relative to today, which means that everyone will have one or two vehicles as a minimum. He stated that he knows that parking in the area is an issue because they have owned the lot for five years and that adjacent property owners consistently park it on because they don't have enough parking.

### **DISCUSSION:**

**Dr. Caplan** thanked the petitioner for having separate buildings, and for not having a massive structure, because it is difficult for the Board to work within the perimeters of the big structures. He stated that in carrying it one step further in order to maintain the residential appearance of the neighborhood, has he thought about vary the facades so that all of the buildings don't look alike and look more like individual homes.

**Mr. Ogletree** stated this they have discussed it and that is something they want to work on between now and the final review where they get into the materials and the details of the fenestration. He stated that the ones on East Broad have their own character with the high stoops, the units on the square have been shown, but their intent is to come back to the Board when they get to that end of the project and they expect them to be very different in character. He stated that what they were trying to do was to give a master plan concept. He stated that the ideas they will be starting on the East Broad end and work their way toward the square, and the two townhomes on the square would be the last projects. By that, time they might have created enough synergy that someone would like a landmark residence on the square. He stated that for the middle units that he would like to explore how to tastefully give some variance, that he doesn't want to use a variety of colors or change the shutter colors because it is not appropriate.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that one of the things that stands out to him, and that it has happened several times in the area, that when you look down the street, that there is a vast row of overhead parking garage doors. He stated that it is a sea of overhead doors and it tends to look incompatible.

**Mr. Deering** stated that there is not a building pattern like it in the Historic District. He said that it does not relate to any of its surroundings. He stated that the master plan doesn't work, that the gaps between the buildings are too big. The buildings are not deep enough because they are trying to fit so much between the block. He stated that the East Broad street house, is a nice idea, but it is not deep enough. He stated that it has been truncated and it is not effective, and that even the building on the square looks like it has been truncated. He said that the back-to-back townhouses is a bad idea because they are trying to get so much on one property that they end up with a sea of garage doors.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that there are 11 cars backing out on Perry Street and 11 cars backing out on McDonough Street, and that it is a parking garage with residences over it. He stated that there is not a window on the ground floor. That even though on the trust lot side where the stairs are shown, that without windows or openings on the ground floor doesn't resemble a historic lot. He stated that he can't understand that having 11 cars backing out on Perry Street, why the people who live across the street that were earlier complaining about one garage in another building, were no longer present to see these plans. He stated that another aspect of having 11 cars backing out was that there was no streetscape, that it was just paving to get to the garage doors. He stated that it was awful, that all there was were paved entrances to openings for garages and open parking as shown on McDonough Street, and that it was not compatible.

**Mr. Ogletree** stated that he agreed that McDonough Street was not a success. He stated that the reason it was not a success was that they did not do garage doors. They only did notches into a courtyard, and that those notches were not wide enough to accommodate a vehicle comfortably. He stated that they were not as wide as his projected courtyards. That the grade on that particular property drops off three to four feet and it was not accommodated for, so there were terrible conditions for driveways. He stated that this project does not have a grade issue.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the entire sidewalk is paved and that there's no grass visible.

**Mr. Ogletree** stated that he fully understood the criticism, but they have not found a solution in a trust lot condition.

**Mr. Ogletree** stated that they were originally looking at the property in a different light. That they were originally looking at it much more like the project on Liberty Street at Houston Street. He stated that the requirement is only 600 square feet of lot per unit, and that they can get twice as many dwelling units on the property if they chose to do one massive building and park underneath. He stated that it was a disservice to the neighbors and a disservice to the ward to do that because the courtyards that they would create between the buildings create a sense of place for the residents, and that there are a lot of examples in the Historic District. He stated that you can walk across the square and see one that is almost like this as far as the rhythm and the courtyards, and that is what they are trying to create. Not just focusing on a garage door issue, but to create an overall sense of place.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that Mr. Ogletree was talking about the space between the buildings being open, and that in most cases it is a garden. He stated that this is a parking lot that is paved with automobiles.

**Mr. Ogletree** stated that the only rationale for someone to park in the courtyard would be along Perry Street where they do not have the additional right-of-way depth to park in front. He stated that on the McDonough side, if you look at the elevations in detail, that there are no gates taking you into the courtyard on the McDonough side, so the garage doors are the only vehicular access.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that there are cars parked in front of the garage.

**Mr. Ogletree** stated that they do not go into the courtyard; that Mr. Meyerhoff was saying that was for parking. He stated that they were trying to get the option along Perry that someone could park, and that his understanding on the brick townhomes down the street is that they were forced into doing courtyard parking. He stated that they are trying to avoid doing 100 percent

parking, or anything of that nature, and that they are trying to make more of a sense of a place for the residents. He stated that they are open to criticisms and comments on a better way to achieve this on a trust lot, but to date this is the solution that they have spent many months working on trying to come up with an intelligent and informed way of doing something where people would enjoy living.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** stated that she agreed that the space in between the buildings, that the rhythm is not visually compatible.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mrs. Carmen Redmond (537 East Perry Street)** stated that she is directly across the street from the trust lot that is proposed to be built on, and commended Mr. Ogletree because he spent hours at the neighborhood meetings, has showed them plans, and discussed their concepts. She stated that she is representing the neighborhood and that one of the things that they love about it is the break between the buildings; the sunshine, the possibility of seeing a tree, having some grass. She stated that she lives in one of five townhomes and that they love their home and the location. But they are the first to admit that from the outside, architecturally, that the building looks like a warehouse. She stated that the concept of the proposed plans actually looking like ten residential homes, which is in keeping with what she sees in the Historic District in the older homes. She stated that right away you look at them and you know they are townhomes, that they aren't condominiums, they aren't a massive structure.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they don't disagree about the green space idea within the lot, that it is something that has been said again and again that 75 percent lot coverage is the maximum. He stated that it is just the way it is arranged and that there is a more successful way to arrange the buildings that follow the building patterns in Savannah on trust lots. Not just the ones that have been shown, not just a row of houses, and not a building like the Lafayette condominiums. He stated that there are ways to handle it.

**Mrs. Redmond** she stated that they like the fact that there will be light shining down on Perry Street, because whatever goes there, that street is 21 feet and four inches wide, and very narrow. She stated that whatever goes there will block the sun no matter what and that it will be very dark and narrow.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that they need to remember they are talking about a trust lot fronting on a square. He stated that he hates the fact that they are drawing comparisons between this project and the one on Liberty Street that doesn't front on the square. He stated that they are two entirely different situations.

**Ms. Cassie DeLuckie (Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that the ARC feels that identical free-standing structures would create a gap-tooth appearance to the lot and recommended grouping them as double houses. She stated that in the plans there is no fenestration on the western elevation, and the ARC felt that windows should be added to avoid a four-story blank wall.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** asked whether the petitioner would entertain a continuance to address the concerns and comments.

**Mr. Ogletree** asked that in the continuance, what would be the methodology to address the concerns because right now it is just come back with another idea.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he would have the resources of working with the Staff to try to come up with some ways to address these concerns.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he could also speak with the Historic Savannah Foundation since they had a good understanding of how it should be grouped.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he did not want the petitioner to walk away with the message that the Board doesn't like the idea of putting a residential type of grouping on the lot. He stated that he thought there was a lot of consensus that this could be done, but that he is also hearing that it is not quite there.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the May 10, 2006, meeting to restudy the special relationship between the buildings. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Debra Caldwell  
H-06-3573-2  
514 East Bryan Street  
Addition

RE: Petition of BKDW, LLC  
Ryan Bacha  
H-06-3574-2  
319 Abercorn Street  
New Construction - Part I Height / Mass

RE: Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects  
H-06-3575-2  
528 Selma Street  
New Construction - Part I & Part II

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the above petitions, and reschedule within 15 days because of the beginning of the Jewish Holiday at sundown. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Lee Meyer, AIA  
H-06-3530-2  
417 East Jones Street

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion for the Savannah Historic District Review Board that this petition be continued to the May 10, 2006, meeting. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-06-3557(S)-2  
6 East Liberty Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-06-3558(S)-2  
9 West Drayton Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Irene Cochran  
H-06-3561(S)-2  
312 East Huntingdon Street  
Exchange Windows  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of Carlton & Beth Ann Gibson  
H-06-3572(S)-2  
523 East Gaston  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
5. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-06-3576(S)-2  
51 Barnard Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
6. Amended Petition of Hansen Architects  
Patrick Phelps  
H-06-3548-2  
215 York Street  
Alteration  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE  
OF APPROPRIATENESS

RE: MINUTES

**RE: ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp