

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

SEPTEMBER 13, 2006

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

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

HDRB Members Not Present:

Gene Hutchinson

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director  
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner  
Janine N. 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: Continued Petition of Poticny Deering Felder  
H-05-3417-2  
102 East Liberty  
Alterations  
Request for a one-year extension

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Continued Petition of Curtis McKenzie  
H-05-3437-2  
619 – 621 Montgomery  
Alterations  
Request for a one-year extension

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Continued Petition of Roy Ogletree  
H-06-3570-2  
543-547 East McDonough Street  
New Construction Part II, Design Details for  
Phase 1**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.  
**The applicant has withdrawn this petition.**

**RE: Continued Petition of Mark Loudermilch and  
Joanne Forkin  
H-06-3648-2  
21 West Liberty Lane  
Alterations to a Carriage House**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Sottile & Sottile  
Christian Sottile  
H-06-3670-2  
113 East Oglethorpe  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Speedi Sign  
H-06-3674-2  
1 East Broughton Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects  
Neil Dawson  
H-06-3675-2  
318 East Liberty Street  
Garage Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**The applicant has withdrawn the continued petition of Bill Norton; Sign Mart, Incorporated; H-06-3630-2; 2 West Bay Street; Sign.**

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

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of Steve Day  
H-06-3652-2  
20 East Taylor Street  
Front Stair and Stoop

Continued to the October 11, 2006, meeting.

RE: Petition of Mark Curry  
H-06-3677-2  
541, 543, & 545 East Congress Street  
New Construction/Roof

Continued to the October 11, 2006, meeting at the request of the petitioner.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Continued Agenda items as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

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

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Lee Meyer

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The petitioner is requesting approval to alter an existing historic carriage house to add a nine-foot-wide garage opening. The amendments include placing a brick arch over the opening, installing a "barn door" design overhead door, and adding louvered shutters to the upper windows.

**FINDINGS:**

1. At its meeting of February 8, 2006, the Board of Review raised the following concerns:
  - The carriage house was an unusual historic example of servant's quarters. A garage door would change the historic character of the building, which is a twin to the adjacent building.
2. The Historic District Ordinance states, "In existing carriage houses, original entries shall not be enlarged," and "An historic structure and any outbuildings...shall only

be...altered...in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure...”

3. The garage door is a routed wood paneled door with glass lights at the top.
4. Wood louvered shutters are proposed and wood single-glazed windows.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Denial of the garage opening based on the adverse impact to the historic character of an original and rare architectural type in the National Historic Landmark District. Approval to repair and/or replace in-kind the 6/6 wood true divided light windows, and approval to add wood louvered shutters, hinged and sized to fit the window openings.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if this was a decision that the Board had previously rendered that was back for reconsideration.

**Ms. Reiter** stated it was continued.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board had not reached a decision on it.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Lee Meyer** stated it was a servant's quarters. He said the Stark's want to have a place to park their car at night. They were concerned about crime in the street and their safety.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** said the ordinance states that, "...an historic structure shall only be altered in a manner that will preserve its historical and exterior architectural features. She could buy that it was not a carriage house, but it was still an historic structure.

**Mr. Meyer** answered that was true, but he restored the several buildings for Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD), along with two diners. He said every one of the buildings had changes made to the exterior and were all approved. This happens to be the smallest. Of all of the petitions that was before the Board today, this was the only one recommended for denial. He said he did not understand it.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** asked if he brought those under the current ordinance.

**Mr. Meyer** stated he was a co-author of the ordinance in 1969.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated she understood, but the ordinance changed in February of 2005.

**Mr. Meyer** stated that architecture changes, too. He said what may have been beautiful 50 years ago may be questionable today, and what we do today we think is great may be questionable 50 years from now.

**Ms. Seiler** asked Mr. Meyer when his clients purchased the building.

**Mr. Meyer** answered about a year ago.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that was when the Board already had the new ordinance in place.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Charles Sawyer (Jones Lane)** stated 417 East Jones Lane should not be turned into a garage. He said it was the unrestored right-hand side of a symmetrical 1883 double house. The other side, 415 East Jones Lane, was restored from its derelict state several years ago. He said lanes contained actual carriage houses, modern garages, repro carriage houses, and some small houses generally referred to as servant's quarters. An actual carriage house by virtue of its wide opening, perhaps invites being a working garage, but turning half of this small double house into a viable garage seems an inappropriate stretch. A more appropriate (treatment) would be to restore it to match its twin. He said lane houses were truly the redheaded stepchildren in Savannah. If this were a little double house on a street, it was highly unlikely that this drastic change in its façade and use would even be considered.

**Mr. Harold Lamb** (415 East Jones Street) stated the matching side of the carriage house was his building. He concurred with Mr. Sawyer. He was opposed to the plan changes at 417 East Jones Lane. One additional concern that he had was that the modifications planned would destabilize his side of the building. The building is only 12 feet wide, they were talking about putting a nine-foot-wide garage door in, and he thought it would be very difficult. On the inside, although it was not the concern of the Board, there was a fireplace that would have to be removed so the space would be wide enough for the Stark's to be able to open the doors of the car. He said no one had presented any plans to him. He stated it was a shared exterior chimney on the building, and he did not know what would happen to his chimney if they take the fireplace out.

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) was against any alteration of this excellent example of a pre-Civil War servant's quarters. With very few examples of intact servant's quarters left in the Landmark District, it is a shame to irrevocably alter this one. She said this servant's quarters had survived since 1842 with no alterations, and should remain an original example of this time period.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he noticed in the findings it says, "...unusual historic example of servant's quarters." He asked if Ms. Reiter knew of how many other examples there are of this particular type.

**Ms. Reiter** stated no more than one or two.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Ms. Dolecki knew the answer to his question.

**Ms. Dolecki** stated she did not.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Meyer** stated they had a structural engineer involved, so any changes to the exterior of the building were being monitored by a structural engineer. The chimney and the fireplace would stay in place. He also would like to continue the petition.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Meyer under what rationale would he want it continued. He asked if they were going to present a different plan.

**Mr. Meyer** stated they were going to stick with the same plan. He said this was what they bought the house for, their concern was about the issues in Savannah, and they wanted to have a safe place to put an automobile.

**Mr. Steffen** stated if he requested a continuance, the Board would be required to vote on whether to give one or not. It was up to the Board whether to do that if there was no rationale on it.

**Mr. Meyer** stated he understood and would take that chance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated if the Board did continue it, it would come back at a different date. He asked Mr. Meyer which date did he want it continued until.

**Mr. Meyer** stated 30 days.

**Mr. Steffen** stated until the October 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Mrs. Fortson-Waring** made a motion that the Board continue the petition.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated everything that Mr. Meyer had said had some truth in it. People want to safeguard their car, and a lot of buildings had been remodeled and redone. However, if the Review Board approved this change, they would be blatantly going against their guidelines and they really had to consider that. Even though the project was small and the lane was not a good example of historic architecture, the Board could not go against the guidelines.

**Ms. Fortson-Waring** stated it was not the guidelines, it was the ordinance. She would certainly vote to deny the petition next month because she would not vote to go against the ordinance next month. If Mr. Meyer would like it continued and have his vote for me next month, she did not have a problem with granting a continuance.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated he had no problem granting a continuance either, but he was of the same opinion. He said Mr. Meyer made the distinction that it was not a carriage house, but the ordinance does say “an historic structure”. He was on the Board primarily as a preservationist, and he did not care what the rationale was. The ordinance states what it states, and he did not like the idea of chipping away at the rare historic structures in the City. It is what made the City’s economy role, and whether they vote on it now or later his vote would be to deny it.

**Dr. Caplan** stated the Board had sent out brochures to the realtors about the Historic Review Board, and the necessity to tell clients that if they wanted to modify things it had to come through the Historic Review Board. They sent the brochures to every real estate agent and to every closing attorney in Savannah, so there would be no misunderstanding that a real estate agent could tell their client what they could and could not do. They wanted to encourage people to come to Savannah and Downtown, but they had to understand there are rules and guidelines. If they had been misinformed, he would apologize for that. It was not that the Board did not make an effort to get the agents and attorneys to tell their clients that because the Board wanted them here, but the Board had rules and regulations. He apologized to the client for the real estate agent or for whoever gave them the idea they could change it because the client couldn’t, and they should have informed the client of this fact.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated regardless of the fact there might be others, mistakes had been made in the past and the Board cannot do anything about it. That was never going to be a rationale in his mind why the Board should continue to make or duplicate the same mistake again. He said he could understand what the client may want to do with the building and why, but the ordinance is the ordinance and he thought the Board would be making a huge mistake to allow it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he was not going to make a comment on the merits of the project. As Chairman he tried not to do that and in this particular case he has very strong feelings, but he was going to leave them aside. He was going to address with the Board the matter of the case

being continued. He said the case was on the first position on their list for a reason. It had been continued a number of times up until today. He was concerned about the Board granting continuances to anyone. He stated he liked Mr. Meyer and he was sure Mr. Meyer was doing it for good reason, but he was concerned about the Board continuing matters again and again. The people who were sitting and waiting for their petition to be heard were going to wait behind this petition again. If the Board had been told there was not going to be any new information or any changes, he did not know why they should continue. He thought they should get it over with and move on. If there was new information or a new plan coming back, by all means, but the Board had an obligation to everyone that was there and not just this one petition.

**Ms. Seiler** stated it did a disservice to the neighbors who had come out many times in support of the lane in the particular neighborhood, and they were very vigilant about upholding the ordinances in that area. She thought the neighbors were to be commended for always watching the signage in that area, and it was a shame that they had to come back out.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby grant a continuance for this petition. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion failed. Mr. Meyerhoff and Mr. Neely voted for a continuance. Ms. Seiler, Mr. Deering, Mr. Gay, Mr. Mitchell, and Dr. Caplan cast a nay vote.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition as submitted. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Jose` Gonzalez.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part II Design approval for a proposed four-story extended stay hotel on the lots between 304 East Bryan Street and 324 East Bryan Street.

**FINDINGS:**

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

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

The following Part II Design Standards apply to the revised project:

PART II DESIGN DETAILS		
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Materials	<p><u>Brick:</u> Century Plus Columbia 4 rough red with a red mortar.</p> <p><u>Stucco:</u> Provence Crème By Behr</p>	<p><u>Brick:</u> Staff recommends that a material sample board be installed on site to study the mortar and brick color. Recent projects elsewhere in the District lack contrast and depth because the brick and mortar are so monochromatic.</p>
Windows, Doors	<p><u>Windows:</u> Marvin Ultimate, Insulated aluminum clad, “Storm Plus” Medium Bronze. The lintels and sills will be Continental Cast stone in a cream color. Windows are recessed 6” from face of building. Stucco lintels will be used in stucco sections.</p> <p><u>Doors:</u> Marvin Ultimate Clad entry door and sidelight system for high stoop entries. Marvin Ultimate Storm Plus French doors with 10 lights for balconies.</p>	<p>The windows at the “Parlor floor” level have been lengthened.</p>
Stoops	<p>Brick piers, concrete stairs with cast stone bull nose treads and cast stone risers, cast iron railing painted Black Suede S-H-790, painted wood column and molding, wood cornice. The stoop canopy is slightly sloped to drain.</p>	<p>The stoop has been redesigned to have bull nose steps; a redesigned canopy;</p>
Balconies	<p>Concrete floors with painted stucco sides. Floors have bull nose edges tiles. Iron railings painted Black Suede.</p>	
Facades	<p>A brick façade is proposed on most of the elevations. The brick is red and the mortar is red. There is contrast with the cast stone lintels and sills.</p>	<p>An enlarged materials sample on site would help determine whether the red brick and mortar are too monochromatic. The first floor rustication does help to break up the façade.</p>
Renovation of the one story historic building	<p>The renovation restores the arched opening on Bryan Street. Essentially, the existing openings on Lincoln are being infilled with storefront. The adjacent</p>	<p>The basic character of the building is retained.</p>



	portion of the new building is setback some on Bryan Street so the old building “reads”.	
--	--	--

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of Part II Design Details.

**Mr. Neely** asked whether the center building should have had a vertical brick course between the two buildings to separate it into two buildings, or should it all read as one building.

**Ms. Reiter** stated she did not know of any pairs of buildings that had separations other than if a downspout went down the middle. She said she did not know of any device that was used on a pair of brick buildings.

**Mr. Neely** asked if Ms. Reiter thought it should not be broken up.

**Ms. Reiter** stated she did not think it should be broken up, but there was a silver line on the drawing and she did not know what it was.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Jose` Gonzalez** stated he had worked with Staff in terms of the issues that were brought before the Board. He said he had been invited that morning to a meeting with some of the neighbors who had expressed some concerns about the project and the whole construction process. There was a concern that the project should lean more toward a residential scale. It was suggested to him that the brick be changed to a lap siding which was more typical with some of the homes in the square. They did not use that typology when they did the building because as you transition to commercial up the street, they used brick and there was a historic brick structure on the corner. He stated the applicant would work with the Board and the neighbors if that was the desire of the Board.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked where was the pool and the spa located.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said the pool was at grade. He said the elevation that was shown was the elevation of the building (beyond the pool). The fence along the lane was not shown.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated he would be glad to do so.

**Mr. Deering** stated he did not know how many times this petition had been to the Board. They were representing townhouses on the streetscape, but there were two stucco members that did not look like they had any entrance to them at all. He thought it was the wrong approach, especially the one with the porch. He could not think of one house in Savannah that had a porch on the street that did not have a door into it. He did not think that the balconies over the building furthest east were very well thought out, because they were concrete and they had very simple railings, and they did not look visually compatible to the neighborhood. The balconies and the door arrangement on the lane elevation looked like a motel. The front stoops of the building were going to have brick going up to a concrete platform, and you would be able to see the underside of the concrete, which was not visually compatible with the neighborhood, except for the parking garage directly across the street. The entablature on the stoops was not very well thought out either. He said it was not a good example of any order, and if you were trying to represent an order, he thought it should be done to look like the correct order. There were other ways to work out the handrail within the iron stairs that could be better thought out.

**Mr. Meyer** said Mr. Gonzalez stated earlier he had a meeting this morning, and asked if he was considering wood siding.

**Mr. Gonzalez** said he would consider whatever the Board deemed appropriate in conjunction with the neighbors concern.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if he was he planning to restudy it in that genre.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated he was waiting to hear the comments from the neighbors and to hear what their input was so they could address it in an appropriate manner.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** said if they were going to restudy it and it was going to have wood siding then they would need a continuance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated Mr. Gonzalez was saying he wanted to give neighbors an opportunity who were there at the meeting to make their comments, Mr. Gonzalez would respond, then the Board would give Mr. Gonzalez directions on whether the Board wanted to approve it, approve the modifications, or continue it. They needed to move through the process.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Paul Hansen (410 East Bryan)** stated he was speaking as a concerned neighbor that lived in the next block. He said they did meet with Mr. Gonzalez that morning, and they talked about some of the neighbor's concerns from a design standpoint. He thought Mr. Deering was very eloquent in his response to some of their concerns with the detailing of the building. He asked that Mr. Gonzalez continue the petition to go back and restudy some of the massing and some of the design details. Mr. Hansen said Mr. Gonzalez suggested he did not want to do that, but that he wanted to obtain approval today and then try to work details out later. Mr. Hansen did not think that was the correct way to go about it because he would rather see the project put off for another month or two to restudy some things.

Mr. Hansen said he did not want to digress by any means into Height and Mass because it had been approved, but he thought they all realized this was a very sensitive neighborhood. The block was kind of an anomaly in that it was a transition between the commercial buildings on Abercorn down to Warren Square where he lived, and you could argue the fact that what was there now was not attractive, and he agreed with that. The parking garage across the street was certainly unattractive, but he had hoped that whatever they build there at some point in time within the next three to five years, that they could make steps to remove the parking garage. It took a while to clean up Ellis Square, and it would be nice to be able to work out an alternative for that parking garage and not be left with something that does not fit the scale of the neighborhood that may go back there. This was a large building, it was one building, it may look like it is cloaked in several facades, but it was one mass. He felt like what they had was a stage front; the façade really does not relate to what was going on behind the building in plan, all of the rooms open up to the lane, and there was really no living activity going on in the front part of this building that would face Bryan Street.

He stated that this project did not comply with the window relationships in the ordinance. The ordinance stated that the balcony should be three feet supported, and these were four-foot six balconies unsupported. The Board's packets may have contained more information than the neighbors, but the detailing of the windows, the balustrades, all of the things that Mr. Deering pointed out was non-existent to their understanding, so they would like for the Board to consider further study of the building, and some rethought given to the massing and façade of the project.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated they had spoken regarding the project at numerous times, and his comments were that Warren Square was one of the most distinguished residential squares in the City. A square with more of the earlier architecture that had very delicate and beautiful detail. He said the petitioner had chosen to go with a traditionalist or classicist approach to the building, but the detailing did not match that commitment to classicism. The detailing was very much lacking, lots of liberties had been taken with orders, and they had several comments about the detailing.

They did not believe the mass and scale was appropriate either but it had already been approved and met the height map. The detailing became very important since the mass and scale of the building is so large, but the detailing here was very blank and very abstracted. They thought that it needed to be much more planned and correct in terms of its vocabulary. The balcony that Mr. Deering talked about looked spindly; it was too thin, the columns were too thin, and it had wood columns that hit the grade, which was not a traditional approach on a streetscape in Savannah. They believed that Mr. Deering was right in that there was no entrance way to the façade. It did not look like a rowhouse at all because there was no way to get in and out of it. He said it stole from the street, it did not contribute to the street. They recommend that the third floor be eliminated altogether, that concrete brick piers be erected where there were (wood) columns, and then there would just be a one-story porch and entranceway. Regarding the building to the far east, it had already been pointed out that the balconies were not correctly detailed, they were wider than the other two bays and they find that to be an anomaly. It was exacerbated by the fact that the detail in the cornice was wider than the other two bays, which was not a normal approach to a three-bay rhythm townhouse. As Mr. Hansen pointed out, the window proportions between the windows on the parlor level and the upper two floors were not typical of Savannah and they needed to be studied in detail. They felt that the belt course between the third and fourth floor should be eliminated as well, and all of the brick piers underneath the stoops were too thin and spindly. These were just five observations, but there were more things that need to be studied. They just recommend a thorough job detailing it, a serious study of Savannah traditional building details be conducted by the architect, and then come back with the package which would contribute to the neighborhood rather than detract from it.

**Ms. Dolly Chisholm (404 East Bryan Street)** stated she was not there to speak on design because she thought Mr. Hansen did that so well. She said she was there to speak on procedure and to read a letter into the record from an interested party who could not be there. With regard to procedure, she realized that at the last hearing that Phase I Height and Mass was passed. They obtained copies of the minutes of that meeting, and just wanted to make a point for the record with regard to the posting of the sign. She said there was an issue about posting because it had originally been noticed for a June meeting and was continued, but the new continuance date was not posted. On the website for the Historic Review Board it says, "Procedure for posting signs. The petitioner is responsible for posting the property at least ten days in advance of the meeting. Continued petitions shall remain posted and the new hearing date printed on the sign no later than ten days prior to the meeting date. Failure to do so may result in the petition being continued until the next meeting. She did not know if anything could be changed with regard to Phase I, but the website and the procedure say the new date did have to be posted and it was not.

With regard to the letter from Mark Smith:

September 13, 2006

Mr. Joe Steffen  
Chairman  
Savannah Historic Review Board

Dear Joe,

I'm submitting my written comments to the expansion to the Staybridge Hotel due to the fact that I must be out of town and cannot deliver my comments in person. I've been appointed by Governor Perdue to the state tourism foundation which is having its inaugural meeting in Columbus, Georgia, this afternoon.

I am opposed to the expansion of the Staybridge Hotel for the following reasons:

1. This is a dysfunctional hotel. It has no front door. The front door on Bay Street for the last several months has been blocked by a sofa, purposely placed by staff to prevent its use. It is impossible to offload people in the parking area on Bay Street given the nature of Bay Street traffic.

The side door on Lincoln Street is serving as the main access point to the hotel. It is dysfunctional in that it can only accommodate two vehicles. Unloading/loading cars are placed southbound in the northbound lane. Expansion would exacerbate the dysfunctional arriving and departure process. It is going to probably force that function to occur in Bay Lane, further disrupting the residential occupants in the block.

As a result of the main entrance on Lincoln Street, the design is not compatible with the Historic District guidelines. Lincoln's right-of-way is 60 to 70 percent smaller than the Abercorn and Habersham rights-of-way that flank this block. The City plan never contemplated Lincoln being a major thoroughfare and able to compensate significant buildings. There are virtually no examples of property on streets like Lincoln and Price. Therefore, it is inappropriate to expand this property based on visual compatibility.

2. It is my understanding that a parking grant is required for this project and that it has not been obtained from the Zoning Board of Appeals. It is my understanding the Historic Review Board does not hear size and mass and architectural detail proposals until zoning issues are resolved. Therefore, if possible I would ask that the discussion be tabled subject to a resolution of the zoning issues.
3. Height and mass would have been opposed by numerous people in the community if the project had been properly posted for last month's hearing. It was not properly posted.

I have never protested against any hotel or commented on their architecture in the past. However, this is so bad it will have negative connotations for the entire tourism industry. Citizens in downtown Savannah are already talking about the need to restrict hotel development in the community and that we have too many tourists in town. Approving dysfunctional projects will only add to that discussion and negatively impact the future projects that should be acceptable.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark Smith

**Mr. Harold Yellin** stated he wanted to address the procedural issues raised by Ms. Chisholm. He said there was no violation of any zoning procedures law under the State of Georgia. He

said there was an initial advertisement for June 2006, for Part I Height and Mass. At the last meeting, the Board voted only on Height and Mass and not Part II design. Because of the notice being only for Part I that was what the discussion was limited to, and that was what the Board voted on. For Part II the matter was readvertised, and that was what was before the Board. At the last meeting he did know that it was an issue, and he mentioned generally speaking that Georgia law was out there. He was a little better prepared today, there was in fact Georgia law, and the two cases were City of Roswell versus Outdoor Systems, and City of Cummings versus Realty Development. Both cases said that there was no requirement to provide notice of every hearing during the continuous process. These cases recognize that a Board may tell a petitioner to go back and bring more information. At the next meeting you may say do it again, and again, and again. That would not require the petitioner to advertise, post, or change the sign every single time. It was understood by the courts that it was part of the process, and that was why you do post and advertise one time, then you come before the Board.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that last month in their procedures, Ms. Chisholm had mentioned there was on the website a statement involving what happens when a matter gets continued, whether there was an obligation on behalf of the petitioner to make a change in the sign or the date. Looking through the notice section on the procedures, it indicated that it was the petitioner's responsibility to change the date on the existed posting sign or require a replacement sign. He would tend to agree with Mr. Yellin that it was not the clearest of directives, but what would be helpful to him as Chairman if Mr. Yellin would give him a writing on those cases in behalf of his client, specifically addressing what the continuing obligation of the petitioner was to change their signs or to give further notice. As a fellow attorney, he thought he knew what those cases say in talking about the procedural due process minimum requirements, but as you and I both know sometimes our standards might require us to follow a little higher standard than that.

**Mr. Yellin** stated he would be happy to do that.

**Mr. Graham Sadler (404 East Bryan Street)** stated he had been unable to express his concerns about mass and scale due to the posting. He was opposed to a hotel use. He talked about the transition from Warren Square and its 19th Century frame houses. It was a fragile neighborhood, and had absorbed the parking deck which was somewhat mitigated by the tree canopy. They talked about siding, windows, and porch decks, and he thought it would be enormously helpful in creating more of a human scale and relating more to Warren Square. He echoed what Mr. McDonald said regarding the balcony on the building to the left, and the balconies on the right-hand side.

The other thing that he did not have a chance to talk (to the architect) about was lighting. He did not know what lighting was planned for this. On Bay and Lincoln Streets there were large lights set into the sidewalk, and he rather hoped that they would not be seeing any of those in Bryan Street. He said he also spoke to one of the neighbors who could not be there who lived on the lane, and he was very anxious about the valet parking and some other lane issues.

**Ms. Cathy Ledvina** stated she was a neighbor across the street on Bryan and Lincoln Streets. She had a few illustrations of the historic buildings in Warren Square that showed the character of the residential historic buildings in the neighborhood. She had an opportunity to meet with Mr. Gonzalez, and they had discussed the Lincoln Street façade which was what she was concerned about. She was also concerned with the massing of the building. She said Mr. Gonzalez was very helpful and actually responded to some of her issues on the Lincoln Street façade, and she believed they were illustrated in this submittal. She thought the overall shape was going to remain constant because there was nothing they could do about it, but the material should differ. Mr. Gonzalez was trying to create a row of houses and she believed that he should establish a separate identity for each of the buildings. Whether it was mixing window

types two over two, one over one, six over one, the alignment of the windows instead of reading straight across could differ a little bit in the alignment, the width of the windows versus the height of the windows, maybe an alternative exterior color palate, and removal of the front porch or at least the door leading up to it. It would be incredible if there was an opportunity to discuss clapboards as illustrated in the historic photographs. You could see that the first floor of the basement was stucco or brick, and the upper floors were clapboards. She did not know if they could change any of the roof types such as hip or gable versus all flat roofs behind parapets. Different front door types, shutters, or maybe no shutters. Just a little varying of the detail would make that whole block read as separate townhouses which was what he was trying to create. As an investor she was excited about this project and it obviously added value to her property, however, she was not residential she was commercial. She believed there was a responsibility to the neighborhood, and she hoped they could reflect the historic neighborhood in this building.

**Mr. Tim Burke (11 Habersham Street)** stated his concerns were the windows and balconies that are directly peering down into his yard on the east side. He did not know what could be done about that, but it was going to make him very uncomfortable. The second point was there had been no mention on the plans regarding garbage disposal. He showed a photograph of Phase I where the garbage was stored, and it constantly stacked up. He said he did not know if they were planning to use the same receptacle.

**Mr. Doug Bean** stated he lived east of the project, and wanted to reiterate to the Board that he and his wife were looking forward to something happening on that piece of property.

**Ms. Jean Brooks (400 Block of East Saint Julian)** stated she concurred 100 percent with the remarks of Mr. Deering, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Smith, the Historic Savannah Foundation, and the Chisholm's.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that he would try to be responsive to the specific comments that had come before them. Before he did that, he wanted to do put aside some issues that were beyond this Board including use. He committed to meet with the neighbors and Historic Savannah again. He requested a continuance.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he found all of this was a little bit ironic. From day one when the project was presented to the Board, they heard that the project would augment the ugly, plain parking garage across the street, and therefore, be a benefit. When in fact, in his view, the parking garage across the street was a very truthful building. It was a parking garage. The projected building had a total false front in that it hid a corridor to a hotel that was behind it.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated Mr. Meyerhoff heard the neighborhood today, very specifically speak to the issue that the scale and character of these facades, that the intent would be to have a continuation, a residential scale and actually residential use fill that street. As they pointed out from the beginning, the dilemma is the fact that they have a very truthful parking garage across the street that was not something that anyone particularly wanted to spend a considerable amount of money on a residence, to look across to this very truthful garage. The dilemma had been, in this transition zoning, to create something that bridges a purer and exquisite residential neighborhood into a commercial neighborhood.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Mitchell made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Deering was opposed.

**508 – 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue  
Demolition/New Construction, Part II Design  
Details of Phase II of a Five-Story Hotel**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay and Mr. Saad Al Jassar.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to:

1. Demolish the Econo-Lodge Motel
2. Part II Design Details to erect a five-story “L”-shaped hotel in two phases. The first phase is a rectangular portion on the north end of the lot along Laurel Street easement between Ann Street and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK). This is called Hotel Indigo and is marked as Phase I on the drawings. **Only Phase I is under consideration for design details.**

**FINDINGS:**

1. Part I Height and Mass for both phases was approved July 12, 2006, with Board comments that a drawing of the “connecting” portion between the two phases of the building be shown as it would be after Phase I is complete including materials, and that the P-TAC systems be reconsidered. Public comments included concern about the height of the glass parapet wall.
2. The existing motel was originally built in 1966 as a Travel Lodge Motel. It has undergone a number of physical transformations and does not appear to possess any historic significance.
3. The following is a list of substantive changes to the Hotel Indigo portion since the last submission. On the MLK elevation:
  - The glass parapet portion has been lowered from 15 feet to 10 feet.
  - The louvers have been removed from the curtain wall.
  - The windows on the MLK side have been narrowed and separated vertically by brick panels and P-TAC louvers.
  - The entry vestibule has a new awning design.

On the Laurel Street elevation:

- The Windows have been simplified with louvers below the glass.
- Recessed porches are used on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> stories.
- The glass parapet has been extended in a wider arc at the roof.

Drawings A 8.1 and A 10.1 indicate the appearance between phases.

**The following Part II Design Standards apply:**

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Windows	Anodized aluminum frames with Mountain Pine 556-7 LRV7 as per Pittsburg Paints. Metal louvers for the PTAC system below. Glass curtain wall on MLK and Ann Street on the corner. Glass Arctic Blue by Pilkington Eclipse advantage glass.	It would be helpful if the applicant could further elaborate on the pattern of spandrel glass and clear glass etc. on the curtain wall system. Where will glass be opaque and where translucent? Is the Arctic Blue glass being used in all glass areas?
Doors	Aluminum storefront entries and storefront glass doors at the balconies.	
Roof	Stucco parapet and band; metal parapet cap. At ground floor entrances on Ann and MLK a projecting canopy with aluminum canopy supports and glass roof is proposed.	Will glass for canopy be the same as curtain wall glass?
Materials	Walls: Ground floor Arriscraft smooth and rocked finish, Verde color laid horizontal. Upper walls and ground floor on Laurel Street side: Dark gray wire cut 763 Carolina Collection brick by “Hanson” company with “sandstone” color mortar joints by “Holcim Mortarmix.” Soldier course brick used as a contrast between floors at the windows. Some upper walls: Sand finish stucco “Flagstone” LRV41 for walls and Dover Gray 518-5 LRV23 for bands as per Pittsburgh Paints.	The Verde finish has a mottled look and is beige (See sample). Use black and white elevations for most current layout of materials.
Balconies:	Recessed balconies with metal railings Color: Mountain Pine 556-7 LRV7 as per Pittsburgh Paints.	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval to demolish the current non-historic motel.

Approval of Part II Design Details with clarification regarding the glass.



**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Saad Al Jassar** addressed the issue of the curtain wall. It was floor-to-floor on only the middle panel, which was six feet high with a translucent glass window. The one below it was two feet to the floor, and the one above it was a dark opaque. He said Phase I would stop at the staircases. The staircases were actually included in Phase I, that would be an expansion joint between the two buildings at both staircases. They do have advanced plans with the rooms with furniture.

**Mr. Neely** asked if the petitioner could address the phasing of the project. He was concerned about Phase II would not be built for three or four years, and the portion of the property where the old hotel had been demolished would look like a construction site for three or four years.

**Mr. Jassar** stated it should have been called Hotel I and Hotel II. It was only because the developer was still in the process of finding another flag for Phase II. The intention of construction would actually go together.

**Mr. Shay** stated the two phases would be built concurrently. The only reason why they could not bring to the Board the design detail for Phase II was that the developer was courting two franchisers at this point, and had not decided which one they want to use. Since the configurations of the franchisers room requirements had subtle implications as to the fenestration and things on the exterior of the building, they could not bring it yet. Their hope was that they would be able to bring the Board the design detail on Phase II later this year.

**Mr. Neely** stated technically you get Phase I approval, and for whatever reason Phase II does not get worked out, Phase I could get built without the Phase II coming together.

**Mr. Shay** said theoretically it was possible, but one thing he wanted to point out was that the parking level that was below grade for both buildings would have to be constructed simultaneously. It was very unlikely that the developer would undertake one project without having a strategy for the second project. He said Mr. Neely was right, as an architect he did not have control over the market forces. If the project for Phase II does not move forward very soon, then the economies of scale of building both of the projects at the same time would be lost to the developer, and that would cost them many millions of dollars. There was a very strong incentive for this project to be built with both hotels concurrently.

**Mr. Neely** stated nonetheless he would say they were still vulnerable to having it continue as a construction site for a number of years.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Seiler** stated there were a number of vacant lots in that area for quite some time, and she thought Mr. Shay answered it in saying that he would have to develop the parking lot. It was too valuable a property now that it had come this far for it to lay vacant.

**Mr. Neely** stated if Phase I is built alone first and they do build a garage, he thought how the ground level on that garage appears from Oglethorpe, was within the purview of the ordinance. It would need to be finished off in some way. A motion might address that if the Phase I gets approved, but with a contingency if it was built before Phase II that details for the appearance of the parking lot, including any screening, come back before this Board.

**Dr. Johnson** said what Mr. Neely was saying was if it was not built, the parking lot would be a part of Phase I.

Mr. Shay stated they were acceptable to the idea that if anything happened to delay Phase II that they would come back with an interim plan for how that area would be protected and screened for the vacant lot. The reason that he was acceptable to that was that it really and economically cannot happen.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted for demolition and Part II Design Details, with the condition that if there is a delay between Phase I and Phase II, a screening plan for the remaining vacant lot will be submitted to the Board for review. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself and Mr. Deering abstained.

**RE: Continued Petition of Hansen Architects  
H-06-3635-2  
Erik Puljung  
400 Block of East McDonough Street  
New Construction of a Four-Story  
Condominium Building, Part II Design**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik Puljung.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part II Design approval for the McDonough Street Condominiums.

**FINDINGS:**

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors	Windows: Single windows and grouped windows 1/1 JeldWen Clad Pozzi Double hung insulated glass- trim color is Black Emerald P703 and sashes are Champagne P003. The windows are recessed a minimum of 3". The entry door is recessed and is mahogany with sidelights. The garage entries are Tongue and Groove 1x6 with "V" groove painted Black Emerald.	The cut sheet indicates a grid, however, 1/1 is correct.
Roof Shape	Flat with parapet.	Verify that the stringcourse extends at least 4" from the face of the building at the parapet.
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches	Recessed balconies are proposed with 10" round Permacast columns in the	From the drawings it appears that the upper columns are less than 10" which would be

	Tuscan order. The second floor balcony will have a brick pier system.	visually appropriate, however the diameter is still listed as 10" also. Please clarify.
Fences	The existing brick fence will be extended with a wood gate.	
Materials	Brick: Pine Hall brick "Manchester" with Crimson Red mortar.	It would be helpful to have a color rendering of the building presented. Staff is concerned that the building because of its size not be too monochromatic. There is not a lot of articulation on the façade, therefore a color rendering showing shadows would be helpful.
Color	Steel railings, Garden gates, louver panels – Black Emerald Columns, pergola assembly: Champagne.	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with discussion regarding whether the cornice projection meets the ordinance and color rendering so that colors can be addressed in more detail.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked what the pergola material was.

**Mr. Deering** stated it said it was wood.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Erik Puljung** stated he supported the request for a brick sample panel to be put up on the site, and he felt that it was a great idea overall.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked Mr. Puljung to show the Board the location of the big oak tree on McDonough.

**Mr. Puljung** stated it would be further down on the site. It would be in front of the adjacent property.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it did not cover the property adjacent to it.

**Mr. Puljung** stated it did not, and that he did not think he had a survey that went that far.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Joe Saseen** asked if the roofline on the third floor was angled.

**Mr. Puljung** stated the parapet was flat, and that it was horizontal.

Mr. Deering stated the building was an anomaly there. There was not a lot of context around it that was similar in its form and shape. He was not saying that it did not suit the environment, but it was peculiar.

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Deering and Mr. Gay cast nay votes.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. David Blitch.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations to a non-historic privacy wall on the property at 433 Tattnall Street. They are proposing to remove an eight-foot portion of the garden wall facing Wayne Street to provide access to off-street parking. Due to vision clearance requirements by the City's Traffic Engineering Department for safety reasons, the petitioner will also need to remove a nine-foot portion of the wall along Jefferson Street, adjacent to Wayne Street. They proposed to infill the opening between piers with wrought iron bars to match the fence across the street (see photo).

**FINDINGS:**

The historic residence at 433 Tattnall Street was constructed in 1872, and is a rated structure within Savannah's Landmark Historic District. The stucco garden wall extends 26 feet 5-inches along the rear of the property does not appear to be original to the building. The proposed alterations will not result in an increase in height to the wall and will have no adverse impacts on any historic structures. Although Staff would typically recommend consistency within the wall, the existing solid wall provides privacy to the owner and screening of the car to the public. As such, Staff would not want the solid portions of the wall to be replaced with an iron fence.

The application to the City's Traffic Engineering Department for a curb cut at this address has been denied on the grounds that the stormwater Alice Tattnall Project has a conflict with this request. While Staff has no reason to deny the above request, we do feel that the existing fence is more appropriate if the curb cut is not approved.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with the condition that a copy of the curb cut approval be provided to Staff prior to final approval.

Ms. Fortson-Waring left at 3:45 p.m.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he thought it came under the Board's purview, but the fact was that the drawings show that there was a 13-foot depth, there was a spiral staircase there, and a big oak tree there. A 13-foot depth means whatever standard car they may have would stick out into the sidewalk. He did not know how the Board could approve something where the car sticks out on the sidewalk.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was in the public right-of-way.

**Mr. Deering** stated if the Board found it visually compatible they could say the petitioner could do this, but every time somebody parks there they would get a parking ticket because they were blocking the sidewalk.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated whatever motion the Board make they needed to put that fact in there, that the Board does not have any control over that, and they were aware of it in making the motion. The only motion that the Board was making was for the compatibility of the fence and the wall.

**Dr. Caplan** stated the Board had a similar approval at Lincoln and State Streets, where they wanted to put a car there but the depth was not sufficient for the car.

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

**Mr. David Blitch** stated he understood that they could not do anything without City approval, and they understood if they had a large car they would get a ticket every time they would park there. They were willing to accept that responsibility.

**Mr. Steffen** stated they were close to the intersection too from a traffic standpoint.

**Mr. Blitch** answered right, but the intersections right up at the corner were much busier than the one on Wayne and August Streets.

**Mr. Blitch** stated there was about five to six feet beyond the pad to the wall.

**Mr. Blitch** stated they could cut the tree down and drive further in.

**Mr. Blitch** stated with the tree there, you would still have a good bit of area. He said there was actually a garbage can there, and there would actually be more space if the garbage can was taken out. They changed the staircases which opened up the courtyard a bit.

**Mr. Steffen** stated it was a non-historic structure (the wall), and the Board's purview is based on visible compatibility of what ended up going there to replace whatever gets torn down. He asked Staff if that was essentially correct. He stated he would probably cheerlead for the Traffic Department and say not to put a cut there, but he did not know if the Board had purview to even consider it.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he would suggest as the Board had done in the past, when they faced a zoning issue or other issues that other departments and other Boards had to approve first, that the Board postpone making any motion on it until there was an approval from the City in regard to the driveway and so forth, because it may alter the entire project. He suggested a continuance until the petitioner got a City approval.

**Mr. Steffen** stated to Mr. Meyerhoff they could do that, but he did not want it put in the record that it was the Board's policy, because it was not their policy. That was something that was discussed at length at the last meeting, that there were things that get brought before the Board,

and it was made clear through a lot of review of all of this stuff that they were supposed to undertake their obligation. It did not mean that the Board had to, and they could do what Mr. Meyerhoff wanted to do on this one, but he did not want it said it was the Board's policy that they allow the City to decide these things because they were having an ongoing discussion as to what that policy was and should be for the future. He did not want to prejudice everything else.

**Dr. Johnson** stated what would happen if the City did not approve the curb cut, and the petitioner decided that he was just going to bump up on the curb and drive in that space.

**Mr. Blitch** stated he did not think they would cut that wall unless you had a viable way to get in there. The wall did provide for privacy.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he would like to amend the motion that the Board realized that the 13 feet that was shown would extend the car out into public property.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that was why procedure was worthwhile following. A motion was made and there was a second. The person that seconded it did not accept the amendment to the motion, so the Board could not vote on the motion as presented, which he was going to ask for a call to the question that they do that. The motion was now that the Board approve the petition with a condition that a copy of the curb cut approval be provided to Staff prior to final approval, and they note their acknowledgement that the 13 feet that was requested for the slab was not big enough to accommodate a car.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that a copy of the curb cut approval be provided to Staff prior to final approval, and let it be noted that only 13 feet is provided for the depth of the parking space. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Gay, Mr. Steffen, Mr. Mitchell, and Ms. Seiler voted against the motion. Ms. Fortson-Waring, Mr. Deering, Mr. Meyerhoff, and Dr. Johnson voted for the motion.

RE: Petition of Judge Realty  
H-06-3663-2  
347 Abercorn  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Lou Thomann

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to install a fascia sign on the building at 347 Abercorn Street as follows:

**Size:** 36-inch tall letters for "Judge Realty" and logo spanning 120-inches above the entrance to the building. Combined, the letters cover a total of 2,300 square inches (approximately 3 feet tall by 5.3 feet wide or 16 square feet). The building maintains approximately 25 feet along Abercorn Street.

**Materials:** The letters are made of exposed aluminum with a metal finish. They will project 1-1.5-inches from the face of the building.

**Lighting:** Two lights are proposed to extend two feet from the face of the building and down-lit the sign.

### **FINDINGS:**

The building at 347 Abercorn Street was constructed circa 1882, but is not listed as a contributing structure within Savannah's Landmark Historic District. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). The following standards from the Historic Sign District Ordinance (Section 8-3121) apply:

**(B)(3) Lighted Signs:** Lighted signs of an enclosed lamp, neon or exposed fluorescent design are not permitted within and "R" zoning district. Such signs shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open spaces.

*The proposed lighting will be down-lit from fixtures attached to the building above the sign as per photographs submitted. The fixtures will be metal on hangars similar to gooseneck lights.*

**(B)(11) Principal Use Sign Requirements:** For each non-residential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than one-square-foot of sign area per linear foot-of-frontage along a given street or a maximum of 20 square feet.

*The standard is met. The proposed sign is approximately 16 SF and the building maintains approximately 25 LF along Abercorn Street.*

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval, with the condition that the lights project no more than one-foot from the face of the building.

**Mr. Gay** asked where would they be placed. He asked would they be at the top of the building, right over the sign, or what.

**Ms. Ward** stated it would be placed right above the sign, but they could ask for verification of that from the petitioner.

**Mr. Deering** asked if the Board received a cut sheet on the fixture.

**Ms. Ward** answered no.

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

**Mr. Deering** stated he did not think that two feet was bad for the projection of the light because it was not very much. He said he would rather it be two-feet out and get a better wash over it, because he thought it would look better.

**Mr. Gay** asked where would the lights be placed.

**Mr. Thomann** stated he was thinking just under where the "A" was on the plans, but they really had not decided exactly where.

**Mr. Thomann** stated the light similar to the one they proposed was going to be fabricated by Paula Danluck and they do not have a cut-out of what she was going to do. He thought the concept was going to be compatible with the sign.

**Mr. Deering** asked Mr. Thomann if he would be opposed for bring it back to Staff for approval.

**Mr. Thomann** stated the only thing was they were hoping to make a date of grand opening for October 6, and they need a lead-time.

**Mr. Steffen** stated what the Board seemed to be suggesting was that they could approve it subject to it coming back to the Staff for the specificity of it, and he was sure that Staff could do it for the petitioner within that time.

**Mr. Thomann** stated that was what he was going to ask to clarify. He asked if they could go ahead with the sign and order that to be made, and then the light.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the sign with the condition that the lighting element, including location and fixture design, be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE:   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**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Charles Oxford.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, of two, two-story townhomes at 601-605 Tattnall Street. The vacant property is at the southwest corner of Tattnall and Huntingdon Streets, and the buildings will be oriented to front Tattnall Street as do the other structures within the block face. As part of this development, the parcel will be subdivided into three lots, with the third lot along Huntingdon Street left vacant for development by whoever purchases the property in the future. The two remaining lots will each contain a semi-attached single-family residence. The residence to the south will also have a home office for which an additional parking space is being provided.

**FINDINGS:**

The parcel at 601-605 Tattnall Street is a large lot which has been vacant (without structures) for decades. Historic 1916 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps indicate that three semi-attached two-story buildings once stood on this parcel and extended the full depth of the lot, similar to what is being proposed. By 1954, no buildings were located within this parcel. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium Density) and will be subdivided into three lots. Building 1 will be on a lot that is 45.21 feet wide by 70 feet deep, and Building 2 will be on a lot that is 25 feet wide by 70 feet deep. The third lot (25 feet by 70 feet) will remain vacant.



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

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>Setbacks:</b> No setbacks are required in RIP-A zone.	Both structures extend the full depth and width of the lot. Building 1 maintains an open space on the southeast corner to preserve an existing Live Oak tree in the street yard.	The standard is met.
<b>Building Lot Coverage:</b> 75% maximum in an RIP-A zone.	Building 1 has a lot coverage of 72.4% with a side garden to the south of the building.  Building 2 has a lot coverage of 80% with a central courtyard between the garage and the main residence	The standard is met.  <b>A 5% building lot coverage variance from the standard will need to be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals.</b> The applicant has submitted an application to this board.
Dwelling Unit Type	Residential townhouse.	Staff recommends approval. Surrounding buildings consist of detached residences and several semi-attached duplexes similar to what is proposed.
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Street Elevation Type	Two-story masonry row house.	Staff recommends approval. One and two story residences surround the property, both in the form of duplexes (similar to what is proposed) and detached structures.
Entrances	Each residence maintains a low stoop entrance that projects from the face of the building.	Staff recommends approval. Neighboring buildings feature mostly low stoop entrances both paired and independent of one another.
Building Height: 3-story height zone. First floor height for residential buildings shall be not less than 11'; each story above shall not be less than 10'.	The proposed buildings are two-stories at a height of 26.5' to the top of the parapet. The foundation height is 2'; First floor height is 11'; Second floor height is 10'.	The standard is met.
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	The buildings are 25' wide at the street and 26.5' tall. Neighboring structures are generally two-stories tall on elevated foundations between 20' and 25' in width and 25' to 35' in height.	Staff recommends approval. The proportions are very similar to the new construction directly across Huntingdon Street.
Proportion of Openings	Window openings maintain a 3:6 ratio which is common on	Staff recommends approval.

	historic buildings in the district.	
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	A three bay rhythm is proposed. This is common within the vicinity.	Staff recommends approval.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The footprint of these buildings within the parcel is similar to what was historically on the lot. A 19.5' side yard is proposed on the south of Building 1, adjacent to an existing historic residence. A two-story office and garage are located at the rear of the lot behind the garden.	Staff recommends approval. The open space will allow the neighbor to access his side porch and assist in preserving the Live Oak present in the street yard.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	Entrance porches project 4' from the face of the building into the sidewalk.	Verify projection of neighboring entrance porches.
Walls of Continuity	A 10.5' tall, 19.5' long brick privacy wall creates a wall of continuity along the street to the south of Building 1.	Staff recommends reducing the height of the wall that extends almost 20' along the street. A decorative treatment at the top and in the opening would help mitigate the fortress effect of the wall.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with restudy of the privacy wall for Part II, Design Details

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Charles Oxford** stated he would be living in the one with the garden on the side if he gets it approved. He stated he concurred with Staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Deering** stated he had very few problems with the Height and Mass of the buildings themselves. He did agree with Staff about the wall that faced Tattnell Street, and the north elevation of what he called Building 2. He said it would be nice to be able to get some break in that façade, rather than having it face the street until which time somebody builds on the lot, or he builds something else. He asked if Mr. Oxford could flip the building so that he actually had the carriage house shape expressed facing north, and then the main house shape expressed. Then the stoops could be together, but he thought it was a better interim solution because he would not vote to accept this in the next phase.

**Mr. Oxford** stated he knew it was a long wall, but the main reason he did that was to keep the stoops separated. He clarified the drawing of the carriage house regarding access for Mr. Meyerhoff. There was a set of interior stairs to the second floor.

**Mr. Deering** stated in the petitioner's plan he had the main house connected to a carriage house with the north wall being completely blank and big, it looked very odd there until somebody would come and build a house next to it. If you flip the plan you could achieve an open area with a garden wall that would be eight or so many feet high, and then have an open

area so that it would look like two separate buildings and there would be some relief to that façade. Otherwise, there would be a 70-foot long by 26 feet tall solid wall.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if Mr. Deering was suggesting flipping the garden area.

**Mr. Gay** stated yes, just take it and flip it around.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the western elevation showed the three-garage door divided into four-quarters, with one-quarter of it being Hardi-plank and three-quarters of it being stucco.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was not in consideration at this time. It would come back when the petitioner comes back for Phase II.

**Mr. Oxford** stated he was trying to make the little indentation look like something that was added on later from when the building was built, which was the reason why he was changing the exterior material.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he just pointed it out so that when the petitioner came back with Phase II that he was aware of it.

**Mr. Oxford** stated to Mr. Deering that he really liked the separation of porches because they were heavy porches. He said he would like to propose finishing that wall off, have it drawn, and planting some good-sized container grown magnolia trees along there to soften it up if that might be a consideration.

**Mr. Deering** stated he could not in good conscience vote for the petition as it was with proposed trees. He said it does not follow the guidelines, and would go against his conscience. He could not vote for the massing as it was presented with the blank wall.

**Mr. Oxford** stated that he would agree to flip it.

**Mr. Deering** stated Mr. Oxford could work with the floor plan to where he could keep the stoop on the front where it was, but do something with the floor plan that would allow him to have the connector back to the back in a different spot.

**Dr. Caplan** thanked Mr. Deering for clarifying it for him. He said if the petitioner did flip it, there would be an opening on the north wall. There would have to be a gate or a fence or something, and they would have to include that.

**Mr. Deering** stated there would be a garden wall.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he did not think the Board could approve Height and Mass if the mass was going to change, and right now the mass as it was on the north side was not approvable in his view.

**Mr. Mitchell** stated it sounded like the Board was talking about a continuance.

**Mr. Oxford** stated he would like to continue it and come back with revised plans.

**HDBR ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to the October 11, 2006, meeting. Board members encouraged the petitioner to resubmit for Part I and II together, address the blank wall on the north elevation and the garden wall along Tattnell Street. Mr. Meyerhoff noted that the Hardi-Plank on the garage seemed out of place. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Oxford on the posting, since he would probably be asking to consider Part II as well, to make sure the sign noted that he would be considering Part I and II.

**RE:   Petition of Architectonic  
      Thomas Michaels  
      H-06-3671-2  
      347 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard  
      Color/Roof/Alterations**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Thomas Michaels.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for a paint color change and exterior alterations to the storefront and balcony on the building at 347 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (MLK) as follows:

1. Replace the existing storefront glass with bronze window frames containing clear glass. The existing detailing at the base of the storefront will be repaired and refinished.
2. Repair and/or replace the bracket supports for the balcony with brackets of a similar profile with synthetic material.
3. Replace the existing balcony rail with a new wrought iron rail system. The existing iron railing does not appear to be original to the building or have any significant historical value.
4. Existing windows and cornice will be repaired.
5. Pedestrian entrance door, north of the storefront, will be replaced with a 6-panel door. The existing door does not appear to be historic.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building at 347 MLK Jr., Blvd. was constructed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century as a Mixed-Use building, and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The existing storefront and balcony have been modified from their original appearance. Significant architectural features, including the bracket supports and parapet, have suffered from neglect and are in need of repair. The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

1. Retail storefront glazing shall be transparent ...shall extend from the sill or from an 18-24-inch base of contrasting material. Storefront glazing in subdivided sashes shall be inset a minimum of 4-inches from the face of the building; provided, however, that continuously glazed storefronts may be flush with the face of the building. Entrances

shall be recessed and centered within the storefront. Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel, or copper as part of a glazed storefront system; bronze, glazed brick, or tile as a base for the storefront.

Staff recommends approval upon submittal of section detail and sketch plan of the storefront verifying that it does meet the standards as stated above. While the drawings indicate that the storefront frame will have a bronze finish, the material is not specified. It appears to have a recessed entry but is not clear. Verify that storefront will be recessed a minimum of 4-inches. A side entrance door will be replaced. Verify material.

2. An historic structure...shall only be altered in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure. The applicant is requesting approval to repair or replaced damaged brackets as needed with "similar profile (synthetic)"

Clarification from the applicant is necessary. Any replacement of these character-defining features should be in-kind to match the existing in design, texture, profile, and material.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with details to Staff for final approval, including a sketch plan and section detail of the storefront. Clarification of the bracket replacement.

**Mr. Neely** asked if the gas meter had been addressed.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Thomas Michaels** stated the only thing he would like to change from the Staff review was item number three, they were going to replace the existing balcony rail with a new rail. After further investigation, they believed they could repair what was existing and they were not going to replace it.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if it was existing rail original to the building or was it something somebody tacked on later.

**Mr. Michaels** stated he thought it was tacked on later, but it matches the neighboring building next door.

**Mr. Neely** asked if there were any comments about the ugly gray pipes.

**Mr. Michaels** stated they were in contact with the gas company about it to see if they could get it moved. They were also investigating the electrical meter on the right-hand side, which was right on the front, and they would like to remove that also.

**Mr. Deering** commended the applicant for doing it because he thought it was a great project. He asked just out of curiosity, what was the use going to be.

**Mr. Michaels** stated the bottom floor was going to be some type of commercial use. They were going to leave it as a shell until they get a tenant. The upstairs was a three-bedroom apartment to hopefully be used by some SCAD students.

**Mr. Deering** stated on the drawing Mr. Michaels had said if the brackets were not repairable, he would replace the damage brackets with a similar profile synthetic. He asked if Mr. Michaels would be in agreement to bring it back to Staff for approval, because he thought it was very important that if they could not match the brackets, would it work. He thought they should match exactly.

**Mr. Michaels** stated his plans with the synthetic was he had already taken measured drawings to a company and had them fabricated since someone had them in stock.

**Mr. Michaels** answered yes. He said his plan was when they start demolition, to take one down and ship it off to the company to make an exact molding of it.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked that it would be fabricated from what.

**Mr. Michaels** stated it would be like a permacast or some type of other synthetic material, and it would weather well unlike the metal that was already there.

**Mr. Deering** stated when it was painted out it would read the same.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if what was there now was metal.

**Mr. Deering** stated he always admired the balcony on the building, he just wanted to make sure that it was restored.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated he wanted to thank the petitioner for taking on the important project.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if they talked about the roof.

**Mr. Michaels** stated the existing roof was hidden behind the parapet and they were going to repair and replace that. It cannot be seen.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if it was a parapet.

**Mr. Michaels** stated it was a complete parapet and the roof cannot be seen, but they put on the application that they were going to repair the roof.

**Mr. Neely** asked the petitioner if he knew that the Savannah Development Renewal Authority had low-interest façade loans for the area.

**Mr. Michaels** answered yes they were. He said they had been in contact with them also.

**Ms. Cathy Ledvina** stated the utilities on the front of the building could very easily moved, and that it was going to take money to move them. If it was two separate uses, there would be the need for two separate gas meters and two separate electric meters. Her concern was if the electric meters were on the front, were there going to be two electric meters or two gas meters now on the front.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that a section detail of the storefront, floor plan, and bracket specifications be submitted to Staff for final approval. The Board encouraged the petitioner to remove the gas and electric meters from the front of the building. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Cynthia J. Hunter  
H-06-3672-2  
530, 532, 534, & 536 East Harris Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Ms. Cynthia J. Hunter.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction of a rear addition on each of the properties at 530, 532, 534, and 536 East Harris Street. The properties contain two 40-foot-wide semi-attached duplexes constructed in 1998, and the work proposed will all be conducted at the same time by the same contractor, hence the single application for the project. On each building, the addition will be located at the rear above the ground floor porch. As such, the building footprint and lot coverage will not be increased by the proposed additions.

**FINDINGS:**

The two-and-one-half-story semi-attached duplexes are zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium Density) and are not historic.

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>(I)(12): Additions</b> 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 as appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.	The additions are on the rear, above the ground level porches. They are distinguished as an appendage by the existing vertical corner board on the exterior of the main house and the shed roof extension.	The standard is met.
<b>(I)(10) Roofs</b> visible from the street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles.	A shed roof extension is proposed surfaced in asphalt shingle to match the existing residence.	The standard is met.
<b>Windows</b>	The existing windows on the rear of the buildings will be removed and installed on the addition.	Staff recommends approval.  Staff recommends approval.

	Openings on 534-536 East Harris Street are in three bays, similar to the existing rear elevation. 530-532 only features two openings with a skylight in the roof for light.	Although the building featuring pairs of three openings is more proportional, the rear will be minimally visible from the lane.
<b>Materials</b>	The exterior will be clad in Hardi-Plank siding to match the main residences.	Staff recommends approval.
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Colors</b>	The color of the exterior and trim will be painted to match the existing residence.	Staff recommends approval.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval.**

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if only half of it was going to be done.

**Ms. Ward** stated on the property at 530 and 532 building, one of the person’s had backed out and did not want to build the addition out there.

**Mr. Neely** asked how would the left-hand wall look.

**Ms. Ward** stated she imagined they would look very similar. That was what was proposed for the side of the wall. They would be the same in the side elevation.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked which one backed out; 530 was going to be done and 532 was not.

**Ms. Ward** answered 536 East Harris Street.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if three out of four would be done.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Cynthia Hunter** showed slides of what the overall rear would look like of 530, 532, and 534, and pointed out 536 had decided not to do the project. The rear elevation could barely be seen from the lane.

**HDRB ACTION:** **Mr. Meyerhoff** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby the petition as amended. **Ms. Seiler** seconded the petition and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Jeff Cramer  
H-06-3673-2  
22 West Broughton Street  
Alterations/Rehabilitation**



The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Jeff Cramer.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

### **NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the façade of the building located at 22 West Broughton Street as follows:

1. Removal of the non-historic applied façade on upper levels.
2. Restore stucco façade according to historic photographs, including replacing window sashes, install canopy over windows, reinstate sign bands, restore Mission style parapet and tile work throughout the façade.
3. Install new glass storefront system. Existing window and door placement to remain.

### **FINDINGS:**

The commercial building at 22 West Broughton Street was originally constructed circa 1926, in the Mission style. Overtime, non-historic modifications and alterations to the exterior obscured the character defining features of the building and, as a result, it is not listed as a rated structure within Savannah's Landmark Historic District. A flat stucco façade and permastone base were added to the south elevation circa 1960, at which time the original window openings and curvilinear parapet were covered up, and the tile roof canopy was removed. The applicant intends to remove the non-historic façade, restore and reconstruct the Mission style elements that once defined this building.

1. Two groups of four window openings still exist beneath the applied façade. Drawings indicate one-over-one double-hung sash windows are to be installed. This is consistent with historic photographs.

Staff recommends that the windows be wood frame with single-pane glass with a lower sash to be wider than the meeting and top rails in order to meet the standards. Since this building is not a rated structure, the applicant may use double-glazed windows upon submittal of manufacturer's specifications to Staff. The windows should be inset not less than 3-inches from the face of the building.

2. The proposed steel frame canopy surfaced in clay tile roofing is consistent with historic photographs. The canopy will be located directly above the second floor windows, extending 2 feet 1-inch from the façade, with decorative wood and stucco bracket supports.

Staff recommends approval with the condition that a sample of the clay tile and detail of the bracket design be submitted to Staff prior to installation, to verify that it is consistent with the original design.

3. It is unclear if the curvilinear parapet and tile work still exist beneath the applied façade. Exploratory demolition will reveal the presence or lack of for this feature. If it no longer exists, the applicant intends to reinstate the parapet to match the photograph as indicated in the drawings.

Based on the historic and existing photographs, the height of the original parapet and the applied façade are the same. The quoins on the neighboring historic structure equal 15 at the top of the south elevation of the building at 22 West Broughton Street in the current photograph and historic photograph. This indicates that the original parapet may still exist beneath the faux façade.

4. The new storefront will consist of replacing the glass and framing to match the existing glass and framing of the entrance doors. The permastone and awning will remain.

Staff recommends approval of the storefront replacement. It is unclear if the tile/glass work beneath the existing awning will be restored. Staff recommends restoring this feature and possibly reducing the width of the awning to be located within the framework of the original storefront.

5. The former sign bands located above the entrance will be reintroduced on the façade.

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the design for the individual signs, if over three square feet, be resubmitted for approval. Originally, the signs were surrounded with decorative tile within the sign band. Staff encourages the use of this historic treatment.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with the details to be submitted to Staff for final approval.

**Mr. Mitchell** asked if it was glass block.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was very small squares of glass that were leaded together.

**Ms. Ward** stated it would be similar to what was on the Whitaker Street building.

**Mr. Deering** stated the glass was put in where Larry's Giant Subs were on Whitaker and State Streets.

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

**Mr. Jeff Cramer** stated his client was very amiable to restoring the building like it was. He said the client was a fan of Mission style architecture, and hoped they could do it. It had some of the original façade there, and they were very interested in getting started on the project. They would like to start November 1 with the demolition, and the discovery process with the façade. They would like to keep the lower canopy as shown, and the top part would be exactly like the photographs they showed, and keep the bottom storefront. He said that he would have to bring the sign back because he knew who was going to rent it, but he had not talked to the tenant about their sign. He did not know if they should approve the sign today or not.

**Mr. Deering** stated the sign would have to come back to the Board.

**Mr. Cramer** stated he was not clear on the sign, but everything else was exactly like it was shown. He said they would keep in close contact with the staff as far as details go. They might even do that upper canopy out of wood instead of metal studwork just to make it easier to build. He was sure they were going to use wood brackets like the original ones, and it might go better with the wood on the upper canopy. They would bring those details back to Staff just like they should.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated they would like to commend the petitioner for the project. He just wanted to ask the Board, the architect, and the Preservation Officer if they have had experience with stuccoing over permastone. It seemed a shame to leave the permastone with the nice restoration. He had never tried it, but was wondering if anybody had experienced it.

**Mr. Deering** stated they could put metal lathe on it and go at it, as long as it had control joints in the right places.

**Ms. Ward** stated there could be a stucco wall right behind it.

**Mr. McDonald** stated that it could be because it was just a thin veneer that could be chipped off.

**Mr. Deering** stated he would caution against it because the storefront glass in this particular building was cantilevered over that stone.

**Mr. McDonald** stated he heard it was replacement glass.

**Mr. Cramer** stated it looked like it was some kind of framework in front of the old stuff.

**Mr. Deering** stated they probably could stucco over it if they were so inclined.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that details and discoveries upon removal of the façade be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Kathleen Dupius  
H-06-3676-2  
217 East Gaston Street  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Ms. Kathleen Dupius.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to construct a brick fence along the east property line in the rear between the lane and the house, to replace an existing chain link fence.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The wall is to extend between an existing 8-foot 4-inch brick column and an 8-foot 8-inch block column. The design of the wall consists of a radial curve that extends for three feet and drops down to a six-foot wall that runs for 50 feet 6-inches, to another three-foot radial curve, and back up to the eight-foot level. The existing wood gates on the lane will remain. The brick and mortar are to match the existing brick pier.

2. A brick arch has already been constructed in the rear yard. This is also visible from the lane.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval, including the previously constructed arch.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of Laura Potts-Wirht  
H-06-3657(S)-2  
19 East Bay Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
2. Petition of Graham B. Cooper  
Inman Park Properties  
H-06-3658(S)-2  
21 East Bay Street (19A Bay Street)  
Existing Windows  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
3. Petition of Metal Craft, Incorporated  
H-06-3659(S)-2  
225 East Hall Street  
Roof Material Replacement  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
4. Petition of The Fitts Company, Incorporated  
H-06-3660(S)-2  
15 Bull Street  
Sign  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
5. Petition of Yellowstone Construction Company, Incorporated  
H-06-3661(S)-2  
503 East President Street  
Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
6. Petition of Nicholas Henry  
H-06-3662(S)-2  
407 East Hall Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

- 7. Petition of Robert E. Jones  
H-06-3664(S)-2  
1 West York Street  
Color/Alteration  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
- 8. Petition of Gary Hall  
Wright Square Cafe  
H-06-3665(S)-2  
21 West York Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
- 9. Petition of Sinisa Domazet  
Green-Meldrim House  
H-06-3666(S)-2  
14 West Macon Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
- 10. Petition of Trustees Garden Development, LLC  
H-06-3667(S)-2  
62 East Broad Street Numbers 9 & 10  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
- 11. Petition of Levy Jewelers  
B. Lowell Kronowitz  
H-06-3668(S)-2  
101 East Broughton Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**RE: MINUTES**

**1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – August 9, 2006**

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Mitchell made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the minutes as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

- Policy Regarding Variance Procedures - **Continued to October 2006**

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

**Mr. Steffen** stated he had received copies of violation letters sent by Staff to a number of people who had taken it upon themselves to get Certificates of Appropriateness's and then did something completely different. He said he did not know if there was any worse offense than that of going through the process, having the public notified, and telling the Board and everyone that they were going to do one thing, and then do something different. He certainly would encourage Staff in those efforts and let the Board know what they could do to help.

**Ms. Reiter** stated a new procedure was being implemented by giving a brightly colored Certificate of Appropriateness card for whatever district you were in. It would note the file number, the date of approval, the address of the property, and very clearly what was approved.

**Mr. Deering** asked if it would be posted with the permit.

**Mr. Gay** answered yes.

**Ms. Seiler** stated it was an excellent idea.

#### **RE: INFORMATION ITEMS**

- Georgia Alliance of Preservation Commissions Fall Historic Preservation Commission Training, October 6 – 7, 2006, Rome, Georgia

**Ms. Reiter** stated the Board was able to send one Board member.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she would check.

**Mr. Steffen** asked what day of the week it was.

**Ms. Ward** answered Friday and Saturday.

- Invitation to Lecture on Savannah City Plan, September 14, 2006 - Dr. John Reys
- Historic Preservation Department Report for the Month of August
- Article on Historic Preservation Academy

**Mr. Steffen** stated the only other item that he would mention was that Historic Savannah had asked if the Board would like help with doing a retreat and dealing with some of the issues that the Board come back on all of the time. He said he spoke to Melissa Jest a couple of days ago and told her the Board certainly appreciated that offer, and that they would certainly undertake to have Historic Savannah involved when they set the retreat up. They were going to wait in setting the retreat up until they seat their new Board since they were going to have anywhere from five to six new Board members coming on in December. They appreciate on behalf of the Board and Staff the offer, and would certainly take them up on it.

Mr. Steffen then asked who was coming off and who was staying. He wanted to suggest to the Board that they consider some good people, and make sure that peoples names were made known to City Council members.

**Ms. Reiter** stated another important thing was the advertisement would probably start going out right after September 22 when this period was over. She said if the Board had people they thought would be good members, they must fill out an application. She had copies in her office

**Mr. Deering** asked why couldn't they post it on the MPC website, and asked wouldn't it be easier to do.

**Ms. Ward** said it had to be submitted to the Clerk of the Council by the City.

**RE: ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp