

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

JANUARY 11, 2006

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Ned Gay (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Introductions

1. New Board Chairperson – Joe Steffen
Board Vice Chairperson – Swann Seiler
2. New Board Member – Gene Hutchinson

Mr. Mitchell stated that he was honored to have served as Vice Chairman in 2004 and the Chairman in 2005. He said at the end of 2005, a Nominating Committee was selected to nominate officers for 2006. The Board voted Joseph Steffen, Chairman and Swann Seiler, Vice Chairman for 2006.

Mr. Mitchell also introduced and welcomed Gene Hutchinson the newest member to the Historic District Board of Review.

RE: Call to Order

Mr. Steffen called the January 11, 2006 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:05 p.m.

RE: Reflection

RE: Sign Posting

All signs were properly posted.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Jerry Lominack
HBR 05-3435-2
37 Whitaker Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Factor's Cottage
Donna Martindale
HBR 05-3511-2
204 East Bay Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Rosewood Studio
Andrew Powers
HBR 05-3513-2
113 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Gale Singer
HBR 05-3518-2
401 – 409 Whitaker Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Will Griffiths
HBR 05-3519-2
17 Lincoln Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

RE: Regular Agenda

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

Present for the petition was Chris Norman.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Details for a new two story residential building at 315 West Lorch Street.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setbacks except as follows: On tithing blocks where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.	The new building aligns with the two adjacent historic structures.	This standard is met.
Dwelling unit type	Detached	This standard is met. Detached structures are typical of this block.
Street Elevation Type	Two and one half stories on a crawl space.	Similar to the houses on either side. This standard has been met.
Entrances A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to face the east-west street.	The front entrance faces Lorch Street.	This standard has been met.
Building Height: The exterior height of the first story shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet.	The height to the porch floor (crawl space) is 2’-6”;	The proposed structure appears to be equivalent to the height of the three story house in the block.
	the height of the first story (to the floor of the second story porch) is 11’;	
	the second story is 10’. The story under the roof is a little less than 12 feet to the roof ridge.	
Visual Compatibility Factors		
Proportion of structures front facade	The width of the houses on either side of the proposed house is 21’ according to applicant’s drawings. The proposed house is 24’-8”.	The width of the house has been reduced by 1 foot-10 inches.
Rhythm of solids to voids	A three bay façade is proposed. Windows and doors align vertically.	A three bay arrangement is typical of this block.
Rhythm of structure on street		The structure is sited similarly to other historic structures on the street.
Rhythm of entrances and porch projections	Double porch with deck on top. Columns.	The porch interprets the use of horizontal siding on adjacent porches in a modern manner.
Roof Shape	A hip roof with dormers is proposed.	There are hipped roof structures in this block. The rear dormer has been extensively reduced in size and two smaller dormers added to the east and west elevations.
Walls of continuity		The proposed structure maintains the street wall.
Scale	The scale of the columns has been revised slightly between the upper and lower floors. The columns are	The upper columns have been reduced by about 2 inches.

	round.	
Materials	Siding- Smooth Hardiplank Columns-wood Windows-Marvin Ultimate clad Roof-Light weight concrete roof tile-grey slate Foundation-cast concrete	The roof tile shingle pattern has been changed to a more regular pattern.
Colors	Siding- Windows, garage doors, trim, porch details- Martha Stewart Nori (Dark slate) Stucco-lighter gray Martha Stewart Zinc	Petitioner needs to review color scheme again for the Board.
Fences	A vertical board wood fence is proposed, stained.	The rear piers are stuccoed.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval with clarification of all colors.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the pickets on the railing were wood or metal?

Mr. Norman stated powdered coated aluminum.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he still felt that the visual compatibility with the other buildings would be better served if the columns were not half columns, but rather full length columns.

The colors were reviewed.

HDBR Action: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was passed 8 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Meyerhoff.

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Dawson.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of Part II Design Details for a four story office building at the corner of Bay and Price Streets.

FINDINGS

Part II Design Details

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Materials, textures, colors	Walls: First floor – Arriscraft Renaissance “Corn silk” Second and third floors- Old Carolina Brick “Charleston” Fourth floor: 2’ x 3’-6” Aluminum panels by Alpolic “Medium Bronze Metallic” with a steel overhang.	Staff has a concern that the texture of the “Charleston” brick appears so deteriorated. Perhaps a panel should be erected before a final choice is made.
Windows	True divided light hope steel windows US 10 Statuary finish (brown). Aluminum spandrel panel painted to match windows. Painted steel header painted black over the windows.	The steel windows are appropriate for commercial buildings on Bay Street.
Porches/balconies	Wood beams spliced with steel strapping support poured in place concrete floors with steel railings painted black.	
Miscellaneous railings	½” gauge steel pipe tube railing painted Benjamin Moore Black Iron on roof structure.	
Miscellaneous materials	Stucco finish painted Benjamin Moore Sandy White on roof structure Wood lattice on stucco wall on rear roof painted Benjamin Moore Brown Sugar.	
Doors	On Price Street fixed steel framed doors with aluminum louvers (one operable to access electrical panels) Garage doors: sliding metal clad panel doors in pairs with surface mounted hardware by K.N. Crowder Mfg. Co.	The doors reflect the commercial nature of the structure. Previous comments had been that the residential nature of the doors in an earlier submittal was incongruous with the overall design of the building.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval, with a panel to be erected prior to final approval of the surface texture of the “Charleston” brick. The elements of the design and the materials selected are appropriate for a commercial structure on Bay Street.

Board Comments:

Ms. Seiler asked Staff if she was concerned about the texture wearing away?

Mrs. Reiter stated no, it was the deteriorated look of the brick.

Ms. Seiler stated she felt it looked like old brick.

Mrs. Reiter stated very old brick. She said she felt if brick looked that deteriorated on a historic structure you would start thinking about repairing it.

Mr. Dawson stated they wanted a tumbled brick. He said they had no objection with further addressing it with Staff.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what color was the mortar and if they were going to match the brick with the mortar?

Mr. Dawson stated ivory mortar so there would be some contrast.

Mr. Deering stated he agreed with Staff that it was a modern building and it could have a smoother brick. The texture seemed inappropriate to the style that they were trying to create.

Mr. Dawson stated he felt a wire cut brick would be inappropriate.

Mr. Deering stated there were handmade bricks that were smoother.

Mr. Dawson stated that was what they wanted to get to and what he would request was to either bring back a bigger sample or mock up a piece for the Board.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt the mortar should match whatever the brick was.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of John Cronk
HBR 05-3472-2
342 East Harris Street
New Construction – Part I & II**

Present for the petition was John Cronk.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design for new construction of a single family residence at 542 East Harris Street.

FINDINGS

In January 2004, two single family houses were approved by the Review Board for this site and the adjacent site. The adjacent project was constructed, but the current proposed site was not built and the approval expired. The current proposal, while similar to the former approved proposal, is not consistent in massing and design detail.

Staff has been working with the applicant since September 2005 when they initially submitted this application. Although the drawings appear sketchy obscuring some details on the rear, the applicant requests that the petition be heard and staff agrees that there appears to be sufficient information for review for Height and Mass. Some of the concerns about detailing may be clarified if the drawings were better detailed.

The buildings adjacent to this site are not rated structures and are not historic.

Part I Height and Mass

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Setbacks (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(3)): There shall be no front yard setback except on tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided. A side yard setback is not required for buildings facing a square. Where a side yard is established, such side yard shall not exceed 20' nor be less than 5'. There is a maximum 75% building lot coverage.</p>	<p>The lot is 27 feet wide by 100 feet deep or 2,700 square feet. The proposed footprint is approximately 1,237 square feet for a 46% building lot coverage. The building face is has a 4' setback from the lot line while the 8' deep porch extends 4' into the public right-of-way. There is a 2' side yard setback.</p>	<p>The setbacks are consistent with other buildings along the street.</p>
Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Rhythm of structures on streets (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(6e)): 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.</p>	<p>The building will sit on the 0' lot line on the west, and will have a 2' setback on the east.</p>	<p>The special relationships between neighboring buildings is visually compatible with the proposed site. This block features mostly new construction; the west end of the street contains attached and semi-attached dwellings with narrow side lots.</p>
<p>Street Elevation Type (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(2)): 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>A two and one half story detached single family structure on a crawl space is proposed. The front elevation is wood frame and of traditional design. The building is similar to the new construction built on the adjacent lot to the east.</p>	<p>Historically, 2-story dwellings lined this side of the street. Neither of the adjacent structures are historic. The proposed building elevation is similar to other buildings on this block, featuring 2-stories, a side gable, and a front porch stoop. This standard is met.</p>
<p>Entrances (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(4)): A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.</p>	<p>The entry front Harris Street.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
<p>Height (Sec. 8-3030 (k)(6)a): New construction shall be within the height limits as shown on the historic district height map. The site is located in a 2 ½ story zone.</p>	<p>The proposed building is 2 ½ stories.</p>	<p>The standard for the number of stories is met.</p>
<p>Height residential buildings (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(1)(h)): The exterior expression of the height of the first story, or the second story in the case of a raised basement shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second story shall not be less than 10 feet.</p>	<p>The crawl space is 4'. The exterior expression of the first floor is 11'-5" and the second floor is 10'-5"</p>	<p>The standard is met. The foundation and floor-to-floor heights are consistent with the adjacent new construction.</p>

Proportion of front façade (Sec. 8-3030 (k)(6)): 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 width is 25 feet and the height is 34'-4" to the roof ridge.	The standard is met. The proposed height is equal to the height of the newly constructed building to the east and is taller than the 1-story non-historic building to the west. It is consistent with the 2-story height pattern within the remainder of the block. The historic buildings on the other side of Harris Street are mostly 1-story semi-attached dwellings.
Rhythm of solids to voids on the front facades.	A three bay rhythm is proposed and the openings are vertically aligned.	This is consistent with the block face.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Rhythm of porch projection	An attached two bay wide porch is proposed.	This is consistent with other buildings in the block face.
Roof shapes (Sec. 8-3030 (k)(6)h): The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related.	A 6:12 side gable roof is proposed with gabled dormers.	The roof is comparable to other side gable buildings within the same block. The porch on the back will be under a separate roof to minimize the size of the roof for the main building.

Part II Design Detail

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Exterior Walls (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(8)): On lots less than 60' in width the front façade shall be constructed so as to form a continuous plane parallel to the street. Bays and porches attached to such elevation may project streetward of the plane.	The front façade is parallel to Harris Street with a 1-story hip roof porch, 2 bays wide, extending streetward of the plane.	The standard is met.
Wood siding is permitted on row houses only in wards where wood-sided row houses already exist or where more than 75% of the lot frontage in the ward contains wood-sided buildings. Where wood siding has been determined to be appropriate, smooth finish fiber cement siding may be used on new residential construction.	Smooth HardiPlank siding is proposed for the exterior cladding material. All of the buildings within this block of Harris Street are clad in wood siding.	The standard is met.
Roofs (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(10)): Roofs visible from a street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles.	Architectural grade roof shingles are proposed for the roof.	The standard is met.
Windows (Sec. 8-3030 (l)(9)): Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on	Norco Aluminum clad 6/6 simulated divided light, double pane glass windows and French doors are proposed. The muntin profile is 7/8". They are to look the same as what was installed next door.	The standard is met. Norco windows have previously been approved in the Historic District.

<p>nonhistoric facades and on new construction, provided, however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8”; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. Windows shall be</p>	<p>Wooden (cedar) louvered shutters are proposed similar to those previously approved on the adjacent property. The surround will also match the detailing of the window next door (photograph provided).</p>	
<p>Standard</p>	<p>Proposed</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>		
<p>Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window Shutters shall be constructed of durable wood. The historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the applicant that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.</p>	<p>The proposed shutters are made of cedar and will be operable and fit the size of the window opening.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Dormer Windows</p>	<p>Two dormer windows within the side gable are proposed on the Harris Street elevation. The have front gable roofs and pediments at an 8:12 pitch and will be surfaced in architectural grade asphalt shingles.</p>	<p>The dormers should have a minimal overhang and cornice.</p>
<p>Doors</p>	<p>The front door is a six panel metal door with transom.</p>	
<p>Porches (Sec. 8-3030 (I)(11)): Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Infill between foundation piers shall be recessed so that the piers are expressed.</p>	<p>The porch foundation will be stuccoed piers with recessed infill. The material matches the foundation of the main building.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate.</p>	<p>The porch will be constructed entirely out of treated wood.</p>	<p>The standard has been met.</p>
<p>Wood portico posts shall have a cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between the balusters shall not exceed 4”. For one and two family dwellings the height of the railing shall not exceed 36”.</p>	<p>It is proposed to build a front porch to match the hip roofed porch previously approved on the house next door. The porch will be constructed out of treated wood with 6” wood posts with a base and capital extending beyond the architrave and a 36” tall balustrade between piers.</p>	<p>The standard has been met.</p>

Rear Porch	A two-story porch is also proposed for the rear elevation. The porch is comprised of a flat roof extending from the main roof 6” wood posts with capitals and bases and a 36” tall balustrade	Staff recommends that the porch roof be located beneath the roofline of the main building
Standard	Proposed	Comment
	comprise the porch. A small storage room on the side surfaced in hardiplank.	
Colors	White siding with black shutters	Staff approval.
Fences	A 6’ tall wooden fence with 20” trellis above is proposed for the rear and side yard (shown on site plan). A photograph of the neighboring fence was provided to show the design.	

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass, and for Part II, Design, with the condition that the porch roof be located beneath the roof line of the main house.

Board Comments:

Mr. Mitchell stated he felt the drawings that were submitted were difficult to read. He said they were 1/4” scale and minimized.

Ms. Ward stated Staff had a larger set for the file that was readable.

Mr. Deering asked if Staff verified that the overall height of the proposed house would match next door?

Ms. Ward stated yes.

Mr. Cronk stated the porch roof will be with the eave of the house.

Mr. Deering asked if he would construct the dormers to match the drawing and not the house?

Mr. Cronk stated it will not have an overhang on the dormer.

Discussion:

Mr. Mitchell asked if he said the overhang will be reduced or that there will not be an overhang?

Mr. Cronk stated reduced.

HDBR Action: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the dormer have a minimal eave overhang and the rear porch roof be located beneath the eave of the main roofline. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Cowart Coleman Group
 Gerry Cowart
 HBR 05-3475-2
 134 Whitaker Street
 Alterations**

Present for the petition was Gerry Cowart.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations to a non rated structure at 134 Whitaker Street as follows:

1. Install retail entries on the ground floor corner of York and Whitaker Street.
2. Install storefront windows on the ground floor York Street elevation.
3. Install a cast stone base.
4. Install doors, lengthening window openings on the second floor level and on the corners of the third floor.
5. Install metal brackets and balconies with mesh railing at second floor and third floor corners.
6. Add a fourth story.

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

The building is 54 years old. It is divided into three 20' bays on the York Street elevation and four bays on the Whitaker Street elevation. The vertical members are broken by a white band above the second floor windows. The style is very similar to the automotive showroom structure on Drayton and Liberty Streets. International style buildings are characterized by their lack of exterior ornament, block forms, flat roofs, and use of glass and masonry within a steel frame. It has not been considered for listing on the City's Historic Building map yet.

Previously, the Board has protected the architectural features of non-listed buildings such as the Broughton Street Municipal Building, a building deemed eligible for listing on the Historic Building map. Two other structures were allowed to be altered. The Penny's building alteration received criticism in academic circles. It is staff's opinion that this building may be eligible to be listed on the Historic Building map as an example of an International Style office building and alterations should take that into consideration.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Section 8-3030 (k) (1) An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenance related thereto, visible from a public street or lane shall only be altered in a manner that	While 134 Whitaker has not been officially considered for listing on the Historic Building list of the city due to its age, it does appear to have some simple design qualities that	The proposed alterations generally do respect the original features of the existing structure. The additions are clearly differentiated from the existing. Note that while the

will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure.	should be taken into account in any rehabilitation.	proposed alterations may be acceptable under local review, they may not necessarily be in conformance with the Secretary of Interior standards, particularly in reference to the fourth story addition and the addition of balconies.
Height. The lot is located in a four story height zone.	A fourth story addition is proposed.	This conforms to the height map and is clearly differentiated from the existing building.
Storefront	The building was constructed as an office building. It is now being converted to retail and residential. Storefronts are proposed for the ground floor. A stone base is also proposed to give the building a commercial base, shaft and cap appearance.	The cast stone base is out-of-character with the original design of the building. If used, it should be reduced considerably to a narrow band, similar to the adjacent structure across the lane. The storefronts meet the intent of the standards. It would be out-of-character with the original design of the building to recess the entry.
Balconies: Section 8-3030 (l) (11) Residential balconies shall not extend more than three feet in depth from the face of the building and shall be supported by brackets or other type of architectural support.	A six foot projecting balcony and six four foot projecting balconies are proposed. The material is tube steel with black wire mesh grate railing and metal brackets.	The projection of the balconies does not meet the standards of the ordinance. The six foot projection covers most of the sidewalk. Staff recommends no more than four feet and if the Board finds this is visually compatible it would require Board of Appeals approval. A sample of the mesh needs to be provided.
Awnings	Shed awnings with ornamental metal awning brackets are proposed. Sunbrella Jet Black	These are reversible treatments and appear compatible in conjunction with the new residential use.
Roof	A roof garden is proposed. There are mechanical rooms on the rear of the roof. A segmental ornamental piece is proposed for the corner parapet.	Further information is needed as to what kinds of garden structures are proposed. They should not be visible from the public right-of-way. Staff recommends deletion of the segmental arch which conflicts with the basic style of the original building.
Garage opening: Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.	A 10 foot and a 16 foot garage opening are proposed.	The 16 foot opening does not conform to the Standards. These openings need to be reconfigured to meet the ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with the following conditions:

1. Compliance of the balconies with the Ordinance.
2. Compliance of the garage opening width with the Ordinance.
3. Deletion or significant reduction of the cast stone base.
4. Clarification of roof garden.
5. Deletion of the parapet arches.

6. Sample of the mesh material.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Cowart stated with regard to the balconies, there were some existing concrete canopies at this location that extended out 6 feet which they were trying to respond to by defining the first corner balcony 6 feet deep. He said he said he would like to show a revised version that had 3 foot deep balconies everywhere except the one balcony on the corner of York and Whitaker Streets which was 5 foot deep.

Mr. Deering stated the plans showed 4 foot deep balconies around the second floor and this says 6 feet deep.

Mr. Cowart stated yes, there was a plan error. He said the plan showed all the balconies at 4 feet deep. He said their intention was to have the first floor balcony on the corner at 6 feet. Arbitrarily what they were trying to do was to let the corner have a higher level of detail or urban presence. He said building the balconies up to the segmented arch at the top was a part of that concept. He said having the balcony at the lower level larger paid a little homage to what was existing which they were planning to remove. Also, the other balconies were only at the second floor level which only extended out 4 feet which could be reduced to 3 feet. He said they would like to reduce all the balconies to 3 feet except the one that was on the corner at the first floor level which would be 5 feet.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what was the detail above the second floor balcony?

Mr. Cowart stated it was a decorative awning support. He said compliance with the garage opening ordinance they were having some plan problems. The owner has chosen to dedicate $\frac{3}{4}$ of the ground floor to new door parking. The nature of the parking was two types: one private for the owner for two cars and the rest private for the other owners. He said those two cars come into a garage sized space which they could put 8 foot doors. He said right now they had a 16 foot door and they had about another 1 foot of play. He said they could do 8 foot doors and have a separation. But they felt the commercial nature of the building and the fact that the lane was narrow and 8 foot was very narrow for garage doors that it would not be a smart thing to do. He said they would like to propose was that they decorate the door in a way that breaks the scale down. He said they were not proposing to have decorative doors, but utilitarian metal panel doors. He asked if they were to divide the 16 foot door into two zones would that meet the intent of the scale of limitations?

Mr. Deering stated he felt it would not meet the ordinance or the intent, but the Board may vote to approve the wider door and he would still have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Cowart stated with regard to the roof garden, there would not be any structures up there. He said it was just an accessible roof with some greenery. He said they were also investigating the possibility of using a sustainable green roof type structure which would allow an 18 inch deep planting base that would be green energy efficient. He said it served two purposes in that it was a place for water landing on the roof to be consumed and thermal protection. With regard to deletion of the parapet arch, he felt that it would not be seen from the ground and if he had to take it off that would not be a problem. He said they could also provide a sample of the mesh material. He said he felt the real issue would then be the masonry base. He said it was addition of material over existing brick and an attempt to add vertical hierarchy to the building (base, middle, and top). He said to also balance the material that was being added to the top.

Mr. Deering stated he liked the base and felt that it gave weight. He said adding another floor using similar material at the base level helped hold it to the ground. He said he also agreed with Staff on the arched parapet element in that he felt it did not do anything for the project and felt it may need to be deleted. With regard to the garage door, he felt with it being a former commercial building he did not see a problem although he has been opposed to garage doors over 12 feet in width. He said if he could comply with the balcony ordinance on York and Whitaker Streets side and let the corner be the only 5 foot projection he felt that would be better.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the petitioner could provide a sample of the mesh railing or balustrade?

Mr. Cowart stated yes. He said they have a large western masonry elevation and they wanted to do a contemporary rail. He said they were looking for a rail that would give them shading as well as enclosed protection. He said they wanted to use a metal material that would be sustainable and that would also be a solar block. The basic structure was tubular steel that would be compatible to the frame.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he concurred with Mr. Deering and had no problem with the 4th floor addition or the 16 foot garage door. He said he also concurred with the deletion of the arched implication on the 4th floor. However, he was concerned with the overhang on the side. He said York and Whitaker Streets were narrow and he knew of no buildings in this area other than the awning that had balcony projection over the entire side wall. He said he felt the balconies should be 3 feet, if not eliminate the corner balcony all together.

Mr. Cowart stated the balconies really were not there for people to go out on originally. He said they were looking for a technique that would create some kind of vertical strength to the building.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt if they were doing 3 feet every where else that the corner should also be 3 feet.

Mr. Cowart stated the present masonry canopy extended 6 feet in both directions. He said he would pull it back to 5 feet or 4 feet, but the intent was to make the corner special and the balcony was a way to do that.

Dr. Caplan stated he realizes that every project is to be evaluated on its on merits, but there have been many times the Board has denied balconies larger than 3 feet and thought about how it would look to be inconsistent. He said there was a situation either last year or the year before where the Board allowed a 4 foot balcony on a project. He said he understood what he was trying to do, but wondered if he would consider reducing the other balconies to 3 feet and he has alluded to the Board that he would consider 4 foot on the corner. He said he felt that might be a good compromise.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she wanted to reiterate Mr. Deering's comments. She said she did not have a problem with the 6 foot extension on the first floor which was retail. She said the ordinance required residential balconies to not extend more than 3 feet from the building.

Mr. Cowart stated the compromise to 4 feet would be acceptable.

Ms. Seiler stated she was not following the argument that the 5 feet would make the retail space more desirable. She said she agreed with Mr. Meyerhoff that 3 feet would be more acceptable.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated to accentuate the corner they could change the railing material than making it 4 feet or 5 feet. He said he felt it would be more compatible with 3 feet and a different railing to accentuate the corner.

Mr. Neely stated he felt a wider balcony created more of a welcoming retail space.

Mrs. Reiter stated Staff overlooked the fact that that was a canopy that was there as part of the original architecture, so it casts it in a different light. She said it was now being reduced back and she felt the Board could argue the 5 feet because it was part of the original structure.

Mr. Steffen stated summing up the issues what he has heard so far were on the balconies there have been a variety of opinions as to whether or not it should be reduced to 3 feet, 4 feet, or 5 feet. With regard to compliance on the garage opening comments were made while it did not comply with the ordinance that it might be acceptable to the Board. With regard to the deletion or reduction of the cast stone base, staff indicated they would like it reduced. However, the comments from the Board were that it was fine the way it was drawn. He said the question with regard to the roof garden was answered. With regard to the deletion of the parapet arches there were two comments from the Board indicating that they should be deleted. And with regard to the mesh material it may be something that could go back to Staff.

Mr. Mitchell stated the canopy on the corner was already 6 feet. He asked in terms of them reducing it if that would be accomplished by cutting it back or tearing it out and reframe and pour it again?

Mr. Cowart stated they were going to tear it out and reframe it with a metal framed canopy that was suitable for a person to walk out onto the second floor.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the existing canopy height versus the bottom of the new balcony height the same or higher?

Mr. Cowart stated the new balcony floor level was about 6 inches higher than the top of the existing canopy. He said with regard to the issues, he would like to suggest that the base remains the same, the balconies be reduced to 3 feet, that the one balcony (canopy) be 5 feet, the garage doors in the rear remain the same but they would modify the simple design so that it was a two panel piece with a larger one panel. With regard to the arch above the corner on York and Whitaker Streets side will be deleted.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF agreed with the concerns raised by Staff. He said they would also like the petitioner to consider the ground parking along Whitaker Street had three large windows. He said HSF was concerned that because they were two different spaces, one or the other might decide to provide screening at a later date in a haphazard manner which would be less effective to the overall composition of the building than if the architect were to design some sort of screening.

Mr. Wesley Zimmerman stated he agreed with the architect about the base being a bigger height. He said if they were going to allow that sort of cap on top of the building he felt a thinner band would not accommodate it. However, his concern was that the top did not conform to the original intent of the building being a 1950's structure.

Mr. Neely asked the petitioner if he had any comments with regard to screening for the windows?

Mr. Cowart stated he felt that was a good idea. He said he would probably use a solar screen (grey fiberglass) on the interior so that all the windows on that side had a uniformed appearance.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended with the mesh rail to be brought to staff for approval and the garage window treatment if it has to be changed due to code requirements. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion.**

Mr. Meyerhoff amended the motion to include that if the Building Department requires the petitioner to do something else at the windows that open to the garage that it be brought back to Staff for approval.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering and Mrs. Fortson-Waring accepted the amendment. The motion passed 7 – 2. Opposed to the motion were Dr. Caplan and Ms. Seiler.**

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

Present for the petition was Haroun Homayun, Architect and Walter Evans, Owner.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

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

FINDINGS

The following Design Standards apply:

Design Standard	Proposed Development	Comment
Height	A five story building is proposed. The height of the first story is 16 feet; the height of the second story is 14 feet; floors three and four are 11 feet and floor five is 12 feet.	A five story building is permitted at this location. On the Gaston Street elevation the entry opening and window over the entry have been modified to pick up important lines of the adjacent two story

		structure. On the Alice Street elevation the corner tower has been simplified through height reduction and removing the vertical shading panels. The wall of the fifth floor is pulled away from the corner.
The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront.	This is a mixed use building, but the first story has been designed as a storefront.	This standard has been met.
The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course. Such architectural feature may be placed at the top of the second story when the first and second stories have the visual appearance of a separate exterior expression.	On the MLK side the first and second stories have a separate exterior expression from the upper stories through the window groupings. The first story is separated from the upper stories on the MLK and Gaston Street elevations by the strong expression of the metal awning.	The intent of this standard has been met.
The height of the first story shall not be less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single story above the first story.	In this case the first and second stories on the MLK elevation read as a separate exterior expression.	The intent of this standard has been met.
The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story.		
Retail storefront area glazing shall be not less than 55 percent. Such glazing shall be transparent. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18-24” base of contrasting material.	The amount of glass exceeds 55 percent and is clear. It extends from a brick soldier course base.	This standard has been met.
Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system; bronze, glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront.	A wood storefront system is proposed with a brick base.	This standard has been met.
The Centerline of windows and doors shall align vertically.	Windows and doors are aligned vertically.	This standard has been met.
All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.	On the MLK side wood casement windows by Andersen and stained wood doors with sidelights by Andersen are proposed. Catalog cuts have been provided. On the Gaston Street elevation a curtain wall system is proposed with casement windows. Circular accent windows are proposed in the stairwell.	The intent of this standard has been met.
Parapets shall have a string course of not less than six inches and extending at least four inches from the face of the building, running the	The roof is flat with a metal coping. A metal canopy and soffit is a modern expression of a stringcourse. The tops of the projecting bays are	The intent of this standard is met with a modern interpretation.

<p>full width of the building between one and 1 ½ feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two-inch overhang.</p>	<p>flared.</p>	
<p>Balconies, Porticoes, stairs, entries</p>	<p>A corner entry is proposed with entries also on MLK and Gaston. These are treated with wood and glass doors and sidelights and a metal awning. The stair tower becomes a corner focal point. Balconies project on the MLK elevation at the third level and above with metal railings and posts.</p>	<p>The use of balconies, porticoes and stairs is in a modern, yet compatible form. Two additional entries have been provided on MLK.</p>
<p>Materials, textures, colors</p>	<p>A brown-red face brick and matching mortar has been chosen. The texture of the projecting bays is accented with a projecting brick pattern.</p> <p>Gray metal will be used for the canopies, soffits and expanded metal panels.</p> <p>All exterior wood windows and frames will be white.</p>	<p>The material and color scheme is compatible. Two patterns of brick texture are proposed. These will also be used on the East wall in addition to new indentations on the East wall to help break down the mass.</p>

FINDINGS

The Standards have been met and Board concerns have been addressed in design changes.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design.

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

**RE: Petition of Nathan Godley
HBR 05-3504-2
310 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Alteration/Addition**

Present for the petition was Nathan Godley.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations and additions to the building at 310 East Oglethorpe Avenue. Additions consist of a new front stair, entrance stoop, and a three-story porch on the rear. Alterations include stucco repair, painting, and installing new window and door openings on the rear elevation.

FINDINGS

This three-story row house was constructed in 1875 and is a rated structure within Savannah's Historic District. The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density). The original front stoop of this building has been missing for over 25 years and the applicant intends to restore this element of the building as well as add a three-story rear porch, similar to the adjacent building to the east. The rear of the building has been altered and is comprised of non-historic materials and windows.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Lot Coverage (Section 8-3025 (d)): Maximum building coverage is 75% for RIP-A zoning district.	The proposed additions will result in a 1,091 square foot building coverage on the 1,980 square foot lot. The building coverage will be at 55%.	The standard is met
Front stoop and rear porch addition (Section 8-3030 (l)(11)c.): Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street.	The portico is 6' wide on 10" square brick columns surfaced in stucco.	The standard is met. The existing wall is brick and stucco. The applicant intends to restore the stucco exterior by matching the existing stucco finish in composition and texture.
	An existing concrete pad marks the location of the original front entrance stoop. The proposed stoop will be located in the same location as the original, which extends 6' onto the public sidewalk and is consistent with the neighboring entrance stoop.	Verify where grade is for clarification that the concrete footing is underground. It is unclear how much of the foundation will be revealed as the section is to an unknown scale. Staff recommends that the foundation on the portico be
Standard	Proposed	Comment
	The plans indicate an 8" CMU wall to tie into a 4" concrete pad footing for both the entrance stoop and rear porch.	minimal if visible at all.
(l)(11)d.: Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precise stone, marble, sandstone or slate.	Precast stone stairs are proposed, extending approximately 11' from the portico.	The standard is met.
(l)(11)e.: Wood portico posts shall have a cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.	The portico and rear porch will be comprised of 10" square wood columns with capitals and bases.	Staff recommends that the applicant submit a detailed portico elevation and section to staff prior to final approval. The drawings appear too sketchy to reveal the level of detail needed to construct a traditional portico for a row house.
(l)(11)f.: Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four inches. The height of the railing shall not exceed 36".	A 36" balustrade with 2" square wood pickets, 5" apart on center is proposed.	The standard is met.
Exterior Walls (l)(8): Wood siding	Portions of the rear (north) elevation	Staff recommends approval. Wood

is permitted on row houses only in wards where wood-sided row houses already exist.	are surfaced in asbestos shingle. This is to be replaced with 6” wood lap siding.	siding is a more appropriate treatment for the exterior and will be within a wood frame porch.
Windows (I)(9): The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.	All historic windows will be retained and repaired. New windows will be installed on the rear (north) elevation fronting the proposed porch. They will be 2-over-2 (true-divided-light), single-pane glass, double-hung sash wood frame windows. All three floors feature a group of three windows and a side door which align vertically within the porch.	Verify the dimensions of the individual windows. The detail provided is to an unknown scale and the second floor window height varies from the first and third floor window height.
Doors	Wood panel doors with four individual single glazed lights are proposed for the rear elevation. These doors are existing within the building and will be relocated to the rear.	Staff recommends approval.
Fence	A 7’ wooden fence is proposed toward the rear of the property.	Verify a design for the fence and submit to staff for final approval.
Paint Color	Wood trim: Sherwin Williams SW 6105; Stucco: SW 6106	Submit paint chips to staff for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval upon clarification of the fence design and portico foundation height with the condition that a detailed elevation and section of the front portico be resubmitted to staff for final approval.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated he was concerned that they selected stock size double hung windows to suit the openings and they plan transoms above that, whereas the house next door had windows that were originally sized to fit the openings.

Mrs. Ward stated the applicant did not intend to replace the windows that were existing.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked on the revised drawing what did the railing show?

Mrs. Ward stated it was vague. The intent was to replicate the existing window grills that have a curved pattern. She said the applicant talked to the State Historic Preservation Division and were going through tax credits for this project and hoped that it would help with the approval of the project. She said the State suggested that the petitioner not mimic the grills exactly, but do something similar to show that it was not an original handrail.

Petitioner’s Comments:

Mr. Godley stated they agreed with the comments made by Staff.

Mr. Deering asked if they were willing to provide a section through the portico?

Mr. Godley stated yes.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if they planned to have the ground floor door level with the sidewalk? If so, he felt they may have some problems doing that.

Mr. Godley stated it was a step – up. He said the threshold had a piece of brownstone that was above the level of the sidewalk.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that a detailed section of the portico and drawing of the stair railing be submitted to staff for final approval. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Andrew Wilford
HBR 05-3506-2
311 East York Street
Alterations**

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

Present for the petition was Andrew Wilford.

The applicant has amended his petition as follows:

1. The existing non-historic extension and deck will be demolished for a garden. No lot area variance is required.
2. The carriage house has been lowered and two 7'-6" garage doors are proposed.
3. The windows are to be custom made. They will be true divided light in the main building and double glazed at any addition or new construction. Doors will be brought back to staff for review.
4. Restore the iron balcony and install a bronze cap rail similar to others in the block.

FINDINGS

1. The garage area is only 16'-5 3/8" wide due to the provision for a three foot exit corridor on the ground floor. Staff recommends that the applicant discuss this further with Derrick Applegate at Development Services and reconfirm the need for this corridor. It is staff's opinion that the garage can span lot line to lot line, thus enabling two nine foot doors which would be functional.
2. The petitioner needs to assure that the windows will follow the standards as set forth in Section 8-3030 (I) (9) Windows.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval to demolish the non-historic addition; to add a third story to the rear addition; to replace the existing non-historic windows with wood true divided light wood frame windows for the historic house and double paned for the new construction with the condition that the windows meet the window standards in the ordinance; approval of the carriage house as amended with the condition that the applicant meet with Inspections (Development Services) to confirm that the ground floor may extend from lot line to lot line so that wider garage doors may be used; Approval to restore the iron balcony and with the stipulation that the front door design be brought to staff for approval.

Board Comments:

Mr. Mitchell asked if she said the material was going to be mahogany?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Wilford asked if the thermal pane also included the third floor bump out?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

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

RE: Petition of Elaine Lahey
HBR 05-3512-2
348 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.
Sign

Present for the petition was Elaine Lahey.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to install a neon projecting sign at 348 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

1. **Size:** The sign is 32" tall and 61" wide. It is approximately 14 square feet in size and is 3" deep.
2. **Projection:** The sign projects 5.5' from the building face and is located 3.4' from the edge of the sidewalk. It has a 10' clearance above the sidewalk.
3. **Illumination:** The proposed sign will feature blue neon lettering for the name of the establishment "Guitar Bar" and a white neon design in the shape of a guitar.
4. **Materials:** The sign is an aluminum box welded together, with a hollow center for the transformers to be placed. The neon is attached to the aluminum box with plastic feet and wire. A clear plexiglass sheet will be attached over the neon. The sign is mounted to the building by a steel plate with two 1.5" steel bars extending to the sign.
5. **Colors:**
 - Background – black and grey
 - Neon Letters – blue
 - Accent – white neon guitar design
 - Additional lettering – red-orange vinyl lettering

FINDINGS

The building was constructed ca. 1912-1915 and is a rated structure within Savannah's Historic District. The property is zoned B-C (community-business).

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

1. **Sign Clearance and Height** (Sec. 8-3121 (B)(2)) minimum clearance shall not be less than 10' above pedestrianways. Projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the structure and shall not project over the roof line or parapet wall elevation of the structure.

The proposed sign is below the cornice marking the first floor and maintains a clearance of 10' above the sidewalk.

2. **Lighted Signs** (Sec. 8-3121(B)(3)) shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open spaces.

The proposed sign appears out of scale with the surrounding commercial establishments along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and no other projecting neon signs are in the vicinity. Staff suggests reducing the size of the sign and eliminating the neon elements which are not typical of this location. Neon can be placed in the interior at the windows without review and is more in keeping with the surrounding commercial establishments.

3. **Principal Use Sign Requirements** (Sec. 8-3121 (B)(11)) for each nonresidential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than 1 square foot of sign area per linear foot of frontage along a given street or shall meet the following, whichever is the most restrictive: maximum of 30 square feet for a projecting sign where the outer edge of the projection extends no more than 6' from the face of the building provided that no portion of a sign shall be erected within 2' of a curblin.

The proposed sign is approximately 14 square feet and the building is 17' wide along MLK Jr. Boulevard. The sign extends 5.5' from the face of the building and is 3.4' from the outer edge of the sidewalk or curblin. The standard is met; however, the sign appears massive and is out of scale for the building. Staff recommends reducing the size of the sign.

RECOMMENDATION

Continuance to restudy the size of the sign and the neon elements.

Petitioner's Comments:

Ms. Lahey stated this area of Martin Luther King fell between Jones and Charlton Streets. The building used to be an upscale building at one time, but over time has become dilapidated. She said with regard to the sign and it not being within the historic context of the area, across the street was Parker's which was neon lit and EnMark which also has a backlit sign. She said in looking at the Landmark district itself there were numerous neon signs such as Sorry Charlies and Outback. She said she has been a part of the revitalization campaign and working closely with SDRA.

Mr. Ameir stated the sign was 13.5 square feet which is less than what is allowed.

Board Comments:

Mr. Mitchell stated he remembered when West Broad Street was lit up with neon and would like to see it again in the area. He said as mentioned directly in front of the building was an Oak tree and other vegetation so you really would not be able to see it.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Mitchell made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion.**

Discussion:

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she was concerned about Martin Luther King Blvd. coming back with a lot of neon signs.

Mr. Deering stated he felt neon was sometimes better for lighting signs than backlit signs. He said he felt internally lit signs were not what you would want to see and felt this was the better solution. He said he also felt the size of the sign was appropriate.

Dr. Johnson stated although the size of the sign was within the limits, he felt it was still too big for the building. He said he felt a smaller sign would be better.

HDBR Action: **The motion was passed 7 – 2. Opposed to the motion were Dr. Johnson and Mrs. Fortson-Waring.**

**RE: Petition of Paul Bush, For
Greg Hagins
HBR 05-3514-2
513 A & B East Hall Street
Alteration/Addition**

Present for the petition was Paul Bush.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. Extend front porches from 5'-3" to 10'.
2. Add a 12'-6" rear first floor addition and a 7'-10" second floor addition. It is proposed to alter the roof pitch to cover the new addition, thus raising the ridgeline.
3. Add an uncovered 6' rear deck.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Windows:Section 8-3030 (l) (9) (b) Historic windows, frames, sashes and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented that they have deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material.	Proposed windows are wood single pane windows.	It is not clear how many existing windows are proposed to be replaced. If they are in fair condition windows should be repaired rather than replaced, and if replacement is necessary they must replicate the historic window.

<p>Double pane (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and new construction.</p>		
<p>Porches: Stoop piers shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Infill between the foundation piers shall be recessed so that the piers are expressed.</p> <p>Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precise stone, marble, sandstone or slate,</p>	<p>Brick piers are proposed for the wood stoops. Wood rails and steps are proposed.</p>	<p>This standard is met. Many of the posts in the Beach neighborhood are simple, thus a cap and base are not a required element.</p>
<p>Additions: Section 8-3030 (l) (12) (c) Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.</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.</p> <p>Additions, including multiple additions to structures, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.</p> <p>Designs for additions may be either contemporary or reference design motifs of the historic building. However, the addition shall be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible as set forth in the visual compatibility factors.</p>	<p>A two story and a one story addition are proposed. It is proposed to alter the roofline by raising the roof ridge to accommodate the additions.</p>	<p>The raising of the roof ridge does not comply with the standards. The additions should be subordinate to the main structure, so that the main structure “reads”. What is proposed alters the mass and scale of the original structure. The two story addition should be placed below the eave line of the original house and recess slightly in width so it is readily discernible as a later addition.</p>
<p>Roofs: Roofs visible from a street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles.</p>	<p>Asphalt shingles are proposed.</p>	<p>This standard has been met.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

Discussion and reconsideration of how the additions are attached so that the form, detail, roof shape and scale of the main building is retained. Clarify which windows are to be replaced.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what was the exterior material?

Mrs. Reiter stated wood frame.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what about the asphalt shingles?

Mrs. Reiter stated they were being removed and it would be a wood framed house.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Bush stated they were proposing to enlarge the front porch and put in a 12 foot rear addition and a 7'-10" top addition. He said with regard to the windows they will restore the front windows and replacing the windows in the back.

Mr. Deering asked if during their demolition process if they found windows that existed on the 2nd floor above the front doors if they would consider putting them back?

Mr. Bush stated he was up there recently and the house has been totally gutted.

Mr. Mitchell asked what will the new windows be in the back?

Mr. Bush stated 6/6 wood true divided light.

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

**RE: Petition of Ronald Erickson, Architect
HBR 05-3515-2
314, 316, & 318 West Taylor Street
New Construction – Part I**

Present for the petition was Ronald Erickson.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of Part I: Height and Mass for the construction of three attached two-story townhouses at 314-316-318 West Taylor Street and three two story carriage houses.

FINDINGS

The applicant has submitted a thorough discussion using the standards as listed on the application.

Setbacks: The proposed setback and encroachments are consistent with historic precedent within the block face.

Height: The proposed height is consistent with the height map and other historic structures on the block.

Floor-to-floor heights: The floor-to-floor heights have been met.

Street Elevation type: A two story structure over a crawl space is consistent with historic precedent in the block.

Entrances: The main entrances face the front street. The 9 foot wide garage openings meet the standard.

Rhythm of solids to voids: A three bay rhythm is consistent with historic precedent in this area. The arrangement of the windows in the semiattached carriage houses creates a long line of windows which do not align with the doors below. Perhaps consideration might be given to shifting the door and stair location to break up this line of windows.

Rhythm of porch projections: The Sanborn maps indicate that historically there were encroaching covered stoops on this block.

Walls of continuity: Staff recommends discussion regarding the proposed height (eight feet) of the fence. Also the petitioner is asked to more fully elaborate on the courtyard additions and partitions which seem to go up to 14 feet.

Roofs: Flat roofs with parapets are proposed. Staff is concerned about the distance between the top of the windows and the top of the parapet on the main houses. Also the placement of the vents outside of the parapet area. Traditionally, vents were placed between a decorative band of dentil brickwork and the cornice or top of the parapet. The vents as proposed look out of place.

General comment on design: The proposed design uses many traditional elements, but uses a modern system of stucco (possibly on wood?) which requires expansion joints. The joints are not consistent with traditional scoring patterns and present an awkward appearance.

Also the use of stuccoed lintels and sills is not traditional. Staff recommends using a stone material or deleting them.

RECOMMENDATION:

Reconsideration of the treatment of the area between the top of the second story windows and top of parapet. Also reconsideration of an eight foot high garden wall and discussion of the height of the partitions between courtyards at the additions. A discussion of the use of stucco lintels and sills and placement of expansion joints would be part of Part II Design.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Erickson stated he had a revised elevation. He said with regard to there being too much area above the window lintels and below the parapet they have reduced the overall height of the building by 1'-4" coming out of the distance between the string course and the top of the lintels of the 2nd floor windows. He said with regard to the vent there also was historic precedent where vents were located below the string course for parapet construction and they were above the string course. He said they moved the vents up to the underside of the string course so it

did not have that much of a visual impact and they wanted to stay with the large sized vents. The reduction in height would also be done through the carriage house. With regard to the 8 foot garden wall they would like to maintain that in order to give the yard as much privacy as possible. He said the question of the height of the walls between the units, the one story bedroom addition they started off at 8 foot and went up to approximately 12 feet.

Board Comments:

Mr. Neely stated with regard to the 8 foot wall he understood the need to have privacy, but at the same time he felt it was a huge monolith. He said if there was a way for it to be 6 foot or 8 foot high that would be better. However, he still felt that he would like to see it broken up into may be two different materials.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if he felt 2 feet would make that much of a difference for the noise abatement? He said it would also give the privacy.

Mr. Erickson stated he felt from a security standpoint 6 foot was high but a person could still get over fairly easily. However, with a 8 foot wall it would be a little more difficult. He said he had no problem addressing that issue in Part II.

Mr. Deering stated he liked the idea of it being a two story structure as well as admired the attempt at taking carriage houses which front a street and creating a space between the pair of carriage houses and the single carriage houses. He said he was not concerned with the 8 foot wall because they existed throughout the district and usually covered with fig vine and not really noticed. He said he also appreciated him addressing Staff's comments of bringing the attic louvers up to string course and reducing the dimension.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the height of the garden walls to be considered under Part II design. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
Pete Callejas
HBR 05-3516-2
107 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Alteration/Addition**

Petition **withdrawn** per Petitioner's request.

**RE: Petition of David Conners, For
Tony Roma's
HBR 05-3517-2
7 East Bay Street
Sign**

Present for the petition was Chris Ogden.

Mrs. Ward gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to install a 7'-1½" neon projecting sign at 7 East Bay Street. The sign is for the restaurant Tony Roma's, who currently occupies the building.

1. **Size:** The sign is 7'-1½" tall and has varying widths of 1'-7" to 2'-9½". It is approximately 17.5 square feet in size and is 1' in depth.
2. **Illumination:** The proposed sign will feature two sets of lighted areas:
 - 1) Exposed red neon 8" letters for "Tony Roma's" spanning approximately 4.5'; and
 - 2) 138 "H-S-14 marquee bulbs" that are 1¾" in diameter.
3. **Materials:** The sign is aluminum.
4. **Colors:**
 - Background – white
 - Neon Letters – Ruby Red exposed neon backed with vinyl
 - Additional signage – "Ribs Seafood Steaks" black vinyl lettering on white acrylic background.
 - Arrow – black background behind marquee.

FINDINGS

The building is a rated structure within Savannah's Historic District and the property is zoned B-C-1 (central-business). A 40 square foot neon projecting sign is located on the same block at 7 Drayton Street for Outback Steakhouse. This is the only other neon sign in the vicinity and it appears too large and staff has received numerous complaints regarding the sign.

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

1. **Sign Clearance and Height** (Sec. 8-3121 (B)(2)) minimum clearance shall not be less than 10' above pedestrianways. Projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the structure and shall not project over the roof line or parapet wall elevation of the structure.

No information regarding the clearance were provided; verify with petitioner.

2. **Lighted Signs** (Sec. 8-3121(B)(3)) shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open spaces.

The proposed sign appears out of scale with the surrounding commercial establishments along Bay Street. The proposed marquee lighting is not in keeping with the surrounding businesses which generally limited neon to the interior at the windows, with the exception of the Outback Steakhouse. The marquee, as the title suggests, is more appropriate for theatre buildings in the historic district.

3. **Restricted Signs** (Sec. 8-3121 (B)(4)) include those with flashing, animation, running light signs, or signs with moving parts except as permitted elsewhere in this theatre [district] for theatre marquees where documented historical precedent exists for such structure.

The proposed sign, with its lighted marquee, appears to be of running lights; however, this needs to be verified from the applicant.

4. **Principal Use Sign Requirements** (Sec. 8-3121 (B)(11)) for each nonresidential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than 1 square foot of sign area per linear foot of frontage along a given street or shall meet the following, whichever is the most restrictive: maximum of 30 square feet for a projecting sign where the outer edge of the projection extends no more than 6' from the

face of the building provided that no portion of a sign shall be erected within 2' of a curbline.

The proposed sign is approximate 17.5 square feet. This appears to be in keeping with the above requirements however, the linear footage of the building façade was not provided. In addition, no information regarding the projection or height placement within the building was provided; verify with petitioner.

RECOMMENDATION

Denial; the proposed neon/marquee sign does not appear visually compatible in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open spaces. The sign also appears to fall under the restricted sign portion of the Historic Sign District Ordinance (Sec. 8-3121 (B)(4)) due to the marquee; however, this needs to be verified by the petitioner.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Ogden stated the sign was 44½ linear feet. He said the lights were not running lights and would only be on during the evening hours.

Mr. Steffen asked if this was a corporate logo?

Mr. Ogden stated yes, and the sign was designed because they did not want to go out too far from the front of the building.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the bulb lights would be blinking?

Mr. Ogden stated no.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the lights were currently set up such that if they chose to make them directional they could?

Mr. Ogden stated no.

Mr. Deering stated he did not mind neon in certain situations, but felt this was a big building and had a different feeling architecturally. He said he agreed with Staff in that marquee lights were intended to be for something that was more marquee type establishment ie. theater. He said he felt that were not appropriate for the restaurant. He said he felt they needed to think about redesigning the sign because the proposed sign did not suit the building.

Mr. Ogden stated he felt they could eliminate the arrow and may be keep the square footage. He asked if that would be acceptable?

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that would be an improvement, but they would need to bring something back for the Board to see. He said he felt he needed to request a continuance.

Mr. Mitchell asked if they were trying to get the customers attention?

Mr. Ogden stated they were trying to get a better sign than what they had.

Mr. Mitchell stated he felt the same as his colleagues with regard to the marquee and felt the signage would accomplish the same thing without the neon.

Mr. Ogden agreed to a continuance.

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

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Rubi McGrory
HBR 05-3509(S)-2
441 Barnard Street
Roof/Door
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
Gretchen Ogg
HBR 05-3510(S)-2
113 – 115 Jefferson Street
Color/Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Richard Mopper
HBR 05-3520(S)-2
212, 214, 216 West Broughton Street
Color/Awning/Windows
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: Other Business

Mr. Steffen thanked John Mitchell for serving as Chairman and providing a template for how to run a meeting. He said he was also pleased that Ms. Seiler would continue to serve as Vice Chairman. He also stated that on Monday he met with Mr. Mitchell, Mrs. Reiter, and Mrs. Ward and they talked about things they needed to do with their procedures in which very little needed to be changed. He said one of the things he wanted to look at as a Board was trying to put together some enforcement in some of the things the Board does. He said Mrs. Reiter had some wonderful input as to the Board being realistic if they were going to attempt to get the City to support it in which she provided him with the old template. He said in the Board's next meeting packet they should have a new proposal for that.

He also stated at the end of the Board's packet they should find an evaluation sheet. He said every one of the City's Boards were given one of these and it was incumbent on the Chairman to fill it out and send it back in to the Mayor. He said he would like for the Board to have the opportunity to fill them out and get them to him within 10 days after which he will put together a final evaluation send it to the Mayor. He said he felt this was a great opportunity to give the City input back as to what they felt they were doing right or may be what things they would like to see done differently.

Dr. Caplan asked what was the status on the filling station and the fact that City Council would like to review all denials on demolition?

Mrs. Reiter stated tomorrow there was a meeting between the parties to start a dialogue to see if a compromise could be reached.

Dr. Caplan stated the Board was given a mandate to either approve or deny a demolition, but somehow this mandate has been taken from them. He said he felt the Board should make a strong objection to this procedural change.

Mr. Steffen stated as he mentioned in last month's meeting he and Mr. Mitchell went to the Council meeting in which this was discussed. He said he spoke before Council and told them that the Board was divided on the issue and he was not there to advocate for or against the petition. But after having attended the workshop in Decatur it was apparent that for almost every other Review Board in this State when their decisions are appealed to the elected Body it is reviewed based on two things: (1) whether the Board followed procedure or (2) whether the Board abused their discretion. He said he urged the Council to treat this that way because the statute itself says *appeal* and it does not say what kind of *appeal*. It was the voiced opinion of the Council members who spoke that they wanted the authority to hear these things completely new. He said whether it was the right thing or not, the Board serves at their pleasure and they can make that decision. He said he felt the Board had a choice on demolitions right now. The Board was asked and authorized to hear demolition. He said he felt the Board needed to realize that they were hearing them in essentially an advisory capacity because there was almost always aggrieved party in a demolition. He said he felt it was the Board's function to help Council make a record and give them their advice which was not the way he felt they understood it to be. He said until Council gets sick of hearing their 8th or 9th demolition and spend hours on it, he felt that was the way it was going to be.

Mr. Mitchell stated Council at their retreat specifically addressed the situation and decided to retain that position.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt there were two things the Board should be concerned with which were they needed to wait and see what the City does and they needed to be concerned that if they try to reach a compromise. She said she felt anything they either approved or disapproved the demolition should come back before the Board. She said she did not see how the City could approve a different project because it was not in the ordinance. She said she felt the problem was that the Board did not have a legal representative and there was nothing written in the ordinance to enforce their decisions.

Dr. Caplan stated he was concerned as a citizen because he felt this would give the opportunity to politicize the entire process and he felt the Board was in place to prevent that.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she felt the Board should let it go and see what happens. She said she felt the minute it happens and if in fact it does become political that is when the Board start doing as citizens a major editorial and campaign because it clearly could be abused. She said she was not saying that the City Council was subject to corruption but if you look at the worst case scenario then yes and that was why it lend itself to improper review.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he heard the Mayor say that he was concerned that Historic Review Board followed procedure. He said he would suggest that the Board write the Mayor and tell

him that if he was concerned about the Board following procedure then may be the City Attorney or the City Assistant Attorney to sit in on the Board meetings.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she watched it on television and Mr. Steffen made that point and some members of Council said no that they were not here to review whether or not they followed procedure, but they were there to decide whether or not they agreed.

Mr. Steffen stated he felt Council was also well aware as to how the Board felt about it.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he talked with two members of Council and he told them that if they override the Board's decision that from hereon every demolition project that should come before the Board would go before Council and they will be tied up. He said neither one realized that.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated no, they realized it at the meeting. She said on the television they said yes they realized it and they accept it. She said they said they decided to retain that power.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the other thing was the Board usually hears the person wanting demolition and a person wanting a Part I of what is being proposed to be constructed. He said he felt the Board needed to get that clarified with Council that if they wanted to take over the task of demolition that was fine, but once the demolition was approved by them that they have to come back for new construction approval.

Mrs. Reiter stated the demolition would not go into effect until the Board has approved the new construction.

Mr. Steffen stated the Council member he spoke with on yesterday was aware of that and concerned about it. He said they also did not discuss the issue that this was supposed to be by convincing evidence.

Dr. Caplan stated he was concerned from a public relations standpoint that some how or another the City Council still may be looking on the Board in an adversarial way. He said he did not want to misread that, but if they appoint the Board and they do these things, some how or another he was not sure their appointments were important because if they take on this function then why should the Board be here.

Mrs. Reiter stated she sent out an email to everyone about a month ago because an applicant put up a panel and wanted to change the rustication on the bottom of the hotel that was being built on Oglethorpe Avenue and M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. In the email she said that it was back around by the trailer and ask the Board to go by and take a look at it and to either email her back or call and only one person responded.

The Board asked Mrs. Reiter to resend the email and they will go look at it.

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

RE: Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca