

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

FEBRUARY 14, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Ned Gay
Dr. Lester Johnson
Eric Meyerhoff
John Neely
Dr. Gerald Caplan
Gene Hutchinson
Dr. Malik Watkins
Sidney J. Johnson

HDRB Members Not Present:

Dr. Charles Elmore

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Thomas L. Thomson, Executive Director
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner
Ellen Harris, Historic Preservation Planner
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant
Marisa Gomez, Historic Preservation Intern

RE: CALL TO ORDER

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Steffen introduced Ms. Ellen Harris' Preservation Law class from Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD). He also introduced Ms. Connie Pinkerton's Preservation Research class from SCAD. He introduced Mr. Sidney J. Johnson, a newly appointed Board member, and said there were two other newly appointed Board members who were unable to attend.

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of D & D Signs
H-06-3740-2
502 West Bay Street
Sign

Continued to March 14, 2007 at the request of the petitioner.

RE: Amended Petition of Dawson + Wissmach
Architects
Factor's Walk
H-05-3477-2
126 East Bay Street
Alterations

Continued to March 14, 2007, 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 continuance of these items to the March 14, 2007, meeting. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Kessler River Street
Brian Py/Agent – Grey Reese
H-06-3607-2
102 West Bay Street
Balcony Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of BMW Architects
Bryce Bounds
H-07-3766-2
306 East Liberty Street
Rehabilitation/Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

RE: Petition of Jenny Reeder
H-07-3767-2
20 East Broughton Street
Addition of a Door

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Lominack, Kolman & Smith
Steve Day, Agent for Day & Day Construction
H-06-3521-2
418 East Bryan Street
HVAC Screening

The Preservation Officer recommends Board discussion.

Present for the petition was Mr. Steve Day.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to amend an application for New Construction of a carriage house at 418 East Bryan Street. During the construction of the new building, a through-the-wall air condenser was installed on the east elevation, which is visible from the public right-of-way. The plans submitted and approved by the Historic Review Board indicated that the HVAC unit would be a stand-alone unit located within the courtyard and not visible from the public right-of-way.

FINDINGS:

The following standard from the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the Historic District (8-3030) apply:

(l)(15)b: HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way

(l)(15)c: Through-the-wall air conditioners may be installed in new construction when they are incorporated into the design of the window system and screened by a decorative gate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends Board discussion.

Mr. Steffen asked if Staff had any specific recommendations.

Ms. Ward stated the petitioner was allowed to have a through-the-wall, but was concerned about the appearance of the screening and if it would draw attention to the unit. Staff prefers that the unit not be visible from the public right-of-way, and has tried to work on a compromise, but it has not been successful.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it appeared to be positioned lower or the wall had been raised.

Ms. Ward said Mr. Meyerhoff was correct because the unit had been lowered.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it was visually lower, but barely.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Steve Day stated he was the contractor on the project, and the air conditioning system was existing but was relocated. The unit being discussed was not submitted as part of the plan. He made the decision because the air needed to circulate around the unit, the homeowner did not want the unit sitting in the courtyard, and it was not a through-the-wall air conditioning unit but a split-mini. The unit shown to the Board was an outside condensing unit. There was a single distribution panel mounted on the inside wall to eliminate ductwork. He said Mr. Meyerhoff was correct in stating the unit had been moved. They had spoken with Staff due to complaints from the neighbor and, painted it the same color as the building to blend, but it did not blend. Staff recommended screening the unit, but the homeowner did not want it screened. Therefore, they lowered it to five-foot-six to the bottom of the air conditioning unit. The height was a result of the passageway on the side of the building that the homeowner would use, and if they lowered the unit further, the passageway could not be used. The homeowner did not want the unit in the courtyard, and they felt the location was reasonable. If the Board wanted the unit relocated to its previous position with screening, they would comply. He felt the present location was a good compromise, but would leave it to the Board's judgment.

Mr. Steffen asked what happened between the time the plans were approved by the Board and the placement of the unit.

Mr. Day stated he did not realize it was not on the original plans and had not discussed it with the architect. They knew they would use the split-mini because it was small, approximately 2 feet long, 18 inches high, and 10 inches deep, but very quiet. They had used them previously without a problem, knew it had to be placed somewhere, but not in the courtyard. The neighbor suggested locating it on the other end of the building, but it would not work. The previous location was an eyesore to the neighbor, so they lowered it to give the homeowner use of the walkway.

Mr. Johnson asked what the new screen was that Mr. Day suggested.

Mr. Day stated he took the photograph of what he had seen in a wrought iron screen.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it would draw more attention to change it rather than leaving it as it was. The photograph appears like an electric meter on the side of a building.

Mr. Day stated six inches was visible above the wall.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Brian Glaze (representative of mother-in-law who resides at 17 Price Street) stated that when his mother-in-law comes into the courtyards; the unit was the first thing visible. She had talked with Mr. Day and the neighbors to compromise, and was satisfied with the location, but was under the impression the unit would be lowered so that it would not be visible.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) recommended denial of the after-the-fact petition because it was unacceptable to do unapproved work. The Board had an opportunity to enforce its decisions by not requiring the petitioner to alter the free-standing condenser unit in the courtyard that was permitted.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Gay stated it did say something about the acceptability of the unit because the owner did not want it in the courtyard, and to put it on the side of the building instead. If it was in the courtyard, it would not be a problem.

Mr. Steffen said due to the number of students present, the issue was not what the neighbor thinks, but what was visible from the public right-of-way. Sometimes items come to the attention of the Board by the neighbor, but it was not a question of whether the neighbor was satisfied, but if it was in compliance with the guidelines when visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked who owned the brick wall between the properties.

Mr. Day answered the neighbor did.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the neighbor could raise the brick wall and she would never see the unit.

Mr. Steffen said the Board was working without the guidance of the Preservation Officer, but it would be proper for the Board to make a motion to approve or deny it, and ask the petitioner to relocate the unit.

Dr. Caplan stated you would have to think of the alternatives which were keeping it as was, put up a screen, or raise the wall which belongs to the neighbors but the neighbor must agree. It could be denied and the unit moved. If moved it could go in the courtyard where it would not be visible. Often, they were put on roofs where they were visible, and sometimes that looks bad. He did not find it objectionable, it was important to the petitioner, but to the person walking down the street the six or eight inches were objectionable.

Mr. Steffen stated if it was denied and was required to be moved, the location was up to the petitioner whether it was moved into the courtyard, or lowered the other six to eight inches. The Board would not direct them, but it would not be visible any longer.

Dr. Caplan stated he appreciated Historic Savannah Foundation's (HSF) feeling about it, but there were certain practicalities since the unit had to be placed somewhere. He assumed that HSF recommend it be placed in the courtyard.

Mr. Johnson suggested they use the screen because it would create a decorative view.

Mr. Neely stated if they were looking at it before the work was done, the Board would say no objectively, but they were dealing with what was there.

Mr. Meyerhoff suggested putting an arch on the top of the wall so there would be no cost to the neighbor. He said he had trouble locating what they were looking for when he drove through the lane, but you could see four to six inches of the metal box. The electric panels on the face of the buildings in the lane wouldn't be any bigger or visible.

Ms. Seiler stated if you live downtown and have a unit that would not go on the roof, then you have to bear having the unit in the small courtyard, which is the price to pay for living downtown. You would have to endure the sound and unsightliness. It's a shame the Board wasn't dealing with it from the start. She thought the owner made every reasonable intent to satisfy the neighbor in lieu of the fact other neighbors weren't present. She said she had to look twice to find the unit.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the amended petition as submitted. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion. Mr. Neely was opposed, Mr. Gay abstained and Mr. Steffen did not vote.

**RE: Petition of Sottile & Sottile
 Christian Sottile
 H-06-3626-2
 38 Habersham
 418 – 422 East Congress Street and Lane
 New Construction Part II Design Details of
 Condominium Building and Attached Lane
 Dwelling**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Christian Sottile.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part II Design Details, for a three-story multi-family dwelling at 38 Habersham Street, known as Building A, and three attached two-story dwellings at 418 through 422 East Congress Lane, Building C. The entire project, comprised of buildings A, B, and C, received Part I approval on July 12, 2006, with the condition that the balconies on the lane buildings be restudied during the Part II submittal. They have been removed, and entrance canopies have been incorporated into the design.

FINDINGS:

The following Part II Design Standards (Section 8-3030) Apply:

38 Habersham Street (Building A)

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p>Windows and Doors: Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. Double glazed windows are permitted on new construction provided the muntin is no wider than 7/8", muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing, lower sash rail is wider than the meeting and top rails, and extrusions be covered with molding. Centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically...shall be rectangular with a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less</p>	<p>One-over-one double-hung sash, Kolbe and Kolbe Heritage Series wood frame windows with double-pane glass are proposed. Windows are rectangular, both independent and grouped in projecting bays aligned vertically. Windows on the main façade have a 3:8 ratio. Single-light windows are depicted on the south/lane elevation and the center west elevation.</p> <p>Single-light custom glass walls are proposed on the north and east elevations. They will be operable,</p>	<p>The standards are met. Kolbe & Kolbe Heritage Series windows have been previously approved in the district and have proven to be visually compatible.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval. The glass walls will be located on secondary facades and be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.</p> <p>The standard is met.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval.</p>

<p>than 5:3...shall be wood or wood clad.</p> <p>Bay windows shall extend to the ground unless they are oriel...</p>	<p>manufactured by Kolbe & Kolbe, of wood frame with double pane glass.</p> <p>Two-story oriel windows with iron frames and copper panels project 2' from the face of the building.</p> <p>The main entrance features a single-light wood frame door with sidelights and arched transom above.</p>	
<p>Garage Openings/Doors shall not exceed 12' in width.</p>	<p>Three garage openings on the lane feature overhead garage doors clad in vertical tongue-and-groove pine painted to match trim. Openings are 9' wide by 7' tall.</p>	
<p>Roofs: Parapets shall have a string course of not less than 6" in depth and extending at least 4" from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between 1-1.5 feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum 2" overhang.</p>	<p>A flat roof behind a 3'-6" brick parapet is proposed. The cornice projects 6" from the face of the brick with a 3" coping at the top of the parapet.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches: Residential balconies shall not extend more than 3' from the face of a building and shall be supported by brackets...</p>	<p>Iron balconies and porches are proposed on the rear elevations (north and east). They are supported with iron pipe columns, landings, stairs, and brackets. The balcony projects 3' from the face of the building, while the porches project 5'. Railings are 3.5' tall.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Fences shall not extend beyond the façade of the front elevation...Walls facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building...</p>	<p>An 8'-6" tall brick piers with a 6'-10" tall wood gate is located along Habersham St., north of the building. The brick wall is a continuation of the piers that extends along the north and east ends of the property.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Materials: Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco.</p>	<p>The exterior is predominantly brick with copper accents in the bays and coping. The brick will be painted and the ground floor is separated from the floors above by a marble band course on the west portion of the building. A</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

	<p>stepped base is incorporated at the foundation and a projecting cornice and parapet cap are incorporated at the roof.</p> <p>Openings feature jack arch headers on the ground floor and Roman arches at the entrance and opening above with brick sills. Brick headers create lintels and sills on openings in the upper floors. A double soldier course is used over the garage doors.</p>	
Color	<p>Painted Brick Base: Sherwin Williams SW 6148, Wool Skein</p> <p>Trim, railings, ironwork, doors & windows: SW 6216, Jasper Bay window panels, roofs,</p>	Staff approval.
	<p>coping, downspouts: copper</p> <p>Entrance door: Mahogany Stain</p>	
Utilities: Electric vaults, meter boxes, [etc.] shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view. HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way.	<p>A 2' deep 4' tall recess is located on the lane elevation to contain electric and gas meter boxes. HVAC units will be located on the roof screened by the parapet.</p>	The standard is met.
Lighting	<p>Solid brass light fixtures with a bronze finish manufactured by Sunrise Lighting are proposed at the front entrance. They are 4" wide and 8" tall on a 4 x 4 base.</p> <p>South and East elevations feature hand forged and cast iron light fixtures with antique pressed glass. They are 16.5" wide by 14.25" tall</p>	Staff recommends approval.

418-422 East Congress Lane (Building C)

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors	<p>Three-light paired casement windows with fixed transoms above are proposed. They have a 3.5:7 ratio on the lane façade. Manufactured by Henselstone Window and</p>	<p>Verify dimensions of muntins. This window appears to be compatible but has not been previously approved and as such, a sample is encouraged to be brought in to Staff.</p>

	Door Systems, the windows are wood with insulated glass and spacer bars.	
Garage Openings/Doors	Wood frame recessed panel garage door is proposed with three rows of glass at the top and a solid row of tongue-and-groove wood on the bottom. Openings are 9.5' wide by 8.5' tall. 8	The standard is met.
Roof Shape	A flat roof behind a 3'-6" brick parapet is proposed. The cornice projects 6" from the face of the brick with a 3" coping at the top of the parapet. A roof garden is accessed from a spiral stair in the interior of the lot. A wood frame extension in the interior feature side gable roofs surfaced in galvanized standing seam metal roofing.	Staff recommends approval
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches	Canopies have replaced the balconies over the entrances on the lane. They will project no more than 2.5' from the face of the building with a 9-10' clearance above the pavement. They are comprised of a steel awnings supported by steel channel rods.	Staff recommends approval.
Fences	8.25' tall brick interior garden walls separate each of the attached units, which will not be visible from the public right-of-way.	The standard is met.
Materials	Red brick with wood trim and cast stone headers over the entrances. Openings feature jack arch headers on the ground floor with segmental arch headers and sills above. A 1" reveal is located around the base and a projecting brick soldier course and parapet cap are incorporated at the roof with a 1" reveal at the base of the parapet. Smooth finish Hardi-Plan siding is used on the extension of the building in the interior of the lot.	The standard is met.

Color	Brick: Boral Monticello Modular with Holcim Brick Red Mortar Trim and siding: Sherwin Williams SW 6071, Popular Gray Doors and windows: Charleston Green Roof: McElroy Metal, Galvanized	Staff approval
Utilities	Electric and gas meters are proposed in between units on the lane facing façade. HVAC units will be located on the roof screened by the parapet.	The standard is met.
Lighting	Two sconces are proposed on either side of each entrance along the lane. They are made of hand forged and cast iron, 8.25" wide by 8.25" tall and project 10" from the face of the building.	Staff recommends approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with final details on the windows for the lane buildings (Building C) to be submitted to Staff.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted, with the window specifications in Building “C” coming back to Staff for final approval. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Reconsideration of Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3711-2
217 West Liberty Street
Demolition/New Construction Part I, Height and Mass for Condominium Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

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

The request for demolition and new construction were denied at the November 8, 2006, meeting of the Historic District Board of Review. Upon review of the proceedings, it was revealed that there was not a full quorum present at that meeting. As such, at the December 13, 2006, meeting the board voted to reconsider the petition at the January 10, 2007, meeting. At this time, the petitioner requested and was granted a continuance to the February 14, 2007, meeting.

FINDINGS:**Demolition:**

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

New Construction:

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

Historical Development Pattern

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

At the November 8, 2006, meeting of the Historic District Board of Review, Staff recommended the following revisions to the proposed new construction. All have been addressed by the petitioner in this amended submittal.

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

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Development Standards: No setbacks are required in RIP-A zone. Maximum lot coverage is 75 percent.</p>	<p>The building will have a 0' front yard setback on Tattnall and Liberty Streets with an approx. 26'-8" wide 12' deep recess in the center portion of the building fronting Liberty. 10' and 11'-8" setbacks are proposed on the east and south sides of the property.</p> <p>Combined the parcels are 99'-8" deep by 121'-10" (12,142.7 square feet). Prior to revisions, The building is approximately 9,841 for a lot coverage of 81 percent.</p>	<p>The standard is met. The recess along Liberty Street has been increased at the recommendation of staff; previously the entrance was 17' wide by 5' deep</p> <p>The City Zoning Administrator has determined that the project as proposed does not require a lot coverage variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.</p>
<p>Street Elevation Type: A proposed building located on an east-west through street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.</p>	<p>Five-story condominium building.</p>	<p>Brown Ward, adjacent to the east, contains the historic DeRenne Apartment building also on Liberty Street, which is a similar building type. Boulevards, such as Liberty Street, are wider and can better manage larger buildings. Pulaski Ward contains a couple of apartment-type buildings including the SCAD owned Pulaski House and the building at 339 Whitaker Street. These are not however 5-stories and are modest sized in comparison due to the differences in the size of the parcels. Four-story buildings within the ward are typically townhouse buildings approx. 20'-30' wide with elevated entrances</p>

		and stairs projecting forward of the building plane.
Entrances	A ground floor central entrance is located on the Liberty Street elevation. This elevation spans 111'-8". An elevated central entrance is located on Tattnall Street, which spans 99'-8".	Staff recommends approval. The central recessed entrances help to reduce the overall massing of the building and divide it into proportional bays. This configuration is similar to other historic apartment-type buildings in the historic district.
Building Height: Five-story maximum height zone. A crawl space or partial basement that is 4' or less above grade shall not count as a story. <u>Residential Buildings</u> : First floor shall not be less than 11'; each story above shall not be less than 10'.	The proposed building is 5-stories with a 3'-6" elevated basement level for underground parking. The overall building height is approx. 60' to the top of the parapet. A 36' deep by 31' wide portion of the building facing Tattnall Street is 4-stories tall for a height of 49'-6". Proposed floor heights: 3'-6" partial basement; 11' first floor; 10'-6" 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th and 5 th floors with a 4' parapet and finials above.	Staff recommends approval. The applicant has reduced the overall height from 65' to 60' by reducing the floor-to-floor heights from a 4' basement, 13' first floor, 11' 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th and 5 th floors, and 4' parapet and eliminating the finials above the bay windows as staff previously recommended. In addition, the four-story portion at the lane has been slightly increased in size. Neighboring historic buildings are approximately 24' to 42'-8" tall.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	The building is divided into bays by groupings of windows, projecting bay windows, and use of balconies of approximately 17' to 24' wide. A flat roof with a parapet is proposed. The widest continuous wall plane is 34'. Varying heights are incorporated into the Tattnall Street Elevation of 4 and 5 stories. Decorative parapets and changes in the cornice create small variations in height along Liberty Street.	Staff recommends approval. The petitioner has explored a wider window bay to meet the standard as staff previously recommended. Staff recommends approval. The petitioner has eliminated the balcony rail at the parapet in the center of the Liberty Street elevation creating a greater height differentiation as previously recommended by staff. In addition, the bays have been more equally divided on the Liberty and Tattnall elevations to create narrower bay divisions similar to historic building lines within the ward of 30'.
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade	Liberty: The 111'-8" wide 60' tall building is divided into three distinct bays with a 26'-8" wide central recessed	Staff recommends approval. Historic buildings within Pulaski Ward are generally divided into units of 20' to 30'

	<p>entrance and balconies above. The bays on either side are 42'-6" wide with projecting bay windows in the center.</p> <p>Tattnall: The 99'-8" wide 49' to 60' tall façade is also divided into three bays with a 31'-8" wide central recessed entrance. The bays on either side are 34' wide.</p>	<p>in width and are up to 4-stories in height. As per staff's previous recommendation, the petitioner has created wider central bays and narrower side bays in order to relate to the historic division of building widths within the ward.</p>
<p>Proportion of Openings</p>	<p>Entrances: The ground floor entrance opening on Liberty Street is approx. 11' wide and extends 16'. The opening on Tattnall St. is approx. 12' wide and 18' tall.</p> <p>Window openings are both paired and independent of one another with a 3:6 ratio of width to height. Those on the ground floor feature transoms, creating a taller window. Projecting bays within the side bays on both facades contain paired multi-paned windows with a 4:7 ratio.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The applicant has increased the Tattnall Street entrance opening as previously recommended.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval of the typical opening size and bay windows. The elongated ground floor openings are a good transition to the upper floors. The recessed balconies on Liberty Street have reconfigured to feature openings with central balconies.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids to Voids</p>	<p>There is approximately 5' or less of solid between window openings on primary facades</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The use of window openings and projecting bay windows divides the facades into bays and helps reduce the overall mass.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street</p>	<p>The proposed building maintains approx. 18' of open space between it and the historic structure to the east. The neighboring 3.5-story historic duplex fronts Liberty Street and maintains a 0' front yard setback with an entrance porch encroaching on the sidewalk. The building across the lane is a two-story carriage house that is setback from the sidewalk. The proposed building steps down in height to four-stories at the lane.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Historically, buildings within the ward were adjacent to one another with small amounts of open space between the structures, which typically maintained a courtyard in the rear and a carriage house beyond.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies</p>	<p>Entrances are within a central bay on both the Liberty and Tattnall St. facades. Each are</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The petitioner has created a larger recessed entrance, as</p>

	<p>recessed about 4' to 12'. The Tattnall Street façade features a raised entrance with stairs projecting forward of the building plane. The Liberty Street façade entrance is accessed at grade.</p> <p>Residential units above feature balconies and bay window projections. They project approx. 3' and are approx. 8' and 12' wide. Four-story bay windows project approx. 2' from the face of the building.</p>	<p>previously recommended to help break up the façade and be more typical of historic U-shaped apartment/condominium buildings of this size.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval. The bay windows now project 2' from the face of the building; previously projected 1'.</p>
<p>Walls of Continuity</p>	<p>Setbacks along the street are consistent with neighboring historic structures. A partial coping wall has been incorporated into the Liberty Street elevation at the recessed</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Verify treatment of electric meters along Liberty Street.</p>
	<p>entry to create a wall of continuity at the street. A brick fence is indicated on the site plan on the east and south sides of the property to provide privacy to the owners and screen the trash from the lane.</p>	
<p>Scale</p>	<p>The scale of surrounding historic buildings is of 2 to 3.5 story residences. They are typically 20' to 30' wide, both paired and individual buildings.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The scale of the proposed building is much larger than the surrounding historic buildings. Non-historic buildings, like the Civic Center and Liberty Street parking garage, have changed the scale of the area by their height and footprint size. The building should look toward historic precedent for large structures in the area. Typically, apartment/condominium buildings within the historic district featured a U-Shaped plan to help break up the mass of the building at the street and provide an interior semi-private courtyard for the residents.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

1. **Approval for demolition of the non-historic commercial building;**
2. **Approval for Part I, Height and Mass, as amended.**

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay and Mr. Bennett's attorney Jonathan Hart were present. He said there was no demolition of historic structures involved in the project and there was no violation of the Oglethorpe Plan or encroachment onto any public right-of-way. There were no variances needed or requested from the Historic District Zoning Ordinance standards, and all comments from the Preservation Staff had been addressed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Dolly Chisholm (Representing the Beehive Foundation and Gary Arthur, Resident) stated that at the November meeting the Board voted against the petition because it was incompatible with the neighborhood structures. She read the highlights of what Mr. Arthur stated at the November meeting, which were:

"The starting point, we believe, when making decisions about new development in the Historic District is in acknowledging that we have been bequeathed the most unique town plan with its small squares and houses, and buildings two stories, three, and three and one-half stories designed on a very human scale. That is what we treasure and what the world treasures when they discover and visit us. The proper frame of reference is the historical buildings in the district, in that neighborhood, and newer buildings that have followed historical precedent. In particular, those immediately contiguous to the site Mr. Shay is hoping to develop."

She displayed some photographs of the neighborhood on Harris Street, which showed the size of the neighboring two- and three-story houses in the district. She showed a depiction of a house located directly behind the proposed building in comparison to the mass of the five-story proposed building. She quoted Ms. Ward as stating most buildings in the surrounding neighborhood are 24 to 42 feet, the proposed was 60 feet and was large and out-of-scale.

She continued reading, "Whatever we do when we plan new buildings, we must remember first what the treasure is, that we are charged to protect and be good stewards of. The standards you apply have as their intent and purpose, this desired end to be respectful of this wonderful place, the largest designated landmark in the nation, to do it no harm, only to compliment it, the treasure. While five stories are permitted on the height map, on this particular site and with this particular context, we strongly feel that a five-story building is visually incompatible. It will dwarf, as you can see, existing structures around it. It should be a four-story structure to mitigate the towering surroundings."

She stated it would dwarf the residential structures behind it.

She continued, "In conclusion, we appeal to you to exercise your authority laid out in Section 8-3029(k) of the Zoning Ordinance standards, with respect to Height and Visual Compatibility. It reads, ""The height of proposed structures should be visually compatible with adjacent structures.""

Mr. Bill Steube (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated that approval of the proposed project should be denied as to Height and Mass, since it did not conform to the rhythm of other historic structures in the ward. Historically, buildings within the ward were adjacent to one another with small amounts of open space between the structures, with a courtyard in the rear, and a subsidiary carriage house beyond. He stated that the massive block of this project does not conform to the standard.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the ARC of the HSF felt the Design Standards for Visual Compatibility say, "Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories." Although this structure is one large mass, the ARC would propose that it violates the spirit of this ordinance, because the building on the lane should be subsidiary to the structures fronting the main streets. This building should step down to two stories across the entire elevation of the lane to be in keeping with the other ancillary structures on the lane. This building should look more toward historic precedent for large structures in the area, and not toward the non-historic buildings, like the Civic Center and the parking garage. The precedent being buildings adjacent to one another with a courtyard and a carriage house. This structure is close to 20 feet taller than any of the neighboring historic structures on the Tattall Street elevation. Should you approve this project, the ARC would suggest relocating the five-story stairwell so that the Tattall elevation reads as four stories. With the mass of the stairwell behind the roof-top garden, the step down is lost."

Ms. Mary Zipser (206 East Gaston Street) stated she concurred with what was said, the building was ridiculously big for the space, and it should not be approved.

Mr. Adam Davis (SCAD Student) stated the idea of a building following the structure of the Derenne seemed fitting for the area. The height would fit better considering the buildings along Liberty Street. Being a four-story building would make more sense regarding spatial compatibility, with the building on the left-hand side. The surrounding area has grown larger, and following the large sizes of new buildings, it would not help with the problems Savannah was experiencing with new buildings that follow the larger footprints. The development makes sense with consideration of the growing population. He suggested four stories might not be cost efficient for the people who were building it, but it would be more functional for the residents.

Ms. Kellie Sowell (210 West Harris) stated she was in agreement with the others that the building should be four stories. She was not thrilled they were condominiums, the overall design was good, but the massing and the size should be considered.

Mr. James B. Blackburn, Sr. (City Attorney) stated the issue has arisen, regarding the height. He stated that the place for the public in reference to the height was in the legislative chamber when the height map was adopted. The adopted height map, the ordinance, and rules the Board follow state that the height map controls. The burden is on the property owner to design the building within the guidelines and under the height limitations. He cited a comment from the minutes of an earlier meeting which states that if you chop off a floor, the building would be compatible. He thought it was beyond the Board's discretion, and gave his legal opinion that the Board consider the project within the height limitations as stated in the ordinance, which is controlling. Although the Board did have some discretion in compatibility, that must be an exercise in judicial discretion, and not a personal thought or whim of disliking the ordinance. The ordinance says five stories, and Staff had stated it met all the guidelines. He gave the opinion notwithstanding the thoughts of some that might like the idea that a story could be chopped off. The Board could not do it because it was beyond their ability and legal charge. Even though the compatibility decisions in the ordinance were stated as not being appealable, no decision made by a public body is absolutely non-appealable, and it can be litigated. He said the Board had to act within their discretion. Any one in an open forum can give an opinion, but the Board is a government of laws, and the Board has to abide by that.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated Mr. Blackburn was correct about the public discussion about the Height Map when it was amended. When it was put into law, what they looked at as a map, they did not expect to get 6(a), which states, “New construction or additions to existing structures shall be within the height limits shown on the Historic District Height Map. He said he had no idea that the City Attorney or the City’s position would be if the height map said six, then you would absolutely be entitled to a six-story building. Everyone on the Committee felt it was the map and the absolute maximum, but the other visual compatibility factors were still in place. The Board still had the right and obligation to look at the compatibility factors, and to make sure that buildings are compatible. It did not do away with subsection “j”, Scale of a Building which states, “The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies and additions, shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.” Even though there is a new “a” that says you’re allowed to build up to the height map limitation, the Board still had the responsibility to look at the scale of the building. He said they were not asking the Board to chop off a floor, but to modify the form of Height and Mass Part I, and to see how the form could be designed to respect the scale of surrounding buildings. He did not see a conflict with the Board requiring the building to be stepped-down in certain sections as it approaches other buildings. The building was almost twice the size of the adjacent buildings, he asked the Board to look at it, and asked the designers to think about it. The building will be there a long time, and they understand there was a lot of development pressure from Council, for the Board to approve everything that comes before it, but it was a big mistake that we’ll be sorry for very soon.

Mr. Blackburn stated if Mr. McDonald cited the ordinance, he should cite the section adopting the map. Section 1 under Height in the ordinance states, “Maximum heights on the height map shall be permitted, and it did not say may chop off a floor. Once that’s done, the compatibility factors were considered with the conditions that were set in the ordinance. One of them was not the height. The property owner is allowed the height because Council adopted a map that stated within a certain area, you build to a certain height. He pointed that out as a matter of law.

Ms. Chastity Malloy (SCAD Student) stated she agreed the structure was too large. She said underground parking was mentioned on the proposed site, and asked where the entrance to the parking would be. There would be a parking problem with the number of residences the condominium would hold at its current size, in addition to the residents who already live there.

Mr. Steffen stated one of the ongoing frustrations of the Board was that parking issues were not the Board’s purview. They were aware of the fact that when undeveloped sites become developed, there would be more cars that need to park, but there was nothing the Board could do about it under their guidelines. It was an issue for the City to solve, he appreciated the comment, but the Board could not take it into consideration.

Ms. Kelly Sowell asked about the entrance in the design aspect, and how it was a part of the building.

Mr. Shay stated there was an entrance to the parking area because it was underground, and you cannot see the full height of the garage door because of a ramp that goes down. It faces the lane, and there was one parking space for every apartment located in the underground garage. He said he had to take issue with the statements made about what was presented to City Council and what was presented in the hearings with the height map. He was on the Committee and it was explicitly presented that the height map would be the height map, and it would be permitted. There was no misunderstanding. When he spoke at City Council as an architect, it was what he talked about. It was in the record and minutes of the adoption of the ordinance. If they were going to change the height map, the height map would be the governing factor. There would be an opportunity for variances for additional height, but the hope was

there would not be the need for many variances to be requested. The height map was presented to the public through the MPC and the website as being the controlling factor.

Mr. Steffen stated he would address the issue of the height map for the sake of the SCAD students. He said when he took a Physics class before he became an attorney, he learned about the word mass. He thought the word mass meant all the dimensions of an object including the height of an object. The guidelines and ordinances deal with height and mass as two separate issues and concepts, and that was how the statute was drawn up, whether right or wrong. The discussion over what the height map meant was discussed by the City prior to the original adoption in February 1997, and was amended in October 2003. Mr. Shay was correct in stating there was much discussion over what height meant and what it would mean under the particular section. He said he looked at the minutes, and it was clear to him that the intent of the guidelines was to allow heights up to the maximum height under any application, and to treat it completely separately from the issue of mass. What something means when written down was why there were courts, and sometimes what people mean to say is not what they say. He understood there were sections that seemed to be contradictory within the ordinances. It would never be resolved with the Board, but unfortunately resolved through the court system, and determined whether or not the City intended to say that the height map meant the height map, and it was absolute. It was clear to him the intent of the City was to create a height map that was absolute, and when people wanted to object to particular locations, the time to do it was when the ordinance was adopted. Whether people did it or not was not clear from the minutes. He said Mr. Blackburn was present to give advice as the Board's attorney. The Board was not obligated to accept the advice, but they should take it very seriously. He would not instruct the Board as Chair, or the attorney to tell them Mr. Blackburn was right or wrong, but only to take what he said seriously in the sense that he had done the research as well and came to his conclusion. He would say the issue would eventually be decided by the courts because somewhere along the line someone would object to the Board's decision, file a lawsuit, and the whole body of laws that were adopted, whether or not City Council specified what they intended to do, which was to say the height maps were to be followed, and they mean what they say. He realized as a non-architect and non-attorney it was counterintuitive because he could understand it when someone talked about massing, and comparing massing from one neighborhood to another, that height should be considered when looking at mass. It was not what the ordinance says. The ordinance says height and mass were two separate considerations, and that was what he believed the ordinance was doing before this issue came about. Unfortunately, this issue may come back again on another project, he was not inviting anyone to go to court, but the best would be for interested parties to get together, look back at the ordinances, and see if they can be made clearer. What was clear was the legislative intent to create a height map that meant what it said, despite the fact there were provisions in the other ordinances which seemed to be contrary.

He asked that a motion be made on demolition because there was no dispute over the demolition. These were two separate issues, and he asked that when a petition comes forward that asks for demolition and height and mass approval in the future, that they be voted on separately because there were two separate statutory guidelines for demolition regarding whether they were appealed or not.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the demolition as presented. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Dr. Caplan stated he wanted to give a historical perspective of the founding of the City of Savannah for the SCAD students. He said Oglethorpe's original charter stated there were certain things not allowed. One of the things not allowed were lawyers, and he brings it up because they were faced with a dilemma on the Board with virtually every project they receive

for condominiums or multi-family items. This was a real distinct change from what they have had in the past. He said the Historic District did not have a lot of large units. Land and housing was at a premium, and just about everything the Board received has now become a multi-family unit or a mixed-use structure. It was a dilemma for him and some members of the Board. The Board had received criticism in the past, but they were operating as well as they could within the guidelines that were given by the attorneys who were present as a matter of necessity, not according to what Oglethorpe said.

Mr. Neely stated he did not like the idea that if it was five stories, it had to be five full stories over the entire site. He could recognize and appreciate the developer and the lawyers who would say if it was five stories, it had to be five stories. At the same time, there should be some allowance for the compatibility standards to balance out the legal question if it could be a full five. There could be some concession on the rear and sides of the building in stepping down to relate more to the lower buildings on the sides. They don't have the choice because the developer had not presented it as an option, and the Staff and City Attorney's recommendation was if it was five stories, it could be five stories throughout the entire site. They don't have an option or room for a nuance and it's a disappointment about the process. He said he thinks of the Derenne when he thinks of Liberty Street, in that tall buildings were appropriate along Liberty Street because it was wider. It pulls him in the direction of allowing a larger building. Looking at the smaller buildings behind the structure, there needed to be some kind of concession, but he did not have that choice. It appeared to be all or nothing, and he did not like that choice. He believed it should be five stories on the Liberty Street façade, and four or three on the rear, but it was not an option for the Board to vote on. He wished the ordinance would be modified to allow the Board a choice like that, but the lawyers stated it was not set up that way.

Mr. Steffen stated the lawyers on the Council and the attorneys that have been giving the Board advice, do so on behalf of their clients. When the City put together the height map, he did not know what the political concerns were, but he could guarantee the lawyers wrote it to try to satisfy those who they were asked to create the ordinance for, which should be the public. As the hearings progress with talk of long-term planning, the people that show up at the meetings do not tend to be the public. When he read the history, it was clear that it was the intent of those who put the legislation together, and it was the lawyer's responsibility to try to draw it right. The idea was probably generated some distance from that.

Mr. Johnson asked if there was an appeal process on the matter. He said the law of the ordinance stated it could be five stories. He agreed it did not look good on the back, but on the front of Liberty Street, it would look good.

Mr. Steffen stated any decision by any public body was potentially subject to appeal somewhere. The issue that Mr. Neely raised, he did not know the answer to that issue, but he just knew what the intent was. Whether or not you read the whole set of ordinances together, whether it leaves any discretion for saying it meant the entire structure or it meant parts of the structure, for it to go to that height. He knew the legislative history says the belief of the people who put the legislation together believed it meant the whole structure. Whether or not it would be the way a court would look at it, he did not know.

Dr. Caplan asked if Mr. Blackburn had an opinion.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Blackburn wanted to address the issue Mr. Neely raised as to whether or not the allowance of the maximum height means the entire structure, or whether or not the Board had discretion to certain parts of the structure.

Mr. Blackburn stated the height map created districts. Within a certain district, certain heights were allowed. The architectural significance and meaning of the windows and various things in the guidelines that were professionally done by consultants in the Chadbourne reports were input. In the final analysis, the Board at this time, the Planning Commission Staff, and the Planning Commission made the recommendations of the wording. Unfortunately, they came from the professional staff of MPC. The answer was the map was done by districts, and within the district, that was the height. The guidelines treat the looks of the building, but the property owner had the right to the height.

Mr. Steffen stated the Staff's recommendation of the approval of height and mass as amended, would include all of the five amendments made on the project, since it was originally presented to the Board in November. The Board's option was to approve or deny it.

Dr. Caplan asked if Mr. Shay could speak.

Mr. Shay stated that the building does step away from the property line, and it steps down to four stories on the two most prominent corners of the building that could be viewed. He did not think it was fair to characterize it as being all five stories high. They have done as much as they could, worked with professional staff to make sure it was done in the best way, and still have a building that was functional and met the other codes. It was not entirely five stories, and it did step back both in plan and elevation on the sides closest to the adjacent historic structures.

Mr. Neely asked if it was on the rear and the east side.

Mr. Shay stated the most visible side steps down four stories and one side steps back from the lane by ten feet. It steps down even though there was not an adjacent structure. He said there was a lot of effort going into it to break up the massing and to make it more reflective of the size of the buildings in the neighborhood. It would not be fair to just say it was a five-story building that was massing out.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Johnson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. Mr. Johnson, Mr. Neely, and Dr. Caplan voted for the petition. Ms. Seiler was opposed, Mr. Gay abstained, Mr. Meyerhoff recused, and Mr. Steffen did not vote. The motion passed by a vote of 5 to 1.

Mr. Blackburn introduced Mr. Peter Giusti, the new Assistant City Attorney.

Mr. Giusti stated he appreciated all the commentaries and opinions on the views of the legal profession, and he hoped to live up to and surpass all of the opinions.

Dr. Caplan thanked Mr. Blackburn and his staff for being present and for their help.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik E. Puljung
H-06-3733-2
212 Houston Street
New Construction**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik Puljung.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details, of a four-story multi-family dwelling. The applicant received Part I, Height and Mass, approval December 13, 2006, with the conditions that the floor-to-floor heights not exceed the minimum standard, more horizontal elements be explored on the façade, and restudy the basement level entrance. All of these items have been addressed by the applicant. The overall height has been modified from the Part I approval to 45'-3" from 45'-8". Shutters and hip roofs on the porches have been incorporated which help to break up the mass of the building and the garden level entrance has been changed from a panel door to a metal gate.

FINDINGS:

The following Part II Design Standards (Section 8-3030) Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p>Windows and Doors: Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. Double glazed windows are permitted on new construction provided the muntin is no wider than 7/8", muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing, lower sash rail is wider than the meeting and top rails, and extrusions be covered with molding. Centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically...shall be rectangular with a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3...shall be wood or wood clad.</p> <p>Garage openings shall not exceed 12' in width.</p>	<p>Windows: Two-over-two, Weather Shield, aluminum clad wood, double-hung sash, with 7/8" simulated divided lites with putty profile and spacer bar.</p> <p>Exterior Doors: painted wood and glass doors. Steel bar gate at garden level entrance.</p> <p>Garage Doors: overhead insulated metal doors with smooth finish. 9' wide by 7' tall recessed 8" between masonry piers.</p>	<p>The standard is met. These windows have been previously approved in the district and have proven to be visually compatible.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval.</p> <p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Shutters: shall be hinged and operable, and sized to fit the window opening. The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the meeting rail of the window.</p>	<p>Shutters: PVC composite Atlantic Shutter Systems raised Panel Shutter in the Charleston Pattern with 'S' shaped holdbacks.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The Atlantic Shutter has been previously approved in the district in the louvered pattern (Manchester).</p>
<p>Roofs: Pitched roofs parallel to the street with less than 4:12 pitch shall have an overhang and be bracketed or otherwise projecting eave detail, or be screened from the street by a parapet wall. Roofs visible from the street shall be covered with</p>	<p>Hip roof for main building, stoop, and verandah, with a 2:12 pitch surfaced in asphalt roll roofing.</p>	<p>Staff recommends incorporating a bracket or eave detail on the main roof to meet the standard. Provide material and color of roofing to Staff.</p>

<p>standing seam metal, slate, tile, or asphalt shingles.</p>		
<p>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches: Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate, or other material as approved by the board. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding...capital shall extend outward of porch architrave. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and distances between balusters shall not exceed 4".</p>	<p>A three-bay front high stoop on the west and three-story four-bay verandah on the north are proposed. Both feature 6" square KDT engineered wood column chamfered above the baluster with capital and base. The baluster is comprised of a 4 by 6 top rail and 2 by 6 bottom rail with 2" square pickets, 5" on center. Stair treads and risers are KDT, painted.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval upon discussion of KDT engineered wood material.</p>
<p>Fences: Walls and fences shall not extend beyond the façade of the front elevation...[and] shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building.</p>	<p>A 6' tall wooden fence is proposed on the north with a 3' wide wooden gate all comprised of 1" by 6" vertical boards.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the fence to be painted to match the building.</p>
<p>Materials: Residential exterior walls shall be finished in brick, wood, or true stucco. Where wood siding has been determined to be appropriate, smooth finish fiber cement siding may be used on new residential construction.</p>	<p>Sand finish masonry stucco over a CMU wall is proposed for the base with smooth finish Hardi-Plank lap siding with a 4.5" exposure above.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Both wood frame and masonry residences exist throughout Crawford Ward.</p>
<p>Color</p>	<p>Stucco Base: Benjamin Moore AC-32 (Pismo Dunes) Siding: BM AC-31 (Hot Spring Stones) Windows and Trim: Weather Shield Alabaster (WSPO8) Shutters, Doors, Floors: BM HC-64 (Townsend Harbor Brown) Porch Ceiling: BM HC-150 Yarmouth Blue</p>	<p>Staff recommends a greater variation in the stucco base and siding color to differentiate the two elements and break up the verticality of the façade.</p>
<p>Utilities: Meter boxes shall be located on secondary and rear facades and shall be minimally visible from view. HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way. Refuse storage</p>	<p>HVAC Condenser units are located east and south of the building, setback behind a wood fence. The electrical meters are located on the east façade at the lane. Trash containers will also be located</p>	<p>Staff recommends placing the trash containers behind the fence to the east.</p>

<p>areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.</p>	<p>within a recessed area fronting the lane.</p>	
---	--	--

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the following conditions to be brought back to Staff for final approval:

1. Incorporate brackets or projecting detail within eaves.
2. Provide roof material and color to Staff.
3. Fence to be painted to match the building.
4. Greater variation in stucco and siding colors.
5. Place trash containers behind fence at lane.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Erik Puljung stated that the KDT notation on the columns was Kiln-dried treated, which was a pressure treated wood that has been kiln-dried so it doesn’t shrink or twist. The columns were made of full two-by material and laminated together with a hollow center to run the tie-down material through it. The roofing material had limited color selections, and they would submit the final selection to Staff. The overhang with the brackets that were requested he did not notice; the lower pitch roof was part of the guidelines or the ordinance. The overhang of the building was designed to fit into the simple Crawford Ward, and he felt they had done a good job with detailing the bead board soffit, the bed mold, and the square four sided material at the cornice. The low-pitch roof was used to minimize the height of the building. They weren’t trying to create an Italianate building, or something that would call for brackets through its design. He asked the Board to consider the overhang as submitted instead of trying to dress up a building that was intended to be simple. He would reconsider the color of the base and submit a new one, because once they considered the foundation color, they would have to look at the fence color. He spoke with the owner regarding the trash containers behind the fence on the lane, and they could probably incorporate it as part of the homeowners association covenants where the residents should keep their trash can behind the gate.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they seconded the recommendations of the Preservation Officer. He said the petitioner stated he designed a simple four-bay building, but on the parlor level there was an entry with three doors. There was a five-bay building on the parlor floor, a four-bay building on the second floor, and a four-bay building on the third floor. They want to see it broken up into either two doors to reflect the bay spacing, or a set of double doors that would set in the center that would still be four units across rather than the five-bay rhythm. He would have to change the floor plan to make it work, one double-door would provide more security because people would have an outside door between them and the public, and it would look more like a traditional double-house or single-family house rather than a condominium or apartment building.

Mr. Puljung stated the three doors were used to provide private entry into two of the units, and for convenience, to avoid going through common spaces. They did not feel it was that dissimilar from other entries in the ward because there were other buildings that have multiple entries and were multi-family units. He could not say they were historic entries, but probably modifications through time. They tried to minimize it to three versus four with a common staircase.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Seiler stated she agreed with the architect that if she wanted to buy a unit, she would want a separate entrance and did not find the three doors offensive. She wanted to know if the Preservation Officer could find some flexibility with the brackets and the detail.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the colors coming back to Staff for final approval. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Amended Petition of J. Steve Day
 H-06-3747-2
 210 – 216 West Gwinnett Street
 New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, Part
 II Design Details

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with clarifications.

Present for the petition was Mr. Steve Day.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design approval for two new condominium buildings at 210 - 216 West Gwinnett Street. It is proposed to build Building “A” first.

FINDINGS:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	A 0-lot line setback is proposed.	The previous apartment building on the site, oriented to Tattnall Street was built basically to the 0-lot line.
Dwelling Unit Type:	A residential high stoop dwelling unit type has been proposed.	See below
Street Elevation Type: A proposed building located on an east-west through street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.	High stoops are proposed.	High stoops on historic structures are not found in this block, however high stoops on historic structures do existing behind the property on Hall Street and on Barnard Street. High stoop new construction

		exists in the same block face and in the block face across Barnard Street.
Entrances: Should face the primary street or the same street that the majority of other historic buildings on the block face.	The entrances are to face Gwinnett Street.	This standard is met. The historic structure entrances face Gwinnett Street.
Building Height:	The proposed structures have a 10'-6" first story (9'-6" stoop), a 13' second story and a 13.5 third story (to eave). The over all height is 42'-4 1/2 "to the ridge.	The buildings are situated next to a two-story house. There are three story structures on Barnard and Hall and two new rows of three story structures on Gwinnett in the same block and adjacent block across Barnard Street.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	The applicant has revised his submission to achieve a more appropriate proportion of elements in the front façade relative to nearby historic properties.	
Proportion of Openings	The applicant has revised his previous submission from French doors to rectangular, vertically aligned double hung windows.	The window proportions and size are more compatible with historic precedent than those previously submitted.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	The applicant has altered his previous submission to reflect a six bay rhythm of openings.	The six-bay rhythms is compatible with nearby historic properties.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The buildings are sited consistent with the historic lot patterns in this block.	The rhythm of the structures on the street is compatible.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	The false balconies have been removed from the front façade. A double stoop is proposed which appears more compatible with the width of the proposed structure.	
Scale	The revised arrangement of the windows helps reduce the elements of scale to better reflect the surrounding structures.	

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards	N A	
Windows and Doors	The front doors are custom, raised wood panel doors with top and sidelights. Windows are Weathershield SDL in Craftsman Bronze color.	Staff met with the applicant. The top lights and sidelights are plain, not beveled. The windows have been approved previously by the Board for new construction.
Roof Shape	Hip, 3:12. Elk Prestige shingles "Sandalwood"	
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches	Building "A" has square posts and Building "B" has round posts. The stoop is 9'-6" tall.	The caps on the posts of Building "A" need to extend beyond the fascia. Staff has details if the applicant needs them. No dimensions given on the tread-to-riser ratio. Study if the run can be shortened by revising tread to riser ratio and still meet code.
Fences	Six-foot-high shadow box fence painted to match siding.	The fence appears compatible.
Overlay District Standards	NA	
Materials	Stair treads, Balcony, spindles handrails, newel posts, fences and gates _ Pressure treated wood. Siding and trim: Smooth finish Hardiplank.	Wood is a prominent material in this area.
Textures	Smooth HardiPlank	
Color	<p>Building "B": Three piece cornice painted Benjamin Moore HC69 Whitall Brown with black trim; siding: Benjamin Moore Sailcloth #77; Window trim: Black; Stoop posts: Sailcloth; stoop rail, steps, spindles, newel posts and rear balconies: Whitall Brown; Brick: Hanson Old Savannah" with La Farge Ivory mortar.</p> <p>Building "A": Three piece cornice painted Benjamin Moore #77 Sailcloth with Benjamin Moore HC157 Narraganset Green trim; siding: Benjamin Moore Annapolis Gray #70; Window trim: Narraganset Green; Stoop posts: Annapolis Gray; stoop rail, steps, spindles,</p>	

	<p>newel posts and rear balconies: Sailcloth; Brick: Hanson “Kensington” with La Farge Ivory mortar.</p> <p>Metal gates: Black</p>	
<p>HVAC/trash</p>	<p>There is a gated enclosure for the trash cans along Tattnell Street at the rear of Building “A” The HVAC will be in a fences area between patios on the rear side of the buildings.</p>	

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval as submitted pending clarifications.

Mr. Neely stated the front façade below the stoops looked odd to him.

Ms. Reiter stated it was recessed. On the ground floor level, you would enter under the stoop and enter a recessed area to go right or left into the apartments. The wall he saw was at the rear of the recess.

Mr. Neely asked if Staff was comfortable with the way it looked on the façade.

Ms. Reiter stated she thought the petitioner would eventually come back for a gate.

Dr. Caplan stated frequently there was a metal gate in that location, and that this looked bare.

Ms. Seiler stated on Drawing 7, you could see the bricks in the background, but she agreed with Mr. Neely that she did not care for it. From a security standpoint, it was not a good idea.

Ms. Reiter stated a gate would be amenable, but it was up to the petitioner.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Steve Day stated the first building of construction was Building B. He said he understood where security was concerned, and would look seriously at putting in a gate. It would be a lit area, and the lighting would be controlled by the homeowners’ association rather than the individual condominium owner.

Ms. Seiler said she had lived on ground level and would have to sneak in and turn quick to look. She thought they should find a way to make it more secure.

Mr. Day stated there would be two gates that would lock, along with lighting, because they were concerned about security. He said the bottom of the buildings would be brick, and he wasn’t sure Staff mentioned it, but the color of the brick would be different on each building. They want to try to differentiate between them with the siding color, the brick, and porch posts. For the steps there will be a six and one-quarter-inch riser on the steps, but they could go to seven and one-half which stays within code, and it would give them two to two and one-half feet which draws those items in. There was concern about the steepness of the stairs, which is something that people were used to in downtown.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Joe Saseen thanked the petitioner for differentiating between the two buildings, and was wondering if they would do something with the lintels on one building to give it distinguishing features or colors.

Mr. Day stated the color would be different on the two buildings.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) commended the petitioner and stated it was a better application, but they had concerns about the entry doors and detailing. He said they had an easement on Building “B” to the east, and they had concerns about Building “A” because of the front door design with the casing. It was unclear about the construction and wanted to get it resolved for their easement. He would like to see the transom lights correspond, stated the light shouldn’t be over a vertical member, and said these were discrepancies in the drawings he would like for the petitioner to correct.

Mr. Day stated he did not know how the door looked. He said he would get with Mr. McDonald and Staff concerning the door and the lights to see if there were minor modifications that needed to be done to satisfaction.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Day would have an objection to the door and entry configuration coming back to Staff for approval.

Mr. Day answered no.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated since the door on the porch is for units, he thought by code it would have to open outward because it becomes a public door, and it needed to be considered.

Mr. Day stated it would have to be an oversized door about 42-inches-wide. The reason they did that was to make it more compatible to other properties along the street. Obviously, they would have to satisfy code as long as the Board and Staff understood.

Ms. Seiler stated with the doors coming back to Staff for approval, she asked if they were good on the other clarifications such as revisiting the gate.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted with the conditions that metal gates be placed below the entry stoops, the stoop portico column placement and entryway be restudied, and new drawings come back to Staff for final approval. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Amended Petition of Martha Reardon
H-06-3753-2
Southeast Corner of Alice & Jefferson
(457 Tattnall/223 West Alice Street)
New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, Part
II Design Detail

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Steve Conneff.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Detail approval for a three-story, two-unit residence at the southeast corner of Alice and Jefferson Streets.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	The house is proposed to be on the zero-lot line on the Jefferson and Alice Street sides. A one-foot setback is proposed on the eastern lot line. There is 11 feet altogether between the proposed house and adjacent home to the east.	The site plan has been corrected. The setbacks have been met.
Dwelling Unit Type	A five-bay-wide dwelling is proposed.	This is an isolated site with little historic residential context. It is adjacent to a four-bay raised stoop house. It will not have an adverse effect on the neighborhood.
Street Elevation Type	A high stoop is proposed.	The street elevation type appears compatible. It is adjacent to a high stoop.
Entrances	A central entrance is proposed facing Alice Street.	The entrance faces a principal street.
Building Height:	An overall height of 40'-2" is proposed. Floor-to-floor heights: 8', 11+' and 10+'.	It appears to be about 32 feet to the eave. While taller than the adjacent property, it appears to be compatible.
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade		The five-bay proportion and proportion of height to width appear in scale.
Proportion of Openings	Rectangular window openings are proposed. The parlor floor windows are longer than the second story windows.	The window openings are compatible.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	A five-bay-wide rhythm is proposed. There is a ground floor entry.	The window and door openings are vertically aligned.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The rhythms of the windows and stoops are similar to the existing house.	The rhythm of the structure on the street appears compatible.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	A stoop encroachment is proposed.	This appears compatible.
Scale		The elements of the design seem to be in scale with the overall height and mass.

Part II Design Details

Windows/Doors	Marvin 6/6 aluminum clad, insulated SDL windows are proposed. A single entry door with transom is proposed. nine-foot-wide “barn style” overhead garage doors.	Verify that there will be a spacer bar and the width of the muntins. Clarify whether door is solid or with glass panel and material.
Roof	A hip roof with 5:12 pitch is proposed. Owens Corning Oakridge Pro shadow Driftwood asphalt shingles. One-foot overhang with crown and bed mold.	The roof is compatible.
Stoop	Composite Columns by Hartmann-Sanders with Doric base and cap. Copper roof. Stucco piers at first floor. 1 1/16” cedar pickets with shaped handrailing.	The stoop is detailed correctly.
Fences	The rear service yard is under the rear deck and screened by pressure treated 1 by 6 board fence between the piers.	
Materials	Hardiplank siding	Verify that the siding will be smooth faced.
Colors	Stucco: Master Wall 616 Tan Perfect (Base of house and stoop piers) Siding: Behr 700D-4 Brown Teepee Cornice, window trim: Navajo White 362.	The colors are compatible.
Parking	Three off street parking spaces are provided under the house.	The parking requirements are met.
HVAC	HVAC meters and garbage located in screened service yard.	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the requested clarifications.

Mr. Steffen asked if Staff still wanted to verify the spacer bar width.

Ms. Reiter answered yes. She wanted to know if there was a spacer, the width of the muntin, whether the front door was solid or had a glass panel, and if the siding would be smooth-faced.

Dr. Caplan stated on the second bay on the ground floor there was a door with an unusual appearance in its location, although it didn’t have to be symmetric to the other side. He asked if Staff found it objectionable and if the door should be in the middle or on the end.

Ms. Reiter stated it could be either opening because it was opening into a ground floor living room.

Dr. Caplan stated it was unusual to have the asymmetric appearance, and did not know if anyone else objected.

Mr. Gay agreed.

Dr. Johnson stated the floor plan dictated that it be there.

Mr. Gay asked if they could put the door on the side.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Steve Conneff stated he represented Ms. Reardon. He stated the door could go either way. He said it was a large room that you walk into. It could not be opened to the middle because it would open into the garage. He said it could be moved to the end.

Mr. Steffen stated there were four things the Preservation Officer ask be verified. He asked about the spacer bar and the width of the muntins.

Mr. Conneff stated there would be a spacer bar but he wasn't exactly sure what the muntin width would be. He said whatever was recommended.

Ms. Reiter stated it needed to be either three-quarters or seven-eighths.

Mr. Steffen said it might be a matter to come back to Staff to be confirmed. He asked if the door was solid or glass panel material.

Mr. Conneff stated it would be a solid door.

Mr. Steffen asked about the material.

Mr. Conneff stated it would most likely be a mahogany, solid, two-panel door.

Mr. Steffen asked if the siding would be smooth-faced.

Mr. Conneff answered yes.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated a pre-fabricated fireplace was shown on the west unit, and the fireplace would need a flue or venting. Although there was not a chimney, he wanted to make sure the west elevation did not have a vent show up.

Mr. Conneff stated it was proposed to be a ventless fireplace, and there was discussion with the client to remove it as far as her arrangement with the furniture.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if a motion was made, should there be any kind of venting proposed for the west elevation, and that it come back to Staff.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted with the conditions that the ground floor entry opening on Alice Street be moved to the eastern bay, and that any exterior venting proposed for the west elevation come back to Staff for final review and approval. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Deidrick W. Cody
H-07-3760-2
436 & 438 Price Street
Rehabilitation/Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Deidrick Cody.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations and additions as follows:

1. Repair or replace windows.
2. Repair or replace stoops.
3. Repair or replace siding.
4. Repair or replace cornice and brackets.
5. Repair or replace doors.
6. Repair or replace roof material.
7. Rebuild back porches and add second set of spiral stairs to match existing.

FINDINGS:

1. The windows are boarded up and their condition cannot be assessed. It is evident that one window on Gordon Street is missing. They are wood, true divided light 2/2 windows. Existing windows should be repaired, rather than replaced. Any replacement windows should match the existing in material, profile, etc.
2. The stoops shall be repaired in kind. The stoop canopies appear solid and should not be replaced. If it is absolutely necessary to replace a canopy it shall match the drawing (i.e., not a sloped roof). The picket railing detail submitted is not compatible. The drawing A101 does not indicate a bottom rail. The correct railing detail is a top and bottom rail that the square pickets dovetail into. (Not the side pieces to hold the pickets together as shown on the detail. This is an incorrect detail for a Victorian structure.)
3. Siding should be repaired rather than replaced as much as possible. The entire Gordon Street side was replaced with new siding without approval. Where wood siding is replaced it shall be replaced with wood.
4. Many of the cornice brackets are missing. Replacement brackets shall match the original in material and exact detail.
5. The doors are covered with plywood. Earlier photos indicated that they were wood, six raised panel doors. This is what should be repaired or replaced.
6. It is indicated on the drawings that the roof is standing seam metal. It should be repaired or replaced to match existing in height of seam and edge detailing.
7. The rear porches are new, however, there should be a bottom rail.
8. Please indicate location of HVAC units and how they will be screened.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the following conditions:

1. Existing 2/2 wood single-glazed double-hung windows should be repaired rather than replaced. If replaced, they should match existing in size, material, and configuration.
2. Stoops shall be repaired rather than replaced, and if elements are replaced, they shall match existing. The railing detail shall be revised to match traditional relationship between pickets and top and bottom railing.
3. Siding should be repaired rather than replaced, and if some is replaced, it shall match existing in material and dimensions.
4. All replacement brackets shall match existing in material and detail.
5. Doors shall be repaired or new solid wood six raised panel.
6. Standing seam roof shall be repaired or replaced to match existing in width of pan and height of seam.
7. Staff to be provided colors, placement, and screening of HVAC systems.
8. Any deviations from the stamped permit drawings and conditions shall be approved by Staff prior to execution.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated in addition to Staff's comments, the submittal did not have a site plan or floor plans. He said the site plan would tell where the proposed condensing units would be that must be with the building. The floor plan would tell whether the spiral staircases were secondary exits from the upstairs, and if they were, code would not permit secondary fire exits to be spiral. The site plan would also show whether or not the spiral staircases were visible from the street.

Ms. Reiter stated they were very visible from Gordon Street.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it was very incompatible with the neighborhood to have spiral staircases. He said it was an incomplete submission because it doesn't tell everything about what was going to happen. Staff had many conditions along with what he said, he thought the petition needed a continuance and the Board should receive a complete submittal, rather than having the Board vote on denying or approving what was presented.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Deidrick Cody stated he was the contractor and referred to the blueprint. He stated it was his interpretation that they were repairing the existing building as they bought it. He had a new shingle roof on it now, and as far as the lap siding they replaced, he said the whole side was dilapidated. They replaced it with the same one-by-six wood, flat siding which was what they pulled off. There was an existing spiral staircase and they were going to match it with one on the left side. There were four units in the building with two downstairs and two upstairs. There were two doors and they were trying to make it accessible on the rear of the building so one resident would not have to walk by the other resident's window to go downstairs.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated what he was referring to was without a floor plan or a site plan, the Board did not know the length of the building, and there were code regulations stating if there was a certain distance that could not be met for an exit on the second level, they would need two exits. The spiral staircase would be something to come back with because the Building Department would not approve it. The Board needed a site plan to tell what was visible from the street, whether the back yard would be enclosed, where the conditioning units were, and there was a lot that could be told from the site plan that they do not have.

Ms. Reiter stated the drawings show a standing seam roof, and the petitioner indicated it was asphalt shingles. She wanted to know if it was a condition when the building was purchased or if it was changed. She said the siding should be replaced only when it was rotten.

Mr. Cody stated the roof was as purchased. The architect drew it with a standing seam roof and he did not know why. He would have to discuss it with the architect and the homeowner, but it was an asphalt shingle roof because he had been on the roof and it was in good shape.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Cody was aware when they remove items from a historic building, that they need to get approval from the Board, even if it was dilapidated or not.

Mr. Cody stated they found out when they started replacing the siding. He received a call from Ms. Reiter, they stopped the work, and began the proper process.

Mr. Steffen stated one of the Board members indicated they did not believe the submission had all of the information needed. Ms. Reiter indicated there were a significant number of things that needed to be addressed before it was approved. He said that Mr. Cody could ask the Board to make a decision on it today, approve it, or deny it. They also had the right to ask for a continuance to next month's meeting, which would give them an opportunity to get the materials to Ms. Reiter and to meet Staff's requirements. The Board could not force them to ask for a continuance, but they would give them the opportunity.

Mr. Cody asked for a continuance, and stated they were given a list from Ms. Reiter. They thought the architect satisfied the list, and regarding the issue with the staircase, it was the only structure being changed in the building.

Mr. Steffen stated he was taking the request to continue, and encouraged them to spend time with Staff, so when they come back next month they could move forward.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to the March 14, 2007, meeting. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of James R. Higgins
H-07-3761-2
520 East Gwinnett Street
New Construction, Part I

The Preservation Officer recommends a continuance.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval for a new single-family residence.

FINDINGS:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	Three-foot side yard setbacks have been provided. The front is built to the 0-lot line with an encroaching stoop step.	The setback standards are met. A city encroachment permit is required for the stoop steps. Encroaching steps is typical of this block.
Dwelling Unit Type	Single-family residential	Both single and multi-family residences are found on this block. No floor plan for the attic was submitted. Clarify whether this is conditioned space.
Street Elevation Type: A proposed building on an east-west through street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type, fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.	Two and one-half story low stoop on a crawl space.	Low stoops over a crawl space are found in this block.
Entrances: On an east-west street the entrance should face the primary street.	The entrance faces the main street, Gwinnett Street.	This standard is met.
Building Height: The height map allows 2.5 stories at this location.	Based on the scale on the drawing, the crawl space is 24"; the first floor is approximately 10 feet and the second story is approximately 11 feet; the attic space appears to be approximately 9 feet to the ridge. The overall height appears to be about 31-32 feet, but it is not clear how that relates to the buildings on either side.	No dimensions are shown on the elevation. The floor-to-floor heights do not appear to meet the Historic District ordinance. No height and width relationships with the adjacent properties were shown as required under item 8 b of the application submittal criteria.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade		Due to the width of the lot, this appears to be a very tall and narrow structure. The comparison would help determine if it is compatible with the surrounding houses.
Proportion of Openings	The window openings do not appear to be drawn to an accurate scale.	
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	The rhythm of the openings includes a projecting three-sided bay and a recessed porch.	The rhythm of solids to voids appears compatible with the block face.
Rhythm of Structure on	It appears that the building	The rhythm of the structure

Street	covers 70 percent of the lot. Side yard setbacks are met.	on the street appears compatible. It is a narrow lot. It is not clear how the building aligns with those on either side because their footprints were not shown on the site plan.
Roof: Gable roof pitches shall be between 4:12 and 8:12. Gable and hip roofs in excess of 8:12 pitch are permitted only where a similar historic building roof pitch exists within the same block front.	A front facing gable roof with a pitch of 9:12 is proposed. Dormers are proposed in the roof.	The standard is not met. No justification given for the steep roof pitch. The dormers are incompatible in the size, shape and proportion.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	A recessed front porch is proposed. A two story shed rear porch is proposed.	The porches appear compatible with the block face. However, more detail is required in the Part II design submission.
Walls of Continuity	No fences are indicated.	
Scale	No comparison drawings were submitted in order to determine the scale in relation to adjacent properties.	

For Part II Design Detail review, much more detail is needed including a section of the porches; dimensions, materials and specifications for the windows. Staff recommends that the petitioner follow the checklist on the application in future submissions.

RECOMMENDATION:

Continuance to bring the Part I Height and Mass into compliance with the ordinance and submit the information required in the checklist. Part II Design Review details may be submitted at the same meeting.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue this petition to the March 14, 2007, meeting. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Barnard Architects
John Clegg
H-07-3762-2
534 – 538 East Gwinnett Street
New Construction of a Carriage House and
Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Will Smith.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a rehabilitation and addition to the building at 534 - 538 East Gwinnett Street, and for new construction of a carriage house at the rear. The two-story addition is 10' deep and 43'-8" wide proposed for the rear of the existing residence with a partial width two-story porch. The carriage house is also two-story with four garage door openings extending 45' at the lane and 23'-4" into the lot.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 534 - 538 East Gwinnett Street was constructed in 1914, and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density).

NOTE: The parcel is 5,477 square feet. With the proposed improvements, Staff calculated that the building footprint (not including the encroaching building), will cover approximately 78 percent of the parcel; however, dimensions were not provided. The applicant states that the 75 percent maximum is met and can be verified to the Zoning Administrator who reviews these standards. The applicant also states that the Zoning Administrator determined that only one off-street parking space for each new dwelling unit created was required, and the existing four-unit residence did not require any parking because it is existing.

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

Rehabilitation/Addition:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Additions shall be located to the rear, [and] shall be sited such that it is clearly as appendage and distinguishable from the main structure. Additions shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.	A two-story addition is proposed with a partial two-story porch on the rear. The addition is setback on the sides from the existing residence and is located under a separate hip roof.	The standard is met.
Additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material, and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features... designed to be reversible.	The building has suffered from deferred maintenance leaving the openings (especially on the rear) open and exposed to the elements. No character defining features exist on the rear.	The standard is met. The rear of the building will be mostly obscured from view by the construction of the proposed carriage house.
Exterior Walls	Painted wood or smooth Hardi-Plank siding is proposed for the addition. Repair and replacement of wood siding on the existing building will be in-kind.	The standards are met. Staff does not recommend the wholesale replacement of historic siding, which should be repaired where possible.
Windows:	Existing building: 2/2 Double-hung sash, wood windows with TDL, single glazing. Addition: wood, aluminum	Historic windows should be repaired when possible if any remain. The standards are met.

	clad Weathershield HR 175 windows, with 7/8" SDL and spacer bar.	These windows have been previously approved in the district.
Roof:	Replace existing metal roof with asphalt shingle roof. Eave and trim materials will be repaired/replaced in-kind to match existing.	Staff recommends in-kind repair or replacement of this material if visible from the public right-of-way.
Porches	Wood railings on existing front porches will be replaced in-kind with wood at 42" in height. Wood turned columns will be repaired or replaced to match the existing.	Staff recommends repairing the original turned columns if possible, otherwise they should go back to match the existing in dimension, material, and design.

Carriage House:

Part I Height and Mass		
Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIP- zone. New carriage houses may provide up to a 4' setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.	A 2' setback is proposed at the lane, 5' on the east and 4.9' on the west. The neighboring building to the west encroaches onto the property 1.9' creating 3' of open space between the existing structure and proposed.	The standard is met.
Street Elevation Type	Four-car, two-story carriage house with one dwelling unit above.	Staff recommends approval. The carriage house is to the rear of a semi-attached residence and a double carriage house would be appropriate.
Building Height: Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories	Two-story carriage house approximately 24' to the ridge of the roof. The main residence is approximately 33' tall.	The standard is met.
Proportion of Openings	Window openings fronting the lane are 2'-4" wide by 3'-4" tall and 2'-6" wide by 5' tall.	Staff recommends incorporating larger window openings on the lane elevation to balance the solid to void ratio.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	Non-historic frame residences line the lane. The carriage house is setback 2' from the lane to apron into the garage.	Staff recommends approval.
Scale	The carriage house is subordinate in height, scale, and mass to the main residence.	Staff recommends approval.

Part II Design Details		
Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors	Weathershield HR 175 wood clad windows with insulated glass and 7/8" simulated divided lights with spacer bars.	The standard is met. These windows have been previously approved in the historic district.
Windows and doors	8.5' wide metal overhead garage doors with flat panels painted to match doors elsewhere.	The standard is met. Verify front door on historic building.
Roof Shape	Hip roof with a 4:12 pitch surfaced in gray asphalt shingles.	The standards are met.
Materials	Painted wood or Hardi Plank siding with a smooth finish.	The standard is met.
Color	Siding: Devoe Paint, Luminescence (yellow) 1W23-3 Trim, Eaves: Devoe Paint, Cradle White 1W13-1 Doors and Garage doors: Devoe Paint, Shaded Moss 2C20-5 Roof: Charcoal Gray	Staff approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1) All historic fabric, including the roof, windows, siding, and porch columns be retained if possible.
- 2) Provide information on front doors (will they be retained or replaced).
- 3) Explore larger window openings on lane façade of carriage house.

Dr. Johnson asked about the parking floor of the carriage house. He said there were four units in the main house and one unit in the back.

Ms. Ward stated she did not get an official reading from the Zoning Administrator on it. She said they tried to make contact with them but they have not responded. The petitioner had conveyed they only needed to provide one space for the new unit, and the other units were pre-existing and did not require any spaces.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated they were still one short.

Ms. Ward stated the petitioner had said they only needed to provide one space. That the four units in the existing house did not need to have parking provided. It was not up to the Board, she tried to get clarification, but she agreed that it seemed extreme.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Steffen stated the Board did not have the purview of zoning as it related to the design and the building. It was indicated that someone had told Staff that the petitioner had been informed they did not need additional parking.

Mr. Will Smith stated he was told, and Mr. Clegg related to them in previous discussions that they needed to have one parking space, in which one of the parking spaces would be designated.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Smith knew whom Mr. Clegg spoke to.

Mr. Smith stated he was not certain but could find out.

Mr. Steffen encouraged Mr. Smith to speak with Mr. Clegg to make sure he had spoken with Tom Todaro, who was the person that made the parking decisions, to find out whether or not what he had been told was true. The last thing he wanted as an owner was for something nice to be built and not be able to get a certificate of occupancy because of parking.

Mr. Smith stated he would do that.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if they started construction prior to approval.

Mr. Smith stated they did what was approved with Staff's permission, which was to redo the piers. Both the east and west sides of the building were deteriorating, and when Frank Martin, the structural engineer looked at it, he felt it was a danger that both walls could fall onto the neighboring building.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if they started construction without coming before the Review Board.

Mr. Smith stated they did what they thought according to Mr. Martin's instructions and Staff's approval.

Mr. Steffen asked why Mr. Clegg was not here.

Mr. Smith stated he did not know. He wanted to be there

Mr. Steffen said it put the Board at a disadvantage to communicate what he thought were important things on a very historic property, and they were not communicating to the person who was doing the work and who had conversations with Staff. He said he was going to give Mr. Smith an option of having the petition voted on, or he had an option to ask for a continuance to allow time to work with Staff and come back next month.

Mr. Smith asked if the concern was parking.

Mr. Steffen stated no. His concern was there was work that took place without coming to the Board first. Secondly, there was a tremendous amount of historic materials on the property the Board does not want to see disappear. Thirdly, Staff asked for further information about the doors, exploring larger window openings on the façade of the carriage house, and things that only the owner could address.

Mr. Smith stated it was his understanding that Mr. Clegg had spoken to someone about the modification of the windows, and they would be using the front doors as they currently exist. The entire front of the building would be reused.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if they were satisfied with being able to work with the petitioner on what was left.

Ms. Ward stated they would need new drawings, and they should resubmit to Staff indicating what they were keeping, the openings, and the doors.

Mr. Steffen stated he was trying to gauge the level of cooperation that the owner was getting from the builder. He appreciated Mr. Smith being present and cooperative because as long as the Board was getting the level of cooperation that was appropriate, then he didn't mind it going back to Staff.

Ms. Ward stated Mr. Clegg verbally communicated that he was willing to investigate the new openings, but she had not seen them. She did not know if she saw them, if they would be compatible, but she was concerned about the amount of historic fabric that had been lost, and that it should clearly notate exactly what was going to be repaired and replaced. Everything but the front had already been removed, and they wanted to make sure they could retain as much of the front façade as possible. If the drawings were clear, they would be comfortable.

Ms. Seiler stated she was very uncomfortable that they don't have enough information.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if the Board was to vote on what they had, it would go into the record as approved or denied, and he was sure they don't have enough information. He strongly suggested that Mr. Smith ask for a continuance to get a set of documents as required, and have the questions addressed on them.

Mr. Smith stated it was his understanding in looking at the documents, that if the material could be preserved and reused that it would be.

Mr. Steffen stated that was correct, but what the Board was saying was that he agreed with the process that involved actually analyzing everything there, and having the builder communicate with Staff to tell them what he can and cannot save.

Ms. Seiler asked with what would he replace it.

Mr. Steffen stated that the decision Mr. Clegg made wasn't necessarily going to be the ultimate decision. Builders do not like to preserve the items, and Staff would like to make sure that everything that could be will be preserved. He agreed with the Board members that the petition was not ready to be decided.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated whatever they were going to do, the Board needed it documented and it was not documented at this point.

Mr. Steffen suggested that Mr. Smith have a serious discussion with Staff over what he could and could not save on the structure, to further address the front doors, and to address the issue of the window openings on the carriage house facade. In the meantime, he suggested the owner get verification from Zoning on the parking issue.

Mr. Smith stated it was his understanding that Mr. Clegg had done those things.

Mr. Steffen stated Mr. Clegg may have done some of them, but all of the work was not done yet, and asked if Mr. Smith concurred that the petition be continued.

Mr. Smith answered yes, if Staff had not heard from Mr. Clegg.

Ms. Ward asked if the work could stop on the exterior until it was approved.

Mr. Steffen stated he did not believe anyone should be doing any work until there is a Certificate of Appropriateness. There may be some inside work that could be done, but as far as the outside, it should not be done without a certificate. It was not negotiable.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Building Department needed to be notified as to what the Board was doing on the project.

Mr. Steffen stated it was up to Staff.

Mr. Neely asked if they should get a continuance, or if it should be brought to Staff.

Mr. Steffen stated the reason he suggested a continuance is because it sends a clear statement to the builder that there was a lot that Staff did not have yet, and these were big items and not details coming back.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the document the Board had was something that could not be voted on because of lack of information.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to the March 14, 2007, meeting. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Hutchinson left at 4:48 p.m.

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs
Donna Swanson
H-07-3764-2
22 West Broughton Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Louis Goodwin.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to install two principal use fascia signs on the building at 22 West Broughton Street as follows:

1. The signs will be located in the signable area centered above the entrances between the first and second floors.
2. The building maintains 30 linear feet along Broughton Street, and each storefront shares the same amount of frontage (approx. 15 feet).
3. The letters are wall mounted foam letters 2.5 feet tall spanning 8.6 feet (Copper Penny) and 6 feet (Shooz). The text "Copper Penny" is copper in color and the text for "Shooz" is black.

FINDINGS:

The historic building at 22 West Broughton Street was constructed ca. 1926, and is currently undergoing a complete renovation to restore the historic Mission Revival style façade. Historic photos indicate that original signs were in the same location as the proposed signs but surrounded by a stucco casing and tile work, indicative of the period and style. The property is zoned B-C-1 and the following standards from the Broughton Street Sign District Ordinance (Section 8-3119) apply:

(2)(c)1. One Principal use sign shall be permitted for each business establishment. One such sign may be mounted or erected as a fascia sign...The copy area shall not exceed 40 percent of the display area of a principal use sign.

The standard is met.

(2)(c)2.(ii) 1) For all principal uses occupying 125 or less linear feet of street frontage, fascia signs shall be permitted one square foot of display area per linear foot of frontage occupied by each principal use; provided, that a maximum sign area of 90 SF shall be permitted...

The standard is met. The individually mounted letters will result in less than 30SF. Rectangular signs with these proportions total 33.5 SF.

(2)(c)2.(ii) 3) The fascia sign shall be located along the signable area of the building façade, and not more than 40 percent of the display area shall be occupied by such sign copy.

The standard is met.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval as submitted.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the insets were to be reinstalled, would the signs fit in them.

Ms. Ward stated they would have to redesign something to fit. It may be less than three square feet if the letters were less than six-inches in height.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Board could not approve the signage until they could tell what they were going to do with the façade of the building.

Mr. Steffen stated Staff was asking the Board to send it back to Staff, and not to come back to the Board for a full hearing.

Ms. Ward stated that they recreate the sign bands as presented and let Staff know what they would put on the inside.

Dr. Caplan stated they did not have anyone to go around and check the projects as they were being done. He said it was supposed to be the mandate of the Inspection Department. The City Manager told the Board at the last retreat that the Inspection Department did this, and to give the Board information about any projects that were not in compliance. In the following month, there were two or three projects in that realm. He wanted to see some discussion with

the Inspections Department about following the plans that were submitted to them, and in making sure they were right.

Ms. Reiter stated the major problem was that the Inspection Department had four inspectors to cover the entire City of Savannah, and it had become evident they were not going to look at issues like this. She said Staff was trying to consider several options to bring to the City to see if they would entertain a dedicated inspector. The system was not working and an entire building was lost last week on Harris Street because of it. No one told Staff it was slowly disappearing. They were inspecting for footings, etc., while all of the pieces of the building was disappearing.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that the stucco sign bands be reinstated and the proposal be resubmitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Ramsay Sherrill Architects
Linda M. Ramsay
H-07-3765-2
505 Tattnall Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Ms. Linda Ramsay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for an addition to the rear of the building at 505 Tattnall Street. The addition is 15 feet wide, aligning with the rowhouse, and 7 feet 6-inches deep. It will be surfaced in stucco on the ground floor to match the existing rear wall with a porch on the second floor. Most of the first floor will be obscured from view by the existing eight-foot fence at the rear.

FINDINGS:

The masonry residence is part of a row of buildings constructed ca. 1920 for an African-American blacksmith named Mr. Blank. The backside of the row faces onto Jefferson Street. The proposed addition is similar in size to two additions that exist on the north and south ends of the row. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density) and the following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Building Lot Coverage: 75 percent maximum in RIP-A	Lot is 70' by 15' (1050 SF). The proposed footprint is 787.5 SF for a lot coverage of 75 percent.	The standard is met.
Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building...constructed with the least possible loss of	The addition is located on the rear and is subordinate to the main residence.	Staff recommends approval

<p>historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building...designed to be reversible...subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.</p>		
<p>Windows and doors: The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically. All windows facing a street...shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3” from the façade of a masonry building. In new residential construction, windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>Jeld-Wen double-hung windows and doors are proposed. Drawings indicate a fixed window on the rear elevation facing Jefferson Street.</p>	<p>Verify window material, design, and inset dimension. Staff recommends that the window on the second floor be taller than it is wide and that an attempt be made to align openings vertically. While the windows have been replaced, it is unclear if the existing openings are original. If so, an attempt to preserve these openings should be made.</p>
<p>Porches: wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed four inches... the height of the railing shall not exceed 36 inches.</p>	<p>Eight-inch by eight-inch chamfered wood columns are proposed with a capital and base. A three-foot’ tall wooden balustrade is proposed with two-inch turned balusters, four-inch on center. A shed roof surfaced in standing seam metal is proposed over the porch.</p>	<p>Clarify design of balusters. Staff recommends square balusters to correspond to the columns and this ca. 1920 building. Eliminate the three-foot wood posts in the center of the railing if possible.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the following to conditions to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval:

1. Verification of window material, design, and inset.
2. Restudy window alignment and proportion of openings. If openings are original, they should be retained if possible in some form.
3. Simplify balustrade on rear.

Mr. Steffen asked if the Board crafted a motion sending it back for verification of window alignment, material design and inset, and indicating that the balustrade would be simplified, would it meet the requirements.

Ms. Ward stated she was more concerned about creating a window that was more taller than wide.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Ms. Linda Ramsay agreed with Staff’s recommendations and would meet with Staff.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the conditions that the window material, design, and inset be verified, a restudy of the window alignment and proportions openings be done (if the openings are original they should be retained), and to simplify the balustrade on the rear, with these items coming back to Staff for final approval. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of R. K. Construction & Development
Dana Opperman
H-07-3768-2
217 West Broughton Street
Rehabilitation

The Preservation Officer recommends approval of exploratory demolition; continuance for final design details to staff.

Present for the petition was Mr. Ramsey Khalidi and Mr. Peter Kusek.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to restore the facades of two buildings 217 and 219 - 221 West Broughton Street. The initial work is the removal of the non-historic stucco façade added ca. 1970.

FINDINGS:

1. Based on the findings after exploratory demolition original material will be retained and repaired. Missing details will be interpreted and replaced.
2. It is proposed to recreate the black glass front per the attached historic photograph. Signage graphics will also follow the style of the historic signage.
3. The current awning will be replaced with a retractable canvas awning per the historic photograph.
4. Uncovered original historic windows will be restored or replaced in-kind.
5. In developing final plans and elevations, recessed storefront entries are required and are shown in the historic photographs.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval to do exploratory demolition. Final plans and elevations, materials, and signage to be brought to Staff for approval.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Ramsey Khalidi introduced his partner Mr. Peter Kusek, and said it was a very exciting project. He showed a profile of the building, and spoke of the evolution of the Sears building and its history, which was now American Apparel. He said in 1937 Sears moved to the building, and then moved to the mall in 1969. One of the major buildings built in 1946, was where the Sears location was in the interim. Belk took the store over and modified the façade. The exciting part about the building was that no one knew the original façade was underneath the Frozen Paradise façade, but it was quite a discovery. Occasionally, in preservation you discover it’s not just a great antique pine floor, mantel, or fireplace that wasn’t lost. He believed what was good about the façade was the granite. They did the Hogan building in 1984, and most of the softer brick was damaged. When you look at the interior, you see the window jams were in place, they were big palladian windows, and a wonderful vernacular building.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the exploratory demolition to include the removal of the non-historic added façade only. Final plans and elevations, materials, and signage to be brought to Staff for final approval. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

F. STAFF REVIEWS

1. Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3549(S)-2
Bay & Abercorn Streets
Amendment – Portico
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of Lisa Thompson
H-07-3758(S)-2
230 – 232 Bull Street
Fence
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Jan and Dan Frey
H-07-3759(S)-2
519 East Harris Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
4. Petition of Joe Steffen, Jr.
H-07-3757(S)-2
422 East Liberty Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
5. Petition of Coastal Heritage Society
Jeanne Fullam
H-07-3763(S)-2
604 West Jones Street
Fence
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson
H-07-3769(S)-2
3 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard
Existing Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

G. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes - December 13, 2006
Approval of Minutes – January 10, 2007

Dr. Caplan stated on the December 13th minutes on Page 24, second paragraph from the bottom it says the floors are 20 floors high and not 20 feet high. It needed to be changed from floors to feet.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the minutes as submitted with a correction being made on Page 24. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

H. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Signs for Minds
H-06-3704-2
24 East Broughton Street
Sign Approval on October 18, 2006

Ms. Ward stated the petitioner came before the Board, and the Board approved it with a specific condition that the base be painted to match the brick behind. They came into Ms. Ward's office the next day and said they did not want to match it and weren't going to match it, and they did not. She said Staff did not have a problem with how it looked aesthetically, but they wanted to make a notation in the file on how they should proceed.

Ms. Seiler asked if everyone did what the petitioner did, then the Board would have a big problem.

Ms. Ward stated that was why she brought it forward. They came into her office and said they were not going to do it, and it was not an oversight.

Ms. Seiler asked what Staff would normally do as the next step.

Mr. Steffen suggested that the petitioner come before the Board next month to explain themselves, and not just tell Staff they can do whatever they want.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the continuation of this petition to the March 14, 2007, meeting. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. Ms. Mary Mims Roberts
H-05-3515-2
314-318 West Taylor Street
Request for a one-year extension of approval for new construction
The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Ms. Reiter stated it was a row of townhouses approved for the corner of Taylor and Montgomery Streets, there were no changes in the context or the building, and Staff recommended approval of a one-year extension to March 8, 2008.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the continuance of this petition to March 8, 2008. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

3. News Press Bay and Barnard Building Update

Ms. Reiter stated Staff had further discussions with the applicant, and they had managed to retain the front façade and a portion of the side. Historic Savannah offered to take full photographs of all sides and portions of the building before the demolition was done. They received a set of precise measured drawings of the buildings so Staff could feel assured the building would go back exactly as it was before it was taken down. Staff had asked for the palleting of bricks and retention of materials taken down, but did not know where they were on the situation because there was a lot of rubble on the ground and broken items. It would have to be pursued further, but they did what they could to prevent it all from coming down.

Mr. Steffen complimented Staff because he had kept up with it as well, and was involved in some of the discussions. The petitioner worked hard to meet the desires the Board expressed when they felt they were faced with a no-win situation, and everyone tried to find a win out of it. He asked Staff to draft a letter of appreciation to all parties involved, and thought the letter might encourage them.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he thought there was a lesson to be learned, because he felt the Board was coerced last month to make a decision on demolishing the building, and having it rebuilt without the petitioner or the Board knowing what was the cause of the potholes. He felt it was a hasty decision and the Board needed to be careful when it came to demolition of historic buildings, and not be coerced to make an immediate decision. Particularly, when the petitioner does not know the cause that prompted the asking for the demolition. Within two weeks after they were before the Board, it was evident it was an old brick sewer line that had collapsed in the lane, that had absolutely no danger to the Bay Street elevation at all. He urged the Board not to make hasty decisions in the future, particularly on demolitions.

4. Georgia Alliance of Preservation Commission Historic Preservation Commissions (HPC) Training - April 27 – 28, 2007, in St. Mary's, Georgia

Mr. Steffen stated some Board members went to the training a year ago, and he strongly urged the Board to take advantage of the opportunity to be trained on how the Board functions. Specifically, with how to deal with issues like the one that came up today when dealing with ordinances and how to interpret them.

Ms. Reiter stated the MPC could pay for one person to go in the spring and one person to go in the fall. She did not have a date yet, but the City was going to put on a joint training for most of the main Boards

I. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

J. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Historic Preservation Department Year End Report 2006
2. Daffin Park Centennial Celebration February 17, 2007

K. 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