

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

JUNE 14, 2006

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

Joseph Steffen  
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring  
John L. Deering  
Ned Gay  
Eric Meyerhoff  
Swann Seiler  
John Mitchell  
John L. Neely  
Dr. Gerald Caplan

HDBR/MPC Staff Present:

Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director  
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner  
Dwayne Stevens, Historic Preservation Intern  
Janine Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Petition of Stephen Booker  
H-06-3591-2  
541 – 543 East Congress  
Demolition of a Non-Historic Building

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Alexandro Santana  
H-06-3604-2  
207 East Charlton Street  
Rehabilitation to Front Stoop

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Incorporated  
Donna Swanson  
H-05-3593-2  
8 East Broughton Street  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Incorporated  
Donna Swanson  
H-06-3595-2  
113 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of William Bridges  
H-06-3596-2  
509 Hartridge Street  
Color/Rehabilitation/Roof Repair

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Charlie Angell  
H-03-2987-2  
11 West Jones Street  
Porch Alteration  
Request for a one-year extension

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of R. K. Construction  
H-05-3409(S)-2  
312 West Broughton Street  
Storefront Alteration  
Request for a one-year extension

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Sign Mart  
Bill Norton  
H-06-3606-2  
424 West Broughton Street  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Mopper-Stapen Realtors, Inc.  
Jessica Pedigo  
H 06-3613-2  
306 East President Street  
Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects  
 Neil Dawson  
 H-05-3477-2  
 126 West Bay Street  
 Demolition, Alterations, and Site Improvements to Factor’s Walk

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of the demolition of a non-contributing concrete parking structure and infill structure on Factors Walk and the replacement with a new pedestrian plaza with pedestrian bridges over Factors Walk and new Factors Walk infill.

**FINDINGS:**

1. On October 12, 2005, the Historic District Review Board approved storefront and window replacement and the addition of balconies.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Demolition: Requests for demolition of any building within the historic district shall come before the Board of Review.	A concrete platform was added over Factor’s Walk in the 20 <sup>th</sup> Century. It was not a part of the original historic structure and is badly eroding. Subsequent incompatible infill was placed between the columns also in the 20 <sup>th</sup> century. It is proposed to remove part of this platform and reconstruct two steel bridges.	The area being demolished is not historic. The bridge system will be reinstated and the infill reduced in depth to allow for a pedestrian walk.
Entrances to uses above River Street shall be from Upper and Lower Factors Walk or from private property, provided however, entrances to end units may front onto public ramps.	The Upper Factor’s Walk storefronts will be clear anodized aluminum. The end wall will be a Centria Formawall Composite metal panel system and clear anodized YKK aluminum storefront. A backlit perforated metal panel will form the roof of lower Factor’s Walk.	The new storefronts will be readily distinguishable as new and not historic, but they will be compatible.
Bridging streets and lanes is	The bridges will be modern	Will the glass block surface be

<p>inappropriate. Streets and lanes cannot be bridged by development, except on Factor’s Walk. Such bridges shall be for pedestrian use only. Factor’s Walk bridges shall not be covered by a roof, awning, or any other type of extension from a building.</p>	<p>interpretations of historic Factor’s Walk bridges using welded painted metal mesh and wood top rail. The bridges will connect to a new reduced plaza connected to the bay street level of the buildings. The new upper Factor’s Walk storefront infill will be less deep than the current infill, in order to provide a pedestrian walkway along Upper Factor’s Walk. Steel columns with zinc sheathing will support the upper plaza and bridges. The bridges will be five feet wide with a glass paver system that will be frosted and illuminated from below. The plaza will be paved with Hanover plaza paver system.</p>	<p>slippery?</p>
	<p>Other: Utilities: Existing condensing units will be moved to the roof or other locations; ceilings will be dropped to hide overhead pipes and operable composite metal panels will conceal meters on Lower Factors Walk.                  Drive: The Upper Factors Walk drive will be regarded so that there will be less drop from the pedestrian walk to the street. Both Upper and Lower Factors Walk will remain accessible to through vehicular traffic.                  Metal cornices: The metal cornices were removed by a previous owner. It is planned to recreate these.</p>	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval. The proposed alterations help this section of Factor’s Walk recover the intent of its original appearance and cleans up a very deteriorated section of Bay Street.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Dawson** stated that he was the agent for the owner of the building, the Two Towers Group out of San Francisco, California. He said with all of the projects they have done, that this one is

probably the most technically challenging. When they developed the design, they looked at a number of examples of how Factor's Walk is accessed, because they felt that it was a fairly unique opportunity to have the chance to design one of the connecting pieces, and to restore that part of Factor's Walk. He said there were a number of sections where the bridge goes directly to the building right over the public right-of-way. There was also the example of a walkway in front of the Gamble Building that comes out anywhere from 5 to 20 feet in front of Factor's Walk, depending upon where you are. There are also a variety of different types of bridges. He said the one that they found the most compelling was really the oldest one, that had more of an industrial feel with some tensile structure.

Part of the issue that they had to deal with were the existing utilities. He said that underneath is an old graveyard of mechanical equipment. Initially they thought that they would like to reduce the width of the plaza, but they found that it is really technically not feasible because they had to maintain all of the mechanical systems, pipes, and conduits that serve all of lower Factor's Walk. He said their proposal was to leave the existing column line that falls on the existing stone wall that defines upper and lower Factor's Walk. He thought it still required a substantial amount of relocation of infrastructure and systems, but it would give the feel of Factor's Walk. The columns would retain and strengthen the wall, but the storefront is setback so that it creates a strong shadow line. They wanted to recess it so that it is less of a visual element. He said regarding the bridge railing, they tried to use a contemporary detailing. In this case, just a single steel beam with supporting ribs that give it an industrial feel with an open grid network with exposed tension cables. The glass block is frosted glass and gives an airy feel to the bridge. He said the surface was rated for outdoor locations and met the ADA slip resistance coefficient.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they had presented any of this to the City of Savannah.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that they met with the City initially about the concept, because almost all of the project is on the public right-of-way, and the City agreed with the concept.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked what did they agree with.

**Mr. Dawson** stated the City wanted to see that it was consistent with the judgment of this Board.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that circa 1973 – 1974 when Mr. Ryan decided to enclose part of Factor's Walk, there was a huge debate going on with the City of Savannah as to who owned Factor's Walk. He said that argument has continued throughout the years. He cited a project on the eastern side of City Hall a couple of years ago, which was supposed to be a wooden deck extended over the concrete framework to allow for outdoor seating. The City had denied that because they did not want anything to impair the existing historic Factor's Walk. He said that he was curious whether or not they should have a consent from the City before the Board even considered this, since there seemed to be an ongoing dispute as to who owned the right-of-way. He said that the other thing that needed to be considered was that they were making the Factor's Walk in a contemporary mode and whether that concurred with the Board's thinking. He really did feel that the Board should not hear this until they have notification from the City that they concurred with this project.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the structure was already there.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that they are proposing to remove what is there and put pedestrian bridges across.

**Mr. Deering** stated that Mr. Dawson mentioned that the City wanted to get the Board's feedback on the design before they would comment.

**Mr. Dawson** stated they were more interested in seeing if it was visually appropriate and compatible, if it was legally not possible, then it was a moot point.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it helped the Factor's Walk area a great deal, to open up one of the lanes between Bay Street and the buildings to open air, and he felt that it would be a great improvement. He said that he had always hated the huge concrete pad that is currently there, and he honestly thought it was a great change and a very positive change.

**Mr. Deering** stated that the right-of-way issues could be worked out, but the Board needed to determine whether or not it was visually compatible and give the City some feedback on it.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that notwithstanding the types of storefronts, he thought that it was one of the most exciting projects that had come before the Review Board in a long time.

**Mr. Dawson** thanked Dr. Caplan and said that they felt honored that it was rare that an architect would get to restore a piece of Factor's Walk.

**Mr. Deering** asked if the louvers on the storefront upper area were removable where the panels would be.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that they would hide the electrical meters behind the other panels. He said they are actually applied over glass, that they only did it to mimic the storefront pattern at the upper level so that when it is seen visually, it had that relationship.

**Mr. Deering** stated that the lane in front of the doors was indicated as raised, and he knew that it was lower than that now. He asked if the cobblestone would be put back or would they stamp the concrete to resemble some of the other lanes in Factor's Walk.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that right now it was stamped asphalt with the false stone stamped on it. He said there was a section of the field stone laid in there, but it was frankly not in good shape. If they could they would like to keep a little edge of the stone in the area so that it revealed that you were on a historic retaining wall. To answer the questions about the pavement right now, he said that he did not know at this point. It would depend upon the City and what their traffic department would require of them.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the paving for Factor's Walk where it is now stamped concrete, would remain once you are beyond the sidewalk.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that they would like for it not to. He said that for his client it would be better if it were pavers or at least a colored concrete stamped pavers, or something that had a little more visual appeal to it. He said that it was not something that they were prepared to discuss now.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that on behalf of the Foundation they thought that this was a top notch application. The historic features were being restored where they could be documented or where they were existent, and the modern elements are being placed in appropriate places. They wanted to congratulate the applicant and ask the Board for their favorable consideration.

**Mr. Steffen** stated regarding Mr. Meyerhoff's comments about the City's approval, that when the City or some other entity is dealing with a legal issue, that it is clearly outside of the Board's purview. He said if it is something that would eventually come back to the Board then they certainly want to look at it. He would not allow that to get in the Board's way of deciding on this one way or the other.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that it made sense and that whoever makes the motion needed to say that if the City altered this in any way in their thought, that the project come back to the Review Board.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff and Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-05-3503-2  
544 East Liberty Street  
New Construction Part II Design Detail Mixed-  
Use Retail/Residential**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of Part II Design Details. Part I Height and Mass was approved April 12, 2006.

**FINDINGS:**

1. There have been no changes to the design since the Part I approval except on the lane. There has been a material change to brick and cast stone for the corner element at Houston and Liberty Streets.
2. **Materials, Textures, Colors:**
  - Brick: Jenkins "Menawa" (Reds and Browns) Mortar Holnam # 1405 sand color. Panels of vertical soldiercourse brick are proposed for the corner element and middle entry section on Liberty Street. Also under the windows on the Houston Street side.
  - Cast Stone Arriscraft "Caramel" to be used first floor third segment on Liberty Street and first floor corner Liberty and Houston Streets. Vertical and horizontal bands of cast stone are proposed for the corner element and as a band between the first and second floors on Houston Street.
  - Windows: Weathershield Clad wood double hung 12/12 and 9/9 on the Liberty Street 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> segments and 2/2 elsewhere. Color Colonial White.

- Metal roof, ornamental ironwork, balcony supports, shutters: Dark Green.
- Ornamental metal railings (No detail given) are proposed for the high stoops. Brick piers under the stoops; step material not given.
- Ornamental metal columns and railings for the balconies. Clarify that drawing “F” depicts the exact design.
- No information given on the entry portico or overhead garage doors.
- No information on front doors to Condos and high stoop townhouses.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with the following conditions:

1. Recommend carrying the cast stone base throughout the first three bays on both Houston and Liberty Streets to help visually subdivide the building into discrete masses.
2. Recommend the deletion of the pedimented entry portico and replacement with a ground supported barrel vault awning.
3. Recommend replacing the rows of soldier course brick with some other brick pattern or shape.
4. Provide information on garage doors and front doors to residential units.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Shay** stated that they had tried very hard to be faithful to what had been previously approved, and would address Staff’s concerns. The railing details that they had submitted are the same, and that they did not cut a section though every condition on the entire exterior of the building. They are what they intend to have for ornamental metal in the segments and profiles that are shown. He said the entry doors were six-panel molded fiberglass doors, instead of wood, and the overhead garage doors in the lane would be commercial overhead doors that were flush panel steel. He said that he did not have a problem with carrying the capstone through, but he couldn’t understand from the Staff report exactly which three bays were being discussed. He was ambivalent about it because he liked the division of the mass into five segments, but he did not have a problem with doing it and agreed to it. He said regarding the pedimented entry portico, they would like to have something that was a permanent element there. He said that if it was a problem with a pedimented shape over the entrance, that was a classical symbol that had been used for thousands of years to dedicate and denote where the entry was. If the Board felt strongly about it and would like for it to be some other shape, then they could go with a flat roof for example. He would like something that was permanent, because the idea of a canvas structure on the front of a residential building did not seem right. It seemed something more appropriate for a restaurant or a side entrance to a hotel. He said regarding the rows of soldiers underneath the windows, they wanted something that was really subtle rather than a different pattern and a different material, like a square terra cotta which would draw a lot more attention to it than what they wanted. He said if that is the difference between getting this project approved or not, then they would certainly consider that.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they could do a basket weave.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they could do that if the Board would like. He said that he would like to stick to the bricks that they have picked so that it doesn’t end up being the thing that your eye is



drawn to the most on that façade. Just something that to give it a little more variety and texture than straight brick.

**Mr. Deering** asked if the balconies could be better detailed because they were just a concrete slab with fiber cement board and entablature beam. It seemed flat and apartment-like. He said he felt like it could be improved upon. The stoop balustrade hand railing pickets that had been selected were a little weak on that high stoop because the stoop is very high, and if they just have the 5/8 inch square picket with a 1 by 2 top rail, that it will be weak looking.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they will consider getting a little more strength to the top rail.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it is a massive building and it could stand to have something a little bit more substantial.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Beatrice Archer (Houston Street)** stated she could not believe that the whole project is happening. She said that it was dictated by greed and bad taste.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board had a recommendation for approval from the Staff with four conditions, and the first condition Mr. Shay had agreed to, and the fourth condition was an information request which was provided. He said that Mr. Shay's comments on recommendation Number 2, that he had indicated a willingness to do a different design other than a pediment on the permanent portico. On the third one, there was a consensus on using a particular type of brick arrangement.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that was if the Board agreed.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board would discuss it afterward because he wanted to get a motion out there.

**HDBR ACTION:** **Mr. Neely** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the detailed design for the portico, the metal handrails on stairs, and the exact location on the brick and capstone of ground floor and west side of the building come back to Staff. **Dr. Caplan** seconded the motion and it was passed. **Ms. Seiler** and **Ms. Fortson-Waring** were opposed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff and Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-06-3523-2  
320 Montgomery Street  
New Construction, Part II Design of a Four-  
Story Hotel**

Mr. Mitchell arrived at 3:38 p.m.

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** with conditions.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part II design detail approval.

**FINDINGS:**

1. Part I Height and Mass was approved by the Board on March 8, 2006.
2. Substantive changes since the Height and Mass approval are:
  - The corner element at Montgomery and Harris has been increased in height from 61 feet to 74 feet.
  - Traffic Engineering has requested the main entrance to be moved to Harris Street rather than Montgomery Street.
  - The dumpster has been removed from Charlton Street.
  - The corner has been “squared” (no post) at Montgomery and Harris Streets.
  - The Harris Street massing has been altered to have two smaller openings to the garage; a wider area stepping back at the third floor from the adjacent historic building and the transition has been further strengthened by a change in materials on this elevation. There is also a 7-foot recess between the portion adjacent to the historic house and the lobby segment.
  - The Charlton Street elevation is more symmetrical and has more windows than previously approved. The East elevation has been moved farther from the property line at the Charlton Street end, from 9 feet to 12'-6”.
  - The number of recesses and protrusions has been reduced on the Montgomery Street side and the balconies eliminated. The rhythm of solids to voids has been more regularized.

**Materials/Textures Colors:**

- Brick: “Hampton” A slightly irregular faced brownish color brick with “BC Ivory Buff” mortar.
- Base: Arriscraft masonry units in buff. Arriscraft smooth stone band at 18-foot level.
- Top cornice – stucco Color “Jute” by Pittsburgh (Dark Beige).
- Metal roofing Slate Green.
- Window frames and storefronts Anodized aluminum “Afternoon tea” (Dark bronze color) Windows are inset 3 inches. Metal PTAC louvers.
- Certain walls and insets – scored stucco.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The changes have taken into consideration Staff and Board comments. Staff recommends approval with clarification of trash storage and pickup and with the recommendation that the top cornice of the brick sections be brick (perhaps a darker color) or cast stone.

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

**Mr. Shay** stated that they had made some progress since they had been to the Board for Height and Mass approval. He said that they met with various representatives of the City of Savannah and their engineering department. They had listened very carefully to the comments made at the Height and Mass approval, and that they had also received some input from the neighbors, and they have managed to come out of it with something that is still a pretty decent piece of architecture. He said they had decided to make the element on the corner a little bit of a tower in the hope that it would mitigate the size and mass of the parking deck beside it. The particular suite would have a higher ceiling and it would be used as a way of trying to mask some of the rooftop mechanical units, and the elements that protrude, to screen the mechanical. He said that from the sample that went around, they very deliberately picked a very dark, by contrast to the usual color, for the stucco and the stone so that they don't have the high contrast in color between those as the drawings would have you to believe. He said for that reason, they would like to stay with the stucco for the element up above the cornice. It was not nearly as much contrast as the drawing in black and white that was in front of them. In this particular project because of its unique and very difficult site, the trash will be taken down to the basement where the parking level is, through the service elevators and man-handled daily. Then they will have to send someone with a pick-up truck to load the trash into the pick-up truck down inside the parking garage, and then take it off-site. He said there was really no other way to deal with that without having a trash door that opens onto a front street. All three sides of the project face front streets; there was no lane. The hotel developers and operator are aware of that and they were satisfied that they could do that.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Dr. Caplan** thanked Mr. Shay for particularly addressing the garbage issues. He asked for clarification on the drawing regarding the space between their project and the adjacent historic building.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the distance from the edge of the building to the property line is about three-foot five inches.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he understood that on drawing A-7.1 it shows the building is separated by three-foot five and one-half inches.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it was three-foot five and one-half inches to the property line, and that the property line is not exactly aligned with edge of the existing building adjacent to it. He stated that there was some confusion and explained that the depth of the recess in the façade, the plane of brick is setback 12 feet from the façade of the building and so it is a very deep recess. The idea was that it would create an element that was distinct from the main mass of the building and mitigated between the height of the historic structures adjacent, and the mass of the building on the corner.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that there was also a seven-foot recess between the portion adjacent to the historic house and the lobby section. So they are not talking in between the buildings but they are talking about a recess actually.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he believed Ms. Reiter was referring to the recess in the façade and not the space between the two buildings, and asked Ms. Reiter if that was correct.

**Ms. Reiter** said that it was 12 feet deep and seven feet wide.

**Mr. Shay** pointed out that Ms. Reiter was talking about an element that is between two segments.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Sasseen** stated that he had no qualms with the building, but what bothered him was that it was the third time this item had come up. The first time they had a large group of people from the neighborhood. The second time a large group of people from the neighborhood were here. They preferred the first rendering over the second rendering which the Board appeared to like and they preferred the first rendering. He stated that no one was here today. It seemed a little strange to him and said that anything was better than the second building.

**Mr. Mark Marshalok** stated that he had been at the meetings every time the structure had been proposed. He spoke on his behalf and for some of the neighbors regarding some of the things that concerned them, and wanted to go back and address them with Mr. Shay. He said that one of their concerns was with the excavation of the parking garage that was going down approximately eight feet or more, with a three-foot offset next to the current historic structure, and on the other side 12 feet off the existing neighboring structures. His concern was that earlier Mr. Shay had addressed this saying that there would be special precautions taken on excavation of the site relative to any pilings or anything that would be driven into the ground. He said that it was mentioned that Ellis Square was now going down three stories and that they were taking extra precautions not to damage any of the historic buildings around the square. He wanted Mr. Shay to come back and address that before the Board. The second thing he asked about was on the Charlton Street elevation, that he would like to point out in between the offset between the current townhouses and the proposed building there is a gate structure. He wanted to know what was the intention of that area, if the gate would allow public access, and what the intended use of the courtyard for (he assumed it was going to be pavers and it would be offset all around the existing townhomes). His third point was if they would comment on the ability to preserve the magnificent oak tree on the corner.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that all three of those things were probably not in the Board's purview, but that he would let Mr. Shay address them when they finished public comment if he desired to.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that she personally would not care to take up the Board's time with addressing things that the Board had nothing to consider.

**Mr. Marshalok** stated that this was brought up before if you look back in the minutes.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that it was just her opinion.

**Mr. Marshalok** stated that he wanted to address that opinion if he could please.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that she preferred that he not.

**Mr. Marshalok** stated that it was brought up in the minutes before about the excavation and that he would like to hear that comment if that was o.k.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that he could hear about it today.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated what might satisfy the speaker here was to talk with Staff and get a recommendation as to who to go to see about that particular concern. He said that it was not within this Board's purview.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he would say one more thing about it to Mr. Marshallock and that he knew that he had been here for a couple of these meetings. Whether there are trees on the property or not is per the province of Park and Trees and that it was not the Board's province. He said as far as what they use particular entrances for is not within the Board's purview. The third question was concerning the public access to a gate is not within the Board's purview either. He said that the Board only deals with the design of the property and whether it is architecturally compatible. Mr. Mitchell's suggestion was correct that Mr. Shay could answer the questions for him privately, or Staff could point him in the right direction, but the Board could not make a decision based on those considerations.

**Mr. Marshalok** stated that it was fair enough and that he just wanted to articulate these concerns.

**Mr. Steffen** thanked Mr. Marshalok for bringing it to the Board's attention.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that they would like to support the Preservation Officer's argument about the cornice being made of brick or capstone. He said that the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) felt that there were too many materials and it would simplify and make it more elegant building if they stuck to either brick or stone on the cornice. They were also concerned about the overall height increasing, especially along the Harris Street façade. There was such a dramatic difference between this building and the new tower. It was not really an issue about the design, but the issue about the height going from 61 to 74 feet and they were concerned about that drastic difference between the buildings in that block face.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that they had recommendation for approval with the condition that changes be made to the brick sections, the cornice, and that Mr. Shay had indicated that he would rather it stay stucco so the Board would have to address that issue. Also, the issue that Mr. McDonald had just raised if Mr. Shay chose.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that she agreed with Staff that the stucco should be changed to brick.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that Mr. McDonald was discussing the disparity in the height. He asked if the original height the Board approved last been changed.

**Mr. Gay** stated that it went from 61 to 73 because of the dome.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that Ms. Fortson-Waring stated brick. He asked her if she meant brick or stone, or to use a specific kind of brick.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that it would be in line with the Preservation Officer's recommendations. She said that she was not an architect and wouldn't design, but that she agreed with the comments that the stucco adds a third element and it distracted from the design.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it was certainly an item that the Board could bring back to Staff if they so chose in the motion.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he wanted to speak to the height of tower, that he actually thought that the tower, especially on the corner did help. He said that there is a step effect that worked fairly well on the Harris Street side. It would be better if the building weren't quite so big, but he thought that it did help it.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked that when Mr. Deering talked about step effect as an architect, was he talking about at the corners there is the taller structure and it steps back down as it goes up the block a little bit.

**Mr. Gay** answered to the smaller building there.

**Mr. Deering** stated that it could be seen in the A-7.1 drawing that the tower element being the tallest on the corner and then it steps back for the next three bays. Then there is the recessed area that Dr. Caplan was talking about, what looked like the firehouse section, and then the small wooden house and the other small wooden house.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated then the question that came into his mind is, is the step back (by the time that it gets from the peak to the building that is of most concern), is that considered a moderate step back or an extreme step back.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he would not know how to decide what is moderate and extreme because it was very subjective.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that it was sufficient.

**HDBR ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the Staff recommendations relative to the stucco as opposed to the brick or stone be approved as submitted. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**Mr. Neely** stated that either refer the choice between the stone or the brick back to Staff, or recommend one of the other.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Dr. Caplan would accept that as a friendly amendment to the motion.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that she thought he had done it too.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he wanted to mention that he was glad that the City highway or streets department decided to put the entry on the side that they did. It got rid of a very dangerous situation that existed previously.

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

**Continued at the request of the Petitioner.**

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that items H-06-3530-2, H-06-3550-2, and H-06-3566-2 be continued until the July 2, 2006, meeting. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously

**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 request of the Petitioner.**

**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 pending Board of Zoning Appeals hearing.**

**RE: Continued Petition of Ryan Bacha  
H-06-3574-2  
319 Abercorn Street  
New Construction, Parts I and II of a Two-Story  
Carriage House**

The Preservation Officer recommends a **continuance**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Ryan Bacha.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New construction Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Detail of a two-story carriage house, fronting East Liberty Lane.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building at 319 Abercorn Street was constructed in 1888, and is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District. The adjacent property at 126 East Harris Street is owned by the same property owner and contains an addition for the residence at 319 Abercorn. Historically, the adjacent lot at 126 East Harris Street contained a carriage house at the rear of the property in the location of the proposed garage. Both properties are zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density).

**NOTE: A minor recombination subdivision plat should be filed and recorded prior to issuance of a building permit.**

**Part I, Height and Mass:**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<i>Height:</i> New construction shall be within the height limits shown on the height map (4 stories). Secondary	A 24'-4" tall two-story carriage house is proposed. The height has been reduced 1'-10" from the previous	The standard is met.

<p>structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two-stories.</p>	<p>submittal of 26'-2".</p>	
<p><i>Proportion of structure's front facade:</i> The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front façade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>The proposed carriage house is 26' wide with a 3' wide side stair, 24'-4" tall, extending 24'-8" into the lot with a 7'-4" deep two-story porch on the south. A three story residence is located immediately east and a 26' tall two-story carriage house is located immediately west.</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the height of the windows and the parapet to be visually compatible with the neighboring properties and proportionate within the building façade. See below.</p>
<p><i>Proportion of Openings:</i> The relationship of the width of the windows to the height of windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>The proposed windows are 7-8" tall. They have been reduced by 1'-5" from the previous submittal of 9'-1".</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the height of the windows to 6', which is 1/3 of the previously submitted window height and what was previously recommended by staff. Although the windows have been reduced in height, they do not appear</p>
<p><b>Standard</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>
		<p>visually compatible with neighboring contributing structures nor are they proportionate within the facade.</p>
<p><i>Rhythm of solids to voids:</i> The relationship of solids to voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>The north façade is broken into two symmetrical bays with two window openings over each garage.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><i>Scale of a building:</i> The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>The window openings are much taller than neighboring buildings. The side stairs on the east elevation have been recessed into the middle of the elevation to reduce their visual impacts on the lane.</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the window height as stated previously. In the previous submittal, the Board had concerns about the stairs as they are seen along the lane and the petitioner has restudied this element.</p>
<p><i>Lanes &amp; Carriage Houses:</i> Carriage houses must be located to the rear of the property.</p>	<p>The proposed carriage house is located at the rear, lane side, of the property at 126 E. Harris Street.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

**Part II Design:**



Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and doors	<p>Kolbe &amp; Kolbe double-hung, 2-over-2, double pane glass with simulated divided lights and spacer bar, aluminum clad windows are proposed.</p> <p>No information was provided for the garage doors.</p>	<p>Verify muntin width to be no more than 7/8". Kolbe &amp; Kolbe windows have been previously approved in the historic district and are visually compatible.</p> <p>Submit garage door info to staff.</p>
Roof shape: Carriage house roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by parapet.	Low shed roof behind a 4' masonry parapet.	Staff recommends reducing the height of the parapet. Its height appears disproportionate with the rest of the building and reinforces the verticality of the second floor.
Balconies, stoops, stairs, porches	<p>The porch on the south elevation facing Harris Street will not be visible from the public right-of-way; a 7' tall masonry wall is located along the street.</p> <p>The side stairs on the east elevation have been recessed from the lane 8 feet. They are comprised of tube steel with wood treads and steel mesh risers. A wire mesh screen surrounds the stairs and platforms which will be painted to match the brick.</p>	Staff recommends approval.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Materials	Four inch brick veneer is proposed for the exterior walls. Brick to be off-white as submitted in sample or Savannah Gray.	Samples to be submitted.
Color	Colors for doors and trim to be submitted to staff for final approval.	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Continuance to restudy window and parapet height.**

**Mr. Steffen** asked whether with the information that was received in the last 24 hours enough for the Board to approve the item and refer back to Staff the items that were not completely finished.

**Ms. Ward** stated no, that the only thing that she had received was the garage door material. She said she would feel comfortable if the Board recommended approval with the conditions

that the petitioner reduce the height of the windows and reduce the height of the parapet, and bring that back to Staff.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if a continuance was necessary or not. He said that it would not be necessary if the Board met those conditions.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that she had a problem because the windows in the building on either side were completely different. To make them visually compatible, it didn't seem to her that you could just pick one and not the other.

**Ms. Ward** asked if Ms. Fortson-Waring meant for the lane elevation.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** asked whether Ms. Ward was saying the windows should be reduced to match which building.

**Mr. Gay** stated the carriage house.

**Mr. Deering** stated the carriage house to the west.

**Ms. Ward** stated the adjacent historic structures on either side. Not necessarily to match, but be comparable in size to those.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** asked if they were both different sizes.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. She stated that in the last submittal that Staff recommended they reduce the size of the window by one pane of glass, to bring it down to approximately one-third the size of the window. She said they reduced it one-foot but that it was still not one-third the size of the window. Staff recommended that they reduce it to six feet because that would be visually compatible with the historic structures on either side of the building.

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

**Mr. Bacha** stated that he had restudied the elevations with the windows and submitted new drawings with the windows reduced down another foot from what had been previously proposed to Staff. He said with that in consideration, they were very close in the same height to the neighboring carriage house to the right. As for the parapet wall, if you go by the IBC 2000 codes that Savannah uses for residential construction, the parapet wall was three-foot two inches at the back, and with the slope of the roof they had to meet a 34-inch minimum for residential, up to 38 maximum. On the façade facing the courtyard, the windows are the same height and they would be identical windows to the lane façade. The parapet wall would have to have the 34 inches and that is why they are needing the height that they have.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he didn't really care one way or another about the windows on the lane, but on the garden side of the structure he felt that the larger windows were more successful and tied it to the main building better, than the smaller windows on the garden side.

**Mr. Bacha** stated that if Staff would be fine with that, they would be o.k. with having taller windows on the courtyard side.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he really thought it related to the 319 Abercorn address and the addition that was already on that building really well.

**HDBR ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that the windows on the lane side be

reduced to six feet as submitted. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Ms. Fortson-Waring opposed.

Ms. Fortson-Waring asked why would they reduce the lane side. Normally the lane is the one side that really doesn't matter how visually compatible it was.

Dr. Caplan stated that it did not but that there was some concern by Staff that they wanted it more compatible with the other houses, and he felt that was reasonable. He said that Mr. Deering's comment on the other side was actually reasonable and if they did that it would please everybody.

Ms. Fortson-Waring stated then there would be big windows on the front and small windows on the back.

**RE: Continued Petition of DPK & A Architects for Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD) H-06-3580-2 227 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard Exterior Alterations and Paint Removal**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions; denial of new stair and balustrade.

Mr. Hutchinson recused himself.

Present for the petition was Clive Copping .

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for the following exterior alterations to the building at 227 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard:

1. Replace metal roof with TCS II Standing Seam roof to be painted.
2. Repair cornice and damaged exterior walls.
3. Relocate existing cooling units to the roof of the restroom.
4. Removal of "abandoned services".
5. Install new humidifier in existing HVAC system and new extract fan in Kitchen and Board Room.
6. Repairs to the sidewalk.
7. Install a temporary roof connecting the building with the sheds to the north.
8. Strip exterior brick walls, cornice, and chimneys and strip stone lintels and sills. Brickwork will be repointed and repaired. Stucco on columns and metal triglyphs to be repainted.

9. Replace accessible ramp and install new stairs, handrails and barrier rail at the front entrance facing MLK.

**FINDINGS:**

The building at 227 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard was constructed in 1856 for the Central of Georgia Railroad and is a contributing structure to the Central of Georgia Railroad Shops and Terminal National Landmark Historic District. This historic Central of Georgia Headquarters and Banking Company Building “is one of the finest examples of Greek revival architecture in Georgia” according to the Historic Preservation Department at SCAD in their 2004 book entitled *The Savannah College of Art and Design, Restoration of an Architectural Heritage*.

Formerly known as the Gray Building, the structure is surfaced in painted Savannah Grey brick, brownstone lintels and sills, and a stone gabled pediment and entablature, which define the entrance of the structure with full story Tuscan columns and a stone stepped base portico entrance. The base has been covered in concrete and painted. Photographs dating from 1923 show a painted or possibly stuccoed exterior.

Items 1-6 are in keeping with the original character of the building and are minor improvements which will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way and/or in-kind repairs. Staff recommends submitting a sample of the roof material or providing supplemental information on “TCS II” material. Verify “abandoned services” and location of cooling units to be moved. If visible from the public right-of-way, they should be screened.

Item 7 – verify location of temporary roof structure and material to be installed.

Item 8 – (Removal of exterior paint and exposing Savannah Gray walls and cornice). The petitioner claims that the original design called for an exposed brick exterior. However, staff has concerns about the lack of research provided and the possible impacts this might have on the historic brick work which has not been exposed to the environment in at least 83 years. The Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for Rehabilitation* recommend the preservation of masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building including coatings and color. The specifically do not recommend “removing paint from historically painted masonry” or “removing paint that is firmly adhering to, and thus protecting, masonry surfaces”. Pending historical documentation on the original exterior surface, staff recommends removal of a three-foot square test area to investigate the condition of the underlying brick surface.

Item 9 – (Installation of new stair and metal railing on front portico). The front portico is the major character defining feature of this high-style Green Revival building. All attempts to preserve the integrity of this feature should be made. The petitioner claims that a new stair and railing are necessary for safety as the existing landing and stair are not level and unsafe for pedestrians. The original stairs have been coated with concrete and painted. An elevated concrete step and ramp were installed directly in front of the entrance at the same time. Although the stair has been modified from its original design, staff has concerns that the proposed stair and balustrade will compromise the overall intact historic and architectural integrity of this building. The absence of a balustrade and a wide spanning stair or base is indicative of buildings constructed in the Greek Revival style as evidenced in other structures of the same typology (the U.S. Customs House, Chamber of Commerce). The proposed alterations would introduce a new element to the primary façade of this building that was never intended by the original architect and remove a portion of the original stepped base.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the following:

Approval for the roof replacement pending further information on the proposed material;

approval of in-kind repairs and repairs to sidewalk, with paint colors on stucco areas and roof to be submitted to staff for final approval;

approval of work to the electrical and mechanical components of the application upon verification of the proposed location;

approval of the temporary roof upon verification of placement and material;

continuance of the paint removal for further research that this was the original intent and that it will not have negative impacts on the historic Savannah Gray brick;

denial of the proposed stair and balustrade because it undermines the architectural integrity of this landmark building.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked regarding the aerial view displaying the railroad sheds behind it, how many of those were left.

**Mr. Ward** stated that it was one continuous structure.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that it wasn't any more.

**Ms. Ward** answered correct. She thought that a majority of the wall was missing and that they could probably ask the applicant. She said that she had photographs in her office, but that she did not bring them with her.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he was convinced that in the past it was demolition by neglect.

**Dr. Caplan** thanked Staff for their very thorough evaluation of the application, and that they did a good job.

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

**Mr. Copping** stated that he was from DPK & A Architects, representing the owner Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD) for this project. He said the project began quite a few years ago when they did a grant funding project to do an assessment on a number of the buildings on the historic campus. Kiah Hall and the north sheds were two of those buildings that they looked at. During that assessment they made a number of recommendations for repair and restoration. This project now is sort of the fruition of that conditions assessment. He stated one correction on the list from Staff regarding the air conditioning units. Moving the air conditioning units from the roof of the north sheds onto Kiah Hall, they consider it a planning gain, even though they were going onto the new roof of Kiah Hall. That would enable, in the future, potential demolition of the box that sticks out of the north shed. He said that this was one piece of the project that was forward thinking to the potential project of the north sheds. He wanted to address some of the issues that had come up, and asked if the Board did not mind that he would like to go through all of the scope items of work, just so they would get a level of comfort of who DPK & A were and how they addressed some of the issues and their thoroughness in the design.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he would ask Mr. Copping to forego that because the Board had a 20-item agenda today.

**Mr. Copping** answered o.k., and wanted to talk about the stripping of the paint, the temporary roof, and then look at the design for the handrails, ramp, and the steps of the building. Looking at the paint stripping in the first photograph, the image showed the brick behind one of the original rain conductors, and it showed the brick unpainted. He said from the 1850's to the turn of the century when the Central of Georgia was in its heyday, the building was not painted and they considered that its period of significance. That is why they asked to do the stripping of the masonry for this project. Also, many of the buildings in this industrial complex for the railroad were not painted.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked whether this was stripping of masonry first.

**Mr. Copping** answered no, and stated that they were stripping the paint off the brick. He stated that they had done a probe, and they just used one application of Peel-Away One and it came straight off in one application.

**Mr. Deering** asked if peel-away was the product they intended to use.

**Mr. Copping** answered yes.

**Mr. Deering** stated that one of the reasons why he thought the building was never stuccoed was that the joints were very thin compared to buildings that were stuccoed. It was very rough and they didn't care to keep the joints the same size and that sort of thing. He said that this building was very well put together.

**Mr. Copping** stated that it tops the building off, and that the pediment and the columns did have stucco on them. He said that they had made some holes in it, which they would patch, to confirm that. He wanted to assure the Board that when the process was done, they would run continuous ph tests to make sure they did not have a problem with salts coming from this. This was done last week and they looked at it yesterday and today, and there was really no evidence of that so the contractor did a pretty good job of that probe. Also, just to add to that, he showed a photo of a grey sandstone and the seal that was uncovered now.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if he could make a point. He said that sheet D-2.01 elevation showed six columns on the portico. On the east elevation there was an arrow going from one and it said, "stucco typical". On the south elevation, there was an arrow going to the same pilaster and it said, "brick pilaster typical". On the north, elevation there was an arrow going through the same column and it said, "stone column typical". Then on sheet 1.03 where there was a section of the portico, it said, "masonry column". He asked if Mr. Copping could explain what the column was.

**Mr. Copping** stated that Mr. Meyerhoff gave everyone a very good review. The columns were stucco over masonry and the pilasters against the building were painted brick. He said that on J-8 was incorrect and it should read as a stucco column and that it was an error in the documents.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it was a brick column that had been painted.

**Mr. Copping** stated that it was a brick column that had stucco on it and then it was painted.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were going to remove the paint and the stucco.

**Mr. Copping** stated no, they were going to remove the paint off brick. They were not going to take the paint off the columns because they were stucco. He said that it was very difficult to get paint off stucco. They were going to paint the pediment and the columns, and strip the paint off the brick work.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the six columns would remain as stucco columns.

**Mr. Copping** replied painted stucco, yes.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if what they would end up with what would be six stuccoed columns.

**Mr. Copping** replied six painted stucco columns.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that he wanted to make one other clarification on Item Number 7. He asked if there was a typo at the end of the sentence where it says, "...install a temporary roof connecting the building with the shed to the north".

**Mr. Steffen** stated that was the Staff's report.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if it was an error then.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the sheds were to the west and that was why Staff mentioned it.

**Mr. Copping** stated that the sheds were probably to the west but they were probably north sheds because of all of the sheds that lie south of it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Staff had recommended approval of everything except for the stairs and the balustrade. He said there were some items that Staff were asking to come back to them for further information. What the Board needed was his response to the denial of the stair and the balustrade because it seemed to him that everything else would come back to Staff anyway, regardless of what the Board did.

**Mr. Copping** stated that he wanted to answer the question.

**Mr. Steffen** stated for Mr. Copping not to worry about that question because it was not an issue that had to do with the Board's report.

**Mr. Copping** stated that considering the design and the need for a guardrail, steps, and a ramp, that as preservation architects, and in working with the cathedral, they agreed with Staff. They did not want to put new steps or guardrails up on a building of this nature, but their feeling was that this was a fairly treacherous situation. He said that from the image, they can see there were a number of steps, all of equal size and very shallow treads that made them potentially unsafe. He knew that the owner of the building would tell the Board that a lot of elderly people came and found it very difficult to get up the steps. The proximity of these steps to Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK) had them concerned that some day someone might trip over and fall into MLK. He said that when they looked to the design for the steps they had two goals. One, to make them accessible and compliant with code and not to impede the sidewalk that was already very narrow. Code required that if you bring a handrail down to the base of the steps, that the projection of the handrail had to be the step plus 12 inches. If they could use the steps to modify, then the profile would actually put the handrail two feet into the sidewalk. There feeling was that they would just be collecting bicycles all day if they did that. He said the steps had already been covered in concrete, and somewhere underneath were the original steps. Their idea was to shift in the plane from this sort of odd concrete-covered step back to something that resembled the original stone steps that was a lot shallower and more

harmonious to actually walk on. He said they did not want to have material where you just stop the concrete and put stone in and have this very rough edge of a material cut through. Their design was to make it interface, in which they used the very honest material of stainless steel that showed a clear cut in the concrete, the new steps of stone being slid in, and then the handrails applied to the side. They also added a guardrail between the columns to prevent people from falling off the steps into the sidewalk, and then a ramp at the end with handrails on the side. He stated that somewhere in the package was a photograph of the Second Bank of Philadelphia which had a very similar detail. He said it was brushed stainless steel and very fine sections placed in between the columns, and at the top of the image was another of the railings sitting in. The idea was that it was not really a guardrail, and that it did not have to be because it is not above 32 inches. It is a sort of visual barrier so that people do not come out of the door and go down the steps, then fall into MLK.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Dr. Caplan** asked what Mr. Copping thought about the Staff's recommendation to put the stairs on the side.

**Mr. Copping** stated that he thought they could put the stairs on the side.

**Dr. Caplan** stated rather than up the front.

**Mr. Copping** stated yes, and asked if that would mean that they continue the guardrail between the columns.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that it was another issue, but they could start with the steps on the side.

**Mr. Copping** stated that they would have to be together. If they remove the staircase from the front to the side and their issue was the safety of the steps, then they would not want to leave one space between the columns open. They would ask that if it was moved to the side, then they would add another barrier in between the columns.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he agreed with Staff on the barrier, that it not be there. He said that it did take away from the original design intent of the building and the steps had been there for a long time. He did not know how many accidents they have had on the steps, but they had met the code compliance by putting the steps on the north end of the portico, the ramp on the south end, and to leave the rest of it alone.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that she agreed.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if you leave the rest of it alone, would it create a drop from the portico to the sidewalk that would necessitate a balustrade.

**Mr. Deering** answered no. He said the existing stairs that are there would remain

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that he thought Mr. Copping was talking about moving the stairs in the front.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that while he concurred with Mr. Copping that they needed railings at the stairs, he totally agreed with Staff and with what the other members were saying. He said that putting the railing between the columns changes the visual portico. If they want to put the stairs there and make the risers the same height, it was fine. They did not need the railing between the colonnades. He said that it changes the character of the building.



**Mr. Copping** stated as he said in the beginning, they are addressing a higher regard and that was public safety. From their point-of-view and the owners' point-of-view, when one comes out of the building, they felt it was an unsafe condition. He would only request that a continuance be considered and that the Board members actually go to the building and look at it. To go up the steps and see how....

**Mr. Mitchell** stated not to interrupt Mr. Copping, but with the public safety issue, he mentioned the treads. That Mr. Copping said the problem was with the depth of the tread.

**Mr. Copping** stated that the steps are narrow and uneven.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if they are narrower and by narrower he meant how many.

**Mr. Deering** stated that the riser heights vary as well.

**Mr. Copping** stated that the riser heights vary. They go up eight inches, nine inches, or eleven, and then you get a four.

**Mr. Deering** stated that you get the same thing when you climb up the Cathedral of Notre Dame, and you get the same thing at the Coliseum in Rome. He said there are hundreds and thousands of unsafe buildings in Savannah that are historic.

**Mr. Copping** stated that he would agree with the Board on that but they are not next to MLK, which is an incredibly busy street.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it was their decision to decide to make it a commercial building.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the applicant could accomplish the same safety issue by placing a removable planter between the columns rather than a colonnade if they did not want people to walk down there. He said there are many ways of doing that then putting a balustrade there if safety is their concern.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that on behalf of the Foundation's Architectural Review Committee (ARC), they strongly oppose the introduction of the balustrade between the columns. He said it would change the character of a National Historic Landmark building. In his opinion, it was totally unnecessary because he had been in this building many times as a member of the advisory committee for SCAD's School of the Building Arts. There were only three steps that are nine inches (27 or 30 inches). He said the code does not require it, it is not a public safety requirement, and he hoped that the Board would oppose it.

**Mr. Alexandro Santana** stated that the handrails and metal balustrades were completely inappropriate and unacceptable.

**Mr. Steffen** stated they have the staff recommendation for approval on five items, and then they had a recommendation for denial of the front stair and balustrade.

**HDBR ACTION:** **Mr. Deering** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the front entrance steps face Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard, and the proposed stairs and balustrade not be included in the petition. **Ms. Fortson-Waring** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen stated to Mr. Copping that what it meant was that he would have to present a separate drawing on those issues, and then Staff would bring them back to the Board on the next available occasion.

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

Continued pending Board of Zoning Appeals hearing.

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 continuance.

Present for the petition was 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 consists of the rectangular section north of the filling station along Laurel Street from MLK, Jr. Blvd. and Ann Street. The second phase runs in an N-S direction along Ann Street to Oglethorpe Avenue.

### **FINDINGS**

1. The existing motel was 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.
2. The Northwest corner of Oglethorpe Avenue and MLK was originally occupied by the Mansion of Mary Marshall and a formal camellia garden. Photos looking west along Oglethorpe Avenue (Then known as William Street) show two and three story masonry townhouses dating from the 1820's to the 1850's as well as frame structures. This was a neighborhood located at the edge of the West End that contained such mansions as the Stiles House and the Scarborough House. The uses in the area gradually shifted over time to commercial and more modest dwellings. In 1961, 35 feet was taken from the lots on the north side of William Street and the street was widened to align with Oglethorpe Avenue. Mary Marshall's house had been replaced by the mid 1950's by used auto sales.

While it could be argued that the bay spacing and rhythms of the Oglethorpe Plan do not apply here outside of the area of the wards, streets and squares, it is critical to maintain vitality at the street level as well as efforts to break up the length and scale of the

building. While technically not included within the Landmark Historic District, the property is within the local historic district boundaries. It is located at a particularly vulnerable site as Oglethorpe Avenue is an entry boulevard into the Landmark Historic District and should be celebrated and enhanced by significant buildings. While there is little historic context left West of MLK, there are a few “modern” buildings related to transportation such as the “A” frame from the old Howard Johnson motel, The Grayline Tour Company Building, the Thunderbird Inn and Sign, and the Greyhound bus station. Suggestions made at the May 10, 2006, Board of Review meeting included expressing the building as three buildings reflecting the various flags and intended uses of the structure including two hotels and residential condominiums. It was also suggested to use a modern vocabulary, including glass, rather than historicist references. Although a Phase II submittal issue, ground floor retail along Oglethorpe Avenue is critical to the urban vitality of the corridor.

**The following Part I Height and Mass Standards apply:**

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Demolition	It is not clear whether the entire Econo Lodge will be demolished for the First Phase or only a portion.	The Econo Lodge is not historic and may be demolished, however a site plan indicating the Phase I condition after demolition needs to be submitted, including surface treatment and screening or the relationship of the remains of the Econo Lodge, if partial demolition is anticipated, with the Phase I hotel.
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in District when next to a BC.	No significant setbacks are proposed.	Historically structures were built to the 0 lot line in this area.
Dwelling Unit Type	Mixed use Hotel (possibly two different ones according to the applicant) and condominium.	It would be helpful if the design reflected the multiplicity of uses.
Street elevation Type	Ground entrances, underground parking.	
Entrances	Entrance to Parking off Laurel Street extension. First phase lobby entered from MLK and Laurel street. Second phase entry on Ann Street. Condo entrances at Ann and Laurel and Ann and Oglethorpe. Meeting room doors on Oglethorpe.	In order avoid long expanses of wall with no vitality on the street Chadborne suggested entrances every 60 feet. If Laurel Street is considered partially a service lane, this Standard is met for Phase I.
Building Height: Five stories is permitted in this area.	Five stories is proposed for a height to the top of the parapet of 57 feet.	
Tall Building Principles and large scale development		The intent of these standards is to break up the mass of a structure. The building as designed is not sufficiently separated into different

		masses.
Proportion of structure’s front façade		The MLK side is 95 feet+/- wide by 57 feet high. The approximate 2 to 1 proportion of width to height creates a horizontality to the front façade which is reinforced by the design of the top story.
Proportion of openings		There are numerous groupings of openings creating square, vertical and horizontal shapes. The various parts of the building do not seem to relate to each other.
Rhythm of solids to voids		There is no set rhythm. The organization of openings within the structure is not clear.
Rhythm of structure on street		It still reads as one long box-like structure all the same height.
Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, balconies		See entrance discussion above.
Walls of continuity		
Scale		The building as presented is one long mass.

**Comment:** The way the materials are mixed on the building, which is not typical of Savannah, is reminiscent of the DoubleTree hotel on Bay and MLK. The windows and PTAC louvers appear flat. The signs are overpowering.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Revisit the massing and organization of solids and voids within the mass to produce a building that will establish a significant entrance to the Historic District. The overall mass of the building could be reduced if the design reflected the multiplicity of uses proposed for the structure.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Shay** stated they had an unusually shaped site with a piece cut out of the corner, which was approved for a single-story gas station. The body of the site is an L-shape that includes an area that was once part of Laurel Street. He said their proposed design is to open it back up again, thus reestablishing a street that was closed off some time ago. He thought it was very important to look at the model because the presentation of the two-dimensional elevation made the building look a whole lot bigger in two dimensions than in three. The façade of the building is about 96-feet-wide. The other façade is about 165 feet long, which is about 60 feet narrower than the Double Tree Hotel. He said there were two long facades. One is 247 feet which faces Ann Street that is not a major street, and the other is 311 feet and faces Laurel Street. He stated

that if you look at the model and try to get down to eye level, you do not perceive on all four sides the 300-foot-long top. The two main thoroughfares have facades on them that are shorter or narrower than the main buildings that are on all of the other frontages of the same street. The existing hotel across Oglethorpe Avenue that was just recently constructed was much wider than what they are proposing, and all of the buildings on the other side; the Courthouse and the Chatham County Jail are wider than the frontage on Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard. The question of what the condition of the building would be at the end of Phase I and before Phase II is built, is something that Mr. Al-Jassar could show drawings that conceptualize it. He said that his client's intention is not to build Phase I and then stop. It is to build Phase I and then when Phase I is done to immediately build Phase II. They had prepared some drawings that will show the Board what the footprint of the building is, and the drawings that had been submitted show temporarily what the elevation is on one side of the building before the second phase of the building constructed.

He stated that the Issue of multiplicity was addressed in their design. What the standards ask of building in Downtown Savannah was that it have a base, middle, and top. He said that this was the written standard and it was in the guidelines as well. That is why the story heights were different as you go up the building. The ground floor level was articulated in different ways, but was primarily expressed through large areas of storefront glass. On those levels were the assembly functions for the hotel. The middle portion of the building is transient residential hotel rooms, and the top are residential condominiums. The resident will not have to enter through the lobby of the hotel because they will have their own separate entrances, and they will share with some of the amenities and services that would be provided by the hotel. They will have access to the restaurants and have access to the concierge services. There are a multiplicity of functions but they are not to function as if they were three different buildings. Mr. Shay agreed that they want it to be a big gateway building, and they would like to present to the Board a very contemporary expression. He said when they came forward at the last meeting, and they presented a building that met the standards, but was in the Neo-Traditional vocabulary, which was what the guidelines lead you into with the proportions and the elements of Neo-Traditional architecture. He said what the Board asked for was a contemporary expression and they took the challenge and said that they would like to do that as well. They went back and revisited the design and came up with something that was not the language of pediments, architraves, and double-hung windows. They came up with something that was the architecture of clean lines, of straight plain surfaces, stucco and brick, storefront with lots of glass, some would be standard glass and some would be the louvers that are necessary for the air conditioning equipment, but it would read as a curtain wall. These are all very contemporary expressions that had been employed on other buildings in Savannah with some of them being in the Historic District, and they thought they were appropriate.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if she could stop Mr. Shay right here and let the Board go ahead and ask him questions. She said that the Board could see what the design was and the Board could see from where they came last month, but she wanted everyone to ask him questions. She felt they were in agreement with the changes that were made, but they need to talk about where they differed.

**Dr. Caplan** asked about the recommendation regarding the signage in the front being overwhelming.

**Mr. Shay** stated they introduced it as an architectural element. If the Board said that they didn't want the sign to have letters on it, but said the name of the hotel, he would still want to have the architectural element there. He thought it was important in the area in dividing the façade and making it more vertical than horizontal just as the Staff recommended, with the vertically aligned windows. He said that he would argue that it was at least a vertical as well as a horizontal expression. If Dr. Caplan thought it was overpowering by thinking of it as a sign that's fine, then

take the letters off. They just think that it is an architectural element that they would like to see on the façade of the building.

**Dr. Caplan** asked how far out does the vertical element extend from the building.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it extended a distance of maybe three feet.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if it came all the way out to the edge.

**Mr. Shay** answered no, that it is a relatively shallow projection. It is not nearly as deep as the projecting canopy.

**Mr. Neely** stated that on the façade on the south side closest to MLK, the big blank brick wall needed to have some ornamentation of windows in it because it was a very strong and more visible part of the whole building.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he is not that fond of some of the curves that are squared off on the fifth floor above that and it does not work within the district. He said that he knew where they were going with the design, and Staff was correct that it does resemble the Double Tree a little too closely. There was some site adaptation that was done with the hotel. There are too many similar elements with the windows and other things.

**Mr. Shay** stated that one of the reasons they are presenting to the Board the curves was that, oddly enough, the property doesn't come to a point, it is actually curved at the radius and they had followed the curve of the property line. They had done some studies in projecting to keep the curve and don't do the square corner at the top floor, and those are somewhat pleasing so they can take a look at that.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that Phase I and Phase II in completing the whole structure as it surrounds the corner gas station, surely they had talked about Phase III as to when you acquire that particular piece of property. He asked if they hadn't anticipated acquiring that at some point.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he was not a principal of the project. That particular piece of property was a gas station that apparently made a lot of money, and it was also a contaminated site. The answer was that it may very well be developed at some point in the future but he doubted that was going to end up being a logical Phase III development scenario.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that Mr. Shay was right because he was asked and encouraged to come up with a contemporary solution to this design question and it was a challenging site. He would like to commend him for coming forward with the risk because the guidelines do encourage Neo-Traditional design in so many ways. He said that he did not think they were so far from a successful design, he just needed a few modifications, and to take heed to Staff's comments about mixing materials especially at the top corners. Trying to continue to differentiate the façade that faces Oglethorpe Avenue, one that faces MLK is important in breaking up the huge buildings. Taking it in all together it is a large building and he wanted to encourage Mr. Shay to continue contemporary design solutions to try to illuminate the mix of stucco and brick, and to try his best to break up the MLK and Oglethorpe façade.

**Mr. Michael Brown** stated that they have all driven by the existing hotel and have seen the massiveness of the building. He said the proposed project is five times the size of the building and we need to look at the perspective. One of the things that Dr. Caplan used were the words compatibility and scale. As Mr. Shay said it was 247 feet just facing the end street. He said it does not face the end street, it is perpendicular to the main thoroughfare into the city. It was a huge, huge site and he was not sure that it was compatible with anything.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Deering** stated that it was a difficult site because it was a big site and there are very few sites this big in the district or in the local Historic District. It was hard to break up a large building like this. He wanted to encourage, as Mr. McDonald said, to continue to look at ways to do that through the final design. He thought that in exploring some more streamlined materials it would be an interesting thing. If it is going to modern let's not put red brick on it.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she went back and read the minutes from last month and she applauded Mr. Shay for being sensitive to the Board's comments, she thought he did a great job with that, and that he had made great strides. She was not thrilled with the thing that sticks out of the building, and she thought that it looked like a movie theater; and a drive-in movie theater at that. She would like to see some of it disappear and she thought it was an improvement on what they saw last month, but they are not there yet.

**Mr. Shay** stated they would like to learn from what was said today, and they agreed with a lot of what they heard today, but maybe not all of it. The height and mass were essential to them. He admitted that it was a big site and a five-story building that was allowed within the area. He said they had done everything that the guidelines told them to do in order to articulate the mass and break it up. A lot of the comments they heard today concerned the materiality. They were asked where was the brick, where were the other materials, and how did they employ them to make the building read as more separate parts rather than one from end-to-end. He said that they were going to end up using the same language. With the vocabulary, the reason that it had some similarities to the Double Tree was because of the proportioning system. He said they could address the comments that the Board wanted them to, certainly in the design detail stage and come back to the Board. As demonstrated in the past, they could do better.

**Mr. Deering** stated from the drawings did not say how deep the recessed areas were. He said that he wanted to encourage that they be deeper and the curved elements that are within the flat areas of the façade be more pronounced. It did help to break up the mass a little bit more.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that it appeared it was all the way out to the lot line all the way around, and it looked like they nipped at the outer perimeters to give it a perception of some recesses, but they really were not deep enough to change the perception because it was quite massive. He felt that Mr. Shay was trying to lock some language in at this point so that he could take off on it later, and he did not know if the Board wanted to lock themselves in at this point.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that he understood Mr. Shay's position and he empathized with him. He said that they were going in the right direction. He said Mr. Shay had long experience with the Board and he was very talented, and he thought he should ask for a continuance to come up with something that might be a better solution rather than just throwing out something now.

**Mr. Shay** stated they certainly preferred an approval of the Height and Mass, but most of the issues they had talked about today; how deep the recesses were, whether a plane was made out of brick or whether it was made out of refrigerator metal panels, or whatever, these were the things for design detail. They want to continue to explore this. They would always continue to work on the buildings and push them in that direction, but he felt the Board had put him in a very, very difficult position to send him out of the room the second time after they did everything the Board wanted him to do the first time, and still not give them a go ahead on the Height and Mass.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that the Board defined of Height and Mass by the Saran Wrap or the plastic wrap around it.

**Mr. Deering** stated as if the building were shrink-wrapped.

**Dr. Caplan** stated that it would be very difficult for the Board to approve it when they are still searching for a way to break up the building so there is not a large amount of continuity. If the Board approved that, then they were not being true to what they had established in their criteria for Height and Mass.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that it was a difficult project and that Mr. Shay was in a difficult position by locking the Board into the Height and Mass situation that put them in a difficult position for later on. He said he did not know if Mr. Shay wanted to do that.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that the overwhelming feeling of the Board was that Mr. Shay asks for a continuance.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of Bobby Melton  
H-06-3590-2  
110 West Taylor Street  
Exterior Paint – Acrylic Paint with Ceramic  
Additives**

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

Present for the petition was Tom Olson.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to paint the exterior wood siding building at 110 West Taylor Street with acrylic/latex paint containing ceramic additives manufactured by Ecospeciality. The paint will be applied to the wood siding after it has been thoroughly pressure washed and cleaned. It is meant to provide a reduced maintenance exterior and combat the effects of the heat and humidity in the coastal area. At the May 10, 2006, meeting of the Historic District Board of Review, this application was continued. The Board requested additional information to be provided by the applicant comparing the chemical make-up and permeability rating of the proposed paint compared with common acrylic/latex based paint.

**FINDINGS:**

The property at 110 West Taylor Street is part of a row of wood frame townhouses constructed in 1851. The building is a rated structure within Savannah's Landmark Historic District. The following standard from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030 (l)(e)) states:

*Ceramic based coatings and sealers used on siding are inappropriate on buildings in the historic district and shall be prohibited.*

The applicant has provided extensive documentation on the proposed paint by ECO-ArmourCote in the attached booklet. The proposed finish is an acrylic/latex based paint with 3M ceramic micropshere additives.



Specifications and Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) were also provided for Benjamin Moore, MoorGlo, a soft gloss fortified (alkyd resin) acrylic house paint comparing the two products.<sup>1</sup> Below are some of the differences in the two products:

Technical Data	ECO ArmourCote	Benjamin Moore, MoorGlo
Volume Solids	60%	41%
Recommended Dry Film Thickness	3-5 mils (1 <sup>st</sup> coat) 2-4 mils (2 <sup>nd</sup> coat)	1.5 mils
Surface Preparation	Pressure washing, sandblasting, sanding, scraping, or any other manner	If previously coated with cement-base water paints, clean by sandblasting

Information regarding the permeability or ability of the paint to “breath” was not provided in the comparison. Doug Faulker, President of Eco Specialty products stated that the coatings offer a better cover than paint and have a permeability rating between 12 and 16. Mr. Faulkner also states that sandblasting is not required for surface preparation. He then goes on to discuss the “Elastomeric coating” stating that they can be removed from the exterior surface “just like paint” and can be painted over. He states the advantages of ceramic bead coatings include thermal benefits, smooth application, and a more abrasive surface. Mr. Faulkner concludes by stating that this product is an Industrial elastomeric coating which has protective value.

An article from *Professional Painter*, Spring 2002, was submitted discussing certain additives in paint. It states that the solid percentage of a paint is generally comprised of pigments and a binder. It goes on to say that “top quality paints usually have a higher percentage of solids... top quality latex paint might have 30 to 40 percent solids and only 60 to 70 percent liquid.” The paint submitted is 60 percent solid, which is more solid than liquid and is considered a coating not a paint. Ceramic beads are not listed as an additive that provides desirable properties.

Since this is a “permanent” finish, staff has questions about the “reversibility” of the product and if it is even possible. In addition, although it has a permeability rating of 12-16, staff has concerns about moisture getting trapped in the building and its ability to breathe which could cause the siding to rot. The applicant stated that the product was recently used to paint the historic windows on the Independent Presbyterian Church administration building on Bull Street. Field inspection revealed that the material did look very similar to average latex paint, but did appear somewhat thicker in composition.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends denial of the use of paint with ceramic bead additives and permanent coatings on historic buildings as it is not permitted in the historic district under Section 8-3030 (l)(e) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance. Staff does not recommend the experimentation of unknown products or elastomeric finishes on our significant historic structures. Historic buildings require regular maintenance and care to preserve their historic integrity and exterior paint on wood siding is an integral component to the preservation of the siding and underlying structure.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

---

<sup>1</sup> When contacted about the Benjamin Moore product, B & B paints stated that they would not distribute ceramic paints due to their hard surface which causes the paint to crack.

**Mr. Tom Olson** from Kern-Coleman stated that he was acting as an agent for Mr. Melton. He said Mr. Melton was also there, but he was there because shortly after the meeting in May, Mr. Melton called their office. He was concerned what to present to the Board. The document Mr. Melton supplied the Board late in May was done at his recommendation and Mr. Melton went well beyond what he was expecting to put together to provide the Board with information to help answer some questions. He provided a little sample to question which part was which. That is part of why they were there. When Mr. Melton put it together and brought the literature to Mr. Olson and he starting looking at it, what he was presenting was a product that did not have to be like Benjamin Moore or Sherman Williams. He said it is 100 percent acrylic latex. It had ceramic beads that were an additive that provide some additional qualities to that coating that he was able to market it as a better product. It did provide some better UV protection than standard coatings. It went on smoother because of the ceramic spheres. He said that they were very small. He would not call them microscopic but they were nearly that. In the booklet, he wanted to point Item 2, which provided documentation on MSBS sheets on his products compared to a typical Benjamin Moore acrylic latex. They are nearly the same. Mr. Melton's product is 100 percent acrylic latex that has an additive. In Item 4, he addressed the reversibility in that you can do scraping and sanding, heat removal, and stripping removal. He said that it was workable just like that typical 100 percent acrylic latex of some other manufacturer. It did have a permeability rating that allowed it to provide some breathing. He had not contacted other painting manufacturers to get their permeability number. Mr. Melton had done that, and he believed that some of the numbers that he had gotten that a lot of the paint manufacturers don't publish, were the 12 to 16 permeability rating that was listed. In Item 7, the building could be repainted, it could be painted over, it could be sanded. The sample was a piece of rough-sawn cedar that was painted over with two products. Those are good products that are going to last for a very long time. If Mr. Melton had brought the product to him to put on a building that he was doing in the Historic District, he would find the product a very good product.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that everything Mr. Olson had said for the most part was 99.400 percent absolutely true. The risk factor that he had not been able to touch on was dealing with the permeability factor. The Board was not willing to risk applying the product to an older house and having it not breathe. If you had ever done an organic chemistry course, you would understand that when mixing in the beads, it changes the structure of the substance. If that change was going to be sufficient enough to reduce the breathability of the building, that was where the Board has a problem with it. He was not sure they were willing to take a risk on experimenting to see whether it happened. Whether you could scrape the paint off down the line.

**Mr. Olson** stated that the ceramic spheres were an inert material, in that, they were just mixed in. They did not chemically combine with the paint. They were just like the pigment paint. They are another particle in that paint and it does not chemically become something new.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated if that was the fact, then the permeability rating should be about the same as the paint. When you did your research to check on its permeability, nothing was being said about how the relationship compared.

**Mr. Bobby Melton** stated he was the owner of Perfect Exteriors. He said that a letter was provided from the Vice-President of manufacturing. One of the reasons that the ceramic bead was added to the proposed latex was to, in fact, improve the permeability of the product performance so that it did breaths better. If you used the traditional 100 percent latex on the building, it was not going to breath as readily as the ceramic. It changed the pure structure of

the 100 percent acrylic latex. He said that he did not work for the manufacturer because his background was engineering, and he was certified in a couple of different fields. He had been working on homes for a long time. When he found this product and did the research, 3M was the manufacture of the ceramic beads, and they went to Eco Specialty and boasted some claims that are listed in Section 13. It was up to Eco Specialty to prove their claims through thorough field-testing and lab result testing and the copies of the test results were included in the documentation. He said as far as experimentation, he wanted to address the question about the permeability of traditional paint. He referred to Section 2 and a toll free number that was listed on the architectural section of the Benjamin Moore section. It was not a numbered page but was entitled, "Benjamin Moore". He said there is a toll-free technical assistance number down at the bottom of the page that he found was very useful. He had spoken to a couple of different technical representatives and asked them specific questions about the permeability of their traditional paint. They explained to Mr. Melton that no testing had been done, and there was no documentation that was available. The only time they test their paints for permeability is if they are requested to do so by the Federal Government.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated to keep in mind that it was not denied solely on the permeability, but that (the ordinance) pretty much outlawed it.

**Ms. Seiler** stated they could debate the permeability of the paint between now and Christmas, but they were not going to take up the Board's time to do that right now.

Mr. Melton stated that he was addressing a specific concern.

Ms. Seiler stated that this was true, but their guidelines clearly stated under Section 8-3030, that the experimentation of unknown products, on the historic structures was not allowed. Right now this paint had not been proven.

**Mr. Melton** stated that the statement Ms. Seiler referred to was under 8-3030 was a ceramic-based paint.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that this ceramic-based paint had not been proven yet. What the Board had to decide to do was whether or not they were going to approve the use of the acrylic finish. She was going to call on comments from the public to see if they had any other comments in regard to this, then the Board could ask any questions. They were not going to stay and debate all day on the chemical composition of this paint.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Dr. Caplan** asked what are the Department of the Interior Guidelines and said about this.

**Ms. Ward** stated that they do not address elastameric coatings or any other kind of additives in paint. They refer to water-based and oil-based paints. They typically say to preserve all paint if it is not flaking off the buildings, to keep it as much as you can and only lightly sand.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if there was no specific admonition against using this type of product.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that they use it on flat roofs, slightly pitched roofs, and some of the roof coatings are elastameric.

**Mr. Melton** stated that when you say elastameric you are referring to a property of a coating and its ability to expand and contract on substrate, but it is 100 percent acrylic latex.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked how long had the product been on the market.

**Mr. Melton** stated that some derivative of the product had been on the market since 1962 minus the ceramic bead additives.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked about this particular product only.

**Mr. Melton** stated that the product had been on the market, to his knowledge, for four years.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked about any studies.

**Mr. Melton** stated that Section 9 would address the study. There had been some experimentation. The Benjamin Moore technical representative told him that anytime you add paint over paint that it reduces the permeability. His point was, if you don't completely strip the wood before you apply the paint, then you are eliminating the permeability. He went on to say that the oil-based paints have a permeability of none.

**Mr. Deering** stated that there were paints that were made and marketed in Europe that you can buy in the United States. They have a much higher volume of solids to liquid. That was generally considered a better paint and it tended to hold up longer. They have mineral coatings and all sorts of things. There are probably far worse things out there that you can put on buildings that will ruin the facade.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that the guidelines prohibit ceramic-based coatings and these are ceramic micro sphere additives.

**Mr. Olson** stated there were ceramic-based coatings out there that were like a chemical coating when two pots are mixed together and you put it on something it provides something new when mixed together.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring stated** that she was just doing it for his benefit.

**Mr. Olson** stated his appreciation and that he wanted to mention it earlier. He was not clear from the statement in the zoning guide what product was being excluding.

**HDBR ACTION:** **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the petition as submitted. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed . Opposed was Dr. Caplan, Ms. Fortson-Waring, Mr. Deering, Mr. Gay**

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Incorporated  
Donna Swanson  
H-06-3594-2  
103 West Broughton Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Doug Bean.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of a projecting principal use sign to be mounted with a steel plate and posts. The sign is oval with a five-foot width by three-foot height. The material appears to be a vinyl face.

**FINDINGS:**

The size, brightness, and material of the sign appear out of character for the historic building to which it is to be attached. Staff recommends that the petitioner consider a four-foot-wide oval in a sand blasted material to be more in character with the Landmark Historic District.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Reconsideration of size and material.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that the size of the sign be no wider than four feet, that it is sandblasted wood, and that colors and a final design come back to Staff. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Incorporated  
Donna Swanson  
H-06-3600-2  
9 Drayton Street  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** with conditions.

Present for the petition was Doug Bean.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of a projecting two-faced principal use sandblasted sign. It is to be mounted at the second floor level to the south of the ground floor entrance. The height is six feet and the width is 4 feet at its greatest point. The height clearance is met. The colors are maroon, dark green, black, cream, and gold. Copy is "Isaac's at 9 Drayton Restaurant."

**FINDINGS:**

1. The actual appearance of the sign will be less bright than the rendering (see actual color samples.)

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval**

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Brian Py.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass, and Part II design approval for a 71-room full-service hotel, and a Finding of Fact that a request for a three-story height variance above Bay Street is visually compatible, and a Finding of Fact that the width of the walkways when Factor's Walk is put back are compatible.

**FINDINGS:**

The site is located within the Factors Walk Riverfront Overlay District: Factors Walk presents a building typology even more tightly defined by precedent than does the Oglethorpe Plan area. There is no other interface between city and river like it in America...nothing should threaten its integrity (Chadbourn) the insertion of tall and or large-scale development in this area threatens its integrity both by singular action and by precedent for future action.

The site has conditions peculiar to the piece of property in that it is shaped like a parallelogram. It is also bounded by the Savannah River and there is opportunity to recreate a Factor's Walk to complement the recreated walk proposed farther to the west. The site provides a transition between the lower 1850's range and the seven-story Hyatt.

**The following Part I Height and Mass Standards apply:**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Buildings along Factor's Walk shall front both Bay Street and River Street at their respective levels. Entrances to uses above River Street shall be from Upper and Lower Factor's Walk or from private property, provided however, entrances to end units may front onto the public ramps.	Entrances are proposed at both levels. The two entrances on River Street are to a restaurant. Glass roll-up doors are proposed that open onto River Street. See drawings marked Item 1.	This standard is met.
Buildings shall be constructed of brick, ballast stone, or wood...	Brick is proposed.	This standard is met.
New construction on the south side of River Street shall not exceed three stories or 45 feet above Bay Street.	Six stories above Bay, for a total of 58'-2", is requested. This includes the recessed glass roof garden. On the roof there are two mechanical and elevator penthouses which do not count as a story,	The Board of Appeals would have to approve a 3-story variance above Bay.  Item 2 shows a section of the roof garden. The applicant's drawings indicate that it

	but the glass roofed sliding glass nana wall system between them is conditioned space and therefore counts as a story.	should not be visible from adjacent streets.
<b>Guideline:</b> Upper and Lower Factor's Walk should be maintained as thoroughfares and not enclosed.	Upper and Lower Factor's Walk will be retained as thoroughfares.	See item three for an elevation of upper and lower Factor's Walk.
<b>Guideline:</b> Factors Walk is exempt from the large scale and commercial development provisions requiring subdivision of upper floors into bays and differentiated massing.	The applicant has chosen to follow the traditional commercial massing.	
<b>Guideline:</b> Elevations fronting River Street or the River itself, are exempt from the provisions regarding vertical articulation. Buildings with flat, rather than articulated facades can be consistent with the riverfront industrial character of the area.	The applicant has chosen to articulate bays.	
Streets and lanes cannot be bridged by development, except at Factor's Walk. Such bridges shall be for pedestrian use only. Factor's Walk bridges shall not be covered by a roof, awning, or any other type of extension from a building.	Two pedestrian-vehicular bridges are proposed. A plaza replicating that planned for the renovation of the Ryan Building is also planned.	The Board of Appeals would have to grant a variance upon a finding of fact regarding the compatibility of vehicular bridges at this location.
<b>Setbacks:</b> No setbacks are required in B-B zone.	No setbacks are proposed. The building aligns with the historic range to the West.	
<b>Dwelling Unit Type</b>	A 71-room full service hotel is proposed.	
<b>Tall Building Principles and large scale development</b>	NA	As perceived from Bay Street this is not defined as a Tall building. It would be as perceived from River Street. The Factor's Walk overlay exempts construction from tall building principles. The footprint does not exceed the threshold area to qualify as Large-Scale Development.
<b>Proportion of structure's front facade</b>	The hotel really has two front facades. The Bay Street façade serves as a transition	

	between historic and non-historic. The River Street elevation retains the character of the plainer factor's ranges, while affording dramatic views of the river.	
Proportion of openings	Because of the views of the river, large window openings are proposed. The scale of these openings is reduced by the smaller scale of the elements within the openings.	
Rhythm of solids to voids	The walls are viewed as a series of punched openings with an industrial flavor. This complements the renovation at the News Press across the street and the Ryan Building adjacent.	Glass Crittall Window systems are used at the corners to help separate the structure from the historic range to the West.
Rhythm of structure on street	The recreation of the bridges recreates the rhythm of Factor's Walk seen on the Eastern side of City Hall.	
Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, balconies	A suspended glass and metal canopy is provided over the entrance.	See Item 4 for detail of canopy.
Walls of continuity	The structure continues the line of the walls of the historic ranges to the West.	
Scale	The building provides a transition from the historic ranges to the west and the Hyatt on the east. The window divisions have a scale similar to the openings in the historic range.	The scale of the elements of the proposed hotel relate to the historic structures and provides a buffer to the Hyatt which is not in scale with the historic ranges.

**The following Part II Design Standards Apply**

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards	NA	
Windows and doors	Metal clad double hung windows. Eagle Windows, metal clad e-tilt double hung, 7/8" Muntin with spacer bar, Crittall window system, painted steel with industrial mullions. French style Crittall windows no mullions (Doors) Nana Wall doors.	The "casement" note on the elevations is a typo.
Roof shape	A parapet roof similar to that of the historic range is	See comments above about roof garden.



	proposed.	
Balconies, stoops, stairs, porches	Balconies are not proposed. A steel and glass canopy is proposed over the doors.	See comments above regarding design.
Fences	Painted cast iron railing – see detail. To be used at bridges and plaza.	
Materials	Main body: Millbrook Signature Series brick. Wood mould, Queen size; red mortar. The lower two stories are a darker red brick than the upper stories at both the River Street and Bay Street levels. Sand finish stucco at mechanical parapet and roof garden walls. Cast stone window sills Metal clad double hung casement windows.	The glass corner resolves how these lower story color changes “turn the corner”.
Color	A color schedule was submitted in greys through brown.	

**Additional questions:**

Parking: How is parking being handled. The plans show spaces numbered 6-15. Where are spaces 1-5?

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff feels that this

Approval of a Finding of Fact that the three additional stories above Bay is visually compatible as a transition between the Ryan Building and the Hyatt Hotel. The footprint of the Ryan building is maintained.

Approval of a Finding of Fact that the use of vehicular bridges is visually compatible due to the use of the building and that the Factor’s Walk system of levels and bridges is being recreated in concert with the separate renovation of the adjacent Ryan Building.

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

**Ms. Seiler** stated that because several of the Board members have read the ordinance, but because there are so many people present today that are interested in it, that it is obvious the petition had to be sent back to the Zoning Board of Appeals. If it is o.k. with the petitioners, the Board would hear this if they like. She asked for Staff’s opinion on that.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the Board should hear the comments of the public and of the Board, and continue the petition to go forward to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** said, “without making a decision”.

**Ms. Reiter** stated without making a decision.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Py**, Vice-President of Development and Finance of Kessler Collection stated that this was their seventh project within the Historic District of Savannah. He said that they had worked with Staff on this project for over a year. He said that their direction from the City was to proceed through HRC first to get the Board's recommendation on the project, and then go for the additional variances. He said they value the Board's recommendations and input very highly, and they would really like to seek approval and come back based upon the variance approvals.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that the way the Board interprets the ordinance is that the petitioner is going to have to go to the Board of Appeals first. She said that the Board would hear them today and let the public come forward. She appreciated their patience, and the Board still had other things to hear today, but this was a very important project for the City. She said the Board wanted to hear them, but the Board could not take action on this until they came back to the Board.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that the Board would not take action today.

**Ms. Seiler** reiterated that the Board would not take action and asked if that was understood.

**Mr. Py** asked to confer with his architect. He said that part of their discussion previous to coming today was that they were here to go through the process. They had traveled from afar to come here for the scheduled meeting today, and they would like to go through as much of the process as possible. If they get the approval on the variance and come back, to not have to go through the whole process again, but perhaps be on the Consent Agenda.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that if the Board would hear the petition today, then the petitioner would not have to re-present the whole petition the next time.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she did not have any problems with hearing it, but that the Board would not take any action today.

**Mr. Py** asked if they could come back on the Consent Agenda if they got the variance, or would they have to go through the whole presentation again.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they would not have to go through an entire presentation.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that they would be on the Regular Agenda and the Board would want to vote on the project.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that, in her opinion, they would be on the Consent Agenda and they would not have to hear the entire presentation.

The Board did not agree with Ms. Seiler.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** agreed, that it would have to be on the Regular Agenda.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the petitioner would first go to the Board of Appeals

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that then the Board would make a decision based on the Board of Appeals and the visual compatibility in the ordinance.

**Mr. Py** reintroduced himself and stated again that it was their seventh project within the Historic District of Savannah. He said that they worked with Staff and the City, and they would like to seek the Board's input and recommendations on moving forward with this very important project in the streetscape of both Bay and River Streets. He turned it over to Grey Reese who was the

design architect on the project, who had also worked for a year with Staff and the City to get to this point.

**Mr. Grey Reese** with Design Reese Architects and Associates stated that they were honored to be presenting for the site and that they realized how important it was to the City. That eventually, whatever is here, will become a cornerstone for Factor's Walk. He said he also wanted to note that they had been in close contact with Neil Dawson's group since they were presenting the project on the opposite end of the street. He said that they were trying to work together to create something cohesive, and maintain lower and upper Factor's Walk. What he thought he would do first, because it was a complex project, was to start in the middle and let the Board know kind of how it ended up where it was. He said regarding the height issue that they felt the site was extremely unique to Savannah based on its location. He said that they were on a cliff or a drop such as Factor's Walk, and that they were not on a flat area in the middle of the City. They were dealing with a lot of change in elevation to begin with, and they were dealing with what has to be financially viable for a hotel, which was between 71 and 75 rooms. They are between the Hyatt and the lower section of Factor's Walk, and they felt like the building had an opportunity to provide a transition between these two spaces. He said that was really probably not considered at the time the height lines were drawn. They had discussions with individuals that were involved in this height line and had gotten a pat-on-the-back and a nudge on this height issue. They felt like it served as the transition piece now that the site itself was being focused on, rather than a time when no one knew what was going to be there when the original lines were drawn.

**Ms. Seiler** asked him to explain to her from whom he had gotten a nudge.

**Mr. Reese** stated that he was just saying that he had talked to people, a lot of people in the City, to get a reaction. He said that there were a lot of people involved in the height thing.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she would like for him to please clarify who he talked to.

**Mr. Reese** stated that it was not even a person, no one that he knew individually, that he was just saying that there was a person just during the meeting here, Gloria here, who was here to talk about it. She was involved with it, she was an old Board member, and that he was not saying that she was giving them a nudge by any means, but people like that.

**Ms. Seiler** asked, "But nobody official?"

**Mr. Reese** stated no official person, no. Just in talking with Ms. Reiter, with people, and with how this thing came about, all he was saying was that he thought the lines were drawn, obviously, to maintain a height. There were several individual sites within all of the height districts, that when you look at them individually, there are reasons, possibly, to go outside of that boundary that had been established. That is all that they are saying here. He thought that this site presented itself with a pretty good reason. Number one, because of the Hyatt situation, and because of what was proposed programmatically for the building to begin with. With that said, he would like to walk through how they got to where they are.

**Mr. Reese** stated that they have had three other projects in the City.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that they knew about the height restrictions and that they were in town when the height map was being presented.

**Mr. Py** stated that in their due diligence during the process of this development, they had spoken with many individuals throughout the city relative to the sensitivity of the height on the site, and what people would like to see on the site, including the transition from the mass of the

Hyatt building down into Factor's Walk.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated that in all of the things that they were talking about; the transition, the height, and the sensitivity, that no one has talked about the sensitivity of blocking off the view to the river.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that it was not under their purview.

**Mr. Reese** stated that he would like to say in reference to blocking the view, if they do what was currently allowed, the view was going to be blocked from everybody that was going to be standing. They are not blocking off any more of the view. He said the very first thing that they had to think about was the entry point of the hotel and where it would occur. Unlike other types of buildings they had to have the drop-off of vehicles brought in right to a point. On this site, there were only three choices for that. One was at River Street, which really did not make sense. The other was Whitaker Street which was on a slope, and somewhat in the alley way between the two buildings, so that was not a viable location for it. The appropriate location as they saw it was on Bay Street, which is the entry point designated now, and the way of accomplishing that was by coming across Factor's Walk in the tradition that they talked about on the other end of the street. The project next door that was discussed earlier where they had established a plaza and an open area. There was the project between them that no one actually had right now. The only difference was that the proposed bridge would actually be vehicular to a drop-off point of the hotel for the upper levels. The site plan focuses on the River Street sidewalk and streetscape and their restaurant which is at street level, along with outside seating and roll-up doors. He said that what he thought he would do is go through the floor plans from the ground up.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that they did not need the floor plans.

**Mr. Reese** stated o.k. He said that Ms. Reiter spoke in the Staff report of what they have done, and probably what he would do was to see if there were any questions at this point. He didn't know how much further he could take it than what had already been said.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that on the second floor level the plans showed the existing access road on the lower level Factor's Walk and the existing access road on the upper level Factor's Walk, and asked if that was correct.

**Mr. Reese** answered yes.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the building goes up covering lower Factor's Walk, that there is a column made between upper and lower Factor's Walk, and that they were building over lower Factor's Walk.

**Mr. Reese** answered that was right, and stated that it was what had been seen earlier this morning that was talked about. Just down below is a walkway that is being continued, there is another building that is being pulled out that is existing there now, and they are continuing the same thing so that the thoroughfare...

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked what building was being pulled out.

**Mr. Reese** answered that he meant they were building their building out just as the building next door was built out.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were building over Lower Factor's Walk, and did they have a variance.

**Mr. Reese** stated yes they were building over Lower Factor's Walk. That what would require the second variance from the City to do.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he would bring up the point that was brought up to Mr. Dawson. Lower Factor's Walk belongs to the City and that they are building over City property. He asked Mr. Reese if he had gotten any permission from the City that they could have air rights over their property.

**Mr. Reese** stated that the Board could address it the same way that it had been addressed earlier that morning. That it was the exact same situation and that it would be addressed the same way the Board did earlier this morning. That in Mr. Dawson's situation that his would be the same as their project. What he is saying is that they would address it the same way that the Board discussed.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that not only do they have to go to the Board of Appeals to get the height variation, but they also have to go to the City and get an air rights regulation.

**Mr. Reese** stated yes, that they understood that.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that in the southeast corner and the northwest corner, that they talk about a Crittall window and door system in the color of Mystique Grey, and asked Mr. Reese to explain what that was.

**Mr. Reese** stated that it is a steel window system that is an industrial style system that was used in...

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if all of the windows had that system.

**Mr. Reese** answered no, that it would just be the windows at the corners.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the windows and around the perimeter of the door as indicated, what will the windows be or what framework will the windows be.

**Mr. Reese** asked if he was referring to the Crittall windows or the other windows.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the other windows that he said are not the Crittall windows, what were they?

**Mr. Reese** answered that they were double-hung windows that you see throughout the district. Metal clad is the same as what they did at the Mansion Hotel and what they are doing at Columbia Place. It was a wood-looking window, but it was metal clad.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that it was not double-hung.

**Mr. Reese** answered that it would be double-hung; that these would actually be double-hung.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were operable.

**Mr. Reese** answered yes, to four inches. That they opened them up to four inches because that is all they were allowed.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked Mr. Reese regarding the Crittall window, to explain that indoor system. He wanted to know if it was a recessed frame or a flush frame.

**Mr. Reese** stated that it is a steel frame and that the glass, of course, was recessed. He stated that he had a photo if it would help and that he had the details in the book (that the Board received) if he wanted to see what they were.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated when they came back to the Board that he wished they would have a clear explanation.

**Mr. Reese** stated that he could bring a sample and photos of the window.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the other question that he had was on the River Street side. There were five canopies. As he looks on the (Whitaker Street) east elevation, that the canopies extend ten feet from the building which means that they are about six feet into River Street. They are covering River Street.

**Mr. Reese** stated that it is extending over the sidewalk.

**Mr. Reese** stated that it doesn't show the sidewalk in the photo. He said if you look at the site plan the building is back almost 14 feet from the curb.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the corners where they had the Crittall windows, you don't go beyond the parapet. He asked if it would alter it within the rooms, change the ceiling heights, or are they just not adding a parapet over the northwest corner and southeast corner.

**Mr. Reese** stated that they are not adding a parapet and it won't affect the rooms and it won't affect the inside.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked where they have explanation of the canopies being steel and glass, when they come back that they should give the Board some details and section through how the glass fits into the steel.

**Mr. Reese** stated that they could show that because it is a detail that they have used several times.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Michael Brown** stated that he was a citizen and a commercial developer of 19 properties within the Historic District, and that all of his properties met the guidelines. He said that this was a nice looking project and that it was quite attractive. The design was nice, the materials were nice, and it would be wonderful if it fit within the historic guidelines. He showed a to-scale photograph of the site that showed what the project would look like if it met the guidelines. He showed another to-scale photo of what was proposed. He stated that there was a substantial difference. The only reason to consider the proposed project was the perceived economic benefit of the petitioner. With this rationale, the next logical step would be even larger, because if it becomes an economical issue, then everything should reach that same height. He said that the guidelines were to protect the integrity of the Historic District, and the Board as guardians of the district, should always put the integrity first and foremost. He was sure that the petitioner was fully aware of the guidelines, and if the land price did not make economic sense based on these guidelines, then he should not have purchased the property. The applicant said that he had 71 rooms to make it work, but he knew what made it work when he bought the property, and if he bought it without the guidelines, then it is caveat emptor as far as he was concerned. All properties in the Historic District are perceived more valuable if allowed to violate the

integrity of the historic guidelines. In reality, the guideline restrictions and the integrity of the Historic District are the only driving forces of the value of the properties within the district. That's what maintains the value, that's why the properties are so valuable, that's why his properties are valuable. He said the facts are that there are approximately 12,600 hotel rooms with approximately 3,000 additional rooms on the drawing board. This is with a current occupancy rate of 68 percent, and do we really need to jeopardize the district's integrity for larger development. He felt that the numbers spoke for themselves. He said that in his opinion the value of his commercial properties is solely due to the restrictions imposed on them. If the restrictions are diluted so is the value of his property and other peoples properties. But probably most important is the value dilutes the lifestyle of the people that live within the district.

**Ms. Gloria Horstman** stated that she came because she was Chairman of the revisions committee to the Historic District guidelines, and they met for three and one-half years. She said that some of the meeting attendees would remember because they were on that committee. The meetings were held here and held at SDRA. They had public hearings. They came before MPC. They went before the City Council, and they spent an inordinate amount of time on the height map. She stated that she brought an amended height map if they had forgotten what it looked like. They had a completed height map and then they did make some revisions to it and came back. At no time was she aware, and she was at all of the meetings because she chaired them, did they discuss changing what had been three stories above Bay Street. So, whatever other things that might be taken into consideration, she just wanted to remind the Board of that, and if it was necessary for people to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals with this (she then asked if this is where the petition was going and Ms. Seiler answered yes), then she would go and remind them as well.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms Fortson-Waring** stated that it should be a continuance.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that they needed to have Board discussion first.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he appreciated the design, that it was fitting for the site, and it is nice to see this design proposed for this site.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** asked if the petitioner would allow a continuance or should the Board deny it until it has been brought back.

**Mr. Reese** stated that the Board should vote on it.

**Mr. Deering** stated that there is nothing to vote on.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that the Board would not vote on it; there is nothing they are voting on.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that they would still have to continue the paperwork.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that it would need to be continued period because there are some unknowns here just by virtue of one board member by the number of things he raised that would need to come back on the first petition any way.

**Mr. Reese** stated his disappointment in the procedure because they had met with the City officials to get a direction on how to take this, and they were told, and they felt like that was the way it should go. To come to the Board, get their support, get their approval or recommendations rather than doing an end run or run to the City and getting a variance. Which is now what they will be doing is going to the City to get a variance or attempt that. He said that

they wanted to have an opportunity to have a real good discussion about this. Now, in this setting, it is hard to discuss it because they are not going to get a vote and they are not going to get a consensus either up or down. He said that they would, as Mr. Py said earlier, play by the rules and start over or do whatever the next step is. He would like to walk out of the meeting understanding where they stand and what was going to happen when they came back.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated in all of the years that he has been on the Board and in front of the Board, when a project was of this size, it usually was presented in two forms. First in Height and Mass Part I and then in Part II design. For the Board to take all of this Part I and Part II where he felt there was quite a bit of information missing, they had never done that before.

**Mr. Reese** stated his thanks and said that he appreciated the comment, but it was actually when they were discussing with City officials relative to this presentation, they thought it was important that in the discussion for the Board's Height and Map discussion that the design would also be a critical and important element relative to both pieces. That is why they submitted both simultaneously. Yes, he understood that it was a little out of character in the normalcy of the submission, but the direction was really that they thought the Board would have enough questions relative to design, that height and mass alone would not answer all of the questions.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated having been a member of the Height and Mass committee, having been on this Board for five years, not paid, losing money, she was playing by the rules sir. The rules were that the Board spends a lot of time and put a lot of their volunteer effort into the height map, and at this point she was not interested in approving something that would just blow away all of that time.

**Mr. Reese** stated that they were not asking for anyone to blow away time. This was a very specific site and a very specific transition along this block from a new adaptive reuse that is in process to an existing massive building that is out-of-scale with the entire Historic District.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated that she was not an elected official, and the elected officials could do whatever they wanted, but the Board plays by rules.

**Mr. Reese** asked if they walked back in with a variance that was approved, does that mean that they don't have to, start with height and mass if it was approved.

**Ms. Seiler** stated no, what they are trying to tell him was if the Board still did not get enough details on the initial design, that they would have passed it today anyway. She said that they could ask several of the architects in the room, Mr. Shay for one. They have looked at many a hotel of this size and it has come back to the Board several times before on height and mass, before they had even got to details. The design of this is a huge thing for River Street, and River Street is one of the most protected historic areas. They have a whole section on it in the ordinance book and the Board is very concerned about what it looks like. There were too many questions today that came up and she couldn't tell them if it would be approved the next time, but they didn't give the Board enough today for them to approve even if it had met the height as far as she was concerned.

**Mr. Reese** stated that it was not what they understood.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated just so the record is clear when Ms. Seiler stated that the Board would have passed this, you meant passed on this.

**Ms. Seiler** stated yes, passed on this.



Mr. Py stated that is not why they were here.

Mr. Reese thanked and expressed his appreciation and time of the Board and the comments. He said they would take them under consideration and integrate them into their program, go through the Board of Appeals and variances, and look forward to appearing before the Board following that review.

**HDBR ACTION: No action taken.**

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

The Preservation Officer recommends approval of shutters; continuance of deck.

Mr. Neely recused.

Present for the petition was Jonathan Hastings.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to construct a four-story deck on the rear of the building at 104 West. Jones Street and to install shutters.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building at 104 West Jones Street was constructed in 1853 as part of a row of four-story brick townhomes. The building is a rated structure within Savannah’s Landmark Historic District and the property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). Although all of the development and design standards have been met, Staff has concerns about the visual compatibility of the proposed deck with the surrounding historic structures. The deck and stair system appear extremely large and out of character for a rear porch with an expansive system of stairs and platforms. This structure should be designed to be a complimentary addition to the historic building or be as minimally visible from the public right-of-way as possible.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>Site:</b> RIP-A development standards have a 75% maximum building coverage.	The proposed deck and existing building footprint will comprise less than 75% of the entire lot.	The standard is met.
<b>Decks</b> shall be stained or painted to blend with the colors of the main structure.		Verify finish on decking.
<b>Shutters</b> 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	Operable, PVC louvered shutters manufactured by the Atlantic Shutter System in the Manchester style are proposed. They will be Charleston Green.	Staff approval. The Atlantic Shutter system, Manchester style, has been previously approved by the Board and is visually compatible.

the window.		
-------------	--	--

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval of the shutters; Continuance of the deck to restudy the overall massing in relation to traditional rear porches and stair systems.**

**HDBR ACTION: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for shutters and grants a continuance until the July 12, 2006, meeting for restudy of the deck and stair addition. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE:   Petition of Robert B. Aiken  
H-06-3610-2  
108 East Gaston Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Robert Aiken.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of a four-story rear addition for a handicap access elevator and additional sunroom and bath space.

**FINDINGS:**

1. With the addition, the lot coverage is still met at 68 percent.

The following Standards apply:

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
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.	A rear addition is proposed. A carriage house blocks the lower portion of the addition.	This standard is met.

<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, brackets and eaves. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building.</p>	<p>There is an existing arch infilled with windows and doors on the back of the house. Since the addition is going up all four stories the third story bracketed cornice will be impacted.</p>	<p>The existing arch will be kept as it is now with the center door being the access to the room where it enters the house from the addition.</p> <p>Confirm that the addition is reversible and that the cornice will be documented and pieces retained so that it could be restored if the addition were removed in the future.</p>
<p>Additions, including multiple additions, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.</p>	<p>The purpose of the rear addition is to give handicap access to all floors.</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 mixed approach has been chosen with wood posts and glass infill. The sides are shutters. All surfaces will be painted Savannah Green.</p>	<p>The materials and design differentiate this addition from the main building.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with clarification requested by Staff.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed.

**RE: Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects  
Neil Dawson  
H-06-3611-2  
210 East Taylor Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** with conditions.

Present for the petition was Neil Dawson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish an existing three-foot by fifteen-foot stucco addition and a six-foot by fifteen-foot wood deck on the north elevation. It is proposed to construct a fourteen-foot by nineteen-foot three-story addition with an eight-foot by nineteen-foot steel frame deck at the parlor level. Also, to install five new window openings on the East elevation.

**FINDINGS:**

The following standards apply:

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p>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 main structure.</p>	<p>The addition is on the rear of the structure. By material and placement it is distinguishable from the main structure.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</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 and brackets. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building.</p>		<p>Please describe the existing conditions of the rear wall of the brick portion and how the addition effects openings etc.</p>
<p>Additions, including multiple additions to structures, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.</p>	<p>The addition has been recessed from the East elevation. It is not clear where the top of the addition hits the existing building. There is a discrepancy between the north and east elevations.</p>	<p>The north elevation indicates that the addition is lower than the top of the parapet. This is the better solution and could be even lower. Staff recommends a reconsideration of the height and a clarification concerning this.</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 contemporary design has been chosen utilizing Rheinzink Titanium Zinc panels, clear anodized aluminum storefront and steel balcony and deck with metal cable railing and shaped wood top rail.</p>	<p>The addition is clearly different from the original building. The simple lines do not compete with the character of the main building. See comment on height.</p>
<p>Double glazed (SDL) windows are permitted on nonhistoric facades and on new construction. The centerline of window openings shall align vertically. Window sashes</p>	<p>Install five new window openings to match size of original and install 1/1 Weather Shield Legacy windows in white. Materials and depth of inset from the face of the masonry wall not</p>	<p>There are no muntins proposed, therefore staff recommends that double glazed windows could be used on this elevation of the historic structure. Explain how the code allows these</p>

shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.	given.	windows to be installed in a 0 lot line wall. Please provide materials and depth.
--	--------	---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with reduction in height so that more of the parapet reads and pending other clarifications requested.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**HDBR ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as amended to lower the rear connection so that 1 ½-foot of parapet is uncovered. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE:   Petition of Lee Meyer, AIA  
H-06-3612-2  
516 Nicoll Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition/Demolition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval** with conditions.

Present for the petition was .

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of an addition to an existing non-historic church building. Also demolition of rear additions to a historic adjacent duplex.

**FINDINGS:**

The applicant has stated that the church addition is Phase I of a two phase project, which in the second phase would include the adaptive reuse of the historic cottages as a social hall, connected to the main church by a covered breezeway and handicap ramp. It is intended to remove the rear additions on the cottages in Phase I.

The current church is constructed of painted concrete block. The addition will also be painted concrete block. The church will be expanded in a north-south direction from 43 feet to 55 feet and in an east-west direction from 24 feet to 50 feet plus or minus. Rectangular sanctuary windows are proposed. Window materials not given.

The south and west elevations and plans do not seem to coincide. Which is correct the plan or elevation?

The double cottage is listed as one of the ten most endangered buildings in the Historic District. What will be the treatment of the east elevation after the removal of the additions and is the roof currently leaking? If so, what will be the immediate steps to repair the roof. It is stated that a standing seam metal roof is proposed. Will that be a part of Phase I?

There is an existing chain ink fence on the property. Chain link is incompatible in the Beach Institute neighborhood, particularly where it is placed in front of the church. Where it is removed it should not be replaced. Any new fences will require review.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of the expansion of the church with the condition that staff questions are clarified in the Board meeting.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with conditions that the siding on the cottage will be replaced and toothed-in where the additions are removed; the chain-link fence will be removed and the cottage roof will be repaired to a water-tight condition. Ms. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of Sam Carroll  
H 06-3592(S)-2  
310 – 312 Hall Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Nehemiah Jayne  
H 06-3597(S)-2  
308 East Hall Street  
Color/Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Gregory M. Parker  
H 06-3598(S)-2  
222 Drayton Street  
Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Mary Holton Kelly  
H 06-3599(S)-2  
300 Bull Street, Apartment 606  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
5. Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Incorporated  
Donna Swanson  
H-06-3601-2  
217 East Gaston Street  
Sign  
**STAFF DECISION:**
  
6. Alice & Robert D. Murphey  
H 06-3603(S)-2  
117 – 119 Houston Street  
Window Grills  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

7. Coastal Canvas  
Jeff Bradtmiller  
H 06-3605(S)-2  
201 West Bay Street  
Awning

**STAFF DECISION:    APPROVED**

**RE:    MINUTES**

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – April 12, 2006
2. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – April 24, 2006
3. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – May 10, 2006

**HDRB ACTION: The Savannah Historic District Board of Review approved the Staff Reviews as submitted.**

**RE:    OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**RE:    ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp