

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

JULY 12, 2006

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Gerald E. Caplan
John L. Deering, III
Ned Gay
Gene Hutchinson
Lester Johnson
Eric Meyerhoff
W. John Mitchell
John Neely

HDRB Members Not Present:

Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring

HDRB/MPC Staff Present:

Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner
Dewayne Stephens, Historic Preservation Intern
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

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

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of City of Savannah
Chris Morrill
H-06-3627-2
Southwest Corner of Jefferson Street & West
Bay Lane
Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Lynch Associates Design
Rebecca Lynch
H-06-3628-2
230 East Oglethorpe Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Keith Howington for
Bob & Judy Tschetter
H-06-3634-2
3 East Macon Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

HDRB 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 passed unanimously. Mr. Deering recused himself from H-05-3417-2 and H-06-3634-2.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

**RE: Continued Petition of Lee Meyer, AIA
H-06-3530-2
417 East Jones Street
Alteration of Rear Servant's Quarters**

Continued at the Petitioner's request to August 9, 2006.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects
Jose Gonzalez
H-06-3550-2
304 East Bryan Street
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass of a
Four-Story Hotel**

Continued at the Petitioner's request to August 9, 2006.

**RE: Petition of Steve Day
H-06-3562-2
20 East Taylor Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

Continued to August 9, 2006, for insufficient information.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3566-2
14 – 22 West Liberty Street
New Construction Part I Height and Mass of a
Five-Story Mixed Use Building (Hotel,
Condominiums, and Retail)**

Continued to August 9, 2006, pending Board of Zoning Appeals.

RE: Petition of Kessler River Street, LLC
Bryan Py
H 06-3607-2
102 West Bay Street
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass and
Part II Design for a Hotel; Variances Requested

Continued to August 9, 2006, pending Board of Zoning Appeals.

RE: Petition of Ciphers Design Company
H-06-3608-2
104 West Jones Street
Shutters and a Four-Story Deck on the Rear

Continued at the Petitioner's request to August 9, 2006.

RE: Petition of Sign Mart, Incorporated
Bill Norton
H-06-3630-2
2 West Bay Street
Sign

Continued at the Petitioner's request to August 9, 2006.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Continued Agenda items as submitted. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of Rowland Commercial
Development
H-06-3586-2
229 Price Street
Demolition/New Construction Part I

NATURE OF REQUEST:

1. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish a non-rated commercial structure.
2. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a four-story 12-unit condo building.

FINDINGS:

1. The non-rated commercial warehouse building was built in 1968 for Baker and Jarrell Electric Company. The structure is an iron frame building with a concrete floor. The walls are glass and cement block. One historic cottage was removed to St. Julian Street by the Lane Foundation in the 1960's or early 70's. The present building is 38 years old and does not appear to possess historic qualities.

2. The Board of Appeals granted a 7.7 percent lot coverage variance for a total of 82.7 percent coverage on an “L” shaped lot. It is zoned R-I-P-C. The 28-foot by 33-foot “L” portion of the lot will be open. The lots will need to be recombined before a permit is issued.

The building footprint is 60 feet-6 inches by 90 feet-6 inches.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIP-C zone.	No setbacks are proposed on the North, South or East elevations. The West elevation setback is not clear.	The setbacks are met, however it would seem the building is encroaching on the public right of way on the north and/or south sides by a total of 6”. The stoop encroaches 8’ onto the public right of way on the north elevation.
Dwelling Unit Type	Apartment Building	While rare, apartment building types are found in the Historic District.

Street elevation Type	High Stoop	High stoops on apartment buildings are not typical. See comments below.
Entrances	The 90 foot long building has a center entrance on McDonough Street. The garage entrance is on Perry Street and exit is on Price Street.	There is no lane for this lot. Only one other historic building exists on this block, a double townhouse facing Habersham Street. It has two entrances with closely spaced high stoops.
Building Height: The structure is located in a four story zone.	<p>The stoop height appears to be 8’-6” with a step up for a total of 9’-6” for the first floor. The second story is 11’. The 3rd and 4th stories are 11’-4” each. The parapet is 5’-2”. The total height is 48’-4”.</p> <p>The applicant desires to reuse an existing slab on the site in order to protect an existing oak tree.</p>	<p>(For comparison, the height of the 13 State Street condominiums on Columbia Square is 52’ and 90’ wide x 67’ deep). The height of the new row across the street is at least 39’-8” and may in fact be taller. The precedent in this neighborhood is for two and three story buildings, therefore every effort should be taken to lower the height of the parapet as much as possible.</p> <p>Consideration might be given to sacrificing the tree and putting the parking underground.</p>

Tall Building Principles and large scale development	NA	NA
Proportion of openings	The windows have a 3:6 ratio. The garage level openings are rectangular, 4'-8" x 3'2.5" with bars. Some are bricked in with bars over the brick. The garage door openings are 12' on McDonough and Price Streets.	The entire ground floor is devoted to parking. Thus passing pedestrians will only see parked cars. The only opening on the ground floor is for cars. If the Board approves this then, the applicant might consider louvered shutters rather than iron bars.
Rhythm of solids to voids	The window openings align vertically. A 12' garage opening faces town houses across Perry Street.	No information was given on the use or appearance of the vacant "L" shaped piece of property. Has the applicant considered using this as access to the garage, thereby eliminating the garage entrance on Perry Street.
Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, balconies	7' and 8'x3' balconies are proposed on the McDonough and Perry Street sides. A high stoop is proposed on the McDonough Street side.	While there are high stoop townhouses nearby, their footprints are considerably smaller than the proposed structure. The high stoop is incongruous on buildings of this width. The applicant should reconsider a ground floor entrance. However, if the Board of Review approves a high stoop then the step treads and risers should be precast rather than brick.
Walls of continuity	NA	NA

Materials:

Brick veneer: No sample provided

Wood paneled shutters: Please clarify what kind of wood or are PVC shutters proposed? Please clarify that shutters will be operable. Do they need to meet hurricane standards?

No information was given on the window manufacturer or design; single- or double-glazed; size of muntins, etc. Need same information for the doors.

Model:

The model as submitted is inadequate.

There is another condominium project before the Board this month adjacent to this site. Staff recommends that both applicants coordinate and perhaps show both buildings on one model and collaborate on materials, colors, etc. It is rare to find two apartment buildings side-by-side. The model would help the board see how these projects relate to one another.

There are a number of large vacant lots in this vicinity. This issue of building coverage and density is being studied because all the lots are filled lot-line to lot-line and tracts combined then the character of this area of Savannah's National Historic Landmark District will be irrevocably altered from its historic appearance.

RECOMMENDATION:

Continue to address issues raised by Staff such as underground parking, ground floor entry, and any additional Board issues.

Ms. Reiter stated that given the size of the building and the height, the tree is going to have to be trimmed because it would run into the building. In this case, it would be better to sacrifice the tree and replant, to put the parking underground, rather than keep the tree.

The Petitioner was not present.

Mr. Steffen recommended that before the Board would undertake the motion to see if there was any public comment on the petition to make sure that no one was there that did not want to stay until the end of the meeting, then he would entertain the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Joe Sasseen commented that the they are putting up are the same brick that the building is made of. They need to concentrate on making them a little more pronounced to help break up the mass of brick.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the Architectural Review Committee strongly agreed with Staff and all of their concerns about the project. They were a bit confused whether it was Part I and II as well. He had two issues to raise that he felt were important and may have to do with the floor plan. They did not have any copies of the floor plan to look at. He said above the front door in the front entranceway were two bricked-in windows they felt were incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and with any brick building in the district. That may be a floor plan issue that needed to be cited now because floor plans have a way of getting locked in. Everything revolves around the floor plan and they asked that it be restudied. The other thing they felt was potentially a life safety issue was the entryway to the parking on the ground floor that dumps right on Price Street. If you look at the model, there is zero lot line on Price Street, and the garage doors open right out onto Price. They felt the cars would have to pull out onto Price before they can tell if any traffic is coming from the north. He said that the traffic moves at a pretty high rate of speed there. They felt it was something that bore some consideration.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review move this petition to the end of the meeting. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay
H-06-3588-2
508 – 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue
Demolition/New Construction, Part I Height and
Mass of a Five-Story Hotel**

The Preservation Officer recommends a **conceptual approval Part I.**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to:

1. Demolish the Econo-Lodge Motel
2. Part I Height and Mass to erect a five-story “L” shaped hotel in two phases. The first phase is a rectangular portion on the north end of the lot along Laurel Street easement between Ann Street and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK).

FINDINGS:

1. The maximum lot coverage allowed in a B-C district is 100 percent.
2. The existing motel was originally built in 1966 as a Travel Lodge Motel. It has undergone a number of physical transformations and does not appear to possess any historic significance.
3. The following is a list of the substantive changes in response to Staff and Board concerns:
 - Plan: Additional indentations have been provided
 - Elevations: Laurel Street the height has been varied for different elements and the fifth floor has been set back.

Oglethorpe at corner of Ann: The façade has been divided into more regular pieces by roof shape changes and widths of the segments. The window openings are more regular and the fifth floor has been recessed somewhat.

Martin Luther King elevation: The façade has been segmented into three bays.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment (See below)
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in BC district when next to BC.		
Dwelling Unit Type	Hotel mixed use	
Street elevation Type	Ground entrance. Two floors underground parking.	

Entrances	Entrance to parking garage off Laurel Street. First phase lobby off MLK with automobile court on Laurel Street easement. Second phase lobby on Ann Street and corner condo entrances at	Entrances are provided on all street elevations. Staff continues to recommend the consideration of one or two shops on the Oglethorpe Avenue Phase II side to create pedestrian interaction
-----------	---	---

	Oglethorpe Avenue and at Laurel Street on Ann.	at street.
Building Height:	Five stories, 57 feet and 63 to top of main parapet. At various points the parapet is extended higher (78' at MLK entry)	
Tall Building Principles and large scale development Frontage divided into 60' sections Bays between 15-20 feet wide Parapet roof or bracketed corbelled or entablature. Primary entrances not exceed 60 feet.	The primary entrance is on MLK for the hotel and corner of Ann and Laurel for the Condos. A solid parapet has been used.	See comments below regarding bays.
Proportion of structure's front facade	The front façade consists of a three part division.	This helps the mass of the structure along MLK.
Proportion of openings	Rectangular windows, single and paired and ribbon are used.	See Part II Design comments. Consider differentiating the condo windows from the hotel room windows.
Rhythm of solids to voids	Larger amounts of glass have been employed to try to segment the building.	See Part II design comments.
Rhythm of structure on street	A bay rhythm is being established.	This might be further emphasized in Part II through the use of consistent materials.
Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, balconies	Recessed balconies are used.	This helps to give depth to the elevations and to reduce the flatness of the long elevations.
Scale	The recesses help reduce the scale.	The materials, textures, depth of openings etc. in Part II will be critical in manipulating the scale of the building.

Comments:

1. The changes to date appear to be moving in the right direction to segment the building and reduce the impact of the overall scale. With little historic context, the cleaner modern lines and wider bay spacing appear to be compatible in this section of the district which is out of the ward and square area.
2. Regarding the glassed areas and windows. The renderings suggest a greater use of glass which is a successful treatment particularly at the entry and along Laurel Street. It is assumed glass is used and not spandrel panels. This needs to be clarified in the Part II submittal. The renderings do not mesh with the lined elevations. It is important that accurate drawings be submitted in the Part II design submittal. The elevations indicate the use of PTAC systems throughout which have an adverse visual impact on the glassed areas. The very first submittal did not employ PTAC systems. Another system

should be explored so that the voids are true. Also, the depth of the windows from the face of the building will be critical to giving depth and scale to the long elevations.

3. There is an opportunity to further segment the building by differentiating Phase I from Phase II through the use of materials. It is also critical that Phase I be able to stand alone in the event that Phase II is not built. Separate Phase I drawings should be provided in the design submission.
4. Indicate in the design submission where the utilities will be placed.

RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual approval of Part I Height and Mass with further development in Part II design to differentiate Phase I and II.

Mr. Deering asked if the rendering could be put up for the public's viewing.

Mr. Steffen asked if the Staff recommended that the Board approve Part I, but Staff had significant concerns regarding Part II.

Ms. Reiter stated she thought they could further use the design to help differentiate the buildings, and every effort should be made to have the glass curtain wall be that and not be filled with PTAC systems, grills, or spandrel glass.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Shay stated he had additional information to submit. The information was not specifically relevant to the project, but he felt there was a general apprehension and a genuine concern for large-scale buildings in the Historic District, and the proliferation of hotels. He thanked the Staff and the Board for allowing them the opportunity to continue to study the building. He thought it had not finished evolving, but they felt it was a much better building through the process, and they pledged to the Board that they would welcome an opportunity to continue refining it as they go forward. He then introduced Mr. Al-Jassar who had additional renderings that were further refined and some additional information to show.

Mr. Saad Al-Jassar stated they had been challenged, it was a challenging building, and he agreed with Staff comments. He said the Board would see from the rendering they were actually working on refining the building. It is a big building. As suggested, they might have to use different materials on the two segments of the buildings. You can tell that Phase I had different colors and materials from Phase II. He said regarding the PTAC, they would come with a definite answer on Phase II submission because they needed to discuss with their mechanical engineer the cost impact. He thought they were on the same page and they appreciated the comments. He said they would take care of the two phases and submit two different drawings for each phase.

Mr. Hutchinson commended them for the steps they had taken based on the comments from the last meeting; he thought they had done a wonderful job. His question was what would the building look like between Phases I and II, and what was the timeline.

Mr. Shay stated the owner was currently in negotiations with a separate franchiser for the second phase. They have, therefore, chosen to express the fact that there would potentially, be two different exterior expressions as a result of that. It was the owner/developers hope that the two projects could be pursued simultaneously, perhaps with two different hotel franchises. He said they had on previous submissions submitted drawings of what it would look like if the

second phase were not undertaken. It was very similar to what is seen in the drawings that show the southern side of the building. A portion of the façade would remain blank for the time being, but it would have the kind of materials that were consistent with the rest of the building.

Mr. Deering asked if they could bring back a drawing of the design section or portion of the petition that would show the Board what that would look like and what the materials would be.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Mr. Deering stated that he would like them to strongly consider Staff's recommendations about the PTAC's and the curtain walls. He agreed with Mr. Hutchinson that it had really come a long way and it looked very nice. He said he loved the indentations, and that it really helped the three-dimensional perspective, the birds-eye rendering really showed how the mass had changed a lot. He appreciated it and thought it looked really nice.

Mr. Shay stated that it was evolving and that it was going to get better. He said they have to explore more fully the ramifications of the various types of mechanical systems. They showed what it would look like with louvers. There was some chance that some of the louvers would go away, especially the curtain wall sections.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they would like to join in the praise for the new submission. They felt that the architectural team had done an excellent job in presenting a contemporary solution to the difficult corner that was a problem site. He said he only had one comment that was not praise. The committee was a bit concerned about the height of the glass parapet wall on the MLK façade where the signage was. They felt that it marred the architecture by turning it into a sign panel and they asked for consideration to maybe reduce the height of it, and accordingly reduce the size of the signage.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Caplan made the motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition containing the Part I Height and Mass. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik E. Puljung
H-06-3635-2
400 Block of McDonough Street
New Construction Part I Height and Mass**

The Preservation Officer recommends **conceptual approval**.

Present for the petition was Erik Puljung.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass for a four-story six-unit condominium building with a 57'-3/4" x 56'-3/4" footprint (not counting the veneer).

The adjacent condominium units facing Habersham Street are owned by the same owner and there will be shared access to parking.

FINDINGS:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	Setbacks have been proposed on the North, South and East elevations.	This helps relieve the cube-like feeling of the building.
Dwelling Unit Type	Apartment/condo	This is a rare form historically in the district.
Street Elevation Type	Recessed ground floor entries on McDonough and Perry Streets.	Ground floor entries for apartment buildings are more traditional than high stoop, and is, therefore, a more compatible treatment.
Entrances	See above.	
Building Height: The site is in a four-story zone.	Four stories are proposed for a total height of 44 feet.	The height criteria is met.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	The front façade is divided into three bays by deep balconies and changes in fenestration.	This helps break the mass into legible pieces and divides the façade into a traditional rhythm of bays.
Proportion of Openings	The openings are primarily vertical and vertically aligned. A 12-foot garage opening is located on both the north and south facades. An 8' high garden wall screens the open west first story.	The applicant may wish to develop the fenestration pattern further in design development phase. There is no other alternative for the garage opening due to the shared arrangement with the condos next door.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	See above comments.	
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The proposed garden walls and slight setback help keep this structure from overwhelming the block front.	The building is separated from the proposed new building to the east on the north side by a permanent 28' x 33' lot. The south vacant lot is not owned by either party.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	Deeply recessed balconies are proposed which give emphasis to the divisions of the façade.	It is important to break these big buildings up into differentiated pieces. Balconies and porches help to provide individual access to the outside environment which is important to the quality of life of residences, especially when green space is reduced or eliminated.

Walls of Continuity	See comment on garden walls.	
Scale	The scale of the building is helped by the deep recesses and fenestration pattern.	

Comments: Because of the joint ownership of the lots, it is not clear whether any lot coverage variances are required. The applicant needs to verify this prior to the Board meeting. It is noted that a 90-foot-wide condominium building is proposed at the same meeting for the adjacent lot. Staff recommends that the applicants converse and show both their buildings on the same model. There are several additional vacant lots in the vicinity. If all are built out to the maximum, then the historic character of Crawford ward will be altered. Aside from several civic buildings such as the jail and police headquarters, Crawford Ward is a ward of small footprint residential buildings. How these larger buildings are sited is critical.

Mr. Gay stated that from a height standpoint it met the requirement, but it seemed that the way it did was by not having the five-foot parapet wall that the other building did. Other than that, it is pretty much the same as far as the height of the floors. In Downtown it seemed that in the older buildings, the first floor is typically not very high, then the second floor will have a ten- or twelve-foot ceiling, and then it reduces. He asked if there was any way they could maybe do that and give it a little bit more of an appearance of what is seen around Downtown Savannah.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Erik Puljung stated they had a program where they were trying to have fairly equal condominium units, and he was trying to work with the fenestration of the building and window header heights to match what was being described. Where the top floor does seem lower than the rest of them, and it was something that he was going to be studying to try to enhance the appearance. He said it was a building that had a base shaft and capital, even though it is four stories.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked Mr. Puljung to clarify the six parking spaces indicated on the west out in between the two buildings. He said in order to get to them you go under the new building and then you had to back under the new building to get out.

Mr. Puljung answered correct. They were not going to be the most easy to access parking spaces but that was how they were doing that.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that in the building they show six parking spaces, and the building is just about 60 feet and that is about ten feet wide for a parking place. On the open spaces with the stairway on either end, it looked like they would have an eight-foot parking space there. He was wondering how it worked.

Mr. Puljung stated that Mr. Meyerhoff was correct. The parking spaces were closer to eight feet and that was why they had two large openings to keep the openings as wide as they could to make the maneuverability as easy as possible.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the eastside if the property was theirs.

Mr. Puljung answered that was not their property.

Mr. Deering stated he would like them to consider Staff comments on the fenestration design when they come back with design submittal.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve Part I as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Sottile & Sottile, LLC
 Christian Sottile
 H-06-3626-2
 38 Habersham Street
 409 & 413 Congress Street
 418 – 422 Congress Lane
 New Construction Part I Height and Mass**

Present for the petition was Mr. Christian Sottile

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for Part I Height and Mass of 12 residential units in Warren Ward divided as follows:

- A. *38 Habersham Street (Habersham Loft Building):* three-story residential building with three units.
- B. *409 and 413 Congress Street (Townhomes on Congress):* three-story townhome in form of a duplex with a two-story townhome over a garden level flat, and two carriage houses with additional unit above at the lane (six units).
- C. *418-422 East Congress Lane (Lane Houses):* three two-story attached “lane houses”.

FINDINGS:

Currently, the property above is vacant and serves as a surface parking lot for the car dealership to the south. It is zoned RIP-A (Medium Residential) and maintains 11,640 square feet. To provide better organization for future submittals during Part II, staff has divided the project into three parts (A, B, and C) as defined above and will go through the standards for each one.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards apply for RIP-A:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIP-A zone.		
Lot Area: A minimum of 600	12 units are proposed on a	The standard is met.

square feet of lot area is required for two-family or multi-family dwellings, per unit.	11,040 square foot lot. 7,200 square feet of lot area is required to meet the standard.	
Lot Coverage: Maximum building lot coverage 75%.	64% building lot coverage is proposed.	The standard is met.
Large scale development: Large scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width.	The proposed development is broken up into four distinct structures of two- and three-story heights.	Not applicable.

Building A – 39 Habersham Street

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Building Height: 3-stories	A Three-story building is proposed which is 37' tall.	The standard is met. The neighboring building is a two-story duplex, approximately 35' tall.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Dwelling Unit Type	Multi-family residence with three loft style units.	The interior of Warren Ward is predominantly residential and contains several duplexes. Mixed-use buildings are primarily on Bay and Broughton.
Street Elevation Type	A townhome form has been incorporated into the design with a single entrance at grade for each of the units to access the building. The proposed form is taken from other apartment-style buildings in the historic district to transition from the more commercial uses along Broughton to the residential nature surrounding Warren Square.	Building forms within the ward consist of single-family (originally) dwellings and duplexes with central entrances, townhomes and row houses with side hall entrances, and mixed-use structures on Broughton Street.

Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, balconies	The arched opening is centered with the door recessed into the structure at the ground level. The neighboring historic duplex has a paired entrance in the center of the building within a slightly elevated stoop.	The standard is met. The centered entrance is appropriate and the recess provides a portico element.
Proportion of structure's front facade	The proposed structure is 42' wide by 37' tall featuring a flat roof and vertical bays which divide the façade into two halves. A pronounced base and parapet break up the façade horizontally.	The standard is met.
Proportion of openings	The openings appear to be proportionate to the neighboring historic structure. The grouping of three windows within the vertical bays is similar to what is found in the adjacent historic structure. Three garage door openings are located on the lane.	Dimensions to be verified during Part II submittal. Staff recommends approval. Although, historically, carriage houses featured one or two openings with a pedestrian entrance, the three-car garage provides one space for each unit and is located along the lane.
Rhythm of solids to voids	A five bay rhythm with groupings of three windows in the vertical bays.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of structure on street	Approximately 7' of open space exists between this building and the neighboring historic structure. The building will be adjacent to the carriage houses on Building B having no open space on the lane.	The standard is met. Only one other structure exists on this block and as such, no rhythm exists. It is common for buildings fronting a lane to be immediately adjacent.
Walls of continuity	Fencing appears in the renderings between structures.	Verify during Part II submittal.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Scale	The proposed building is slightly taller than the neighboring historic structure but is proportionate to itself and incorporates historic building proportions.	The standard is met. The neighboring structure across the lane is not a rated building.

Building B – 409 and 413 East Congress Street

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Building Height: 3-stories	Two three-story townhouse buildings, 33' in height are proposed facing East Congress Street. Two two-story carriage houses front the lane.	The standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type	Each townhouse will have a garden level unit and a two-story residential unit above. The carriages houses will each have a three-car garage with a residential unit above.	The interior of Warren Ward is predominantly residential with several duplexes containing a garden level space below.
Street Elevation Type	<p>Three-bay high stoop townhomes with a projecting vertical bay and low sloping side gable roof are proposed on the Congress Street.</p> <p>The carriage houses are divided into three bays with a central balcony.</p>	<p>The projecting bay corresponds to the proposed building on Habersham creating a unified appearance while dividing the project into smaller structures. Side elevations should be submitted. Residential buildings within this vicinity feature pitched roofs.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval. Although, historically, carriage houses featured one or two openings with a pedestrian entrance, the three-car garage provides one space for each unit and is located along the lane.</p>
Entrances	High stoop entrances are used on the main building. They are 8' above the sidewalk.	Neighboring buildings feature modest to low stoop entrances. No entrances appear on the ground level of the proposed building.
Proportion of structure's front facade	Each townhome is 25' wide, spanning 50' total. Neighboring structures range from 20' to 35' in width.	Staff recommends approval. Historically, the property contained two wider semi-attached dwellings.
Proportion of openings	<p>The openings appear to be proportionate to the neighboring historic structure. Non-historic buildings to the east feature lower floor-to-floor heights.</p> <p>Three automotive openings are on each (2) carriage house. Three openings align above with a central balcony.</p>	<p>Staff recommends further study of the openings to fully define the paired windows within the bays and ground floor openings.</p> <p>The window openings on the carriage houses appear larger than those on the main residence and staff</p>

Standard	Proposed	Comment
		<p>recommends further study. Staff also recommends</p> <p>the elimination of the balconies projecting into the lane. This might block access to vehicles and balconies should front the courtyard and not the service corridor. Although historically carriage houses featured one or two openings with a pedestrian entrance, the three-car garage provides one space for each unit and is located along the lane.</p>
Rhythm of solids to voids	Each townhome has three-bays with a two-story vertical bay containing paired windows.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of structure on street	The semi-attached townhomes maintain 5' side yard setbacks on the east and west. Approximately 15' of open space is created on the east and west.	The standard is met. Although a greater amount of open space is created between these buildings and their neighbors, it is due to the proximity of those buildings and their property lines.
Walls of continuity	Fencing appears in the renderings between structures.	Verify during Part II submittal.
Scale	The proposed structure appears more elevated than any of the neighboring structures within the block face due to the high stoop element.	High stoops are found throughout the ward and surrounding Warren Square.

Building C – 418-422 East Congress Lane

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Building Height: 3-stories	Three two-story “lane houses”, 24' in height, are proposed.	The standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type	The buildings feature a one-car garage on the ground floor with a residential unit above.	Carriage houses with dwelling units above are common in the historic district.

Street Elevation Type	The elevation is two bays wide with openings which align vertically and horizontally comprising a service oriented residence found in lanes throughout the district.	Photographs of this building type within the historic district are provided in the applicant's submittal.
Proportion of openings	Window openings appear to be at different heights. Grouped openings of three windows are located above the garage doors.	Staff recommends that the window height be less than the door openings and should be consistent on the second floor.
Rhythm of structure on street	The lane houses are attached in a row and are immediately adjacent to the proposed carriage houses in Building B.	Staff recommends approval. It is common for buildings fronting a lane to be immediately adjacent and this area historically contained three attached dwelling units.
Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, balconies	Balconies or canopies appear to be on the elevations but are indiscernible.	Verify in Part II design. Balconies and canopies on the lane should be taken into consideration so as not to interfere with emergency and service vehicles.

RECOMMENDATION:

Building A: Approval of Part I, Height and Mass.

Building B: Approval of Part I, with clarification of window openings on the townhouse and revision of openings and elimination of balconies on carriage houses during Part II, Design Details.

Building C: Approval of Part I, with clarification of openings on second floor during Part II, Design Details.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if there was any indication of what the finished materials would be. He asked if everything was brick or stucco, or was there a combination between the buildings. He stated that it was difficult to visualize the Height and Mass if the base is stucco and the upper portion is brick or otherwise.

Mr. Gay stated that if the Board just approved the Height and Mass, then it is the petitioner's problem to get the design past them.

Mr. Deering stated there were no drawings for a Height and Mass approval submitted. There were no dimensions for height, and there were no sections or any thing like that. It was a conceptual approval, which the Board does not even do. He asked if that was what the petitioner asked for.

Ms. Ward stated the petitioner was asking for Part I approval of Height and Mass.

Mr. Deering stated that building heights are necessary for Height and Mass.

Ms. Seiler stated she was wondering if she was missing some details herself. She said that in one part of the design book where it showed the architectural patterns for the lane houses, and they do have a history of having residences on lanes. She asked if Ms. Ward could give her an example where there was a lane neighborhood or a lane series in recent years because she could not remember one.

Ms. Ward stated she could not recall because of her nine months tenure with MPC. She said what she was referring to in her comments was a photograph that was provided that was something very similar and what she thought was probably an inspiration for the building.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Christian Sottile thanked the Board for their review and stated that they were very pleased to have the opportunity to work on a restoration of a block in a very important part of Downtown. That is really what their report was about, and they believed it to be a master plan for the block. What they were most excited about with this project was the opportunity to take a large parcel and restore the historic lot lines in that block. They thought it was a healthy way to restore larger parcels, especially in very fragile parts of the City, and they wrote the report to communicate that. As far as the buildings were concerned, they spent a lot of time thinking about the height and mass they had proposed. He said he wanted to address some of those issues. In Mr. Deering's point, he said they did include both the site plan and the section, and they addressed total building height in relationship to adjacent buildings. He wanted to address specific concerns that Staff had brought up.

Regarding the loft-style building on Habersham Street, there were no specific concerns on that building. On Congress Street, there was a question about entrances at street level versus a walk-up stoop. He said they looked at buildings in that ward carefully and they modeled the height of the walk-up stoop on the building that is adjacent to their project. They modeled the height of the stoop for the townhomes they were proposing on Congress Street to the height of the stoop across the corner of Habersham Street which is a little bit lower than average. They have the raised stoop at a total height of eight feet, which is 18 inches below the standard that the guidelines recommended. They explored the idea of having the entrances to the garden level flat on Congress Street, which they are open to doing. He said they had noticed, in looking at other historic examples, that sometimes the flats will enter from the side yard, and they had removed the building from the side yard by about five feet. They thought it would be a nice opportunity to have fewer doors fronting the street. He said if they were to go back and have the entrance to the buildings on Congress Street, then it would clearly fall underneath the portico, which would also be historically a very appropriate way to do it.

He said the balconies on the lane elevation for the carriage houses were another question. If you had a chance to look through the historic Sanborn Maps they had provided, there was a very residential character they thought was intriguing, and a great opportunity to have a smaller-scale set of uses on the lane. Of course, in modern standards, they would also need to park cars along the lane and they were doing that. He said with the two carriage houses if you look at the site plan, they actually have their entrances from the garden courtyard, and it was historically correct to do that. He said the garden could be entered from Congress Street down the five-foot side yard, and the carriage house entered from that direction. On the lane elevation, they could not propose anything that would restrict emergency vehicle access. He did not think a canopy needed to extend more than three feet, maybe less, but the thought was to provide additional eyes on the lane if the building not only opened to the garden, but provided some exposure to the lane as well. He said after reading the comments he asked, in lanes, what kinds of encroachments do they historically see? There is not a lot of evidence left of lane dwellings, but when they do find them, it seems like you would find stoops that project into the lane slightly. They are not recommending anything with columns, but they had shown in their

lane elevations two slightly projected balconies. He stated that it seemed to him after looking at other examples of even new construction, that they were finding examples of small projections to provide some articulation to the surface of a building for residential entrance.

To speak to the question about materials, they think they would be extremely important, and this had been a very challenging site for that reason. It is in a part of the City that has predominately-wooden structures with masonry bases. There are, at the same time, a handful of great masonry buildings in the area. On Habersham Street, the thinking was that it would be a brick building on all levels with a parapet wall. Along Congress Street, they felt like that would be the right approach in that block. He said they provided a perspective that showed the character of that corner with the buildings added to it, and they felt like with the predominate number of wooden buildings, the best way to respond to the character of the area would be to alter the material slightly and do a great building with a slightly different material. They felt like the way to work with the massing was to do a building that was masonry.

In the lane, their thinking was differentiating the lots in the buildings, they have a masonry building on Habersham Street, masonry buildings for the lane houses, and the carriage houses in between those would break up that rhythm and provide most likely masonry at the base and then wood above that.

Mr. Deering asked if Mr. Sottile had any comment on Staff's opinion of the bay windows on Congress Street and the "D" building.

Mr. Sottile stated that the comment as he understood it was requesting further clarification and design on the paired windows. They had suggested bay windows in the third bay of the three bay schemes, and they agreed they felt it is something that needed to be studied further. What the drawings showed were paired windows, and there were paired windows below to open up views into the square.

Mr. Deering stated that it is part of the mass.

Mr. Sottile agreed that it was something that would be studied very carefully.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he wanted to take the opportunity, because he had several students in the audience, to point out that the document is one that the students should really take a very close look at. It had addressed the issues of Master Planning within the urban system, the architectural elements were well-documented, the graphic content was superb, there was documentation of neighborhood conservation, and the characteristics of the project plus block evaluation and the issues within the design process of need, context, and form.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Sasseen stated he wanted to draw the Board's attention to the garage doors. He said they were looking at an awful lot of garage doors, which the petitioner may not be able to avoid. He was not totally hung up on this, but asked the Board to please make sure the petitioner and the Board do whatever they could to distract the eye from the garage doors. Even if it meant they could have balconies.

Mr. Tom Calesento (419 East Congress Street) stated while he agreed with the garage door alley, he would say they needed more garage doors. What is happening here is there are 12 units that would house at least two people each, each person would have a car, and this community in Warren Square is extremely pressed for parking. Especially on Friday evenings when they do the sweep on early Saturday morning, it is almost impossible to find a location to park. He understood that there was a parking garage right off Warren Square, and if the City

would grant free parking, that would make a lot of sense. However, he did not think that would occur. He said one of the objections that he had was the density of the number of units and the impact of parking. He also felt that any protrusion into the lane was going to be an encumbrance because it is a very tight lane. There was a restaurant directly behind these units, especially in the lane, that had a lot of service trucks coming into the lane that could create a potential problem. He said if anybody had a home in the lane that had a garage; it almost becomes impossible to make a turn in the tight lane to get into the garage. His deepest concern, and he thought he had expressed it enough, was the fact that there would be an impact on the community with a lot of vehicles, and he felt that the garages would be used more for storage than they would for vehicles.

Mr. Mitchell asked the petitioner whether they included a study of the turn radius.

Mr. Sottile stated they were intimately familiar with the dimensions of lanes Downtown that were 22½ feet, and that it had been scientifically proven, that it was very hard to drive a car into a garage. He thought over the years the response to that was doing 16-foot-wide doors which made it easier for cars to turn in. The guidelines do not allow that now, so the garage doors that they design were going to be nine feet wide, which does present a challenge and that was the way the City was made.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the petitioner was dealing with two entities. He was dealing with the width of the garage door and how much space you have in the lane. You cannot separate those two.

Mr. Gay stated most people that live Downtown who have a garage and live in the middle of the block were going to want to park their car in the garage. They were not going to want to park somewhere else at 3:00 in the morning. So, he thought that the garages would be used.

Mr. Calsento stated in reference to any of the buildings being masonry, anybody who knew Warren Square, the square is surrounded by wood structures. It is a beautiful square, quite often used...

Mr. Steffen stated he would stop Mr. Calsento because the Board had discussion and they were not going to deal with materials today. It was just on Height and Mass, and when the petitioner come back for their second-level of approval, assuming that they get approved today, the Board would deal with materials then. He said he would let Mr. Calsento go ahead and finish his sentence because he did not want to lose it to the record, but that he was just telling Mr. Calsento that they could not deal with that today.

Mr. Calsento stated his comment was that he felt that masonry buildings in this particular square would make it look more like apartment buildings rather than dwellings. He strongly suggest they go with wood to keep the flavor of the community together.

Mr. Deering first thanked the Kaminsky family for doing the design. He thought it was a great planning project, and he thought it was wonderful for them to return the site to structures that were really appropriate, and he commended them. He said the Board should approve with conditions HBR 06-3626-2 with the two conditions being that the balconies in the lane be studied. He did not think that the fire department would allow them to have anything lower than 13 feet 6 inches. He said he was not opposed to the balconies in the lane, he thought as Mr. Sasseen said, that it would add interest. He was opposed to the bays on the fronts of the two townhouses on Congress Street, and he thought that the petitioner needed to restudy those and wanted make that a part of the motion. To omit the bays from the Height and Mass approval.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of review approve the petition for Part I Height and Mass with the conditions that the bays be deleted on the Congress Street elevation, and a restudy of the balconies and carriage houses facing the lane be done during Part II Design Details. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects, P.C.
Patrick Phelps
H-06-3629-2
210, 212 & 214 Whitaker Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Phelps.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting an additional extension of the decision of H-02-2793-2 for remodeling and additions to the structures at 212-214 Whitaker Street and a structure behind them on the lane.

FINDINGS:

The petition was originally approved in 2002, and extended for one-year in 2003. No changes have been made in the plans, or in the vicinity of the project that would influence the original decision.

The drawings have been resubmitted for review and a new file number established due to the two-year delay.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the entrances be redesigned to incorporate a rectangular top light, and elimination of the keystone and radial scoring and the changes be brought back to Staff. (This was an original condition)

Mr. Patrick Phelps stated he was representing Independent Presbyterian Church. He said he appreciated the Board's patience and time in taking the third look at the project for consideration. First, was approval with conditions, and he repeated what Ms. Reiter stated was that they were looking at the entrance door and changing that to a rectangular light above the door rather than an arched radius. The original design intent was to mimic the door on the Axson building that was currently on the campus of Independent Presbyterian Church. He thought the intent of that was to give it more of a commercial feel since historically, that probably was a commercial entrance. Also, on the entrance back toward the rear, there was some archway quoining that they were advised to go back and look at the detailing around the arch of that doorway. He said they would certainly continue to look at that and meet with Staff and meet the recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they supported the project. He said if the Board would remember they almost lost the building and it was only through a compromise that the Independent Church saved it.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the conditions that the entrances be redesigned to incorporate a rectangular top light and elimination of the keystone and radial scoring and that the changes be brought back to staff. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
Pete Callejas
H-06-3631-2
19 East Gordon Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

Present for the petition was Mr. John Deering.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

Mr. Deering recused himself.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for demolition of a non-historic carriage house and new construction, Part I and II, of a carriage house and garden wall, Part I and II.

FINDINGS:

The building at 19 East Gordon Street was constructed in 1881, and is a rated structure in Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. On October 12, 2006, the Historic District Board of Review approved an application for demolition of the non-historic (ca. 1960s) carriage house at the rear of the property at 19 East Gordon Street (Application No. HDBR-05-3471-2). The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density) and the following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: New carriage houses may provide up to a 4’ setback to allow a turning radius.	No setbacks are proposed at the lane	
Lot Coverage: Maximum building lot coverage 75%.	55% building lot coverage is proposed.	The standard is met.
Height: Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two-stories.	A 27’-8” tall two-story carriage house is proposed.	The standard is met.
Lanes & Carriage Houses: Carriage houses must be located to the rear of the property.	The proposed carriage house is located at the rear, fronting Gordon Lane.	The standard is met.
Proportion of structure’s front facade:	The proposed carriage house is 34’ wide with a 4’ wide side balcony, extending 24’-4” into the lot. A non-historic one-story garage is located immediately west and an eight foot tall privacy wall is	The standard is met.

	proposed to the east. One and two-story carriage houses are across the lane.	
<i>Proportion of Openings /</i> Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.	Three automotive entrances are on the ground floor with four window openings above. Garage openings are 8' and 10' wide by 8.5' tall with a jack arch header. Window openings are 3' wide by 5' tall. A false window opening (covered by shutters) balances the window composition.	The standard is met.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Windows and doors: Double glazed windows are permitted when the following is met: 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. Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3" from the façade of a masonry building.	Kolbe & Kolbe double-hung, 2-over-2, double pane glass with simulated divided lights, aluminum clad windows are proposed. The windows are inset approximately 5½" from the face of the building. Wood plank garage doors are proposed. Side French doors and transoms are Kolbe & Kolbe wood doors with simulated divided lights.	Verify muntin width to be no more than 7/8" and the use of a space bar for the windows and doors.. Kolbe & Kolbe windows have been previously approved in the historic district and are visually compatible. Staff recommends approval. See above statement.
Roof shape: Carriage house roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.	A flat roof behind a 3' masonry parapet, with a brick chimney on the lane side, is proposed. A terrace will be located on the roof.	The standard is met.
Balconies, stoops, stairs, porches. Residential balconies shall not extend more than 3' in depth from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets.	A 4' projecting wood balcony is on the east elevation overlooking the interior courtyard. It features decorative cast iron railings and brackets. A metal spiral stair is at the southern end of the building providing access to the balcony and roof terrace.	Staff recommends approval. The projection is over the owner's property and not public right-of-way. Cast iron detailing is compatible with masonry structures and balconies throughout the historic district.
Materials	Brick veneer is proposed for the exterior walls.	Sample to be submitted to staff.
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.	Operable wood louvered shutters are proposed. The drawings indicate a horizontal rail meeting the center rail of the window and sized to fit the openings.	The standard is met.

Color		Colors for doors and shutters to be submitted to staff for final approval.
Fence:	An 8' tall brick privacy wall with a sloped cap is proposed at the rear and east side of the property as shown on the plan (A1.1). A wood plank door, matching the garage doors, provides access into the side yard.	Staff recommends approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that brick and color sample be submitted to Staff for final approval.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with color and brick samples to be submitted to Staff for final approval. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Ramsay Sherrill Architects
Linda M. Ramsay
H-06-3632-2
435 Tattnell Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

Present for the petition was Ms. Linda M. Ramsay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations and an addition to the building at 435 Tattnell Street as follows:

1. Remove porch rail and post on front façade (east elevation) and replace with portico to match adjacent sister building. A 3-foot-high metal rail will be installed on top of the portico.
2. Install brick curbing at the base of the portico to prevent water intrusion.
3. Install downspouts under the sidewalk to drain into street.
4. Remove non-historic rear addition and replace with a two-story stucco addition similar to adjacent townhouse with the addition of an 18.5-foot-wide balcony projecting 4 feet from the addition.

FINDINGS:

The historic building at 435 Tattnall Street was constructed in 1872 as part of a brick duplex (435 and 437 Tattnall) and is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. The request to install downspouts under the sidewalks is beyond the purview of the Historic District Board of Review and the applicant will need to contact the City of Savannah’s Facilities Maintenance Department.

Photographs in Mary Morrison’s *Historic Savannah*, 1979 edition show that the neighboring sister building once had a metal rail above the stoop entrance and that a larger window opening above has been in-filled with different brick. Neither stoop on either residence is original to the building.

The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density) and the following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Lot Coverage: 75% maximum building lot coverage	75% building lot coverage. The proposed addition will be built in the same footprint as the existing porch with the addition of a 4’ balcony, which does not factor into building lot coverage.	The standard is met.
Portico (Section 8-3030 (I)(11)):		
Balconies, stairs, stoops, etc.: Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate.	The applicant is reusing the existing brick piers, concrete landing, and concrete stairs. The existing building is brick and the lattice infill will be removed and the existing garden level window will be visible.	Staff recommends approval of reusing the existing portico base.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.	The proposed wood portico will be comprised of 8” by 8” square wood post supports with a flat roof. A base mold is proposed but the cap of the post is absorbed into the detailing of the architrave to match the neighboring portico detailing.	Staff recommends revising the cap detail of the portico post to meet the standards and submitting to staff for final approval.

Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed 4"; the height shall not exceed 36".	Balusters on the landing and metal rail above are 3" apart and 3' tall. The balusters on the stair appear to be 5" apart and 2'-3" tall.	Verify dimensions and provide detail in section drawing.
Stoop heights shall be visually comparable to other historic stoops to which they are visually related and shall not exceed 9'-6".	The existing stoop height is approximately 7' tall and is equal in height to the adjacent half of the townhouse duplex.	The standard is met.
Addition (8-3030 (I)(12):		
Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure of 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.	The proposed addition will be constructed on the rear of the building in the same foot print as an existing porch addition. It will be surfaced in stucco to clearly differentiate it from the brick residence.	The standard is met.
Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building.	The rear exterior wall of the historic townhome will remain intact. The dentil molding on the rear will be obscured but is echoed in the simplified cornice on the stucco addition as was done in the adjacent building.	Staff recommends approval.
Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.	The proposed addition will be equal in height to the parapet of the main building, but extends only 9'-5½" from the residence and matches the height and mass of the adjacent addition.	Staff recommends approval.
The addition shall be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be visually compatible.	The proposed stucco exterior clearly differentiates the addition from the main structure. The stucco will match the adjacent addition in color, detail and extent of projection.	Staff recommends approval.
Windows: residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.	Double hung windows are proposed.	Provide manufacture's information or detailed section drawing for windows and doors indicating materials and depth of recess into facade.

Balconies: residential balconies shall not extend more than 3' from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.	The proposed balcony extends four feet from the rear of the building. It overlooks a private courtyard and does not extend into the public right-of-way.	Staff recommends approval upon verification of balcony support system which will be minimally visible, if visible at all, from the public right-of-way.
--	--	---

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the following conditions:

1. Revise the portico post detail to meet the design standards.
2. Verification of balustrade dimensions and provide section drawing.
3. Provide information on windows and doors.
4. Verification of balcony support material.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Ramsay stated on the front, they had just intended reusing the existing rail up the stairs. She agreed with Staff that it does not meet the standards but it was existing. They would correct that section of the post. She said the windows and doors would be provided. The photo was what they were looking at but she would get the detailed information. She stated that the balcony in the back was designed to be cantilevered.

Mr. Deering stated that the left column on the proposed portico was not in alignment with the left side of the existing pier below. He knew why Ms. Ramsay had done that, but he did not think it would be so perceived if they actually moved it over to where the left sides did align.

Ms. Ramsay stated o.k.

Mr. Deering said when you look at the front doors you can never really tell whether or not they are centered, and many of the historic examples are not centered on the door, the portico is not centered on the door.

Ms. Ramsay stated it would provide more space on the balcony above and asked the owner if she had any objections.

Ms. Kathleen Aderhold said no.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that the portico post detail be revised to meet the design standards and align vertically over the pier below, to provide the manufacturer's information on the windows and doors, and that the conditions be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen left at approximately 3:30 p.m.

Ms. Seiler took over as now acting Chairman.

**RE: Petition of Coverall Construction
Rickey Basko
H-06-3633-2
408 East Hall Street
Demolition/New Construction**

Present for the petition was Mr. Rickey Basko.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff Report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish a one-story T-111 circa 1970's storage shed in the rear yard and replace with a two-story frame carriage house.

FINDINGS:

1. The storage shed is not a rated structure on the Historic Building map and does not appear to meet the criteria for a historic structure.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	A two foot setback is proposed for the lane side in order to place the apron on private property. Two 4'-6" side yard setbacks are proposed for pedestrian access and HVAC equipment.	This standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type	Carriage House	
Street Elevation Type	NA	
Entrances	Two 10'x7' roll-up fiberglass doors are proposed for the lane elevation.	Meets the standard for garage door sizes. Please confirm that design will be like the catalog cut and not the elevation.
Building Height:	The height to the roof ridge is 22'-7 5/8". The height to the eave is 18' +/-.	Meets the standard that carriage houses are secondary to the main structure.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade		
Proportion of Openings		
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	A second story corner window is proposed. Windows are to be by National wood double glazed with grills.	Please confirm that windows meet the ordinance standards including no greater than 7/8" muntins and that there will be a spacer bar between the glass etc. Staff is concerned about the irregular spacing of the windows.

Rhythm of Structure on Street	Located on a dead end lane.	While no other carriage houses are located on this lane, the siting is appropriate.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	The deck is on the Garden side not on the public right-of-way.	

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards	NA	
Windows and Doors	See above re National Brand.	
Roof Shape	Hip with a 6:12 pitch.	
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches	A ground supported deck is proposed on the garden side.	Not visible from public right-of-way.
Fences	Two gates are proposed on the lane side.	Please provide elevation and material of gates.
Overlay District Standards	NA	
Materials	Roof: Fabral ¾" rib on 9" center standing seam steel roof. Lap siding.	Please address how edge of roofing material will be treated. Raw edges are not appropriate. Is the siding wood or smoothfaced HardiPlank?
Textures		See above
Color		Please provide color of roof material and siding and trim, garage door, fence etc.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval in concept pending additional material and clarifications requested.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Basko stated he was there to represent his client who resided in Italy. Between emails and phone calls, they were trying to get some of this clarified. He said to answer the questions about the different plans, the one with the three windows were correct.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked about the ground floor window that was shown that was not on the drawing that he had.

Mr. Basko stated it was upon the request of his client. The client was concerned with the lack of light in the parking area. Between the original design and the one that he had sent to the Board, it was changed per the request of the client.

Ms. Reiter stated it was not visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Mitchell wondered about the drawings at the top, the one on the left, the window at the extreme right at the corner, and the drawing at the top right, the window to the extreme left are butted up against the corner molding of the house. He asked why.

Mr. Basko stated Mr. Mitchell was correct and said it was requested by the client. He said it was their effort to introduce as much light in to what would be the eating area there.

Mr. Mitchell asked if Mr. Basko was going to try and talk the client out of that.

Mr. Basko stated they were, yes. He said in fact he had since, communicated that they are willing to and able to move the windows.

Mr. Mitchell stated that from an aesthetic construction standpoint he had never seen them put that close to a corner like that.

Mr. Basko stated they really wanted full glass in that corner, but he realized pretty soon that it just would not meet....

Mr. Mitchell stated to the Chairman that he was not completely sure what he would be voting on.

Mr. Deering asked about the other two windows in the upper left-hand elevation which were, in his opinion, visually incompatible with the neighborhood. He said the windows were entirely too small, they were not centered over the garage doors, and he thought that it needed a reorganization of windows on the lane side. He agreed with Mr. Mitchell on the one that was butted against the corner. It was a typical thing to do in modern houses, but in this sort of replica of a lane cottage, it did not seem to work at all. He would like for them to restudy the windows.

Mr. Mitchell asked about the garage doors and if Mr. Basko mentioned something about them being different that what is on the drawing.

Mr. Basko answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that the Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Savannah Foundation felt that the floor plan should not dictate the placement of the windows and the doors. Also, the rhythm of solids to voids were unbalanced.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Seiler stated that the petitioner was requesting to demolish the one-story shed in the rear yard, and replace it with the carriage house.

Mr. Deering asked if she wanted to separate them.

Ms. Seiler stated that she thought they should.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the garage door was listed as 10 feet wide and asked if it was at a nine-foot level or was the Board allowing a 10-foot.

Mr. Deering stated they were allowed up to 12 in width.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Johnson made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the demolition as submitted. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Deering stated that he would move to approve the Height and Mass of HBR-06-3633-2, but not the design. He said the petitioner would have to come back to the Board with new window placements and new garage doors shown on anything they could see from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Basko asked if the public right-of-way was the lane.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Height and Mass, and conditions with new window placements and new garage doors shown on the drawing and revised for design review. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of David Blitch
 Custom Construction Company
 H-06-3637-2
 433 Tattnall Street
 Alterations**

Present for the petition was Mr. David Blitch.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for the following exterior alterations:

1. Remove a 7-foot-6-inch portion of the garden wall facing Jefferson Street to provide access to off-street parking.
2. Remove a non-historic metal stair at the rear of the building and replace with a steel spiral stair to be painted black.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 433 Tattnall Street was constructed in 1872, and is a rated structure within Savannah's Landmark Historic District.

1. The stucco garden wall extends 26 feet-5 inches along the rear of the property does not appear to be original to the building. Several other properties within this block, fronting Tattnall Street, have surface parking in the rear along Jefferson Street. A new pier, to match the existing piers, will be erected at the newly created endpoint of the garden wall, where the void will be.
2. The spiral stair will be minimally visible from the rear and have less of a visual impact from the public right-of-way than the existing metal stair.

Ms. Ward stated the item had been on the Consent Agenda. She stated that she pulled it off the Consent Agenda for something she was about to show the Board, because the petitioner had revised what they had wanted to do based on comments by the City Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the Board needed some drawings as to what the applicant desired to do. He did not think the Board could vote on wordage at this point. He really thought it needed to be drawn, and he suggested a continuance.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Blich stated what they originally requested was to cut an opening on the rear wall, but that was not permissible. Now what they were proposing was to take out the entire length on one side, and a portion of the wall around the corner, and use the low concrete fence with railing to be able to drive in at an angle. All they really want permission to do now was to remove the old iron staircase and replace it with a spiral staircase, to meet with Mr. Weiner and Staff to come up with new drawings.

Mr. Deering stated he felt that was acceptable.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted for the iron stair replacement, and the proposed garden wall and gate to come back to the Board for approval upon resubmission of revised plans. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Continued Petition of Rowland Commercial
Development
H-06-3586-2
229 Price Street
Demolition/New Construction Part I**

Petitioner arrived at 4:08 p.m.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Seiler told the petitioner for their information that the Board had heard Staff presentation and they had already heard from the public. The Board now had questions for the petitioner. She asked Ms. Reiter if there were any highlights.

Mr. Guerard asked Ms. Seiler to ask Staff to review the focus on the concerns and their recommendations.

Ms. Seiler asked Ms. Person to go back and to read any comments from the minutes.

Ms. Person stated that Mr. Joe Sasseen commented on the lintel material.

Ms. Reiter stated the comments from Historic Savannah were that it was on the zero lot line on Price Street and they felt that it was dangerous. That they would have to go out so far to be able to see what traffic was coming, and there was a discussion regarding the bricked-in windows.

Mr. Meyerhoff said the McDonough Street side entry projected about eight feet into the McDonough Street right-of-way. He asked how would it effect the sidewalk on McDonough Street.

Mr. Guerard stated there was no sidewalk on McDonough Street. He said the cars are parked every which way. The actual sidewalk, if there was a sidewalk on that street, would be the oak tree that sits right in front of it. There would be the steps, the oak tree, and then the sidewalk. He said you wouldn't put the sidewalk on that side because it would be closer to the curb and gutter.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what did he intend to landscape in front of his building. The plans just say entry, step, and foundation, and it does not really show what was being done there.

Mr. Guerard said that as far as the landscaping goes, it was usually submitted, as you know, to the Engineering Department. What they would try to do was to put some plants and a brick sidewalk. He wanted to make that side of the street pretty and he wanted to put a brick sidewalk to match the brick sidewalk across the street. Unless the Board approved the Height and Mass on the property next door, which he thought was nice, he did not have a problem putting in a nice streetscape, putting in the brick pavers, and putting in the ground plants. He did not think it needed another tree because the oak tree was massive. He would request that the Board would also request that somebody else carry the brick the other 120 feet down the side of the property so the whole street would look nice.

Mr. Meyer stated in light of that, the stair as presented to the Board was tremendously massive as compared to most of the stairs, having that brick wall at the face of the outside. He asked if any consideration could be given to having that open rather than enclosed.

Mr. Guerard stated he would also offer, as a compromise instead of just opening that up is that they do not need steps going up from both sides. They could just eliminate one of the steps on one side, which he thought would help it. In the mass, he had no problem with opening it up underneath because they could put brick in a pattern that you could see through it, or they could leave it wide open underneath and put columns. He said you would not see it because it was centered right on a 70-inch oak tree.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it called attention to it because it was so massive.

Mr. Guerard asked if Mr. Meyerhoff would rather see a brick column supporting it right there by itself, or would you leave it open like most of the stairwells Downtown and just leave the pre-cast coming right down.

Ms. Seiler stated that the Board was not there to design today.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he was not designing; all he was saying that what was presented was too massive.

Mr. Guerard stated that one of the comments was about the staircase, and as far as designing or not designing it, he did not get a chance to address it all because he had to whisk through it all. The biggest two problems were the stairwell in the front and the height of the building.

Mr. Deering stated on the Perry Street side, the center of the building had a very odd bay and a very odd window placement; he thought they really needed to restudy it.

Mr. Guerard said it was because of the elevator shaft and the emergency stairwell.

Mr. Deering said he did not care what it was because of, they needed to restudy it. There was no pedestrian entrance anywhere on that street and you cannot have more than 60 feet on a street. Not just a garage entrance but also a pedestrian entrance because there were other houses that face it and they need to look at something other than just the backs of the buildings.

Mr. Guerard stated what he was trying to say was they could put a ground entrance in but as far as putting a second floor type in to match the other side they could not really do that, because there is only four feet to the road.

Mr. Deering stated that he did not think it was necessary to put a high stoop entrance in.

Ms. Reiter stated one of Staff's concerns was perhaps not having ground floor parking. She asked if it could be addressed.

Ms. Seiler stated there was discussion about the possibility of underground parking. She said the Board did discuss the fact there was not any in that particular area that the Board was aware of.

Mr. Guerard said they had an arborist out to look at the oak tree out front, which was not their oak tree; it was the City of Savannah's oak tree. The arborist looked at it, and based upon the existing foundation of the footings that are soon to be in place, they had to dig down some. He thought they could go about two or three feet into the ground without disturbing the oak tree, which he thought would accomplish part of the goal. With those three feet plus a little bit more for the wrought-iron windows, you would not be looking at the car any more because it would be down below. It would also help to reduce the height of the building. Three feet in the ground would drop it to 45 feet, which would be the same height as the building adjacent to them which was approved earlier. He said he did not have any problem with adjusting their plan to meet the exact height of the building next door if that was what the Board liked.

Mr. Mitchell asked why have bricked-in fake window openings when it could be avoided altogether, and asked what was the rationale for it.

Mr. Deering stated they needed to look at some other solutions for the bay on that side so that it does look like it had a door to the street, or some window openings or something that worked with the rest of the building. He like the idea of Mr. Guerard saying they could drop the building down three or four feet.

Mr. Guerard said according to the arborist it appeared they could drop the slab that the cars would be parked on between two and three feet, and he could make up the other foot in the parapet wall to match the building next door.

Mr. Mitchell asked how many cars would be parked if they had to go underground.

Mr. Guerard stated he believed it would be 12.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the petitioner would like to resubmit it on a continuance taking into account everything that Staff had recommended and the Board had discussed.

Mr. Guerard stated he had no problem with that. He said he saw where Staff recommended it for a continuance before and the reason he came was to be able to discuss with the Board and to see more of what the comments were. What he gathered from this was that they do not like the windows being bricked up where the elevator shaft is, they agreed that if they could drop the building down two or three feet, and that was what they want him to address. He would address the front stairwell

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the stairwell and the entry on the Perry Street side.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the lintels the same brick material as the other brick.

Mr. Guerard answered yes.

Mr. Deering stated that was a concern too. If they could change it to pre-cast or capstone or something like that just to break up the mass so that there would not be just one building material on the exterior. It would help.

Mr. Guerard stated that he would like to request a continuance to address the issues raised.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the August 9, 2006, meeting. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-06-3614(S)-2
539 East Taylor Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-06-3615(S)-2
44 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-06-3616(S)-2
110 – 120 Jefferson Street
Color/Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-06-3617(S)-2
17 East Bay Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Stephen Morton
H-06-3618(S)-2
558 East Jones Street
Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Tom Kale & Cindy Glick
H-06-3619(S)-2
316 East Jones Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Mopper-Stapen Realtors
Jessica Pedigo
H-06-3620(S)-2
613 Habersham Street
Alterations
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Petition of Carole Lufburrow
H-06-3621(S)-2
440 Price Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

9. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
H 06-3622(S)-2
526 Turner Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

10. Petition of Mopper-Stapen Realtors
Jessica Pedigo
H-06-3623(S)-2
101 - 103 Gordon Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

11. Petition of Margaret (Trudy) Enloe
H-06-3624(S)-2
509 & 511 East Perry Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

12. Petition of Knight Sign Industries
Jessica Harcrow
H-06-3625(S)-2
312 West Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

13. Petition of Karen B. Kleisner
H-06-3636(S)-2
410 East Jones Street
Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: MINUTES

1. Distribution of Regular Meeting Minutes – June 14, 2006

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Mitchell asked about the format of the Staff reports because he gets lost. He said when he reads through the block section and he has to find where he is each time. He asked what the flow of the blocks should be.

Ms. Reiter said the standards were in the first cell, the second cell was what was proposed, and the third cell was Staff comments.

Mr. Mitchell stated he did not ever recall there being an explanation when the Board changed to the format.

Mr. Deering stated that the Board had talked about it at some point.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that Staff did ask whether the Board felt it was appropriate and the majority of the Board did.

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

Mr. Gay and Ms. Seiler stated they had seen a sign up on a building at President and East Broad called Sails and Rails.

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp