

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

July 11, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman
Gene Hutchinson
Dr. Malik Watkins
Dr. Charles Elmore
Ned Gay
Eric Meyerhoff
Sidney J. Johnson
Brian Judson
Richard Law, Sr.
Linda Ramsay

HDRB Members Not Present:

Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Thomas Thomson, AICP, MPC Director
Charlotte Moore, Director of Special Projects
Ellen Harris, Historic Preservation Planner
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: CALL TO ORDER

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of Charles Oxford
H-06-3669-2
PIN No. 2-0032-08-005
601 – 605 Tattnall Street
New Construction Part II, Design Details of
Three Two-Story Townhomes

Continue to August 8, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3711-2
PIN No. 2-0031-16-006
217 West Liberty Street
New Construction Part II, Design for a
Condominium Building

Continue to August 8, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3784-2
PIN No. 2-0016-04-003
501 West Bay Street
New Construction Part I Height and Mass –
Hotel/Condominium**

Continue to August 8, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

**RE: Continued Petition of Nancy & Erik Duncan
H-07-3831-2
PIN No. 2-0032-48-014
440 Habersham
Alteration to the Front Porch and a Balcony
Addition**

Continue to August 8, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

**RE: Continued Petition of Houston & Oglethorpe,
LLC
Richard Guerard
H-07-3832-2
PIN No. 2-0005-30-002
143 Houston Street
New Construction/Rehabilitation/Addition Part I,
Height & Mass, Three-Story Condominium**

Continue to August 8, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

Mr. Steffen stated the next meeting was scheduled for August 8, 2007, and he said that he and the Vice-Chairman would be out-of-town. He suggested that the August 8 meeting be postponed for two weeks to August 22, 2007.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the rescheduling of the August 8, 2007, meeting to August 22, 2007. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the date of submittal would also be delayed.

Mr. Steffen stated he would leave it up to Staff but assumed they would keep the same guidelines.

Mr. Thomson stated that the applicants would be notified to submit by the deadline because it had already been established that the meeting date had changed.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board attended a retreat and a change needed to be made regarding the By-Laws. He said it would allow the Board more flexibility with some petitions.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Continued Agenda items as submitted to August 22, 2007. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from H-06-3711-2 and H-07-3784-2.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

**RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Mr. Patrick Shay
H-05-3327-2
PIN No. 2-0016-01-001
Northwest Corner of Barnard and Bryan Streets
Alter a Previously Approved Decision –
Increase Height**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to amend a previously approved application for New Construction of a six-story building at the northwest corner of Barnard and West Bryan Streets. The amendment is requesting to elevate the height of the third through six floors by two feet, from 10-foot floor-to-floor heights to 12-foot floor-to-floor heights. The overall height has increased by 10 feet from 80'-8" to 89'.

FINDINGS:

The previous application received a one-year extension in 2006 that expired on June 8, 2007. The application for a building permit to the City's Development Services Department was submitted prior to this date. The newly proposed floor heights are to accommodate new condominiums within the building; the previous heights were for a proposed hotel development.

The building is within a six-story height zone identified on the Historic District Height Map (amended October 2, 2003). Floor-to floor height standards, as stipulated in the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030), for residential and commercial (minimum of 10 feet on upper floors) buildings have been met. The building is surrounded by new multi-story hotel developments and smaller historic structures in a four-story height zone.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval as amended.

Ms. Ramsay asked if they were apartments or condominiums.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay) stated that there were both condominiums and apartments.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the Architectural Review Committee believed the increase in height by ten feet one-inch had exaggerated some of the previously approved detailing, specifically the columns on the Ellis Square and Barnard Street sides, as well as the Greek Templesque pediments. She said the building should be brought down to human scale while increasing the floor-to-floor heights and the pediment could be replaced with a parapet wall. In addition, the ARC believe that the columns should be enlarged to appear to hold the weight of each floor and could be added on the second, third, and fourth floors of the Ellis Square elevation for consistency in the center of the building.

Mr. Shay stated the increase in height was eight feet and not ten feet.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of Igor Fiksmen
H-07-3810-2
PIN No. 2-0045 -25-003
312 Lorch Street
New Construction of Single-Family Residence
Part II, Design Details**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Igor Fiksmen

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part II Design Details, of a three-story single-family residence at 312 Lorch Street

FINDINGS:

The parcel is currently vacant and is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). Part I, Height and Mass, was approved by the Historic District Review Board on June 13, 2006, with the condition that the applicant consults with the City’s Development Services Department with regard to the windows on the east elevation.

The following Part II Design Standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors: Residential windows facing a street shall be double- or triple-hung, casement or Palladian. Double-glazed (SDL) windows are permitted	Two-over-two double-hung sash, wood aluminum clad windows by Jeldwen is proposed. Windows and doors align vertically and appear to have a 5:3 ratio.	Provide manufacture’s specifications for windows and French door to determine if they meet the standards. Verify material of panel door.

<p>on new construction, provided: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8 inches, the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing, the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails, extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. Snap-in or BTG muntins shall not be used. Centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically. All windows facing a street shall be rectangular and have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. In new residential construction, windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>Six-panel-door by Jeldwen.</p>	<p>Openings should feature a header, sill and trim piece.</p> <p>The City's Development Services Department confirmed to staff that windows/glazing could not be installed on buildings within three feet of the property line. Windows on the east and west elevations should be eliminated to meet the building code.</p>
<p>Garage doors: Overhead garage doors shall not be used on street fronts, adjacent to sidewalk, unless they are designed to resemble gates.</p>	<p>Overhead garage doors designed to simulated traditional carriage style doors are proposed.</p>	<p>Verify material.</p>
<p>Roof Shape: Gable roof pitches shall be between 4:12 and 8:12. Roofs visible from the street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile, or asphalt shingles.</p>	<p>A low-pitched side gable roof is proposed. This is consistent with neighboring structures in the block face. The roof will be surfaced in Moiré Black asphalt shingles. A frieze with decorative wood brackets is proposed in the eaves that project from the face of the building.</p>	<p>The standards are met.</p>
<p>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches: Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. 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 shall not exceed 4 inches; the height of the railing shall not exceed 36 inches.</p>	<p>A two-story front porch is proposed with square stucco piers on the ground floor supporting the porch above. Eight-inch square columns with a wood picket railing are proposed with an entablature and flat roof above.</p>	<p>The standards are met.</p>

Fences:	No fencing is proposed.	
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 construction.	The building is clad in HardiPlank siding with 6-inch exposure. Other neighboring structures are clad in wood siding. The ground floor is surfaced in Sto Stucco.	The standard is met.
Color:	Stucco: Beige Body: Glidden Spanish Moss Trim: Glidden Sand Piper Windows and Doors: Mesa Red	Staff approval.
Utilities and Refuse: 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.	HVAC units and electric meters are not depicted on the plans.	Verify location of HVAC unit and electric meter. Meter should not be placed on the primary façade but on a side elevation.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with details to be submitted to staff for final approval including:

1. Window and French door specifications. Materials for panel and garage doors. Eliminate windows on the east and west elevations to meet the building code.
2. Verify location of HVAC and electric meters.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Igor Fiksman stated electrical drawings were submitted to show locations of the HVAC condenser. He said he would submit the specifications for the windows and doors to Staff for review, and that the east and west elevation windows would be deleted per the Building Department.

Mr. Steffen asked about the materials on the panel and garage doors being returned to Staff.

Mr. Fiksman stated he had brochures and information from the manufacturers.

Ms. Ramsay stated there was asphalt shingled roofing on the flat roof and that it would not be recommended because anything lower than 3 and 12 for asphalt shingles gets rain underneath. She recommended using metal or another material.

Mr. Meyerhoff suggested that the petitioner check the distance of the footing of the adjacent building so that they will not run into any problems.

Mr. Fiksman stated that a survey would be conducted and he would address it at that time.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that the window and door specifications, the materials for the panel and garage doors, and the roof materials be resubmitted to Staff for final approval. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen stated the Review Board members had met during a retreat with Preservation Law experts and individuals from the Metropolitan Planning Commission. He said there was discussion of the Board's inability to continue an item when the Board felt it should be continued, unless the applicant agreed to the continuance. There were no statutes or any precedent with other City Boards where there was such a case. One of the things that was needed was to amend the By-Laws to allow the Review Board to order a continuance when the circumstances indicated. The caveat was, if the Board stated something was to be continued, the reasons why and what was being continued should be stated. It was the consensus of the entire group that the change should be made.

Mr. Judson stated the question was not that the Board could suggest a continuance at the approval of the petitioner, but that the Board could not bring up the issue of continuances, and that it was only within the petitioner's power to request a continuance.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review be empowered in the Procedural By-Laws to have the ability to move for a continuance within reason. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen stated it did not change the fact that if a matter were to be continued, the Board would ask the petitioner what their preference was and consider it in making the motion. He said that in the past, the Board could not decide on the petition and the petitioner would have to tell the Board he wanted a continuance. If the petitioner did not want a continuance, the Board would have to vote. It was very cumbersome and there were some things that would have been done better if they had been continued. He felt the change would be welcomed and would better serve the interest of the Board and the public.

**RE: Continued Petition of Alexandro Santana
H-07-3824-2
PIN No. 2-0032-08-005
219 East Charlton Street
New Construction of a Carriage House, Part II,
Rehabilitation & Additions to Main Building**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Alexandro Santana

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part II Design Details, of a two-story carriage house, a rear porch addition, and exterior alterations to the property at 219 East Charlton Street. Proposed alterations include: modifying the rear openings to access the porch, install skylights on the roof, remove all surface paint from the brick exterior walls, add an iron railing within the existing entrance stair, install a gas lantern at the entrance door, paint exterior windows and doors, and reopen ground level windows.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 219 Charlton Street was constructed in 1890 as one-half of a double house. The building is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). The 75 percent maximum building lot coverage standard has been met, including both the new construction and proposed addition. All of the design standards are met as outlined in the findings below.

Carriage House:

The following Part II Design Standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p>Windows and Doors: Double-glazed (SDL) windows are permitted on new construction, provided: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8 inches, the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing, the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails, extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. Snap-in or BTG muntins shall not be used. In new residential construction, windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>Three dormer windows with four-light casement windows manufactured by Kolbe & Kolbe, wood frame, double-pane glass with 7/8-inch muntins and true divided lights.</p> <p>Half-round single-light fixed windows are proposed on the side gables at the property line also manufactured by Kolbe & Kolbe to be fire rated.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p> <p>The City’s Development Services Department confirmed to staff that windows/glazing could not be installed on buildings within 3 feet of the property line. Windows on the east and west elevations should be eliminated to meet the building code.</p>
<p>Doors: Garage openings shall not exceed 12 inches in width.</p>	<p>Nine-foot-wide overhead garage doors by Holmes Castillian are proposed. They appear as vertical wood plank doors with cross bracing. Side pedestrian wood plank doors are also proposed.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Roofs: Shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat, or shed hidden by parapet.</p>	<p>A side gable roof with side brick parapet walls, surfaced in 12-inch panel copper standing seam metal. Three shed dormers are equally spaced within the roof also surfaced in standing seam metal.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Materials:</p>	<p>Brick and mortar to match the brick and mortar on the primary residence.</p> <p>Dormers are clad in six-inch clapboard siding painted Devoe Sanibel Sand 1W12-5.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

	Cast stone coping in Devoe Sanibel Sand.	
Lighting:	The Rhett light fixtures by Charleston Gas Light are proposed. They are approximately two feet tall and ten-inches wide made of metal frame.	Staff recommends approval.
Colors:	Garage door: Devoe Lodge Green 2C19-6 Windows: Devoe Antique White 1W20-1	Staff recommends approval.
Utilities and Refuse:	HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way. Refuse storage areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.	No condenser units are indicated. A refuse storage room is located within the carriage house with a door providing access to the lane. HVAC units shall not be visible from right-of-way.

Porch Addition

The proposed two-story porch is 18 inches wide by 8 feet deep, with a stair extending into the interior courtyard. It will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way when the newly proposed carriage house is erected. It features stucco piers below a cedar wood frame porch with Ionic columns and a shed roof surfaced in copper 12-inch panel standing seam metal. Columns are 11 feet tall and made of wood by Hartman Sanders No. 230. Stucco base to be Devoe Sanibel Sand 1W12-5. Porch will be painted Devoe Antique White 1W20-1.

Alterations

1. Kolbe and Kolbe, true-divided-light, French Doors and transom above are proposed to fit within the existing brick opening on the rear of the building to access the proposed porch. A paired French door will be placed within the side openings and a new oculus opening installed between the two. Original segmental arch headers will remain. New doors and windows will be recessed four inches from the exterior wall. These alterations are to the rear and will be minimally visible once the Carriage House is erected.
2. A Bronze Handrail, painted Devoe India Black is to replace an existing steel tube pipe rail within the existing front staircase on the face of the building.
3. New six-foot by four-foot bronze finish skylights are proposed on the flat portion of the roof. These should not be visible from the street. Skylights are only allowed to be visible from the lane [Section 8-3030 (l)(10) d.]
4. Replace existing scupper and downspouts with copper and install copper flashing.
5. Clean and repair cast iron grills on windows and paint High Gloss Black.
6. Remove all exterior paint, clean, and repoint where needed to match other half of double house. The drawings indicate that a four-foot-by-four-foot test patch of paint removal methods will be conducted prior to wholesale removal of the paint. Abrasive methods such as sandblasting and power tools such as grinders should not be used.

7. Clean cast stone sills, stringcourses, watertable, and brackets.
8. Install metal frame gas lantern next to front entrance by Charleston Gas Light Co. to be 32 inches tall and project 17 inches from the building.
9. New French Limestone tile finish honed treads and risers on entrance stairs.
10. Reopen ground floor window openings and install windows to match the existing historic windows. Windows should be two-over-two, true-divided-light, double-hung sash wood frame windows.
11. Exterior Paint -
Doors: Devoe Antique White 1W20-1
Windows: Devoe Antique White 1W20-1

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the glazing on the side elevations of the carriage house be eliminated to meet building code requirements.

Mr. Steffen asked about the HVAC units.

Ms. Ramsay stated the elevation showed the glazing as fire rated to meet the code requirements.

Ms. Harris stated they could verify with the Department of Inspections if it would meet code, but there were no design objections.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Alexandro Santana stated the HVAC units would go underneath the porch addition behind the stucco piers. He said the fire rated glazing would be one glass sheet that was three-quarter inches wide.

Ms. Ramsay stated the whole assembly needed to be fire rated.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the carriage light on the lane side projected into the right-of-way.

Mr. Santana stated it projected out eight or nine inches, and the light that Mr. Meyerhoff was referring to was on the courtyard side and was not visible from the right-of-way.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if the light projected into the right-of-way of the lane that passing trucks might hit it.

Mr. Santana stated the lateral walls of the carriage house project further than the posterior elevation of the building, and the buttress walls meet the right-of-way with an eight-inch recess from the right-of-way of the lane façade.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that Staff review the glazing for proper fire rating. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Daniel E. Snyder
H-07-3830-2
PIN No. 2-0032-16-007
4 West Taylor Street
Rear Porch Addition/Rehabilitation of a
Carriage House

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Daniel Snyder.

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to:

- 1) Replace existing rear porch and additions with a new two-story rear porch system. A steel railing is proposed that will be computer controlled cut into a design.
- 2) Enlarge existing carriage door to accommodate a car.
- 3) Add a second garage door to the existing carriage house.
- 4) Modify lane door to accommodate garbage cans.
- 5) At third floor, replace rear two doors with windows to match existing windows. Replace center window with Hope steel and glass doors to deck.

FINDINGS:

The new porch rails are Computer Numerical Control (CNC) milled, water jet cut one-half-inch steel plates cut in a delicate abstract pattern that reflects the oak leaf canopy in Monterey Square and reflects the intricacy of original ironwork on the building in a modern medium. The plates are a part of the structural system of the porch. The porch cantilevers past the house to obtain a view of the square.

The present additions (garage, bathrooms, and porch) are not character defining features of the 1852 house.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of requested demolition, garage doors, garbage enclosure, rear window and door changes and rear decks with the condition that the final design of the railing be brought to Staff for approval.

PETITIONER'S COMMENT:

Mr. Dan Snyder displayed perspectives showing how the porch would impact the rear of the house. He said that in all of the illustrations that the guardrail on the porch was an abstraction because they had not done the final design. He passed around an example of the one-half inch steel plate and the powder-coated steel finish. He said he would bring in the final pattern to Staff for approval.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the cantilever would need brackets.

Mr. Snyder stated the rail would act like a truss and would be a part of the cantilever.

Mr. Gay asked if the two trees on the site plan were being removed.

Mr. Snyder answered yes, because a pool was going into the side yard.

Mr. Gay said there were five different designs of ironwork, asked if they were adding a sixth design, and said in his opinion they should use a design that they already have.

Mr. Snyder answered yes, and said it was a simple Greek Revival House with the Philadelphia brick. He felt the richness of the ironwork was part of the beauty and adding the ironwork of the era was a good addition.

Ms. Ramsay stated the rendering had a more lacy railing than what was shown.

Mr. Snyder stated they wanted to make it as lacy as possible, but it would not be as lacy toward the back.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation representing the Architectural Review Committee) stated that with the south elevation the ARC felt the porch read as a balcony and should be held to the standard of a balcony. She said the cantilever looked like it was not supported visually, even if it was structurally supported. They agreed with Mr. Gay's comment about the amount of ironwork.

Mr. Snyder stated the reading of the porch as a balcony was a result of a flattened elevation that made it look like a balcony. In the perspectives, the supports hold up the porch and it did read as a porch.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it was the policy of the Board that any addition should be defined by different materials so that the addition to the original would be predominately visible.

Mr. Law stated he thought it was a beautiful building and he liked the arrangement of the balcony, but the Board had to follow the ordinance.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that the final design be brought to Staff for final approval. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Ronald W. Erickson
H-07-3836-2
PIN No. 2-0045-06-005
314 – 318 West Taylor Street
315 – 321 Berrien Street
New Construction Part I of Seven Townhomes

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Ronald Erickson.

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass, of seven townhomes. Three semi-attached townhomes are proposed at 314 - 318 West Taylor Street and four attached townhomes are proposed at 315 - 321 Berrien Street. A private lane is proposed between the two developments to provide off-street parking for the Berrien Street residents.

FINDINGS:

The vacant parcel is zoned B-C (Community-Business). The proposed development appears to meet all of the Part I, Standards as outlined in the tables below.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) Apply:

314-318 West Taylor Street

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks:	Two feet from West Taylor Street to be consistent with neighboring structures on the street, and to provide room for ample sidewalk and plantings.	Staff recommends approval.
Dwelling Unit Type:	Rowhouse with three units. This is a common dwelling unit type within the block.	The standard is met.
Street Elevation Type:	High stoop rowhouse with ground level garage entrance. High stoops are found throughout the block.	Staff recommends approval.
Entrances:	A high stoop entrance is proposed with a ground level pedestrian and vehicular entrance below. While the garage level entrance is not common and not found on historic structures, the building does not have access to a lane and a similar design was approved at 308 - 310 West Taylor Street.	Staff recommends approval.
Building Height: Three-story height zone.	Three stories with overall height of 34'-8.25". Ground floor/basement level is 7'-10.5", the second floor is 10'-1.25" and the third floor is 10' with a parapet above. The neighboring historic structure is two-stories tall at a height of 26'-11". Other row houses within the block are of new construction and are three stories tall at 34 feet.	Staff recommends restudy of the vents during the Part II, design submittal to fit within the parapet and increase in size to be proportional with the scale of the building.

Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:	Each of the units is approximately 28.5' wide and 34' tall and are proportionate with other rowhouses in the area and within the block.	The standard is met.
Proportion of Openings:	Window openings are rectangular and maintain a 3:8 and 3:6 horizontal to vertical ratio. This is proportionate to other openings throughout the block and district.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids:	A three-bay rhythm is proposed with windows and doors aligning vertically. The parlor level openings maintain a more vertical appearance helping to break up the amount of solid and to be similar to other historic structures in the district.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Structure on Street:	The buildings are attached with a four-foot-wide passageway on the east property line to access the rear of the property, and step back from the detached residence on the neighboring property. Open spaces between structures exist within the block.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:	Stoops project 4.5 feet from the face of the building with a side stair. This will allow for a four-foot-wide sidewalk and tree lawn. The historic neighboring property has a porch projecting approximately the same distance with a stair beyond. Similar stoops exist further within the block.	The standard is met.
Walls of Continuity:	A garden wall/gate is proposed to the east to create a wall of continuity at the street at the location of the open space.	The standard is met.

315-321 Berrien Street

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks:	The front wall is at the zero lot line with the entrance stoops encroaching four feet into the	The standard is met.

	right-of-way to be consistent with other structures on the block.	
Dwelling Unit Type:	Rowhouse with four units. Rowhouses are common unit types within the ward.	The standard is met.
Street Elevation Type:	Low stoop rowhouse with pitched roof. A detached historic residence with a side gable roof and non-historic concrete block commercial building exist within the block.	Staff recommends approval. The building form is in keeping with the neighboring historic structure.
Entrances:	Low stoop entrances with side stairs are proposed. This is similar to the neighboring historic building, which features a low porch at the entrance with side stair.	The standard is met.
Building Height:	Two- and one-half stories with an overall height of 35'-10". First floor is 10 feet above a 1'-9" foundation, second floor is 9 feet and half story is 9'-6" with a side gable roof and dormer. The historic neighboring building is two stories with a side gable roof and overall height of 29 feet.	Staff recommends approval.
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:	Each unit is approximately 20 feet wide and 35'-10" tall to the top of the roof.	Staff recommends approval.
Proportion of Openings:	Window openings are rectangular, taller than they are wide with a 3:6 horizontal to vertical ratio. This is similar to other buildings in the area and district.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids:	A three-bay rhythm with a dormer above is proposed. Windows and doors align vertically and the entrance features sidelights and a transom.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Structure on Street:	Attached townhouses do not exist within the block but are present within the ward. The building is setback 20 feet from the east property line to provide access to parking behind and beside the building.	Staff recommends approval. Parking is required, and the single curb cut along Berrien street to access the parking has less of an adverse impact than four curb cuts along the street for each of the units.

Rhythm of Entrances Porch Projections, Balconies:	The low stoops project four feet from the face of the building. This is consistent with the historic building in the block.	The standard is met.
Walls of Continuity:	The site plan indicates a seven-foot high garden wall and iron gates to access the parking along Berrien Street.	The standard is met.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the garage doors met the standard.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Ronald Erickson stated that with a limited front they could not fit a 12-foot door. He said the Board had approved two buildings down the street with 9-foot doors.

Ms. Ramsay stated she disapproved of garage doors facing a street and said there would be a problem backing out onto West Taylor as well as the parking problems.

Mr. Steffen stated Staff had made a comment on the rhythm of structure on the street with the parking being required, and a single curb cut along Berrien Street to access the parking had less of an adverse impact than four curb cuts along the street for each unit.

Mr. Erickson stated that the Berrien Street townhouses had private lanes to provide off-street parking, but they did not have enough off-street parking for all seven townhouses. They incorporated parking for three townhouses on Taylor Street within the unit, which was similar to 308 and 310. He said it was a busy street, there was parking on the north side of the street, and there was no parking on the south side of the street but a car could negotiate backing out easier rather than having parking on both sides of the street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Joe Saseen stated the smaller garage doors were better.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the Architectural Review Committee objected to the garage doors on Taylor Street. She said if the lane was created for the Berrien Street homes, then HSF would recommend placing the garage door opening on the rear of the homes in lieu of the proposed courtyards. The ARC recommended removing the balconies on 317, 319, and 321 Berrien Street and replace them with double dormers in a more traditional pattern because it looked odd with just one dormer.

Mr. Gay asked if they were under Part II.

Ms. Dolecki stated that it was solids and voids.

Mr. Steffen stated that regarding Part I Height and Mass, when dealing with the philosophy of shrink-wrapping a project that any projections and openings were a part of Part I Height and Mass. He said the Design Details had more to do with the materials.

Ms. Dolecki stated the ARC also recommended having two front facades all of the way across.

Mr. Erickson stated the client wanted to separate the Taylor Street townhouses from the Berrien Street townhouses to reduce activity in the rear of Berrien Street. He said it would add three more cars where the private lane would be for the Berrien Street townhouses. If they had eight dormers on the front of Berrien Street, it would be too busy because the townhouses were only 20 feet wide. The criteria in the ordinance states that any open porch should be on the rear of the building as opposed to the front.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Erickson had any objection to double dormers on the other side.

Mr. Erickson stated it was too much. He said if they had an elevation with eight dormers, it would be too busy.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Judson asked if the location of the garage doors were part of Part I or if they were Part II.

Mr. Steffen stated he thought it was part of Part I because there was an opening.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he agreed with Mr. Erickson that the addition of the dormers would add too much projection and what they had done was simpler.

Ms. Ramsay stated it was hard to judge without seeing it drawn.

Mr. Hutchinson stated he agreed with Mr. Meyerhoff.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated when the Board was faced with new construction in the Historic District with no lane, the only option to get the car off the street would be to have an opening on the street side, and that there was no other way.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Johnson made the motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve Part I, Height and Mass as submitted. Mr. Watkins seconded the motion. Ms. Ramsay was opposed. The motion passed 8 to 1.

**RE: Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson
H-07-3837-2
PIN No. 2-0005-06-028
32 East Broad Street
Demolition of a Non-Historic Structure**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Neil Dawson.

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish a non-historic structure and replace with street improvements, removable bollards, renovate south façade of existing historic building to the north of the new street, erect screen wall to hide non-historic cmu building; add structural canopy.

FINDINGS:

1. The non-historic structure to be demolished is a one-story masonry structure with applied siding façade, built after 1954 and before 1973. It is not rated as historic and does not appear to be eligible in terms of architectural significance and age.
2. When the one-story building is removed, it will reveal the south wall of the historic building to the north. Pending what historic fabric remains it is intended to re-clad this façade in wood siding and add 6/6 wood, true divided-light windows.
3. A wood and steel trellis canopy will project from the south wall beginning approximately 71.6 feet from the East Broad Street right-of-way. It will be partially obscured from East Broad by the addition.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval to demolish non-historic structure; approval of removable bollards; approval of canopy. Precise renovations to be coordinated with Staff after demolition. The wood panels, storefront and metal mesh are obscured from view by addition and depth from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Steffen asked if there was more to come back to Staff.

Ms. Harris stated that was how she was reading it.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the trellis canopy was temporary or permanent.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Neil Dawson (Dawson + Wissmach Architects representing Mr. Charles Morris) stated his interpretation of Staff's recommendations was a concern for the removal of non-historic fabric revealing the historic building behind it. He said Staff wanted to be involved to make sure the restoration did not detract or remove any historic fabric in any way, and that they were open to it. He did not read the recommendations as not recommending approval.

Mr. Steffen stated he might not get an answer from the Board because of Staff's emergency and felt that Staff had left good directions.

Mr. Dawson stated the most pressing issue was the demolition and they would work with Staff concerning the new part.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the trellis and the scrim wall were temporary, if a new building would go in, and the amount of time it would take.

Mr. Dawson stated the client had an easement to open up St. Julian Street to re-create a primary entrance to Trustees Garden. He said the easement grants them the right to tear down the building, put in a brick street, and create an outdoor sidewalk café. However, they do not own the building that abuts the property and were requesting permission on the historic building to restore the façade that was covered with a brick veneer. The remainder was a non-historic concrete block building that is the kitchen for Pirate's House and other support services, and they do not have the right to tear them down or alter them. Their solution was to build a modern screen wall that included steel framework off the existing building, and included wood panels and a metal screen that would allow plants to grow. He said it was not temporary, but was not a permanent building modification.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated with the A/C work on the building that was to be demolished, he would like a more definitive answer whether there was a historic building behind it.

Mr. Dawson stated that it was definitively not a historic building and was only historic to a certain point. He said that from walking through the interior that the framing may be under the brick but they will not know until they open it. The demolition was the pressing issue and he said they could bring additional detail on the scrim.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Dawson if the Board made a motion to approve the demolition and the remainder be continued until the August meeting, would it be agreeable.

Mr. Dawson answered yes, and said they would prefer to work through the finer details with Staff.

Mr. Steffen stated they could do that in the interim, that Staff would give the Board a final recommendation, and they may approve it at Staff review.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the demolition only, and to continue the scrim wall and the proposed street for further review by Staff, with final revisions to come before the Review Board if necessary. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Judson asked if the City of Savannah had any standards for recycling material or covenants for covering demolition.

Mr. Steffen stated the only standard he was aware of was that the City maintains the right to review demolitions. Regarding the materials, he was not aware of any standards and asked Mr. Thomson if there were any in place.

Mr. Thomson stated there were none right now.

Mr. Steffen stated that occasionally if they were historic materials the Board ask that they be stored and restored, but it was not the case on this project.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects,
Patrick Shay
H-07-3838-2
PIN No. 2-0015-34-001
15 East Liberty Street**

The petitioner is requesting conceptual comments on a proposed addition and entryway revision for the DeSoto Hilton Hotel.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting comments on the concept of changes to the entrances to the DeSoto Hilton Hotel. No vote is requested at this time.

The changes are as follows:

1. Add a glass and metal enclosure over the existing patio to the east of the Liberty Street entrance.
2. Remove existing cantilevered canopy on Liberty Street and replace with curved steel and glass canopy with signage on top.
3. Add new entry doors with another canopy and Hilton logo.
4. Add spandrel glass and marble columns.
5. Improve ramp to be ADA compliant.
6. Add new guardrail and patio to west of Liberty Street entry and install doors to access patio.
7. On Harris Street, elevation reclad existing porte cochere in painted metal with circle inserts. Clad columns in marble. Add cable supports.
8. All balcony railings to have applied metal ornament.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. Conceptually a glass enclosure on the east patio will render this more usable space, since it is rarely used in its present form. A glass and metal enclosure is compatible; however, Staff recommends reconsideration of the curved roof form, which seems too suburban in this urban context. Staff has catalogs of conservatory examples to which the applicant may want to refer.
2. The design of the proposed metal canopy on Liberty Street does not appear to relate to the design of the hotel in material or scale. The second awning over the door is redundant and out-of-scale. Staff recommends retaining the existing masonry structure and reworking it. Staff recommends eliminating the existing blue awning and consider alterations to the existing canopy, perhaps through the use of an etched glass internally illuminated ceiling for instance.
3. Staff recommends that the same reworking should be considered for the existing Harris Street canopy. Cladding it in metal does not improve its relationship to the design of the hotel.
4. Staff recommends leaving the balcony railings as they are and focus the resources into improving the entry canopies. Sidewalk improvements such as tree lawns are in the purview of the City streets and sidewalks department.
5. It has been mentioned that it is the intent to relocate the existing carved relief plaque in the exterior entry foyer to an outside location. This falls within the purview of the Site and Monument Commission.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay stated the hotel was being renovated on the interior and exterior. He said the difference between what was there and what was being proposed was the cantilevered canopy in the entrance was proposed to be enclosed. This dark and difficult to maintain space would become a part of the interior lobby and the entrance of the hotel would move forward. Currently, when standing in the space looking back to the north, you cannot see direct daylight and it had a foreboding appearance. They propose to insert something light and glass in its place; glass material on a steel frame, and some form of decorative lighting so it would light up the area and glow at night to add some badly needed sparkle to the entrance. The signage would be integrated into the architecture, and would be reduced in size. There would be a revolving entrance canopy door and it may be confusing about the redundant entrance. It needed to be round so the doors would revolve and stay on track. If the scallop shape is objectionable then it could be substituted with something flat, but it would still be a projection with a round face. The idea for the rounded shape was cribbed from the elevations of buildings shapes from that era, which were character-defining features. A quarter of a sphere was used to break it in half, then continuing with the glass going down.

The porch is three and one-half feet from above street level, never used, has blank walls, and a glass wall that looks into the backside of the registration lobby. The idea was to make it part an outdoor-indoor bistro or café that connected to the lobby. He said that the porch had a wonderful view from the north in the shade and that it would be glazed.

The owner wanted to see more detail on the balconies because the pattern from the ground level was random-looking and the added balconies had more detail with a set of straight pickets. It would add some detail from inside the rooms looking out.

The concept for the porte cochiere element on the opposite street side was to take the concrete and expose the aggregate element with added cladding. They did not want people to think it was the main entrance to the hotel because it did not enter the lobby but rather the backside of the atrium meeting space. The suggestions from Staff for the luminous ceiling and some of the treatments were things they could look at, but he wanted the Board's and the public's feedback on whether they liked the idea of creating a glazed bistro effect. He said it would be a big addition to the streetscape, especially at night when being lit from the inside giving sparkle at the street level.

Mr. Steffen stated the welcoming entrance was reminiscent of Paris with the glass and light on an important boulevard in Savannah. If the patio wall part was open air and the canopy could be closed off during inclement weather, perhaps it would provide more benefit. He asked for the Board members to comment.

Mr. Shay stated the glass would have sliding panels and that there was an area that would be open air all of the time.

Mr. Gay said that it was a good addition.

Mr. Judson stated he agreed because he felt the building was not welcoming. He said the shape of the pointedness above the arch was not in harmony with the rest of the building. He felt there was more flexibility to incorporate signage and lighting along with other features within the arch, but the pointed cap in the center added nothing.

Mr. Shay stated regarding the terra-cotta lions, that some of the only remaining features of the former historic hotel were on the outside. The intention was to make sure the three terra cotta pieces were displayed on the exterior of the building.

Mr. Hutchinson commended the petitioner on the design and said the arch and the straight lines play off and compliment each other. He said it pulls the large arches together on the north elevation, which brings it down to human scale.

Dr. Elmore stated he was wondering about the function of the glass enclosure. He asked if you could eat there, and open and close the windows.

Mr. Shay answered yes, and said it would be similar to a bistro or an indoor/outdoor cafe.

Ms. Ramsay stated she agreed with Staff regarding the “greenhouse” look of the glassed-in area. She felt that it needed a more conservatory approach. She did not have objection to the curved entryway, but that the curve gave a suburban-look to the glassed-in area.

Mr. Shay stated he had heard the comment twice regarding the suburban-look and had struggled with where someone would find a curved roof in the suburbs.

Ms. Ramsay stated a greenhouse enclosure.

Mr. Shay asked if the Board liked the idea of having a shape, that when lit at night would be distinctive. He said with the curves and when the light is on the panes of glass, that it would add character.

Dr. Elmore asked if they would consider a veranda.

Mr. Shay stated they would and said they had found some photographs that had a lot of neon incorporated into the entrance.

Mr. Steffen stated there were many ways to articulate the top of the patio area other than the curve. He thought the idea of the light and glass was phenomenal for the location if it could be unique.

Mr. Shay stated the comments that were made would help him to design the bistro with more detail and historical interest so someone would take the time to look at it.

Dr. Elmore stated there should be brochures with historical content working hand-in-hand with the hotel, and asked them to remember the history from 1953 that blacks could not enter the hotel.

Dr. Watkins stated that he echoed what was said, and he liked the functionality of what was presented. He said the design did not emphasize the historical significance of the area and did not pull him to sit or participate in the streetscape. Something that pointed out the history of the area that would highlight the existing buildings and would be compatible would be better. As presented, it does not make him want to participate, but he liked the overall concept.

Dr. Elmore stated they might make reference to the Siege of Savannah of 1779 when the troops came through the area of Oglethorpe Avenue.

Mr. Shay stated the comments helped him and he appreciated the Board giving him their input.

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture
 Keith Howington
 H-07-3839-2
 PIN No. 2-0016-33-001
 201 Papy Street
 New Construction of a Five-Story Hotel, Part I**

The Preservation Officer recommends: **Continue to August 8, 2007, for additional information.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Harold Yellin, Mr. John Deering, and Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Harris and Ms. Moore gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval of a New Embassy Suites hotel on a site bounded by Oglethorpe Avenue on the North, Papy Street on the East, Turner Street on the South, and the Thunderbird and a vacant lot on the West.

FINDINGS:

Staff had initially placed this petition on the Continue section of the HDBR agenda for the July meeting in the opinion that there were outstanding issues that affect Height and Mass. However, the architects and owner have insisted that the petition be placed on the regular agenda. Staff has included the original memo to the architect together with his responses. This is in addition to the regular staff report below. The Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the City on November 2006. One of the strategies of that plan was to require new development in areas adjacent to downtown to be integrated into the grid of the town plan, and to provide a ward structure or similar plan that adds to rather than subtracts from the public realm.

Meetings Between Staff and Petitioner

April 24, 2007	<u>Papy and Oglethorpe</u> : Present were Beth Reiter, Sarah Ward, John Deering, and Keith Howington
July 2, 2007	<u>201 Papy</u> : 140 rooms: Discussed orientation, siting, height and mass, and how it does not meet the ordinance. Developer’s representative stated that the footprint is the new concept for Embassy Suites and cannot be changed and that Buck Lindsay was handling that. Staff pointed out this was in Savannah’s Historic District and buildings should not be imposed on the plan. Talked about the Downtown Master Plan concepts.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in the BC zone.	The proposed structure is essentially built to the lot line.	This standard is met; however, the Oglethorpe Avenue side provides no relief for the pedestrian from the 70-foot height on one side and street traffic on the other. There is no tree lawn and the

		<p>result is a harsh pedestrian experience not within the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>
<p>Entrances: A building on a Tything Block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street. For large-scale development, primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. Buildings less than 60 feet wide located on a corner Tything lot abutting a north-south connecting street shall locate primary entrances on both the east-west and north-south streets unless a corner entrance is utilized. Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances.</p>	<p>The length of the lot along Oglethorpe Avenue is 239 feet. The site is located outside of the square and Tything block system. The building has been sited with a pedestrian entry on the secondary street (Papy) rather than Oglethorpe Avenue. A vehicular entrance is on the rear of the lot. A small pedestrian door to a corridor connecting to the lobby is located in the middle of the block on Oglethorpe Avenue. There is a corner entry to lease space on the corner of Oglethorpe Avenue and Papy Street.</p>	<p>There is a concern that Oglethorpe Avenue is becoming a “dead zone” because of the lack of interactive pedestrian activity on the ground level.</p>
<p>Building Height: The site is located in a five-story zone.</p>	<p>Five stories are proposed. A 20-foot first story, four 10-foot stories above, and a 10'-4" parapet is proposed. The plan is an H shape with a one-story entrance section on Papy Street.</p>	<p>The height zone standard is met, however, because of the large footprint, the mass and scale of the proposed structure overwhelms all of the context, both historic and non-historic. There is an abrupt transition from the 70-foot height of the proposed structure down to the Thunderbird Inn, which is one-story. There is no modulation of height except on the side street. Staff recommends moving the building away from the Thunderbird to allow access to the parking garage from Oglethorpe Avenue.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development: The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide. Buildings greater than four stories shall use window groupings, columns, or</p>	<p>Through groupings of windows and manipulation of the façade, there are architecturally distinct sections to the building. The roof has a parapet.</p>	<p>An attempt has been made to modulate the mass of the building above the first level, however, the scale of this structure is larger than anything within its context.</p>

<p>pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet, nor, more than 20 feet in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature.</p>		
<p>Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:</p> <p>Also, the Historic District Ordinance Visual Compatibility Factor general paragraph states New construction shall be visually compatible with structures ...and places to which it is visually related. The (visual compatibility factors) shall be considered in determining the visual compatibility of such a building. Greater weight shall be given to adjacent historic structures.</p>	<p>A one-story covered center entry is proposed. It appears that motifs have perhaps been taken from the Landmark railroad buildings to the south.</p>	<p>The juxtaposition of the railroad motif with the palace-like style of the proposed structure is incongruous. Staff recommends reconsidering the design to utilize this space as a true ground level court entry and to pursue the railroad inspired design. The Central of Georgia Landmark District is across Turner Street.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</p>		<p>The mass and height of the proposed structure does not relate to any historic structure in the vicinity.</p>
<p>Walls of Continuity:</p>		<p>The siting of the building to front Papy rather than Oglethorpe Avenue diminishes the success of Oglethorpe as a boulevard. The building abuts a very narrow sidewalk with no street trees. The intent of the Comprehensive Plan is to re-establish connectivity with the expansion areas on either side of the Historic District. The proposed building does not enhance Oglethorpe as a boulevard, nor does it front the primary street. Staff recommends looking at setting the building back from Oglethorpe and installing a tree-planting strip at curbside to give “breathing room”, and enhance the pedestrian walkability of this boulevard. The immediate juxtaposition</p>

		of a building of this mass next to the Thunderbird Inn without some special break adversely affects the adjacent restored structure.
Scale:	The height and mass of this structure together with its footprint is larger than any historic building in the vicinity.	Staff recommends restudy of the design to break it into several buildings.

Ms. Charlotte Moore specifically addressed some site issues that were an essential part of the review and could affect the Board’s decision. She said it was not clear if the proposed hotel was either a 140- or 168-room hotel because there were two different figures. The site presently was dedicated to overflow parking for the Hampton Suites. There is an asphalt parking lot with approximately 107 parking spaces, and the proposed hotel would be built on top of the parking lot. Staff did not know where the existing 107 parking spaces would be relocated while the hotel was under construction. The applicant indicated there would be a future parking deck, but because it was in a B-C district and not B-C-1, parking was required. There was indication that approximately 168 parking spaces were available for the Embassy Suites hotel, but it could not be verified without a proper room count as well as knowledge of the other uses. The parking garage would need to be built at the same time or before the hotel was built so that parking would be available when the hotel opened. Staff would need to know where the existing parking for the Hampton Suites would be relocated. If the parking lot and the hotel were built concurrently, the spaces could not be relocated.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the property belonged to a new property owner.

Ms. Moore stated she was not certain if the ownership was under the same name, but it was off-site parking.

Ms. Harris stated the proposed parking deck was not included with the application and Staff did not have any details on it.

Additional Concerns that effect Height and Mass

1. Parking is required in the BC district. How many spaces are required to cover all uses and handicap and how many are being provided. The building is being built on a site currently being used for overflow parking for the Hampton (possibly as many as 100 cars). The site plan indicates that a parking garage is anticipated in the future. No drawing is provided regarding the proposed garage, which will have additional height and mass impact on the complex.
2. HVAC: No information given on the proposed HVAC system. Architect states it is not a PTAC.
3. It is shown that refuse is to be in a container on the street. This should be internal to the complex.
4. There is a historic marker along Turner Street. Any impact on this marker will need to be coordinated with the Site and Monument Commission.

RECOMMENDATION: Continuance to address the height and mass issues raised by this submittal.

Mr. Steffen stated that often Staff would recommend something be continued and in some cases, the applicant agreed. He said in this case, the applicant asked the Board to hear the matter although Staff requested a continuance. The Board had the right to vote in favor, against, or partially in favor of the project, or to continue the items or the project as a whole. Any recommendation that Staff gave was their recommendation, but the Board was not bound by it.

Mr. Judson asked if the number of parking spaces was solely based on the number of rooms. He said his concern was that employee parking or that the meeting room and the facilities proposed would be overwhelmed with occupancy. He asked if these were factors that were looked at.

Ms. Moore said they would be. She said that restaurants, bars, and meeting rooms would have to be factored in to the calculation.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Harold Yellin (Representing Oglethorpe Associates) stated there was a Comprehensive Plan that was approved in November 2006. He said there was also a Downtown Master Plan that had not been approved. There were inferences in the Staff report about working on items that seemed to be related more to the Master Plan than the Comprehensive Plan. He asked the Board to keep in mind that the plan had not been approved, there were items in the plan that may not remain once it was approved, and that the plan may not be approved for several months. The key document was the Comprehensive Plan and not the Downtown Master Plan. He said they were surprised by the Staff report because Staff wanted it to be continued even though they wanted to be heard. They felt they were complying with the current ordinance in effect, thought it was good to have feedback from the Board, but felt they had a complete petition. He said Mr. John Deering had served on the Board and was confident that Mr. Deering understood when a petition was or was not complete, and Mr. Deering felt strongly that the petition was complete. The motion made earlier continued the petition to August 22 and not August 8, which would be six weeks. The primary issue was another building next to theirs, and he had seen where the Board could approve Part I for the hotel and consider the garage later. He said the hotel would take 16 to 18 months and the garage will take four months to build, and there was not a reason to stall and continue the hotel while waiting for the information.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the petitioner owned all of the proposed land.

Mr. Yellin stated it was one property identification number owned by the same owner. He said it was an awkward piece that swings behind the Thunderbird, but it was all under one ownership.

Mr. Gay asked if the parking lot used by Hampton Suites was needed or if it was extra parking and once it was taken away, would it be a big deal.

Mr. John Deering (Greenline Architects) stated that the parking was necessary for the Hampton Suites. He said that parking garages were quick-built and quick-design projects because they were simpler structures that take less time to design, and they feel they could start them while still finishing the engineering and architectural drawings on the project. The Hampton guests would use the garage while the project was under construction so there would not be any disruptions.

Mr. Gay asked if it would allow enough parking for the new structure and the Hampton Suites.

Mr. Deering stated there would be a two-story deck that would provide parking for the Hampton Suites, the proposed Embassy Suites, and some public parking. He said the Historic District Guidelines encouraged a parking garage in the area when it was written, and the developer was willing to provide parking for the hotel and public use.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the Hampton Suites also owned the proposed project.

Mr. Deering answered yes, and said the developer owned and operated the hotels. He said the Thunderbird had been restored, did not have a grand entrance, and they were trying to help improve it. He showed photographs of adjacent buildings and said they all have parking. In the Historic District, they want to try to conceal the parking and not have it out front and have buildings built to the lot line. (Comments inaudible – stepped away from the microphone). He said Oglethorpe had been a dead zone for a long time and felt they were improving it. There was an entrance planned for the hotel and they had modulated the building with large windows, but the best remedy for not creating a dead zone would be the corner entry for a leased space. The façade was 240 feet long and the leased space was 116 feet long, half the length of the building. If someone was walking or driving by, they would be able to see inside the large windows that would give an interactive experience. The entrance on Oglethorpe was a guest entrance, and if the leased space needed an entrance, they could place an entrance there.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the entrance was shown on the elevation but it was not on the floor plan.

Mr. Deering stated they had not worked out the exact details because they were there for Height and Mass and wanted to get comments first.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Board did not know if the entrance projects or recesses.

Mr. Gay asked if there was a setback.

Mr. Deering stated they may set it back or project it or it could be a combination of both, but they were going to ask that it be looked at in the Design Details.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it was part of Height and Mass.

Mr. Deering stated that regarding the height of the hotel, a 20-foot first story was important with the building. He said the 10-foot upper floor stories were appropriate and called for in the guidelines and the Historic District ordinance. Staff felt that the 10-foot 4-inch parapet height was too tall, but in designing the building to keep the classical proportions correct he thought they needed the space. The Gibbons Range building that houses the Lady and Sons Restaurant was a classically designed building with similar floor-to-floor heights, but they have a very large cornice section at the top. He felt it was important to keep the cornice on the top of the building or it would look like it was not designed in proportion with the rest of the building. He thought it related more to the historic structures and not to the 50's, 60's, and 70's structures that existed. He said along Oglethorpe, if they could squeeze any space in along with the recesses that occur, they could place trees and put crape myrtles similar to what was done on Whitaker and Drayton Streets.

Mr. Gay stated the drawing does not show any entrance on Oglethorpe projecting out and asked if it went in.

Mr. Deering stated it was something that would have to be worked out. He said they felt they were ready for Height and Mass with the exception of the projecting entrance. They would like to improve the building beyond what was seen concerning the details and get a decision. The zoning for the site can allow for a five-story, 100 percent lot coverage structure, but the design

was broken up. There were long, narrow buildings along MLK that have big footprints that go back. (Inaudible – stepped away from the microphone.)

Mr. Keith Howington (Greenline Architects) stated that he and other teams had met with Traffic Engineering and they thought it would be disastrous to put an entryway off Oglethorpe. He said that backing up traffic, entering and exiting along Oglethorpe was against the recommendation, and they had parking concerns. They had submitted the plan with underground parking and they felt the parking deck was a better solution to serve both hotels and some of the public overflow.

Mr. Deering stated that Staff felt they should put the entrance of the hotel in one location and Traffic Engineering stated it would be disastrous because it was too congested. He said bringing it around and having the main drop-off and registration on Papy Street would help the congestion on Oglethorpe, the valet could park the car, and when they become familiar with the hotel, they could find the auto court on their own. Appropriate signage was necessary as well, and they would present it to the Board at another time.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated there was 240 feet of building on the north elevation, and two five-foot indents, but it was part of Height and Mass. They had a vision of the building being gigantic with 240 feet of a strong horizontal line separating the ground floor from the other floors, with the Ariscraft material versus the stucco on the rest of the building. He said many of the newly constructed buildings had the smaller vertical feeling, while having two views of separate materials as shown on the south and east, that there should be some differentiation in the vertical 240 feet of materials on the second through fifth floors. It would greatly enhance the overall vision so the building did not look like it had been squeezed out of a toothpaste tube. A very strong issue in Height and Mass approval is massing and the articulation of the elevations. He said the setback on the east elevation was a strong statement and wondered how many signs they would need to help people find the entrance on Papy Street, and whether Papy Street was wide enough to park a car and remain a two-way street; there should be some kind of indentation. He said they did not have the entrance on the east or north sides of the floor plans and the corner was not delineated. Staff recommended a continuation; the Board had heard the presentation and made a decision regardless of what Staff had recommended. He asked if they could respond to his comment about the vertical indication of materials, particularly on the north elevation.

Mr. Deering stated the side that faces the Hampton Suite also had a stucco and brick combination that looked incongruous to him as one building to have little sections of brick come down in certain places. He said the firm designed the Liberty Street parking garage where sections of the building were cast stone and other sections brick. He did not feel it was as successful to make it appear as one building with the areas setback five feet and the second through fifth floor getting more modulation. It begins to read as a central entrance. He said they could examine the materials but it was not usually a part of the Height and Mass review to come up with a solution to please everyone.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated they could also change the colors. He said the recesses could have balconies in the notches or anything that would break up the continuous 240 feet of stucco.

Mr. Deering stated they would not be opposed to balconies because it would give some interest, detail, and life as well.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that with everything that needed to be studied, his opinion was that the Board was not ready for what had been presented to be approved as Height and Mass without seeing the studies. He said in accordance with Staff that there needed to be a continuance.

Mr. Deering stated he disagreed because the exterior materials and entrances were part of the design submittal process, and felt they had enough to achieve a Height and Mass review.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that in his view the articulation was part of Height and Mass.

Mr. Gay stated that on the last project the Board was told that the entrances, windows, and openings were a part of Height and Mass.

Mr. Deering stated there was never a ruling on it and the six years that he sat on the Board, he could understand their position. He said Mr. Meyerhoff always thought the windows should be included but felt they were a design detail. If you take the building and shrink-wrap it, the envelope was what had been talked about in many meetings before as Height and Mass, but it never concluded.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board discussed it at the last retreat and they had reached a consensus that it was the shrink-wrapping concept, and there may be differences of opinion on whether it means windows. He said as far as materials and articulation of colors it was clearly Design Details, and with projections that may include entryways where they project in and out, then it was clearly Height and Mass.

Mr. Judson stated Mr. Deering had ambiguity in his design on the north elevation, the Oglethorpe entrance, whether it would be recessed, and in his mind, it was a critical portion of Height and Mass. He said that he was picturing a boulevard-like Oglethorpe rather than a prison front like Oglethorpe. In order to get approval today on Height and Mass, he asked if they would be willing to stipulate that there would be a recessed entrance. With the other recesses he did not see them going down to the street where they would be accessible for tree planting because they start at the second floor on the model.

Mr. Deering stated that there were two recesses at street level, and the others picked up the second to fifth floors. He said they were happy to stipulate that it would be recessed because it was the only way to create the correct entrance.

Mr. Judson asked about the two-story parking garage and asked if there was a count for spaces. He said several references had been made about the public and SCAD use, but did not know how many spaces per floor or whether it was a realistic expectation. He asked if there was a ballpark number.

Mr. Howington stated there were preliminary counts and there would be more than enough for the overflow of the Hampton Suites and the required parking. He said the count was 275 spaces. It was two stories above, the ground slopes a bit, and one would be partially underground.

Ms. Ramsay stated most people would see it as they came into Savannah on Oglethorpe and that the west elevation was the most critical. She said they would see a 75-foot-high wall of stucco as the first view of the hotel.

Mr. Deering stated it was not their desire either.

Ms. Ramsay asked why they would not recess it three feet and put in windows. She said the whole wall of the building was what you would see as you came over the bridge and the wall was overwhelming.

Mr. Deering stated that it was modulated on the second through the fifth floors.

Ms. Ramsay stated it was a solid wall of 264 feet of building.

Mr. Howington stated that there was a bump out and a large motor entry. He said as far as no windows on the wall, he agreed that it was a Building Department issue because of the lot line, and at this time he could not put windows on there.

Mr. Steffen stated the reason they could not put windows there now was because of the lot line. He said if it was back from the lot line, then they could place the windows.

Mr. Deering stated they would do what they could to place windows on that façade because it was important.

Mr. Judson asked if they would be willing to give up three feet.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Saseen stated there should not be another Hampton Suites with no design, it was a disgrace, and the Board could not make another mistake like that. He said these buildings would be here hundreds of years after everyone was gone, which was nothing but a crate with a bunch of windows. Three months ago two five-story hotels were approved behind a gas station on Oglethorpe and MLK. The new Board members needed to know because the proposed building would not be standing by itself.

Mr. Jim Ashby stated that everyone was talking about coming in on Oglethorpe to Savannah. He said there would be five-story hotels on all sides, the jail, a five-story hotel on Montgomery and Oglethorpe, an ugly office building next to it, the convention center, a SCAD dorm that was an old run-down motel, and the federal bathroom building. This was the entrance to Savannah and asked what historic aspect was in it. All they were getting were a bunch of ugly, big, nasty, non-traditional buildings that were ruining the City.

Dr. Elmore stated he took umbrage to what was being said because Mr. Ashby did not know anything about the history of Savannah. He said what they were doing was getting ready to put a big building in the shadow of the Spring Hill Redoubt and other historic places, and they were trying to minimize the historic significance of what Savannah was. What was being built had nothing to do with the history.

Mr. Ashby stated he was pointing out that Savannah was known as a quaint historic city and the Board was taking away the quaintness; and that Dr. Elmore's point was well taken. He said the hotels were springing up like toadstools and were as attractive as toadstools, and today they were talking about placing a huge one, next to another huge one, across the street from two more huge ones, and a block and a half over another huge one. When the people come in to Savannah, these hotels were what they would see before they see anything historic or quaint.

Mr. Steve Day stated the size of the property was significantly large and they keep getting bigger and bigger, they do not know where it would be stopped, and something had to be done. He said it was not the Board's purview but the City itself. The thing to be resolved before a decision was made on Height and Mass was the parking. Parking needed to be solved because it was said there was overflow parking required for the Hampton Suites. It was said that Hampton Suites could use the parking garage as long as the same owner owns both properties. If the properties were split and sold, then the Hampton would go out of business because there would be no parking, and until the parking issue was totally resolved no one would know how big the hotel could be.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the Board could comment on the parking but they had no jurisdiction over the parking. He said they could comment on the petition that was presented, but they could not tell the owner what he could and could not put on the property. They could comment on the height if the height varied from the guidelines, but no one had spoken about the height of the building other than Staff's report. The only thing that the Board could comment on was the presentation of the proposed building, which was being discussed today. He said the mass was a major issue as was the height, and the mass included the articulation of the building.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the Architectural Review Committee met with the architect and would support Staff's comments regarding the walkability of the area. The ARC recommends creating space for a tree lawn on the Papy Street and especially the Oglethorpe Avenue side. She disagreed with Mr. Deering regarding a restaurant with large windows that would create a pedestrian feel, and said that only a mix of uses like retail, restaurants, and offices along the road would give the people reason to walk down the street, which was what the Tricentennial Plan was encouraging.

Mr. Deering stated the Board's purview was to address physical structures within the Historic District. He said the comments from Mr. Ashby regarding ugly buildings was not what they were designing but that they were trying to do the best they could with the need in Savannah. He thought that a leased restaurant that was half the length of the building on Oglethorpe was better than four of five retail shops that cannot be leased and sit empty. He did not know how favorable Oglethorpe was until other areas improve for retail, and he did not want to see retail spaces sit empty, blank, lifeless, and dead. He would rather see a restaurant with the lights on and people in it.

Mr. Steffen stated that Mr. Meyerhoff was correct in stating what the purview of the Board was, and sometimes the Board gets frustrated when the public criticizes them for not addressing things not within their purview. It was the reason some of the comments were made in Staff's report to the Board regarding other comments being made by other departments of the City on this particular project, and specifically as it relates to the Downtown Master Plan. He said that Mr. Yellin was correct in that the plan had not yet been approved, and when it would be approved they did not know. The Board cared very much for the number of hotels and structures being built, but they do not have enough tools in their box when dealing with them. The City was attempting to give the Board more tools through the adoption of the Downtown Master Plan. Once they were passed, he urged the people to support them and the types of projects built within the Historic District that would be somewhat different. What they were dealing with today was the applicant's right to be heard under the existing law, and he wanted to give them the opportunity to be heard although Staff recommended a continuance. He had a concern with the walkability and thought SCAD students were using the area more and more as a thoroughfare. They would want the applicant to do whatever could be done to increase the walkability when the project was completed. Another concern was about the proposed building bumping up directly against the Thunderbird. He would like to see more of a step back because the Thunderbird was important. It historically speaks to a particular era of motor travel and travel into hotels, there had been a wonderful renovation of the building, and he might agree that it was not in the best place it should be, but it was still there.

Mr. Gay stated the Board had no say over parking, but asked if the Board had the ability to approve something that goes against the regulations like eliminating the parking.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board could bring their logic into the room, and if it did not logically make sense, then the Board could approach the issue with some level of suspicion. Technically, the Board did not make decisions based on whether there was enough parking, but they cannot leave their common sense outside of the room.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to August 22, 2007. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Judson abstained.

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture
Bryce Bounds
H-07-3840-2
PIN No. 2-0045-19-007
605 Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard
Rehabilitation/Addition**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Bryce Bounds

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations and a new sign on the Popeye's building at 605 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK) as follows:

1. Remove the existing shingle deck roof and modify the existing storefront. No alterations to the footprint are proposed.
2. Clad the front exterior portion (east elevation and a 24-foot portion of the north and south elevations) of the building with brick simulating piers with a stepped parapet and stucco panels. The remaining rear half of the building will retain the existing storefront windows and new stucco will be installed above. The existing drive-thru on the south elevation will be bricked to match the front portion of the building. A water table will be installed around the base of the building. The proposed parapet is 18'-4.5" tall and the existing height is 16'-7.5".
3. Standing seam metal awnings are proposed over the storefront windows to be Regal Red. They extend 7.5' above grade and project 3 feet from the face of the building.
4. Gooseneck lighting is proposed over awnings and signage to downlight the façade and sign, which will not be internally illuminated.
5. Colors -
 - Awnings and gooseneck lights: Regal Red
 - Stucco: Sherwin Williams Crisp Peach (SW #159)
 - Stucco bands: Benjamin Moore Exotic Red (BM #2086-10)
 - Brick: Jenkins Chocolate wire cut with matching mortar
6. Signs (note an existing freestanding principal use sign at MLK will remain):
 - a. Principal use sign to replace existing principal use sign on front façade (east elevation). To be 31.2 square feet within the center of the front street facing façade. It will be illuminated from gooseneck lights above. The text for "Popeye's" is red (Pantone 187c/3M 3632-53) surrounded by a blue (Pantone Reflex Blue/3M 3632-87) band with a green (Pantone 3435c/3M3632-126) subheading below with the text "Chicken & Biscuits" below.

- b. A second principal use sign is proposed on the north elevation. It will feature the same illumination and colors as stated above but is reduced in size to 10.17 square feet.

FINDINGS:

The existing building at 605 MLK, Jr. Blvd. is not historic and was originally constructed ca. 1968. The property is zoned B-G (General Business) and the building maintains approximately 31 linear feet of frontage along MLK. The building has been greatly modified overtime and has most recently suffered damage to the front façade when struck by an automobile. The alterations are being requested as a result of that damage and are more in keeping with the surrounding historic context that the existing façade. Staff has recommended that the applicant and owner consult with the Savannah Development and Renewal Authority (SDRA) to adapt to the future plans for the MLK/Montgomery Street Corridor.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Bryce Bounds stated the reason for the renovation was because the building was struck by an 18-wheeler, which severely damaged the roof, and there was severe water leakage that had been patched with tarps. The client had received some insurance money and they had discussed possibilities with the SDRA, but it was more of a 10 to 15 year time frame as opposed to immediate assistance. He said the economic incentive and the available money was not there presently. They did not have a problem eliminating the secondary sign that faces Burger King, and they were pleased with Staff’s recommendation.

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

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture
Keith Howington
H-07-3841-2
PIN No. 2-0016-36-010
148 Montgomery Street
Demolition**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Bryce Bounds

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish 148 (152) Montgomery Street.

FINDINGS:

148 (152) Montgomery Street is a one-story commercial structure built between 1916 and 1954, but most probably dates from the Post WWII era in the late 40’s. Although older than 50 years it is not listed as historic on the Landmark District’s contributing buildings map and appears to have been altered so that it no longer retains its character-defining features. It is currently a restaurant and commercial space.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval to demolish this non-rated structure.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Steffen asked if the petitioner could add anything to the history of the building.

Mr. Keith Howington stated he did not because he only had the history that he gave. The building housed a leased place and a restaurant, and that it had been altered so many times that he thought there was no historic fabric left.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Joe Saseen stated the property was renovated many times and there was nothing left that was original.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Gay** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the demolition. **Dr. Watkins** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture
Keith Howington
H-07-3842-2
PIN No. 2-0016-36-010
148 Montgomery Street
New Construction of a Five-Story Hotel, Part I**

The Preservation Officer recommends **Continue to August, 8, 2007, for additional information.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

Staff had initially placed this petition on the Continue section of the HDBR agenda for the July meeting in the opinion that there were outstanding issues that affect Height and Mass. However, the architects and owner insisted that the petition be placed on the regular agenda. Staff included the original memo to the architect together with his responses. This is in addition to the regular Staff report below. The Downtown Master Plan that will have a section on zoning had not been adopted; however, there have been a number of public meetings about the plan and discussion on goals for large development within the Historic District.

NATURE OF REQUEST: The applicant is requesting approval of a five-story Springhill Suites hotel on the Tything block bounded by Montgomery Street, Oglethorpe Avenue, Jefferson Street, and York Lane.

FINDINGS:**Meetings Between Staff and Petitioner**

May 21, 2007

148 Montgomery: Present were Beth Reiter, Sarah Ward, John Deering, and Keith Howington.

Discussed inactive ground floor uses and stepping building down to historic residences across the lane. Talked about additional height in exchange for loss of rooms to interactive uses and stepping down. Developer wants assurances that City would approve height. Staff could only say that given the context it was a possibility.

May 31, 2007

148 Montgomery: Present were Chris Morrill, Lise Sundrla, John Deering, Keith Howington, Beth Reiter, and Sarah Ward.

Discussed using incentives to achieve desired results of interactive ground floor uses and goals of Downtown Master Plan. Discussed feasibility of outing overflow parking in the Robbie Robinson garage. Discussed using project as a pilot project. 170 rooms.

July 2, 2007

148 Montgomery: Developer has stated he does not want ground floor retail. Does not want to bargain on “ifs”. Just meet the standards and get approved. Now 144 rooms. Buck Lindsay to handle site plan review, engineering, and CAT. Talked about needing to know location of internal waste storage; talked about pool location and effect on adjacent residences; discussed proposed curb cut, moving of bus stand, and impact on trees and entrance and traffic. Developer’s representative stated that permitting time is a problem for the developer. Discussed how proposed design does not meet Historic District standards.

Submittal Requirements: The submittal requirements that street trees be shown with trunk diameter and canopy spread. Grassed areas are shown on the plat copied from the demolition petition, however, the location of the existing trees is not shown. The architect has stated no trees will be removed. This relates to the existing major CAT bus stop in front of the Hotel on Oglethorpe. A copy of the demolition site plan is attached.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in BC-1 zone.	The main block of suites has been recessed from the lane above the second story.	Some residences are located across the lane from this recess.
Dwelling Unit Type:	Hotel	No ancillary public functions are proposed at ground level for the hotel.
Entrances: A building on a Tything Block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street. For large-scale development primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. Buildings less than 60 feet wide located on a corner Tything lot abutting a north-south connecting street shall locate primary	One entrance is located on Oglethorpe Avenue 60 feet from the Montgomery Street corner. No other entrance is located on Oglethorpe Avenue. No pedestrian entrance is located on Montgomery Street.	The standard is not met. Aside from the lobby there is no pedestrian ground floor interaction with Oglethorpe Avenue or Montgomery Street. The architect has stated they will put a door on each street.

<p>entrances on both the east-west and north-south streets unless a corner entrance is utilized. Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances.</p>		
<p>Building Height: The site is located within a five-story zone.</p>	<p>Five stories are proposed.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development: The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide. Buildings greater than four stories shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet, nor, more than 20 feet in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature.</p>	<p>The building is divided into three sections of roughly 60 feet, 28+ feet and 150 feet. These divisions are further subdivided by window groupings and recesses.</p> <p>The roof is flat with a parapet.</p>	<p>The 150-foot length of the front façade does not meet the intent of the standard.</p> <p>The roof standard is met.</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:</p>	<p>Not all the division of the building appears taller than they are wide.</p>	<p>Although the design attempts to break up the mass of the building through a glass curtain wall, the building still retains a large horizontal quality. In addition, the glass curtain wall is tinted or reflective and punctuated with what appear to be PTAC grills for the bedrooms behind it. The architect has stated they can mitigate this.</p>
<p>Proportion of Openings:</p>	<p>The windows are rectangular in a 5 to 8 proportion.</p>	<p>In Part II the design of these windows needs to be specifically detailed.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</p>	<p>Double bays of windows are separated by 6'-5" recesses.</p>	<p>Verify depth of recess. Needs to be deep enough to give a modulation. Verify depth of window from face of the building.</p>

Rhythm of Structure on Street:	Through the use of a glass curtain wall the structure has been subdivided into three sections. The cornice is also broken.	The 60-foot lot widths of the Oglethorpe Plan are not clearly articulated in the façade.
Walls of Continuity:	The building is constructed in a continuous plane parallel to the street.	The wall of continuity along the street is maintained. Since there are no interactive pedestrian uses along the bulk of the Oglethorpe Avenue Façade, there is a continuing dead zone along Oglethorpe, reinforced by the jail and Civic Center.
Scale:	Devices such as window groupings, recesses, a break in the parapet, and glass curtain wall have been used to break down the scale.	More study should be given to further manipulating the scale.

Refuse and storage and handling have not been specifically addressed. This is a part of the Part I submittal.

In addition, the screening of the pool has not been delineated which would also be a part of Part I Height and Mass.

RECOMMENDATION: The suggestions of Staff that some of the Site Plan and infrastructure concerns be addressed up front were made on part experience and with the desire to achieve the best building and save time for the developer in the process. The City has expressed on two occasions a willingness to work with the developer to produce a building in the spirit of the goals of the Downtown Master Plan. Staff recommends a continuance so that that process can happen.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the north and south elevations were misnamed.

Mr. Howington stated they were incorrectly named.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Harold Yellin stated the petition was similar to the previous petition in that the Downtown Master Plan had not been approved. He said that it may not be the final product, and they do not know when it would be approved. Most of the comments were more Master Plan than Comprehensive Plan. There had been conversations between the petitioner and Staff with Staff requesting that the building be made six stories with retail below. It would be more vibrant, in keeping with the Master Plan, and they would like to see retail on Montgomery Street. It would also require going to the ZBA to get an approval for a variance. He said the petitioner did not want to do that and wanted to do a five-story hotel with the height that was permitted for the area. The petitioner cannot be told what to do with his property and rather than going six stories with retail, the petitioner desired to go with five stories, which is permitted for the zoning classification for this part of Downtown.

Mr. John Deering stated that he had several meetings with Staff concerning this project, and tried to come up with the exchanges if they did a six-story. He asked how much would they be allowed to do and how much retail space would be needed for six stories. They were happy to

comply if the numbers worked, but the developer had to make the numbers work. With no assurance on how much square footage retail would have to be provided to build the square footage for a sixth floor, the developer decided to go back to what was within the Zoning Ordinance for a five-story height zone, and the Historic District Zoning Ordinance guidelines. They could not get any definitive answers and submitted a five-story building they felt was well designed for the area, and said they were only there for Height and Mass.

He said there were no setbacks for the B-C zone and they did not provide setbacks except for the entrance to an underground garage on the lane. To get away from the smaller historic structures on York Street, they designed a u-shaped building that was 90 feet deep on the west and east end, and the u-shaped space did not go up the entire five stories. It was not like some of Savannah's hotels that had been built completely to the lane and were five stories. It had a large recess from the second floor to the fifth floor that places it further away from historic structures that front York Street to the north.

There was a primary entrance and drop off on west Oglethorpe to enter the lobby. The ordinance stated they needed to provide an entrance into the public space, and there was a pedestrian entrance, which they felt met the Historic District Zoning Ordinance. If they needed to put an entrance into the building from Montgomery Street, they would do so. In the 150-foot length there needed to be an entrance and it was shown on the revised colored elevation. Staff stated the building was divided into three sections (60 feet, 28 feet, and 150 feet), and the 150-foot section was modulated by recessed areas, it responded to the Savannah 60-foot block pattern because the Savannah 60-foot blocks were broken down into many things depending on if it were townhouses, a commercial building, or something else. The sections were 30 feet from centerline to centerline, and there were projections to give it modulation in the 150-foot length. He said they felt they had met the ordinance and the standards concerning the modulation of the façade on Oglethorpe. The ordinance stated the bay should not be less than 15 nor more than 20 feet, and theirs were more than 20 feet. The guideline suggested a 16 to 32 feet guideline and they were somewhere in between. The comment about the horizontal quality of the building was unwarranted and he felt they had broken it up. There was a 60-foot commercial building, a glass recessed area, and the 150-foot long section broken up into 30-foot modules, which was done on purpose. He said the Kress building was a 90-foot wide brick corner building, which had a distinctive theme with other shops and buildings beyond it, and the commercial building development patterns in Savannah were what was needed to be looked at concerning the development of new buildings.

The openings were a 5 to 8 proportion and the zoning required a 3 to 5 proportion, but if taken into ratios, the 3 to 5 proportion was a 1 to 1.66 ratio. He said the windows were a 1 to 1.6 ratio and the verticality of the windows met the ordinance. The depth of the recesses shown on the plans were two feet deep and created a great modulation in the façade, and in the design portion they would work further to develop details to help modulate the scale and rhythm of the elements on the facades. It was unfortunate that the courthouse and the jail were built, the civic center was built away from the street, and it would be nice to pull it up to the street. There was the old Downtown Motor Lodge, (the SCAD Oglethorpe dorm), the old Chamber of Commerce building that was not well modulated, the Telfair building, and the Federal building. It was a neighborhood of modern influence and they wanted to do another nice modern building. He believed they met the requirements for the Height and Mass in the area and had been sensitive to other structures in the neighborhood.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if there was an engineering study to show that they could go down two levels with parking.

Mr. Deering stated they were working on it and said that the architect and developer had done four hotel projects within the Historic District that had two levels of underground parking.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated when the Commerce Building was built they could only go down four feet and he felt hesitant that they could go down 24 feet across the street.

Mr. Deering stated they would investigate it and said he would like the Board to focus on Height and Mass.

Mr. Steffen asked if there was discussion about going to six floors on the left section as an additional floor to create some retail on Montgomery Street. He said he understood the answer to Oglethorpe Avenue because of the bus stop and high amount of traffic that could be incompatible with traditional retail, and it seemed to be a good location for it.

Mr. Deering stated that with a sixth floor and a staircase at one end of the hotel, the elevator and another staircase on the other end, it became a matter of economics. The rooms cost more to build with a secondary staircase and elevator service, and they would only get six rooms for the floor. The cost and development of retail space with lease rates not being high on Oglethorpe and Montgomery would not work economically. He said they welcomed everyone's comments on the sixth floor and the exchange with retail space.

Mr. Steffen stated he was more concerned with the ability to create retail space on Montgomery than he was on Oglethorpe, and he understood the dilemma with high traffic and the bus stop.

Mr. Thomson stated during a conversation with the City Manager a question came up about the screening for the pool in the back, said that there were two concerns, and asked if it was possible to do some things with height to step down the back of the hotel some. He said instead of having the two-deep rooms with a hall in the center, to move one-half to the back and step it down, raise it up on Oglethorpe, and put the pool to the interior of the hotel. He said the idea was to split the hotel to where the hallway would go around in a circle, the rooms would be off to the side, and the pool would be in the center. On the lane, the elevation there would be two-stories and made to look like townhomes (*inaudible – stepped away from the microphone*). The back would be notched out in the lane with the rooms and the pool in a place where the noise wouldn't reach outside and travel. The retail...(*inaudible*).

Mr. Deering stated that their firm was not charged with handling the interior arrangement of the hotel and he would to see if it was possible, but was not sure it was a possibility from the function of the structure and if the square footage was being used effectively. He liked the recess backed away from the historic structures on York Street, keeping it at two floors was a great idea, and to screen the pool with a story high wall to keep from interrupting the people in the back on the other side of the lane could be a solution.

Ms. Ramsay stated she was concerned with the horizontal look. She said it was nicely rendered and delineated, but it would read as a wall of white with the sun coming down on it.

Mr. Deering stated they could work with the fenestration and colors, but they had not decided on colors for the rendering.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the plans had been to the Traffic Engineer because of the buses turning onto Montgomery Street. He said by moving the entrance to the Jefferson Street side it seemed the Traffic Engineer would tell them whether they could do that or not.

Mr. Deering stated the Board did not have purview over the traffic and buses and their firm was not hired to do that, but that the developer was working directly with Chatham Area Transportation (CAT).

Mr. Howington stated he met with two representatives of Traffic and they like where the entrance drop-off point had been moved, although there were some concerns regarding the bus stop. He said this was the first step of many in the process, and one issue was the right lane was to be designated to CAT buses only but people drive and turn right in that lane. The plan opened up the right-hand turn on Montgomery Street along with other lane discussions. They were also in favor of the drive-in for the hotel on Montgomery Street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Gene Brooks stated he has had an office for 15 years at 313 York Street, and that Mr. Leonard Lewis and Mr. Jim Ashby live in the only historic buildings in the area. He said all of the buildings around them were tall and the proposed building was much taller. His building was approximately 33 feet tall and the proposed building would be over 65 feet tall. At the end of the block were two two-story buildings and the proposed would be twice the size of these buildings. He said in the regulations for the Historic District that the height was an issue and does not automatically become five stories just because it was zoned for five stories, but had to be visually compatible with the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Steffen stated it had been an issue that the Board had wrestled with for over a year.

Mr. Brooks stated there were visual compatibility and height factors, and the purpose of them was to preserve the historic nature of the buildings. The only historic buildings in the area were the group of buildings that he, Mr. Ashby, and Mr. Leonard had put a lot of effort and investment in keeping the buildings maintained. He said Mr. Leonard lives in the oldest continually occupied house in the Historic District. All of the ingress and egress of the traffic from the proposed building would be going out on the lane and it would be better to move back the two wings and eliminate them so the lane could be extended. He showed photographs taken in the lane between 9:00 and 11:00 a.m. of a bulldozer, a restaurant delivery truck, and power lines that 150 vehicles would be using. He suggested dropping a floor, and the wings on both side be backed up to allow another lane for expected traffic.

Mr. Lewis Leonard (311 West York Street) stated he lives in a house built in 1820. He said it was a large structure that cost a lot to maintain and his taxes were high. He said they were terribly worried about the proposed structure's Height and Mass and he was concerned about the lane. He measured the lane as only 24 feet wide and said it was congested with existing traffic. He could not imagine a two-level underground parking facility adding the exits of the parking garage onto the lane. The proposed pool was even with the deck on the back of his house and would be a few feet away from him, and did not know how much use he would get from his back porch on his second-story level. He was concerned about using his property during construction, and asked about auto exhaust coming from the underground parking with 140 cars. He asked what was being planned to remove the exhaust and the vibration damages to an 1820 fragile and historic structure with pile-driving being done to dig the subterranean parking. He would like to see the refuse and storage handling and the screening of the pool be addressed with Staff, which was part of the Part I submittal. He said the mass at the lane would be overwhelming for the York Street structures, and asked if an archaeological survey could be done on the property before paving because it was part of the battlefield for the Battle of Savannah.

Dr. Elmore suggested contacting Mr. Scott Smith the Executive Director of the Coastal Heritage Society. He said they used archaeologists to discover historical artifacts and elements of the Spring Hill Redoubt.

Mr. Leonard asked the Board to grant a continuance to allow a meeting with the developer, find out about traffic, the pool, the trash, and the other items so that at the August meeting there would be more information.

Mr. Steve Beauvais (301 West York Street) stated that Mr. Leonard's recommendation for a continuance was well taken and that there were significant issues with the parcel. He said the Board voted to remove an eyesore from the block and asked it not to be replaced with another eyesore. He felt there were concerns with the mass of the building, the 150-foot break-up and the intrusion on the lane. Traffic may not be a concern of the Board but it was a reality. The lane was blocked by one truck, and the petitioner wanted to dump 170 cars in and out, but you cannot get by. No one can get out at the end of the day when the traffic light at the corner of Oglethorpe and Montgomery is red, and you cannot turn onto Jefferson Street and get out. He said the lane was not built at this point to handle the project and that there needed to be a step back. He urged the Board to vote for a continuance so the matters could be addressed and the project done correctly.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that the Architectural Review Committee had met with the architect. They agreed with Staff's comments that a wall was created along the Montgomery and Oglethorpe sides of the building that did not allow for pedestrian access or activity from the street. She said they would be supportive if the petitioner would like to seek a height variance.

Mr. Deering stated there would be an opportunity to meet with the neighbors after the meeting, and that he did not want to address the things pertaining to construction, traffic, noise, lighting, etc. He said he agreed with a continuance if they could get a definitive of what they could present by dropping it one floor and bring the u-shaped portions back in, but they could not do it without a promise of a full six-story. If it was to be dropped one floor, the ZBA would be an issue, and he felt they were between a rock and a hard place because one resident did not want the addition of one floor and another wanted one floor removed with the wings taken back.

Mr. Steffen stated he had spoke with the City Manager briefly regarding the Downtown Master Plan, and the Board may have the ability to make trade-offs in the future. For example, when there would be a situation with residents and businesses that had concerns with the back end that faces the lane, there were also the Oglethorpe and Montgomery height that would not be a problem, but the Height Map still dictates. He thought a continuance would allow the concerned citizens and the City to work with the petitioner to do trade-offs so that the project would work for the clients.

Mr. Deering stated that presently they were allowed a five-story height, and they had not completely covered the lot, and they were left with design and how it related to the surrounding buildings and the surrounding buildings were larger.

Mr. Steffen stated that July 24, 2007, was the next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting and they may get some significant input or approval from them prior to the next Historic District Review Board meeting on August 22. He would personally like to see the Oglethorpe and Montgomery corner be higher and trade-off other areas that were more objectionable to the residents and business owners on the back.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to the August 22, 2007, meeting. Dr. Elmore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Gonzalez Architects
Wayne Anderson
H-07-3843-2
PIN No. 2-0004-38-007
2 East Broughton Street
Awning/Stucco Repair//Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of maintenance items. Denial of new canopy and existing canopy revisions.**

Present for the petition was Jose Gonzalez.

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of a ground supported curved canopy leading to the corner stair tower entrance on Bull Street and Broughton Lane. The fascia of the canopy has a principle use sign with copy "Bull Street Chophouse". The existing canopy is to be strengthened and used for outdoor dining with marble tables. One door colored and textured to match existing stucco wall will be cut into the Broughton Street and Bull Street walls for access to the dining area. A 42-inch high green tinted glass and solid etched stripe railing is to be installed. Existing storefront windows on stair tower to be polished and restored. Existing granite façade to be polished and restored. Existing stucco façade to be restored and painted white.

FINDINGS:

1. 2 East Broughton Street was built in 1947 for the Lerner company as a "ready-to-wear" department store. It was designed by Savannah architect Cletus Bergen. It was the first building on Broughton Street originally designed for complete air conditioning. The windowless feature of the exterior upper floors was a characteristic of this controlled environment.
2. Dr. Richard Longstreth, Director of Historic Preservation George Washington University and distinguished author on American architecture and the development of the department store wrote that the Lerner building "Constructed in 1946-1947...was a pioneer locally in modern retail design..." "Lerner's was also in the forefront of applying innovative new design approaches to its stores. During the post World War II period, Lerner Shops were among the most distinctive medium-sized establishments on many shopping streets nationwide. The Savannah store was no exception. This was the first example locally to have its upper walls cantilevered from its structural columns to permit an uninterrupted band of glazing at street level, offset by story-high signs on both fronts. "...the loss of a major landmark in Broughton Street's evolution should remain the overriding determinant, just as it would in key buildings of 1847 or 1897."
3. The building is within the Broughton Street Urban Renewal District. The Broughton Street Urban Renewal Plan stipulates that any physical improvements made to structures in the project area shall conform to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as well as to the Historic District Standards.

4. The Secretary of Interior Standards recommend against additions that destroy, damage or obscure the character-defining features of an historic building; that are of a size and scale that are out of proportion with the historic building, thus diminishing its historic character or that radically change the historic appearance of the building.
5. Section 8-3030(k)(1) states that “An historic structure...or any appurtenance related thereto visible from a public street or lane...shall only be...altered or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto.
6. The existing canopy is a character-defining feature of the art modern style of the building. It is also an encroachment into public space. The proposed curtained canopy is an encroachment into the public right-of-way subject to approval by the Mayor and Aldermen.
7. Outdoor café dining is subject to the City's outdoor café policy.
8. The placement of a glass railing, tables and chairs and the cutting of doors into the upper façade of this building adversely impacts character-defining features of the building and change the historic appearance of the structure.
9. The proposed ground supported awning is visually incompatible with the architectural style of the building. It appears to come within two feet of the curb thus interfering with the opening of a car door. No information was given on the material of the canopy and size of the proposed sign.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the maintenance and repair items as outlined above. Denial of the alterations to the existing canopy and denial of the proposed ground supported canopy as not in compliance with Section 8-3030(k)(1) of the Historic District Ordinance and the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Mr. Steffen asked was Staff asking the Board to approve the essential maintenance and clean up of some of the existing buildings.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Jose Gonzalez (Gonzalez Architects) stated they agreed with Staff's report, but took issue with the conclusion of the report. He said it was a building that was built in the 40's and did not have windows. Years ago the Board approved an additional story and windows throughout the building and he wanted to preserve the original design of the building and had said that they went through great lengths to preserve it. They believed that the building should not be altered in any significant way and was requested by the client to design a canopy that would be an addition or a modification to the structure. They felt it was inappropriate because the building was a landmark building, but they wanted to help the clients and not alter the building, but still wanted to achieve what they needed to achieve to make the business work. The canopy was an applied canvas canopy that was wrapped and not permanent, which could be removed years later without altering the building. He said that throughout the city there were series of canopies that had been applied to historic structures, and if pulled off, the character and fabric of the building had not been altered. He felt strongly about it and said that the canopy was just an appliqué.

He said the building had a big stucco façade on Bull and Broughton Streets and that they did not want to alter any original design characteristics of the building or degrade the original fabric of the historic building. The glass railings were a design into the canopy that could be removed in the future, and said the canopy would not be altered. He said the use issues were not the purview of the Board. With regard to the aesthetic and the concern for preserving the building, they tried not to build a canopy that would be a permanent structure to the building, which was in conformance with the Department of the Interior Standards, as opposed to altering the structure. He said they studied it with a full, clear glass, but they thought it would be nice to do a modest sandblasting of the glass to give a light look similar to how the stucco reads.

He said in the renderings there were no openings because they were designing flush doors that were done with the same stucco, meaning they were hidden doors. They did not alter the continuous stucco look of the building. When the doors were closed you could see the continuous façade that was not storefront nor was it glazed, but strictly built like a hidden door into the side of the façade.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he felt strongly that the canopy was designed to be a canopy. He said it was built to have approximately 30 pounds per square foot. There would be people up there and the building code required over 100 pounds per square foot, and he asked if they would tear down the canopy and rebuild it to look exactly the same.

Mr. Gonzalez stated they were not tearing it down, but because of the way it was structured they were able to add additional members to increase the load.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how they would accomplish this.

Mr. Gonzalez stated there was a cantilever member that tied back to the second bay inside, it supported the member inside. They would penetrate the wall and place additional members inside. He said they would have to resurface the roofing and when they remove the roof to do repairs...*(interrupted)*.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it would add more weight and he could not see how it could be done with the depth of the existing canopy.

Mr. Gonzalez stated they could and that was why they brought it to the Board. He said if they could not do it without altering the canopy he would not have brought it to the Board.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the porch extended halfway from the building to the sidewalk, which meant that the people walking on the outside closer to the street could get hit by a falling fork, thrown out food, etc. He had never seen a restaurant balcony at that level over half of a sidewalk.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that objection would have to be given to any city in the world. He asked if Mr. Meyerhoff had ever walked outside of the canopy perimeter and if he normally walked underneath in the shade.

Mr. Meyerhoff answered no, but if someone with a baby carriage and two four-year olds were walking on either side of them, he would have to walk around them because he walked faster than the would and he would be outside of the canopy.

Mr. Gonzalez stated they were not trying to change the character. He said they were trying to make a 1940's building work in the 21st Century, and based on things that the Board had approved and what they were asking, he thought they were reasonable. It also conformed to the Department of the Interior of Standards that allowed a building to have changes for new contemporary uses while respecting the original fabric.

Mr. Steffen stated that there were three issues: the maintenance and repair items for which Staff recommended approval, the contemporary canopy at the entrance, and the alterations to the existing canopy that would allow seating on the outside of the second floor of the structure.

Mr. Judson asked who had purview on whether the applicant could have an elevated sidewalk café to get the desired use of the canopy.

Mr. Steffen stated there were a couple of levels of approval that would occur beyond the Board. He said the Board's purview was limited to the historic integrity of the building. There were questions about outdoor seating and if it had to go before City Council and engineering, and questions about whether it could structurally hold the load.

Mr. Judson stated he was in agreement with the three separate questions.

Mr. Steffen stated there might be four issues because of the door. Mr. Gonzalez said that when the door was closed it could not be seen.

Mr. Judson stated his point was how long it would take to get a determination about the use.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board was asked to decide the issues that came before them without reference to whether another board may or may not approve them. He said if they wait for other boards then no one gets an answer that the applicant was entitled to on the issues the Board looked at. If there were serious concerns that were related to the design or architecture, then the Board would want to look at it. He understood they wanted something to let people know where they were and to draw attention, said there were other canopies in the area, but what he was seeing was a little over the top.

Mr. Johnson asked if there were handrails for the people sitting on the top and to keep a child from falling off.

Mr. Judson stated there was 42 inches of glass.

Dr. Elmore stated he would not approve the sign because it was hideous, to put the glass on the building would destroy the building, and he would not want to see it done for even a brief period of time.

Mr. Steffen wanted to separate the issues based on what was heard, and to approve what the Board could.

Mr. Gonzalez stated there were only two issues because the maintenance issue was not an issue.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Watkins made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the maintenance and repair items as submitted in the petition. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the continuance of the canopy to August 22, 2007, and that the petitioner meet with Staff for further discussion. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated there were 50 seats on the canopy and two doors, and he did not see how they could have 50 people going through two doors along with servants with trays. He said he thought they would need more doors that were more visible. The doors open out and in case of an emergency, they should open in for people to get out.

Mr. Judson stated he agreed with Mr. Meyerhoff regarding maintaining the integrity of the building while making an addition of a temporary use, but what it overlooked was the restaurant would be successful and present for a number of years, and for a number of years they would be looking at it.

Mr. Gonzalez stated he hoped they would. He said he could present the idea, and the idea was to use the canopy for outdoor dining. It may or may not be the right idea, but the question was if it was an o.k. idea, how he could best respect the building and do it in a way not to alter the building or in a way that was irreversible. He said this would be his concern because they had seen buildings in the city with incredible modifications to structures and buildings that had been affected. The Board would tell them no they do want it or yes they would allow it.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the request for the use of the fixed canopy. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion passed 8 to 2. Dr. Watkins and Mr. Hutchinson abstained.

RE: Petition of Wayne Spear
H-07-3844-2
PIN No. 2-0005-23-001
424 East President Street
Rear Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Steve Day.

Ms. Harris gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of a three-story addition to existing house to accommodate an elevator. Lap siding to match existing siding and color (Benjamin Moore Platinum Gray) to match existing color. 12-inch wood pilasters. Weathershield HR175 insulated windows with 7/8" muntins.

FINDINGS:

Upstairs porch is recessed.

The applicant's builder has agreed to lower the addition roof to be under the eaves for the main house as much as can be allowed by the position of the elevator cab.

Applicant has requested option to use smooth face HardiPLank or wood siding.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of addition with option to use smooth face HardiPlank or wood siding, and with the understanding that the addition will be placed under the eave as much as can be allowed by the position of the elevator cab.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the submission did not have a floor plan with both floors, or a section through it, which made it difficult without reading Staff's comments to know that there was a recessed porch on the second floor.

Ms. Harris stated it was not submitted with the application.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Steve Day stated he understood Ms. Ramsay's position, and it was a mistake. He said the only point he wanted to make was the comment Staff made about the roofline being underneath the eave. It was not a problem and the only reason it was drawn that way was because approximately a block away there was another structure that had the same roofline and they thought it would be best from a compatibility standpoint to keep it that way. He spoke with Staff and their concern was the head height on the elevator above the elevator car. They were going to keep it as far under as possible to satisfy the requirement.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Day had any problem with Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Day answered no, and said they were planning to use Hardi-Plank smooth surface because everything in Savannah rots, and that they would paint it the same color of the existing building.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions set by Staff. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Amended Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects
Neil Dawson
H-06-3611-2
210 East Taylor Street
Alterations to a Carriage House
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of James & Deborah Smith
H-07-3833(S)-2
202 East Gwinnett Street
Stucco Repair/Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Inman Park Properties
H-07-3835(S)-2
9 Lincoln Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: MINUTES

Approval of Minutes – June 13, 2007

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the minutes as submitted. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

Adopt Code of Ethics

Mr. Steffen continued this item until the August 22 meeting.

RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

RE: INFORMATION ITEMS

- Retreat Summary

Mr. Steffen stated the retreat summary was in the Board's packet and he appreciated everyone being involved with it. He felt that with the Board getting through the length of the agenda in the time that they had was good.

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp