

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

**REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET**

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

NOVEMBER 8, 2006

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

**Joseph Steffen, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
John L. Deering, III
Ned Gay
Eric Meyerhoff
Gene Hutchinson
W. John Mitchell
John Neely**

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

**Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner**

RE: CALL TO ORDER

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Steffen introduced students from Professor Lee Williams Armstrong Atlantic history class and from Professor Connie Pinkerton's SCAD survey class.

RE: SIGN POSTING

All petitions were properly posted.

RE: ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA

**RE: Continued Petition of Steve Day
H-06-3562-2
20 East Taylor Street
Front Stair and Stoop**

Withdrawn at the petitioner's request.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

**RE: Continued Petition of Charles Oxford
H-06-3669-2
601 – 605 Tattnall Street**

(Southwest Corner of Tattnall & Huntingdon
Streets)
New Construction Part I Height and Mass

Continued to December 13, 2006, at the petitioner's request.

RE: Petition of BMW Architects
H-06-3713-2
18 West Bryan Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration

Continued to December 13, 2006, at the petitioner's request.

RE: Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
H-06-3709-2
342 Drayton Street
Rehabilitation/Addition/Part I Height and Mass

Continued to December 13, 2006, at the petitioner's request.

HDBR ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approve the Continued Agenda items as presented. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder
Keith Howington
H-06-3634-2
3 East Macon Street
Porch Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.
Donna Swanson
H-06-3703-2
28 Abercorn Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of R. K. Construction & Development
H-06-3712-2
322 West Broughton Street
Color/Awning/Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Sign-A-Rama
Jimmy Groover
H-06-3714-2

107 West Liberty Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDBR ACTION: Ms. Seiler moved that the Historic District Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and the motion passed with Mr. Deering recusing himself from petition # H-06-3634-2.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of Gonzalez Architects
Jose` Gonzalez
H-06-3550-2
304 East Bryan
New Construction of a Hotel Development

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Jose` Gonzalez.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

REPORT STATUS:	March 8, 2006	Initial Report
	April 12, 2006	Continued for Revisions
	May 10, 2006	Continued for Board of Appeals Variance or Revisions
	August 9, 2006	Part I Height & Mass and Demolition Approved
	September 13, 2006	Part II Continued
	October 11, 2006	Part II Continued

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of Part II Design details for a proposed four-story hotel. The applicant has amended the petition in response to Board comments.

FINDINGS:

Part I Height and Mass was approved August 9, 2006.

The following is a list of items raised at the October 11 meeting and the applicant’s response:

1. The window pattern on the east townhouse should be consistent on all elevations. The window pattern is 6/6 throughout this unit.
2. “Dummy” windows should be noted on the drawings. Two false windows are located on the south elevation of the west unit at the third and fourth floors. Four false windows with closed shutters are located on the north elevation of the east unit at the second and third floors.
3. The garage opening on the rear did not match the plans submitted. Provide revised rear elevation.

There is no garage opening on the rear. The drawings have been revised.

4. The porticos should be detailed to have a recessed ceiling and wood stair treads and risers. Detailed elevations and sections with materials noted should be submitted. This has been provided in drawings A3.01-2, A3.01-3, A3.05-1. A wood newell with cap is proposed.

Staff Comment: The Raised Porch Detail drawing A3.05-1 states that the stair will have wood stringer, wood treads, and cast stone risers. Please confirm whether this is a notation error. The risers should also be wood in a wood stair system.

5. Clarify that the stucco sills are located only on the stucco portions of the building, and that the brick units will have cast stone lintels and sills.

This has been so noted on the drawings and details.

6. Note location of condenser units, that they will not be visible from the public right-of-way, and that existing trash receptacle will be used.

Air conditioning units are to be located on roof concealed by parapet. See A0.01. The applicant indicated in the October meeting that the existing trash receptacle will continue to be used with a more frequent pick-up schedule.

7. Delete the arcaded portico on the new portion of the Lincoln Street elevation. Provide details on the drawing (noting materials) for the changes made to this elevation so what is proposed is clear. See drawing A2.01-2.
8. Verify windows and materials on Bryan Street. The windows will be Marvin Ultimate wood double-hung See A2.01-1 and A2.01-2 for note.
9. Provide details of balconies. The balconies project three feet. They are concrete with bull nose tile on fully grouted bed. Painted stucco sides. Cast iron bracket and railing.
10. The Board expressed concern regarding the red brick and monochromatic qualities of the previous brick with the red mortar. Brick type I is to be Century Plus Columbia 4 with Premium red mortar by Jenkins, standard 3/8-inch joint (matches existing hotel); Brick type II is to be Palmetto brick red smooth with Holcim-200N mortar (white) with ¼-inch joint.
11. A stringcourse on four-story center portion between ground floor and second floor should be reinstated. See A2.01-1.
12. The openings in the existing building on Lincoln Street will be infilled with stucco and doors rather than storefront material.
13. The roof material will be a true standing seam metal roof.
14. The public had concern regarding two doors in the stucco portion. One door has been replaced by a window.
15. Indicate material and operability of the shutters. Timberlane, fixed louver, painted wood-hinged shutter.
16. A small window is in the side gable of the east unit.

17. The windows in the historic building will be painted Behr color to match medium bronze. The trim and woodwork on the Bryan Street side will be Behr Powdered Snow WD700. The ironwork will be Behr Black Suede SH790. The stucco will be Behr Provence Crème 320A2.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of Part II design based on amended drawings dated 11-08-06.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Gonzalez, project architect stated he felt all the issues had been met and that he had met with the neighbors as well.

Mr. Deering asked if he intended for the cast stone sills to be 8" tall? He said they should be more like 4" tall.

Mr. Gonzalez stated they picked that size to break up the façade better.

Mr. Deering stated that it was odd to have a sill the same height as the lintel.

Mr. Gonzalez also clarified that the stairs are all wood (treads and risers).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mark McDonald, Director of Historic Savannah Foundation, commended Mr. Gonzalez for working so diligently with the neighborhood representatives and Historic Savannah.

Paul Hansen neighborhood resident stated that the project has progressed in a positive manner. He asked that the final working drawings are reviewed thoroughly for details.

Cynthia Hunter, architectural designer, expressed a concern about Board consistency regarding the infill of the garage doors on the existing building on the corner.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Deering asked when drawings come to staff before going to the permit office does staff review them to see that all these details are on the drawings. Staff responded yes.

HDBR ACTION: Ms. Seiler moved that the Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the final plans come back to staff for review. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed with Me. Meyerhoff casting a nay vote.

**RE: Petition for The House Doctor
Charlie Angell, Inc.
H-06-3707-2
11 Houston Street
Fence**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Tommy Holland.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations and installation of a fence on the property at 11 Houston Street. Exterior alterations include replacing the existing columns, balustrade, and eaves on the front stoop. The proposed fence will feature a pedestrian and vehicular gate.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 11 Houston Street, originally constructed in 1807, is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Landmark Historic District. The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
(l)(11) Stoops and Porticos: Wood portico posts shall have a cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed 4"...the height of the railing shall not exceed 36". Supported from porticos shall be constructed of wood unless the proposed material matches other façade details on the same building.	New round Tuscan Columns (FRP by Pacific Columns) are proposed with wood railings. The historic fascia board and soffit detail will be restored. A non-historic wrought iron railing exists on the porch currently. New brick pavers are proposed for the stairs.	Staff recommends that the columns be made of wood. This is a rated building in the district and although the existing columns and portico are not historic, wood is a more accurate material that would help rebuild this character defining feature. Staff recommends eliminating the brick pavers from the stairs, as they are incongruous with the rest of the portico. Detailed drawings of the balustrade should be provided to staff for final approval.
(l)(13) Fences and garden walls: Walls and fences shall not extend beyond the façade of the front elevation. Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building...	A 6’ tall flush vertical wood plank fence is proposed adjacent to the main façade, to replace an existing fence, with a 3’ wide wooden pedestrian gate. An 8’ tall vertical wood fence is proposed to the rear of the house along East Bay Lane. A pair of 6’ wide gates swings inward for vehicular access.	The standard is met.
(l)(15) Utilities and refuse: Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view. Refuse storage areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.	A 7.5’ wide portion of the side fence, fronting East Bay Lane, is setback from the street for trash storage and electric meters.	Staff recommends placing the fence closer to the sidewalk and locating the trash storage behind the fence to screen it from the lane.

RECOMMENDATION:

While the proposed alterations are an attempt to create a portico more in keeping with the original design of the building, Staff encourages the applicant to explore the incorporation of

wooden stair treads and risers and a wood deck that is more typical of entrance porticos. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Detailed drawings of the proposed balustrade be provided to Staff for final approval.
2. Incorporate wood columns into the portico instead of synthetic.
3. Locate the trash storage behind the proposed fence to screen it from the lane.

The petitioner agreed with the conditions.

HDBR ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff moved that the Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that detailed drawings of the balustrade be provided to staff for final approval; that wood columns be used; and that the trash storage be located behind the proposed fence in order to screen it from the lane. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it carried.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3710-2
305 – 311 Tattnall Street
Demolition/New Construction Part I Height and
Mass**

The Preservation Officer recommends a **continuance for revisions.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Ms. Reiter gave the following report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish two non-rated one-story commercial structures and erect a four- to five-story office building.

FINDINGS:

The Zoning Administrator has found that no lot coverage variances are required for this site.

Pulaski Ward was laid out in the 1840's. The western Trust and Tithing Lots were truncated by Tattnall Street. Using the 1916 Sanborn Map book, residences were the major use along Liberty, Tattnall, and Harris Streets. One exception was a theatre, located mid-block on the South side of Liberty Street between Tattnall and Barnard Streets. This building later became a skating rink.

Along Tattnall Street there were approximately 10 lots with two- to four-story duplex residences facing Tattnall. The average lot coverage in 1916 along this block was 68 percent and a similar lot coverage was found (69 percent) on Harris between Tattnall and Barnard Streets.

In 1916, west of Jefferson, the fabric was made up of residences interspersed with more intense uses such as livery stables, veterinaries, boarding houses an Episcopal orphanage and an undertaker.

By the 1950's, the stable uses had been converted to auto-related uses which gradually eroded the fabric along Montgomery Street and crept into Pulaski Ward along Tattnell Street.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.		A 7'-6" walkway has been provided on the South side.
Dwelling Unit Type	NA	
Street Elevation Type	Commercial style with base, shaft and top	There is one other large commercial structure on Pulaski Square, the former Jewish Education Alliance building, later the Salvation Army. Located on a Trust Lot it has a smaller scale than the proposed building, however the tripartite division of the proposed building helps to mitigate the size of the proposed structure on Tattnell.
Entrances	A central recessed covered court is provided on Tattnell Street 36.50 feet wide.	Several other apartment buildings in Pulaski Ward use a feature of a recessed central entry.
Building Height:	<p>The lot straddles two height zones. Five stories are allowed nearer Liberty Street and four south of Liberty Lane. The overall height is 66 feet to the top of the cornice of the five story portion and 51 feet +/- to the top of the 4 story portion.</p> <p>A 15' first story is proposed with 12' stories for the remainder.</p>	While the building does step down a story in height as it approaches its adjacent three story historic neighbor, the overall height is of concern. The five story portion appears to be taller than the adjacent modern parking garage. There appears to also be a very deep and heavy cornice. In order to mitigate the impact of a building this size in Pulaski Ward there seems to be opportunity to reduce the floor-to-floor heights and depth of the cornice to achieve a more compatible building.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	The building has been divided into three legible sections that are reminiscent of the historic lot pattern widths. There is a base, middle, top relationship.	These standards have been met.
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade	The stepping down of the sections helps to define three distinct parts each taller than it is wide.	
Proportion of Openings	Vertical windows are grouped in pairs.	In an effort to vary the window proportions the top floor windows of the five story section might be altered in size or design.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	Each section of the building repeats a three bay rhythm.	This appears compatible with nearby rhythms of solids to voids.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	There is no lane. The building combines several lots however this recombined lot is developed in the third dimension as three	

	elements.	
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	The main entrance faces Tattall Street and is recessed within an open covered court which helps break down the mass of the building. There are recessed porches at the second third and fourth levels. The fifth level features a wave shaped roof.	The shape of the roof at the top level is incongruous with the remaining lines of the building. The applicant should consider restudying this feature.
Walls of Continuity	There are no lines which pick up traditional horizontal lines on the block.	
Scale	The scale of the elements within each section of the building does not vary.	The building might make a more comfortable transition from Liberty Street to Harris Street by varying the scale of the elements in each section, creating a finer texture as the building approaches the historic structures of Pulaski Square.

RECOMMENDATION:

Consider reducing the height of the stories and cornice to lower the overall height of the building. Further emphasize the three sections by altering the detail and proportion of openings within each section to achieve a finer grain in the southern section of the building since it is closer to the historic buildings of Pulaski Ward. Explore making it appear to be two buildings with a connector.

Mrs. Reiter also pointed out that the placement of the lane is different on the model from what is in the packets. This is important since the project crosses two height zones.

Ms. Seiler pointed out that the Liberty Street drawings had been put with the Tattall Street staff report and the Tattall Street drawings put with the Liberty Street staff report in the packets. The Board members switched the drawings before proceeding.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay introduced John Heimes an associate of the firm who is opening an office for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay in South Carolina. He complimented staff on the clarity and timeliness of the staff report. He stated the model was a little off concerning the location of the lane. He said the two projects before the Board should be considered as an ensemble complementing one another.

He said the thing he was most concerned about was the visual expression, showing a drawing from the right-of-way.

He said he was open to restudying the fenestration of the building in general. He felt that was a design detail. Regarding the shape of the roof he said he really liked the roof shape. He said it would not be in his opinion something one would see from the public right-of-way. Regarding the issue of reducing the story heights he said he could look at that. He said if he could vary from the commercial ground floor standards he could reduce it by several feet. Regarding the cornice he said the height was a code requirement. He said he could make it less obvious perhaps. He said it would require more study.

Mr. Deering said he agreed with staff regarding the roof. He said it was more modern than the rest of the building vocabulary and he thought it would be visible from Liberty Street. He also added that he would like to see the south part reduced even further to residential standards to help it relate to Pulaski Ward a little bit better. He also thought that the four story portion should align with the carriage houses on the other side of the lane. He thought more glazing in the center section would also help. He recommended deleting the cornice on the stair tower.

Mr. Shay stated the center would be curtain wall. He said the floors have to line up.

Ms. Seiler agreed with Mr. Deering regarding the floor heights. She said the proposed construction would overwhelm the homes in Pulaski Ward. She felt things could be done to help it fit in. She objected to the curved roof.

Mr. Hutchinson stated regarding the roof that it ties the right and left sides of the project together. He agreed with the issue concerning floor-to-floor heights.

Mr. Steffen asked if there were any other ways to tie the two halves together?

Mr. Shay said they could look at a more contemporary expression.

Mr. Neely asked if he could get the one story building on Liberty Street.

Mr. Shay said there was an on-going negotiation to try to bring the building into the project.

Mr. Mitchell said to him it was two separate buildings tied together by the center piece and he was concerned with the massing in that location. He said the Board had seen several of these massive footprints lately.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Joe Saseen, resident said it was a 21st Century building and he approved of the windows. He did not want to see the windows narrowed because they would clash with the center section.

Mark McDonald, Director of Historic Savannah Foundation complimented the architect on the overall design of the building particularly the simplicity and deep porticos which make the masses look like two separate structures. He did comment, however, that the overall height was too tall and that the floor-to-floor heights should be reduced to the commercial minimums which could lower the height by 6 ½ feet. He was in favor in varying the compliance with the commercial guidelines. He agreed with Mr. Deering regarding the curvilinear roof being inconsistent with the more traditional design of the building. If the arched windows were changed then the roof might be a detail to retain. He said the cornice line was too bulky and neoclassicist. He said there were no dimensions on the windows.

Gary Arthur resident adjacent to the project. He said aside from the Civic Center and the Liberty Street Parking Garage the structures in Pulaski Ward were laid out on a very human scale. He said that the proposed design did not take into account the human scale issue. He said they agreed with staff that it would not provide an appropriate transition to the modest scale of the buildings in Pulaski Ward. It would create a forbidding canyon on Jefferson Street. He said he would endorse reducing the floor heights to 13 feet for the ground floor and 11 feet for the upper floors. He said more than reducing the floor heights is called for. He said the maximum height of the building should be limited to four stories. Also he asked that the cornice profile of the brick double house be considered. He said he was concerned about the eccentric curving element on the roof.

Leo Beckmann adjacent property owner stated that Mr. Shay has agreed to make revisions and that he was in favor of a continuance. He said most of his comments had been incorporated in what had already been said.

Tim Fodder Armstrong Atlantic student stated he uses the street daily as a Pedicab driver and felt that this site was more a part of the Civic Center/Parking garage area than Pulaski Ward. From that viewpoint he felt it was appropriate and he was in favor of the curved roof and felt it added interest to the urban space.

Dolly Chisholm Trustee of the Beehive Foundation, property owner in the neighborhood. She cited the Historic Zoning Ordinance that “the height of proposed structures shall be visually compatible with the adjacent structures”. She said the proposed development would not be.

Beth Kinstler Preserving Savannah Neighborhoods (PSN) spoke in support of lowering the height of the building to be more compatible with surrounding buildings.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked to speak but could not as he was recused.

Mr. Steffen stated he thought Mr. Meyerhoff’s concern was with the conflict between what Mrs. Chisholm stated regarding the compatibility criteria for height and what the City tells the Board that if it is listed as a certain height it shall be allowed. He said they don’t have an answer on that conflict yet.

Cynthia Hunter, architectural designer, expressed concern about the pedestrian pathway on the south and how it altered Savannah’s plan.

Mr. Shay said they did not want to crowd the adjacent building. He said they would go back to the drawing board. He asked the Board to allow comments be made so he can consider them in revisions.

HDBR ACTION: Mr. Deering moved that the Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to December 13, 2006 for revisions. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Meyerhoff was recused.

RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3711-2
217 West Liberty Street
Demolition/New Construction

The Preservation Officer recommends a continuance for revisions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for Demolition and New Construction, Part I Height & Mass on the property at 217 West Liberty Street. A two-story commercial building is currently sited on the lot and will be demolished for the new construction project. The new project is for a five-story condominium building containing 28 units, with underground parking.

FINDINGS:

Demolition:

The property at 217 West Liberty Street is not listed as a rated structure within Savannah’s National Landmark Historic District. The two-story commercial building lies on two individual parcels. The smaller lot to the west contains a portion (approx. 1/3) of the overall building and appears to predate the newer portion to the west. Neither appears to be historic. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps indicate that the portion to the west may be over 50 years old; however, subsequent alterations have resulted in a loss of historic integrity. Sanborn maps reveal that the building to the west, and most likely the alterations on the portion to the east, was constructed sometime after 1973 and, therefore, is not 50 years of age. As such, the existing building at 217 West Liberty Street does not appear to possess any historical significance that would qualify it for inclusion as a contributing building within the Landmark Historic District.

New Construction:

The parcels at 217 West Liberty Street are zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). A recombination subdivision plat will need to be filed and recorded prior to issuance of a building permit. The Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance from the lot area standards to allow for 28 condominium units within the building. According to the applicant, the City Zoning Administrator has determined that this project does not require a variance from the lot coverage requirements.

Historical Development Pattern

Pulaski Ward was laid out in the 1840’s. The 1916 Sanborn Map indicates residential dwellings as the predominant use along Liberty, Tattnall, and Harris Streets. One exception was a theatre on the south side of Liberty Street between Tattnall and Barnard Streets, on the location of the proposed new development. The theatre covered approximately two-thirds of the lot in which the new building is proposed and was equivalent in height to a four-story building. The building was later converted into a skating rink. The average residential unit width was 25 feet to 30 feet. The 1950’s saw new automotive uses within the ward. This was followed in the 1960’s by demolition of blocks of residences on the north side of Liberty Street, to make way for the Civic Center.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Development Standards: No setbacks are required in RIP-A zone. Maximum lot coverage is 75%.	The building will have a 0’ front yard setback on Tattnall and Liberty Streets with an approx. 17’ wide 5’ deep recess in the center portion of the building fronting Liberty. 10’ to 17’ setbacks are proposed on the east and south sides of the property. Combined the parcels are 99’-8” deep by 121’-10” (12,142.7 square feet). The building is approximately 9,841 for a building lot coverage of 81%.	The standard is met. The City Zoning Administrator has determined that the project as proposed does not require a lot coverage variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
Street Elevation Type: A proposed building located on an east-west through street shall	Five-story condominium building.	Pulaski Ward contains a couple of apartment-type buildings including the SCAD owned

<p>utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.</p>		<p>Pulaski House on the square and the building at 339 Whitaker Street. These are not however 5-stories and are modest sized in comparison due to the differences in the size of the parcels. Four-story buildings within the ward are typically townhouse buildings approx. 20'-30' wide with elevated entrances and stairs projecting forward of the building plane. Brown Ward, to the east but not adjacent, contains the historic DeRenne Apartment building also on Liberty Street which is a similar building type.</p>
<p>Entrances</p>	<p>A ground floor central entrance is located on the Liberty Street elevation. This elevation spans 111'-8". An elevated central entrance is located on Tattnell Street, which spans 99'-8".</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Building Height: 5-story maximum height zone. A crawl space or partial basement that is 4' or less above grade shall not count as a story. <u>Residential Buildings</u>: First floor shall not be less than 11'; each story above shall not be less than 10'.</p>	<p>The proposed building is 5-stories with a 4' elevated basement level for underground parking. The overall building height is approx. 65' to the top of the parapet, with finials and an elevator shaft above. A 33' deep by 30' wide portion of the building facing Tattnell Street is 4-stories tall for a height of 54'.</p> <p>Proposed floor heights: 4' partial basement; 13' first floor; 11' 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th floors with a 4' parapet and finials above.</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the floor-to-floor heights to the minimum requirements and eliminating the finials above the bay windows in order to reduce the overall height to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic buildings. Neighboring historic buildings are approximately 24' to 42'-8" tall.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development</p>	<p>The building is divided into bays by groupings of windows, projecting bay windows, and use of balconies of approximately 11' to 18' wide. A flat roof with a parapet is proposed.</p> <p>The widest continuous wall plane is 46'-8". Varying heights are incorporated into the Tattnell Street Elevation of 4 and 5 stories. Decorative parapets and finials create small variations in height along Liberty Street.</p>	<p>Explore a wider window bay to meet the standard.</p> <p>Staff recommends providing more distinct variations in height along Liberty Street to meet the intent of the ordinance. Removing the balcony rail at the parapet might help achieve this.</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Facade</p>	<p>Liberty: The 111'-8" wide 65' tall building is divided into three distinct bays with a 17' wide central recessed entrance and balconies above. The bays on either side are 46'-8" wide.</p> <p>Tattnell: The 99'-8" wide 54-65'</p>	<p>Historic buildings within Pulaski Ward are generally divided into units of 20' to 30' in width and are up to 4-stories in height. Staff recommends creating wider central bays in order to relate to the historic division of building widths within the ward.</p>

	<p>tall façade is also divided into three bays, with a 28' wide central recessed entrance. The bays on either side are also 28' wide.</p>	
<p>Proportion of Openings</p>	<p>Entrances: The ground floor entrance opening on Liberty Street is approx. 14' wide and extends almost 16' to the top of the first full floor. The opening on Tattnall St. is approx. 6' wide and 9' tall.</p> <p>Window openings are both paired and independent of one another with an approximate 3.5:5.5 ratio of width to height. Those on the ground floor feature transoms, creating a taller window. Projecting bays within the side bays on both facades contain paired multi-paned windows with a 4:7 ratio. No openings are depicted behind the balconies on the Liberty Street Elevation.</p>	<p>Staff recommends increasing the Tattnall Street entrance opening to better define this as the main entrance on a 99' wide façade. For Part II, Design Details, staff recommends restudy of the Liberty Street elevation, as the arched Palladian entrance seems out of place with other openings on the building.</p> <p>Staff recommends incorporating openings fronting onto the balconies on Liberty Street. A blank wall behind a porch or balcony is not typical within historic Savannah buildings. Staff recommends approval of the typical opening size and bay windows. The elongated ground floor openings are a good transition to the upper floors.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids to Voids</p>	<p>There is approximately 5' or less of solid between window openings on primary facades</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The use of window openings and projecting bay windows divides the facades into bays and helps reduce the overall mass.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street</p>	<p>The proposed building maintains approx. 18' of open space between it and the historic structure to the east. The neighboring 3.5-story historic duplex fronts Liberty Street and maintains a 0' front yard setback with an entrance porch encroaching on the sidewalk. The building across the lane is a two-story carriage house that is setback from the sidewalk. The proposed building steps down in height to four-stories at the lane.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Historically, buildings within the ward were adjacent to one another with small amounts of open space between the structures which typically maintained a courtyard in the rear and a carriage house beyond.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies</p>	<p>Entrances are within a central bay on both the Liberty and Tattnall St. facades. Each are recessed about 4' to 5'. The Tattnall Street façade features a raised entrance with stairs projecting forward of the building plane. The Liberty Street façade entrance is accessed at grade.</p> <p>Residential units above feature balconies and bay window projections. Balconies are both recessed and projecting. They</p>	<p>Staff recommends creating a deeper and wider recessed entrance along Liberty Street. The overall façade is 111'-8" and creating a larger recessed entrance would help break up the façade and be more typical of historic U-shaped apartment/condominium buildings of this size. Staff also recommends recessing the Tattnall Street entrance if possible. The stairs create a nice transition from public to</p>

	project approx. 3' and are approx. 10' wide. Recessed balconies are approx. 8' deep by 17' wide. Four-story bay windows project approx. 1' from the face of the building.	private space but this could be elaborated on to have a greater effect on this 99'-8" façade. Staff recommends eliminating balconies on the lane elevation. This is not a typical treatment for a lane façade and staff does not recommend having balconies cantilever over the lane.
Walls of Continuity	Setbacks along the street are consistent with neighboring historic structures. A brick fence is indicated on the site plan on the east and south sides of the property to provide privacy to the owners and screen the trash from the lane.	Staff recommends approval. Verify treatment of electric meters along Liberty Street.
Scale	The scale of surrounding historic buildings is of 2 to 3.5 story residences. They are typically 20' to 30' wide, both paired and individual buildings.	The scale of the proposed building is much larger than the surrounding historic buildings. Non-historic buildings, like the Civic Center and Liberty Street parking garage, have changed the scale of the area by their height and footprint size. The building should look toward historic precedent for large structures in the area. Typically, apartment/condominium buildings within the historic district featured a U-Shaped plan to help break up the mass of the building at the street and provide an interior semi-private courtyard for the residents. Staff feels that this building could accomplish this effect if recessed entrances were elaborated on.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Reduce floor-to-floor heights.
2. Increase size of recessed entries to create a stronger division of bays, echo historic apartment-type buildings, and reduce the overall mass. Increase size of Tattnell Street entrance opening to better define as the main entrance along the 99-foot-8-inch façade. Explore wider window bays to meet the standards.
3. Provide more distinct variations in height along Liberty Street.
4. Incorporate openings facing Liberty Street behind central recessed balconies or porches.
5. Eliminate balconies on the south elevation that cantilever over the lane.

Staff showed photos of the YWCA Building at approximately 110 feet wide and divided into three bays without U-shape form. Projecting porches are 35 feet side and project 10 feet. Central portion is recessed and is about 45 feet wide. Another building is the Graham Apartments and spans approximately 120 feet on State Street. Again it is broken into three bays with a U shaped plan and is only three stories tall, side bays are 35 feet wide with a fifty foot wide central portion which is recessed 55 feet. The Derenne Apartments is approximately 110 feet wide along Liberty. Again it is three bays with a U shaped plan and is eight stories. Side bays 45 feet wide with central portion only 20 feet wide but recessed fifty feet.

Ms. Reiter pointed out that there was a discrepancy between the elevations and perspectives that were submitted with regard to the number of stories.

Mr. Mitchell stated that when the DeRenne Apartments is used as an example of a footprint that is comparable to what is being built it is a bit misleading because this building (DeRenne) is situated among others that complement its height and have similar height and mass, whereas the proposed structure is being situated in a community that it just dwarfs everything. (Mr. Mitchell left at 3:25 p.m.)

Patrick Shay with Gunn Meyerhoff Shay architects said he had John Heimes, and John Hart who represented the owner, present. He complimented the staff on the clarity and timeliness of the staff report. He said it gave a lot of time to study some of the recommendations. Mr. Shay stated that he was in the process of learning 3-dimensional computer modeling and that was why there were discrepancies between the perspectives and the other drawings. He clarified that the street elevation standard stated that a proposed elevation located on an e-w through street shall utilize a street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or adjacent ward. His prototype is in the adjacent ward (Brown) which is centrally located and adjacent to many other wards on Liberty Street. He said ironically Currietown ward has 6 and 7 story buildings where there is no historic building that meets that standard.

He said the idea of exploring a wider window bay pattern was one that we did have time to take a look at. He said the center bay had been made wider so there were three equal bays. Also there was some reduction of the height of an upper element and the railing at the roof had been eliminated (actually stepped back from the edge of the roof.) He said he tried to eliminate the balconies, but did not like the look of it.

He said the other thing he did was to reduce the floor heights and take out about five feet. He said he does not want to go to ten feet because he needed some thickness for the slab. He wanted some ten foot spaces in the apartments. In rereading the standards you couldn't have a bay that projected on a four or five story building, but now you can so he wanted his bays to project about 2 feet.

He agreed about the balconies over the lane, but wished to retain them in the recessed portion. He showed the DeRenne Apartment showing that the back side and does have balconies on it and look out over lower buildings. He thinks it does not loom.

Inaudible.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Shay if his intent was to try to proceed in a similar fashion to the last project.

Mr. Shay stated that was up to the Board to a certain extent. He said he would do everything that the staff has required. He asked for the opportunity to proceed and address the design detail issues. He said if the Board felt that he had to come back for another height and mass

submittal he would do that but would like to address not only staff comments, but any other comments that are out there.

Mrs. Reiter stated that it was very important to keep in mind that the Board hear from the public so that if the petition is continued that a whole new palette of issues aren't raised on the same subject.

Mr. Deering stated that he would really like to see this a four story building.

Cassie Dolecki of Historic Savannah stated that their ARC found numerous discrepancies in the plans, elevations and renderings. She said some of these had been addressed by staff and the petitioner. They found a discrepancy in the parking and asked for clarification, stating that they did not want parking on the tree lawn. No window dimensions were noted. They wanted the floor-to-floor heights reduced to the minimum. She said that neighboring structures were at most 43 feet tall. The proposed height of 65 feet is 22 feet higher than any of the surrounding structures.

Mr. Saseen, Historic District resident, stated that he was in favor of the balconies.

Gary Arthur adjacent property owner stated he owned a single family residence across the lane from the proposed 28 unit residential condominium and another of the Beehive Foundation Office buildings is located across the lane also. He said these buildings were two and three stories high with gardens typical of Savannah. He stated that the project was in the boundaries of the Historic District. He said there was a fundamental misunderstanding on the part of some that the crucial starting point for making proposals and decisions about new development in the Historic District. He said the starting point is in acknowledging and celebrating that we have been bequeathed this most unique town plan with its small squares and a bounty of houses and buildings two stories, three, three-and-a-half sometimes four stories of various, but mainly traditional 19th century styles, designed on a very human scale. That is what we treasure and what the world treasures when they discover us. He said to make your starting point the exception to the general character of the Historic District when arguing for height and mass, to start with say the 1960's Civic Center or a late 1990's large City parking garage or to build things put up by a hotel chain, that is to get it all backwards. These large buildings do not define what we mean when we talk about the treasure of Savannah. The proper frame of reference are the historical buildings in the District and the newer buildings that have followed historical precedent, particularly those near these two sites. This particular site is surrounded by these modest buildings. Whatever we do when we plan and approve new buildings, we must remember first what the treasure is that we are charged to protect and be good stewards of. The standards that you apply have as their intent and purpose this desired end to be respectful of this wonderful place, the largest Historic Landmark Historic District in the nation. To do it no harm, only to complement the treasure. The standards promote these objectives by placing barriers against new buildings that are too tall, too bulky, or otherwise incompatible with the predominant historic pattern of General Oglethorpe's town plan.

With respect to the 217 West Liberty Street condo project, while five stories are permitted on the height map, at this particular site and with this particular context we strongly feel a five story building is visually incompatible. It will dwarf the surrounding historical structures which are modest in height 2.5-3 stories in height. He said his view is that the floor-to-floor heights of the condos can remain 13 feet and 11 feet, but that one floor should be deleted. It should be a four story structure maximum to mitigate towering over the historic surroundings. He said what was before the Board did not provide for a transition between the historic and new development creating a jarring juxtaposition. He appealed to the Board to exercise their authority under the ordinance. He said he was also concerned about the shallow entrance on Liberty Street and stated it should be wider and deeper to break down the mass of the two primary volumes. He

said that the apartments in the building need light too which a more generous U-shaped entrance would accomplish. Other concerns were that there was no relationship between the columned balconies and the pseudo Palladian entrance. Columns would not be historically placed over the sidelights of a Palladian window.

Mr. Steffen complemented the eloquence of Mr. Arthur, but added on behalf of the Board that while the transition between one property and another, the visual compatibility or incompatibility are very definitely within the province of this Board, the problem is though that the code section cannot be taken in a vacuum. One of the other sections that the Board is obliged to follow is the fact that the City of Savannah has determined that if there is a particular height restriction, then the developer is allowed to have that floor and we are forced to follow that. We can still deal with visual compatibility and transition but we must work within that restriction. That is the current state of the law.

Beth Kinstler of Preserving Savannah's Neighborhoods stated that they were in support of the request to lower the height of the building. She added that personally she thought it was a beautiful building.

Mr. Steube of the Downtown Neighborhood Association endorsed the comments of Mr. Arthur and added that they would like to see consideration be given to the visual compatibility of this property to neighboring properties.

Mr. ? stated that it was coming to a point when a tourist will come into Savannah, drive off the ramp, turn right onto Liberty Street and drive to the DeSoto Hilton and walk into the door and ask how do we get to the Historic District from here? He admonished the Board that they were the stewards of the Historic District.

Mr. Steffen said the Board was the steward but within the restrictions of City Council that appoints the Board and the laws that they make. The Board does not have the authority to do everything that they wished they could do.

Mr. Shay stated he would like to consider the comments he had heard to day and bring them back to the Board unless the Board would let them proceed with the design detail with the understanding that they would reduce the floor-to-floor heights and address in a positive way all the other staff comments.

Mr. Deering stated that the design direction taken was very much like the DeRenne and other early 20th Century apartment buildings and on this site he felt that was the wrong thing to do. He said the neighborhood behind it was much more Savannah with smaller houses that were simple and modest in design. He said he felt the proposed building, although attractive, looked like it belonged on 5th Avenue in New York and did not seem very Savannah in its inspiration.

Mr. Steffen stated that he thought he had heard Mr. Shay say that he was not specifically requesting a continuance, but was requesting that the Board act on the recommendations of staff.

Mr. Shay responded that the character of buildings around squares has been historically much different than the character of the buildings that are on the main boulevards. He stated that the reason members of the Board may think that this building belongs on 5th Avenue is that 5th Avenue is a boulevard. He said that when a building is on a boulevard with a nice wide street, it actually needs to be taller to encapsulate and make a space out of a boulevard. Sometimes Savannah is thought of as a city of squares and sometimes as a city of boulevards. He stated that there are character differences between the buildings that front the boulevards and the buildings that front the squares.

Ms. Seiler: Are you going to be willing to lower the height not just the floors but...

Mr. Shay: To eliminate a story?

Ms. Seiler: Yes.

Mr. Shay: No. We went through a public process for years about what the height map was going to be and where it was appropriate to have four on the map and where it was appropriate to have five on the map. The public has had plenty of opportunity to participate in that. I was asked to be a part of that. When I went in front of City Council this group said that was the way they wanted to have the Standards changed so that where it says four it means four and where it says five, it means five.

Ms. Seiler: Well no, it doesn't say that you have to make it that though.

Mr. Shay: No it does not.

Ms. Seiler: What we are asking here is because of the surrounding neighborhood. What would be better with the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Shay: I understand and I know that it is perhaps easier to personalize this and say Patrick, why don't you do what we want you to do. I don't own this property. I am not investing...

Ms. Seiler: It comes back to what we were talking about before, the economy of the building, right?

Mr. Shay: Yes, I mean if you want to say that's a negative, then say that's a negative, but economics is a part of the world that we have to consider, and even though it doesn't aesthetically...you can't make an argument that says well, I want to make a building that's out of cheap materials because it is less expensive but the underlying economics is part of reality were still a wonderful capitalist country.

Mr. Steffen: What is the Board's pleasure.

Mr. Deering: We'll vote on it if you want us to.

Mr. Steffen: What I think I hear Mr. Shay saying is that he believes that he has complied with or indicated a compliance to the recommendations of staff and so as a Board we have the authority to either accept the recommendations of staff or say we don't accept those recommendations or make some alterations to them. The other option is to have a continuance, but Mr. Shay has to specifically ask for that and I haven't heard that on this project.

Mr. Shay: Again what I said was if that is what you want me to do then I will accept that, but if you are willing to allow us to move into design development I will do that. I do not want you to be deceived. I am not going to come back here in a month with a four story building. That is just not going to happen, so we've agreed to comply with all the other things brought out by the staff report. Everybody else has stood up and said they agreed with the staff report. The only thing that I had in my notes that was a significant deviance in terms of the height and mass was that everybody seems to want to have a four story building and I do not have it within my power to do that.

Mr. Steffen: To make it crystal clear if I haven't already, the City has made it clear to this Board that if there is a request to use all four stories or all five stories that the City Map now indicates

then we are obliged to grant that request. It doesn't restrict us as to massing and all the other things we look at, but we are on that. That's the way the law is and we are not going to act outside the law. The other option is to continue this matter on the basis of height and mass and allow the petitioner to address design elements at the December meeting as well. That's the third option. I need some direction.

Mr. Gay: What is the maximum height limit? I don't mean stories, feet.

Mr. Steffen: There is none.

Mr. Deering: Stories have minimums.

Mr. Gay: 40 feet. He can get his five stories but they have to be forty feet.

Mr. Shay: The way the standard is written now, the height is measured in stories. There are minimum floor-to-floor heights, but there are not maximum floor-to-floor heights.

Mr. Steffen: It is getting kind of technical now but we still have purview as to mass. And if the massing of the structure is beyond the appropriateness for a particular location then I think we can address that, but we can't address it in a guise of trying to address whether or not there is a requisite number of floors. We have got to address it as mass.

HDBR ACTION: Mr. Deering moved that the Historic District Board of Review deny H-06-3711-2 on the basis that the mass is not visually compatible to the surrounding historic structures. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion. The motion passed with Mr. Hutchinson casting a nay vote.

**RE: Amended Petition of R. K. Construction
Agent for American Commercial Developers
H-05-3394-2
513 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval of the window and door revisions and a continuance for the condensing units.

Present for the petition was Ramsey Kahlidi.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to amend a previous submittal for exterior alterations to the buildings at 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue. Alterations to the approved plans were made in the field during the course of construction without approval from the Board or Staff. The petitioner has submitted an application at the request of Staff to help mitigate some of alterations that are not in compliance with the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030).

Alterations include the following:

1. **Doors:** Change the doors on the rear, fronting Houston and Hull Streets from the previously approved solid steel doors to metal frame doors with ¼-inch commercial grade clear plate glass. Commercial doors with between-the-glass muntins were installed without approval.

2. **Windows:** Change the windows in the southeastern building from the previously approved Anderson 400 series, nine-over-nine, true divided light, double-hung sash windows to fixed single-light metal frame windows to match the doors and storefront material. Fixed, metal windows with between-the-glass muntins and exterior iron bars were installed without approval.
3. **Shutters:** Delete approved paneled shutters from the previous submittal.
4. **HVAC:** 19 condenser units were installed along Houston and Hull Streets without approval. The applicant is requesting approval to keep the units in place, surround them with a “green screen”, and plant ivy to screen them from view.
5. **Electrical:** Numerous electrical panels were installed on the Houston and Hull Streets elevations without approval. The petitioner is requesting to surround each of the electrical panels with a privacy fence and security door.
6. **Parapet:** The petitioner received Staff approval to paint the metal parapet Charleston Green. It was then painted a lighter pastel green color. The petitioner intends to paint the parapet Charleston Green as was previously applied and approved for, along with all exterior metal trim along Houston and Hull Streets.

FINDINGS:

The one-story commercial building and industrial building located at 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue are not rated structures within Savannah’s National Landmark Historic District. The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

(I)(9) Windows: Double-glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction [provided that they meet certain standards]; “Snap-in” or between-the-glass muntins shall not be used.

The standards are met provided that the petitioner removes the between-the-glass muntins from the windows and doors. Since this is a non-rated commercial structure, there are no requirements that the windows be double-hung or made of wood.

(I)(15) Utilities and Refuse: Electrical vaults, meter boxes, and communications devices shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view. HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way.

Staff identified four electrical panels on the exterior of the building (three facing Houston Street and one facing Hull Street). The screen for these is an 8-foot 10-inch wide by 3-foot deep masonry addition with wooden double doors for access. While these are on secondary facades, they still face a square and are clearly visible. It appears that these screens would project right out to the sidewalk, if not over it. The site plan submitted shows approximately 1-foot of space between the face of the building and the property line.

While the proposed “green screen” may help to screen the HVAC units, the units are located on the ground within close proximity to the sidewalk, and will remain clearly visible. Field inspection indicated that several of the condenser units installed actually encroach onto the existing sidewalk. As such, it appears that the proposed screens would also be in the sidewalk. Please clarify. Staff

recommends that an attempt to relocate some of the 19 condenser units to the roof be made.

Although Hull and McDonough Streets occupy the rear spaces for the tenants of these buildings, these facades front directly onto Crawford Square. The corner building at the intersection of these streets does have an entrance across from the square. By placing all of the 19 HVAC condenser units and numerous electric meters and boxes on these elevations, the building completely turns its back on a square, which has had a recent resurgence of activity and development. More should be done to enhance these elevations instead of detract from them.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the window and door change as they meet the standards. Staff recommends a smaller enclosure be erected to shield the electric panels from view, and that as many of the HVAC units be relocated to the roof as possible. Staff does not recommend approval for any HVAC units and/or screening of any kind that encroaches onto the sidewalk. Staff has consistently recommended restudy of HVAC units and electrical meters proposed on the front of buildings facing a street. While these utilities have been placed at the rear of the building, they are located adjacent to the sidewalk and within close proximity to Crawford Square. The location of these items was not previously presented to the Board and does not meet the intent of the ordinance.

BOARD COMMENTS

Ms. Seiler stated that she had received numerous comments about this and she felt they should be moved. She asked what the Board originally said.

Ms. Ward stated that the Board said nothing because the HVAC and electrical were not on the original drawings. She said the petitioner said they were on the site plan for the building permit.

Ms. Seiler stated she did not remember the awnings on the Houston Street side.

Mr. Deering said staff can approve awnings.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Kahlidi if he was originally involved with this project.

Mr. Kahlidi said no. He said the issues are valid. He said the shutters, bars and mullions were all being removed. The glass will be replaced. He said the roof is gabled. He acknowledged that the HVAC units encroached into the public right-of-way. He said different units will be installed that do not encroach. He asked to not do anything on the Hull Street side. He said he would like to install a Charleston green fence along the Houston Street sidewalk to shield the mechanical units starting where the electrical panels are. He said units had been previously along both streets. To move the units and built platforms on the roof in his opinion...(did not finish thought) The metal parapet will be repainted Charleston Green.

Mr. Steffen stated that staff felt the changes to the windows and doors will meet the standards. The power boxes and condensing units are a problem. He asked if any would be placed on the roof.

Mr. Kahlidi said nothing would be placed on the roof.

Mr. Steffen stated then the proposal is to change out some of the units so they no longer encroach on the public right-of-way (7 of them) and the rest of them including the new ones and the power boxes would be placed behind a fence.

Mr. Kahlidi said yes and they could do it on both streets.

Mr. Deering said he did not want to see a bunch of little service yard fences.

Mr. Steffen said there were no drawings to show what it was going to look like. He said Mr. Kahlidi has proposed a solution but it should go first to staff and then come to the Board considering what Mr. Deering mentioned.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated there was no submission. Something was built contrary to what was submitted. The applicant submitted something the Board approved and then he did something contrary to that approval and are now asking for the Board to approve something by word of mouth. He said the petitioner mentioned that it was impossible to put the condensers on the roof.

Mr. Kahlidi said he did not say that. He said it was a gable goof and platforms would have to be built totally visible to the public. There is no parapet.

Mr. Deering agreed that they would be more visible on the roof.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if visibility was the only reason for not putting them on the roof because he said if the applicant can build 350 feet of fence then they could go on the roof and a parapet built.

Mr. Kahlidi did not agree. He said the two main issues are the embellishments and the mechanical units he said there was an oversight because although the elevation drawings did not have the mechanical systems shown, the inspection site plans did.

Mr. Steffen said in order for the Board to consider the fence they need to be able to see it. He recommended that the board act on the windows and that the applicant ask for a continuance on the mechanicals.

Mr. Kahlidi wanted a continuous fence with gates the whole way.

HDBR ACTION: Ms. Seiler moved that the Historic District Board of Review approve the changes to the windows and doors and continue the fencing to conceal these mechanical units. Mr. Gay seconded the motion.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the Board was being asked to approve changes to windows and doors and a set of drawings should be on record on file for all the changes contrary to what was approved.

Ms Seiler withdrew her motion and Mr. Gay withdrew the second.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Stephanie Langford with American Commercial Developers stated that there were air conditioners along the side when they bought the building.

Mr. Deering said if they had been left, the Board would have had no jurisdiction, but since they were removed the Board now has jurisdiction.

Mr. Meyerhoff said and those were three and these are 18 or so.

HDBR ACTION: Ms Seiler moved that the petition be continued to December 13, 2006 on all issues. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it carried.

G. STAFF REVIEWS

1. Continued Petition of Mark Curry
H-06-3677-2
541, 543, & 545 East Congress Street
New Construction/Roof
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

1. Petition of Total Imaging, Inc.
Rick Galavitz
H-06-3691(S)-2
236 Drayton Street
Sign
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3693(S)-2
1 West Jones Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3694(S)-2
108 West Jones Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of RE: Think Design, LLC
Joel W. Snayd
H-06-3695-2
208 West Bay Street
Rehabilitation/Addition/Demolition/Existing Windows & Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3696(S)-2
1A West River Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3697(S)-2
30 Barnard Street
Color/Awning

STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Petition of Trustees Garden Development
H-06-3698(S)-2
618 East Broughton Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
9. Petition of B. Matthews Bakery & Eatery
Brian Huskey
H-06-3699(S)-2
325 East Bay Street
Color/Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
10. Petition of Lisa & Damon Thompson
H-06-3700(S)-2
230 – 232 Bull Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
11. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3701(S)-2
21 East Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
12. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc.
Jeff Bradtmiller
H-06-3702(S)-2
15 West York Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
13. Petition of Coastal Subs, Inc./Coastal Canvas
H-06-3705(S)-2
Mark Turner
102 East Broughton Street
Color/Awning/Stucco/Sign
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
14. Petition of Thomas Krejci
H-3706(S)-2
424 East State Street
Rehabilitation
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
15. Petition for Richard R. Rekau
H-06-3708(S)-2
300 Bull Street
Existing Windows/Doors/Rehabilitation/Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

H. MINUTES

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – October 11, 2006

HDBR ACTION: Mr. Deering moved that the minutes of October 11, 2006 be approved as mailed. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it carried.

I. OTHER BUSINESS

**RE: Petition of Lominack Smith
Steve Day, Contractor
H-06-3521-2
418 East Bryan Street
Air Conditioner Placement**

Ms. Ward explained that an air conditioning condenser unit had been placed on the side of a new carriage house off Bryan Street. The windows as installed were not approved, but staff is working with the contractor to get the specifications that they meet the standards. The condenser unit was not on the drawings and is visible from the street and lane and is not screened. The neighbors have complained.

Members of the Board requested that the petitioner be brought before the Board at the next meeting.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the Board finally has a Height Ordinance that certain blocks can have five stories and others four stories. There are Chadborne Guidelines that recommend story heights and compatibility. He said the public state the buildings are too high and it was pointed out that a petitioner does not have to reduce the height. He said the Board needs some sort of legal agreement.

Mr. Steffen said there are two conflicting ordinances.

Mr. Meyerhoff said when neighbors come up and say they have a two story structure and the proposed structure isn't compatible the Board should not agree with them but say what the ordinance states. He said we did that today.

J. NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. Steffen appointed Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Meyerhoff and Mr. Gay to be on the Nominating Committee.

K. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

L. INFORMATION ITEMS

M. ADJOURNMENT