

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

June 13, 2007

2:10 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman
Gene Hutchinson
Dr. Malik Watkins
Ned Gay
Sidney J. Johnson
Brian Judson
Richard Law, Sr.
Linda Ramsay

HDRB Members Not Present:

Eric Meyerhoff
Dr. Charles Elmore

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Thomas Thomson, AICP, MPC Director
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant
Nick Fuqua, Intern

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 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 July 11, 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 July 11, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

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

Continue to July 11, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

RE: 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 July 11, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

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

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Image is Everything, Inc.
H-05-3360-2
PIN No. 2-0016-34-004
223 Martin Luther King, Jr., Blvd.
Alteration to the Side Entrance

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Sign-A-Rama
Robert L. Miller
H-07-3818-2
PIN No. 2-0016 -14-001
35 Barnard Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.
Donna Swanson for Paula Deen
H-07-3825-2
PIN No. 2-0004-30-002
108 West Congress Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Ciphers Design Co., Inc.
H-07-3828-2
PIN No. 2-0005-06-015
34 East Broad Street
Alteration/Additions

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Ramsay Sherrill Architects
Linda Ramsay
H-07-3829-2
PIN No. 2-0015-19-002
204 East Liberty Street
Addition to a Rear Porch

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Mr. Saseen asked if the public could object to a Consent Agenda item.

Mr. Steffen stated he understood that the prerogative was with the Board, but it an interesting question that he would research before the next meeting.

Mr. McDonald stated that he thought it would violate the rights of the public to comment.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board had guidelines that indicate a Board member may remove it, but it does not indicate anything about public comment. He said he would try to answer that next month.

Mr. Johnson asked what were the conditions for H-07-3829.

Ms. Reiter answered that the shutters be hinged and able to close over the windows.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Continued Agenda items as presented. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Ms. Ramsay recused herself from H-07-3829-2.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Dawson + Wissmach
Architects
Neil Dawson
H-05-3477-2
PIN No. 2-0004-13-001
126 West Bay Street
Window Revisions

The Preservation Officer recommends denial.

Present for the petition was Josh Ward.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval to amend a previously approved application with regard to replacement windows.

FINDINGS:

1. On October 12, 2005, the Historic District Board of Review approved Kolbe Heritage series 8 light, wood, true divided light replacement windows with four light fixed sash above for the openings on the third, fourth, and fifth floors. The original windows were 6/9 lights and later were 2/4 lights. These were removed at some point in time and replaced with inappropriate sashes.
2. The proposed windows have already been made and several examples have been installed on the building.
3. The proposed replacement windows do not reflect what was previously approved nor do they approximate the appearance of the historic windows. Their proportions are not compatible with the architecture of the structure, nor with the previously approved renovation designs.

RECOMMENDATION:

Denial of the request to amend the window selection and reconfirmation of the previous approval.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Ward stated the owner and contractor were eager to get started, may have misinterpreted the drawings, and built something that the petitioner did not draw. He said they were after-the-fact windows for which they were seeking approval.

Ms. Seiler asked if there were two windows.

Mr. Ward stated there were three actual existing windows.

Ms. Ramsay stated they appeared to be French doors instead of windows, and asked if there was a reason.

Mr. Ward stated there was not a reason, but they would be fixed and would not operate as doors.

Ms. Ramsay asked if they were doors.

Mr. Ward was not certain, but thought they were made by someone in town, and they were not off-the-shelf doors. They may have similar proportions to doors, but he did not believe that was the intention.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they recommend that the Board follow Staff's recommendation and deny the request and require the property owner to install what was approved. He said to do otherwise would reward them for violating the provisions of law.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the request to amend the petition for windows, for the reason that the replacement windows are not compatible with the building in terms of proportion and design. They do not meet the Historic District window standards in that they are fixed. The Board further reaffirms its previous approval for Kolbe Heritage series eight light, true divided light windows. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of H. O. Price, LLC
Richard Guerard
H-07-3785-2
PIN No. 2-0005-30-002
342 Drayton Street
New Construction Part I Revised, Part II Design
Details**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Richard Guerard.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a revised New Construction, Part I Height and Mass, and Part II Design for a three- and four-story condominium building.

FINDINGS:

The substantive changes in the Part I from the approved submission are:

1. The structure has been flipped so that the four-story section is on Drayton Street and the three-story section is on the east.
2. No variances are requested.
3. The overall height is 44 feet for the three-story portion and 56'-8 ¼" for the four-story portion.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone. The R-I-P-A zone allows a maximum 75 percent building coverage.	75 percent lot coverage is proposed. A 3-foot +/- setback is proposed from the east lot line and a 7-foot +/- setback is proposed from the west (Drayton Street) lot line. A planting area is proposed along Drayton Street.	Staff recommends shifting the building to the west two to three feet, which still allows for planting along Drayton Street and moves the building further away from the residence to the east.
Street Elevation Type: The proposed street elevation type for new construction shall comply with the following: A proposed building on an east-west connecting street shall utilize	Three low stoops are proposed.	Low stoops are found in this ward including on the adjacent residence.

<p>an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front, or on an immediately adjacent tithing or trust block. Where the aforementioned conditions cannot be met, the proposed building shall meet the visual compatibility factors.</p>		
<p>Entrances: A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.</p>	<p>The entrance is proposed on Charlton Street.</p>	<p>This standard is met. Multiple entrances have been used.</p>
<p>Building Height: The building is located in a four-story height zone. A basement that is entirely underground; a crawl space or partial basement that is four feet or less above grade...shall not count as a story. For residential buildings, the exterior expression of the height of the first story shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet.</p>	<p>The building has a four-story and a three-story section. The three-story section is used to step down to the adjacent three-story residence.</p>	<p>The proposed structure meets height map standards. The floor-to-floor height standards have been met.</p>
<p>Large Scale Development: Development whose ground floor footprint is equal to or greater than 9,000 square feet is subject to the Large-Scale Development standards. These are Large-scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width. Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street.</p>	<p>The ground floor footprint is approximately 9,127 square feet. The heights are varied in several sections each less than 60 feet. There are three primary entrances not exceeding intervals of 60 feet.</p>	<p>The Large-Scale Development standards are met.</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:</p>	<p>The three-story portion is similar to the width of the adjacent residence. The center entrance is recessed 4'-4" from the face of the eastern portion. There is a second small setback before</p>	<p>The applicant has used recesses to articulate the mass as well as height differentiation.</p>

	the section with the third stoop.	
Proportion of Openings and Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:	<p>Rectangular openings, vertically aligned are proposed.</p> <p>The windows have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3 and are vertically aligned. The space between windows is not more than two times the width of the windows.</p>	Staff recommends separating the windows on the Charlton Street façade of the western portion into two single windows and adding shutters to help fill this space. This would achieve a three-bay rhythm. Also, delete the balconies on this portion since there is a recessed porch.
Rhythm of Structure on Street:	Three stoops are used to establish a rhythm. Setbacks are also used.	The width of each section approximates the width of other historic structures on the street.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:	Recessed porches are proposed on the sides with shutters on the west end to suggest the shuttered porches elsewhere on the block. Balconies are proposed on the Charlton Street elevation.	Porches and balconies are typical of this Ward.
Walls of Continuity:	It is understood that a low fence will be used along the front property line to create a wall of continuity along Charlton Street. This has not been shown.	
Scale:	The scale of the building has been addressed by window groupings, recessed balconies, varied heights, and setbacks and varied cornices.	Staff has previously suggested separating the windows on the western portion of the Charlton Street side. Other suggested devices to help with the scale include deleting the canopy over the eastern door and adding a transom and possibly sidelights. Also, change the orientation of the stoop to be a masonry stoop such as brownstone with a direct flight of steps (rather than sideways).

Part II Design

<p>Windows: Residential windows facing a street shall be double- or triple-hung. Double-glazed windows are permitted on new construction provided that the window muntin shall be no wider than 7/8 inches; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash rail shall be wider than the meeting and top rails and extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. The centerline of the windows shall align vertically; shall have a vertical to horizontal ration of not less than 5:3; window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building; shall be constructed of wood or clad wood;</p>	<p>Single and paired rectangular windows are proposed, vertically aligned.</p> <p>6/6 Anderson Narrowline Permashield Double-hung windows are proposed. The eastern portion have brick lintels and sills. The western portion has stone lintel and brick sills.</p>	<p>Lintels and sills should match – i.e., stone lintels and sills rather than stone lintels and brick sills.</p> <p>Louvered shutters (Manchester style) by Atlantic are proposed for the eastern portion.</p> <p>Moulded urethane louvered panels are proposed for the western porches on the Charlton Street side. Provide sample.</p>
<p>Doors:</p>	<p>Single doors without top or sidelights are proposed for the two outer stoop entrances. The are traditional doors by Simpson. The center door is by Simpson with top and sidelights.</p> <p>French doors access the balconies of the east portion.</p>	<p>Staff has previously suggested that top lights be added and possibly sidelights to the eastern door and that the canopy be removed since there is a balcony above.</p> <p>See comments on the use of balconies on the east portion.</p>
<p>Roof: Parapets shall have a string course of not less than six inches in depth and extending at least four inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and one and one-half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two-inch overhang.</p>	<p>The eastern portion has a 4'-8" parapet. A much shallower parapet with cap molding is proposed for the taller portion. Vents are proposed on the eastern parapet.</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the height of the parapet by one-foot. There appears to be no purpose other than decoration for the vents on the eastern parapet. If needed they should be slightly larger. If not needed they should be deleted. It appears that the projecting band is one inch shy of the minimum projection required in the ordinance.</p>
<p>Balconies: Residential balconies shall not extend more than three feet in depth from the face of a building, and shall be supported by</p>	<p>Projecting balconies are proposed for the Charlton Street elevation. A metal bracket is proposed and metal railing.</p>	<p>This standard is met. Delete balconies on the Western portion of Charlton Street elevation.</p>

brackets or other types of architectural support.		
Stoops: Front stair treads shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone, or slate. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave. Supported front porticos shall be constructed of wood unless the proposed material matches the façade details on the same building, such as terra cotta or wrought iron. Stoop heights shall not exceed 9'-6".	Two outer low stoops are shown and a center stoop with a direct flight of stairs. No sections or information on the materials have been provided.	The stoops need to be detailed with cast steps.
Side Porches:	Recessed porches are proposed on the sides of the building. Those on the west side have shuttered ends similar to other porches in the neighborhood. Raised panels are proposed beneath the windows and/or louvers.	On the Drayton Street elevation continue the panels in lieu of the railing for design continuity. On open side of all recessed porches provide folding louvered shutters so that the occupants can have privacy if they desire.
Materials:	Walls: Brick: Carolina Ceramics "Beechwood" Porches: Wood pilasters, columns, and raised panels. Metal balconies with wood floors; metal brackets. Moulded stucco band between first and second stories of western portion.	The brick choice is inappropriate. A finely grained smooth brick in the brown range should be used adjacent to the eastern residence. A varying color brick should be considered for the western portion.
HVAC and Trash:	The HVAC units are to be located on the roofs of both buildings. Trash is serviced in a fenced yard at the lane with a five-foot brick lattice fence and metal gate.	Can all HVAC units be located on the four-story roof? Verify that the fence will completely screen a dumpster or compactor.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of Part I and Part II with the following conditions and revisions to be submitted to Staff for approval.

- 1. Consider shifting the building westward toward Drayton Street two or three feet.**
- 2. Separate windows into two bays and add shutters on the Charlton Street elevation between the pier and Drayton Street porches.**

3. Provide plan and elevation of proposed front fence.
4. Delete canopy over eastern door and add a top light at a minimum.
5. Redesign eastern stoop to be a direct flight masonry stoop such as brownstone. Provide sections and materials for all stoops.
6. Where applicable, match stone lintels with stone sills.
7. Consider reducing height of eastern parapet by at least a foot and consider deleting vents if not functional. If functional enlarge opening slightly. Verify that brick projecting band meets ordinance standards.
8. Continue raised panels on Drayton Street recessed porches in lieu of railing and add fold back shutters for privacy.
9. Submit alternate brick samples for Staff review and before construction erect a sample panel on the site.
10. Consider locating all HVAC units on top of the four-story building roof and verify that the rear trash enclosure is tall enough to hide the container.

Mr. Judson asked about the fence on the front of the building on Charlton Street.

Ms. Reiter stated there were varying setbacks, and on one elevation there was a low iron fence that was not detailed on the site plan.

Mr. Gay stated he did not know how the cars would access the garage.

Ms. Reiter stated it was proposed that a sloped ramp off the lane would be the entry and that it would be reviewed by Traffic Engineering in the Site Plan Review process.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Richard Guerard stated they have been working with the project for six months. He made the following comments regarding the ten recommendations of Staff.

1. Shift Building Westward: He did not want to follow Staff's recommendations because it was at a zero lot line in the zoning. He said with the landscaping created to add height to the building, where it would be positioned on the lot was where they would like to have it. He felt they were not in violation of any ordinances and it fits their landscape.
2. - 3. Windows & Fence: He did not have a problem with separating the windows and detailing the fence.
4. East Door: He said they would take the stoop off the door.
5. – 6. Realign Stoop & Add Stone Lintels/Sills: He did not have a problem with moving the steps forward and changing the brick.
7. Parapet & Vents: He said they would reduce the height of the parapet wall as much as they can by code. He thought the parapet wall had to be 42 inches and said they will reduce it to the minimum required by code, and remove the metal vents.

8. Panels on Drayton Side: He said he did not want to put the louvered shutters in because they were expensive and he considered them to be aesthetic. He felt they had gone to great lengths to appease the Board and Staff.
9. Brick Sample Panel: He said they usually make a two- and one-half, three-foot-wide by three-foot-tall sample.
10. HVAC: He said they would move the HVAC units on top of the roof.

Mr. Steffen asked the petitioner what he intended for number eight.

Mr. Guerard stated he would continue the raised panels around the Drayton Street elevation side to match the front. He said the porch was not intended to be a private porch, but just a porch and did not need the louvered shutters.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Guerard agreed to everything except for the pull back shutters.

Mr. Guerard answered yes.

Mr. Gay asked if they were going to change the brick.

Mr. Guerard answered yes. He said they would build a brick wall sample for Staff to come by and approve. He said they might build two or three different ones to choose from.

Ms. Reiter asked about the trash enclosures.

Mr. Guerard stated it was a dumpster on wheels and Atlantic Waste would be providing the trash service. He said it would be shielded from the public and the dumpster would be rolled out and picked up with the truck, and then returned. It would be hard for a City truck to get to the dumpsters.

Mr. Gay asked if the east doorway would not have a light over the top and both sides. He also asked if they were doing away with the balconies on the west.

Mr. Guerard answered yes. He said they redesigned the building again to shrink it and make it smaller, they were at the 75 percent, and they were not requesting any variances because it was well within the ordinance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Walter Hartridge (Representing his wife Mrs. McIntire, Mr. Dryden, and The National Society of Colonial Dames) stated the plans were submitted on Friday, June 9, 2007. He said previous large roll-up plans were submitted and he had obtained copies of them. He spoke about the resubmittal of new plans that were brought in after the deadline date and the events that took place with the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). He felt that if the Board went forward that the petition should be denied because of a lack of procedural due process and that it should not be continued because the plans were filed on Friday the 9th for today's hearing.

Mr. Steffen asked if the second part of the issue concerning the lot coverage left an indication that the plans that were submitted were not submitted with proper lot coverage.

Mr. Hartridge stated that previously the petitioner stated he was seeking a variance from the ZBA, and a second set of plans were submitted for the May 24 deadline. He said the plans before the Board today were the reduced sets that were hard to read, and he wanted to raise the issue of a continuance.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if they had a comment on the issue that Mr. Hartridge had raised.

Ms. Reiter stated the second plans that were submitted were the ones that came before the Board in a previous month when the Board asked the petitioner to flip the building. She said the petitioner went back to the reduced 75 percent and flipped the building and resubmitted them. She indicated the second revised set came in after the deadline.

Mr. Steffen asked if it was the same submission and not substantially different than the initial submission.

Mr. Reiter stated the differences were the lowering of the height of three-story portion and adding two and one-half feet on the four-story portion. The revised submission does not require a variance according to the petitioner.

Mr. Hartridge stated they respectfully dissent and that it still required a variance. He said interior things have taken place, and other design factors that were submitted were going to require very stringent review City Inspections Department. He said there were no architect or engineer stamps on the plans.

Mr. Steffen stated he was being asked to make a legal decision. He said it was not something that would be voted on as a Board, but whatever decision he made on whether it should be continued, the Board could over rule him. He said Mr. Hartridge raised an issue that the initial submission was supplemented later with additional materials. He said it was his view that it happens on a regular basis, and the question would be whether what was submitted was substantially different to create improper notice to the public, the Board, and to Staff. It was his opinion that what was submitted was not substantially different to require a continuance, and he would not indicate that the petition be continued, but it should be heard on its merits. He said he would allow any Board member to indicate if they dissented or disagreed from the ruling. He asked Mr. Hartridge to proceed on the merits and noted his objection.

Mr. Hartridge stated he objected to the way it was characterized because the rolled-up plans that Staff had were the ones submitted after the petitioner went to the ZBA. It was in the record of the Board, and they were not the same. He said the previously submitted plans and the subsequent plans that were submitted on June 9 were prepared by an architect or engineer, and the regulations of the City Building code state, "...that a design professional who shall be an architect or engineer legally registered shall have the seal affixed to drawings and buildings of structures three stories or more high, or containing 5,000 or more square feet." If the City required a professional to stamp the plans, then many things may not be approved and it would have to come back, and they object because it may be a moot proposition.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board asks petitioners to submit the highest level of architectural drawings. He said that it has been the policy of the Board that they do not make decisions based upon on what other agencies of the City may or may not do. They decide based on their own guidelines of historic compatibility and design detail issues. Mr. Hartridge may have a legitimate point for the buildings approval to be given before the structure was built, but it was not a consideration for this Board.

Mr. Hartridge stated that the submitted plans show a building coverage in excess of 75 percent of 12,100 square feet. He said they have been denied and have not met the 75 percent requirement because it was in excess of 75 percent, and the rules were not being followed.

Mr. Steffen stated the issue of lot coverage that was one the Board should decide. They have heard from Staff, Mr. Guerard, and counsel for the neighbors and there were different opinions

whether there was 75 percent lot coverage. He said the Board could make a decision if it was a zoning issue, and he would withhold any ruling.

Mr. Gay stated it was 75.2 plus percent.

Mr. Steffen stated that Staff had said it fits within the 75 percent along with Mr. Guerard, and Mr. Hartridge has stated otherwise. He said he was going to allow the Board to decide after hearing from the public regarding how they want to address that issue.

Mr. Hartridge stated the numbers speak for themselves, that it was not what Mr. Hartridge said but it was on the application.

Mr. Hartridge stated there were a number of other corollary points he wanted to make as to why they should have architectural plans so they don't have to come back. He said the Board would receive a handout from Ms. Anna Smith that would address the following issues: 1) an inadequate turning radius in Charlton Street Lane, 2) the redesign would increase the rear building setback, 3) excessive slope of the ramp, 4) inadequate head room, 5) lack of two-way access and ingress, 6) inadequate fire exits, 7) inadequate service area, 8) east wall too close to the property line of 119 East Charlton, 9) inadequate windows and natural ventilation for two bedroom units, and 10) excessively tight design. He spoke about the building code requirements regarding two bedroom units and the required lighting, space, ventilation, exits, exterior doors, heating, in addition to the brick and mortar. He said the parapet was approved and the parapets were high and gave a top-heavy look to the structure. The building should not be approved today because of the flaws and if the Board approved Height and Mass, they should not approve the design today leaving final approval of details to the purview of Staff and the applicant, but the Board were the arbiters' of the design and should approve it.

Ms. Anna Smith (National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of Georgia) stated they own the Andrew Low House museum across the street, which was a National Landmark and is being renovated. The proposed building would affect the visual nature of the rear courtyard of the Andrew Low House. She said to have the historical compatibility, the importance and process of the details, as well as the aesthetics dismissed was a bit much. She was concerned about the proximity of the building to Mr. Hartridge's house. There was a wall that was supporting the house and the new plans have the east windows one-foot away from the 24-foot-high wall, and the windows do not function. The Historic Review Board was there to protect the historic structures and the owners, and she did not feel they were being protected. There were no photographs, drawings, or measurements of the adjoining buildings submitted, and the doors were not compatible with the adjacent buildings. She said he had added one-foot and one-half to all four floors, and that the top floors only have to be ten feet and not eleven, and the four-story section of the building was nine-foot higher than it needed to be. She did not think that the trash dumpsters would fit through a three-foot side gate, that Drayton Street did not have any landscaping anywhere, and the building was poorly designed. There were standards that must be maintained and she felt they were being abandoned.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board had not made a decision on the project and asked where Ms. Smith saw the Board abandoning their responsibilities.

Ms. Smith stated the Board did not make an effort to get details of the adjoining building or to ensure the appropriate scale was followed. She said the Board was allowing their time to be wasted on a building that cannot work, that the 75 percent variance was not working, and that the petitioner was being sloppy and incompetent because he had not hired an architect.

Mr. Steffen stated there was concern that the property was jammed up against the adjoining house, but that the building should be supporting the adjoining house.

Ms. Smith stated there was an existing garage wall that was holding up the end of Mr. Hartridge's house, that Mr. Guerard intended to remove it, and wanted to dig a deep hole next to it.

Mr. Steffen asked if Ms. Smith believed that the structure should be jammed up against the house so tight that it supports it.

Ms. Smith stated if Mr. Guerard were designing what should be there (rowhouses), which would not have caused him grief, that the support would be provided by the adjacent building. She said that the entire basement vents of the parking and the first floor windows would be gone. There was no point to having recessed windows and the porches because there was one-foot of air space. The windows were two-feet from the boundary on the upper floors and there must be a minimum of three, and the petitioner stated he just did not feel like changing them.

Mr. Steffen asked what Ms. Smith's background was.

Ms. Smith stated she was a member of the Royal Institute of British Architects, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania, that she was an architect but was not registered in Georgia, and was representing the Dames so it did not matter whether she was an architect.

Mr. Steffen stated he would find it inappropriate if personal comments continue to be made about anyone with regard to their intent or intelligence.

Mr. Lee Meyer stated the building was not ready to be reviewed by the Board. He said there were issues with the building codes. He said that the Board had been entrusted with the future of the community, and that it should not be taken lightly.

Mr. Hartridge stated it was there contention that under Forsyth versus Riches, a Georgia Supreme Court decision from 1959, that the wall was a party wall. The applicant stated that it was his wall, but the wall was married to a low Savannah Gray brick wall that stands on Mrs. Hartridge's property, and was married to the carriage house in the back. Under the decision the wall cannot be taken down because it provided support to the Savannah Gray brick wall that has been there since 1852, and the carriage house since 1881.

Mr. Steffen stated that was why he asked his question as a serious question and not rhetorically. He said City Council approved the demolition of the previous property and asked if the issue was not dealt with at that time.

Mr. Hartridge stated the wall was reserved, and it was in the minutes of City Council. He said they have taken the position throughout, and if the wall stands on H. O. Price, LLC's property, it was still a party wall under the law of Georgia.

Mr. Guerard stated he went to great lengths to do everything he had been asked to do by the Board and from Staff recommendations, and had resubmitted the plans. He said the math was simple, but percent surface coverage area had never been carried to the decimal point, and if it was divided out it would equal 75 percent of the coverage area. He did not think the wall was Mr. Hartridge's wall, and if something was in violation of the building codes it was an interior issue and should be handled with the Building Permit Department. He felt he was personally attacked. He said he had done a lot to get the building to its present point, and asked the Board to approve the petition.

Mr. Steffen stated Mr. Guerard's point about the building codes was correct and the Board does not make decisions based on them. In the past, people have raised them as logical issues, and in that sense, it had some relevance. He asked Staff about the 75.2 percent lot coverage whether it should be rounded.

Ms. Reiter stated she did not know regarding to lot coverage, but she did know Zoning does not round up on density.

Mr. Steffen stated since he had been on the Board the issue had never come up. He asked other Board members if they knew about the lot coverage issue. They did not. He said as a Board they would have to decide if 75.2 meant 75, and that he did not know the answer. The parties have differing opinions.

Mr. Tom Thomson (MPC Executive Director) stated his opinion on the mathematics was if it said 75 percent in the code it meant the significant digit was the whole number. If it was 75.0 in the code, than the significant digit would be a decimal point, and his guidance was if the calculation was 75.6 it would be 76, and if it were 75.2 it would be 75.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board could give an advisory opinion and the ZBA would have to decide whether 75.2 meant 75 or whether it meant 75.2.

Mr. Hartridge stated the 75.2 was not 75. He suggested that the design phase should be put aside because Mr. Guerard went to the ZBA, it was denied, and still submitted plans that show more than 75. They were asking that Mr. Guerard follow the mandate of the ordinance enacted by the City Council.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Watkins stated the Board was talking about .2 percent, but they were also talking about 52 square feet that puts more of a conflict with the design issues.

Ms. Ramsay stated from the codes she understood that from zero to three feet to a property line there had to be a one-hour protected openings.

Mr. Gay stated that Mr. John Deering's firm was the architect of a previous submission, was removed, and he did not know why.

Dr. Watkins asked if there was an architect on the project.

Mr. Steffen stated it was never a requirement of the Review Board to have an architect, but it made the decision-making process easier when highest-level drawings.

Dr. Watkins stated there were many nuances in the drawings that could be better explained and many statements have been made with no specific answers are submitted.

Mr. Johnson stated he felt the whole design was open because there were things that the Building Inspectors would not approve, and he suggested the petitioner get an architect and come back with a new design.

Ms. Seiler stated Mr. Guerard had worked with the Board for a long time on the project and had completely redesigned it. The Board had not required architects before, and she did not want to put in a new requirement. Mr. Guerard's buildings have been acceptable in the Historic District before. It can keep being delayed, but it was putting a great deal of financial hardship on the builder for details that Staff was ready for the Board to approve on Part I and Part II. Mr.

Guerard had already met the Board with what they had asked for. It was a completely different project than what was first presented, and she respectfully disagreed with what people had said about the courtyard facing the front because it was an attractive front compared to what was presented before.

Mr. Gay agreed with Ms. Seiler that it was an improvement over what had been presented before.

Ms. Ramsay asked why there was not a complete submission and why the Board did not see the adjacent structures.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board had seen previous submissions. Part of the issue that Mr. Hartridge raised regarded items coming later as supplements with changed design, but this was the fourth time the Board had seen something on this site.

Mr. Hartridge stated the new Board members do not have the history.

Mr. Judson stated the issue for lot coverage had come up and in the past and the Board recommended a Statement-of-Fact regarding a variance. He said Mr. Hartridge had raised the point that the definition of the footprint of the building may be in question, and if the Board approved Height and Mass and the measurement revealed the lot coverage had gone to 76.0, what would happen.

Mr. Steffen stated because the issue had been raised that 75.2 percent was 75.2 percent and not 75, and if it was the case then the Board would be asked to give an opinion whether they thought 75.2 percent was visually compatible. He said what the Board should do if they approve any portion of it, they should render an opinion whether the lot coverage was visually compatible. He felt it would go to ZBA and they would want to know what the Board thought about it.

Mr. Judson stated it wasn't just the 75.2 but they were also talking about the other appurtenances to the building that might increase the 9,127-foot to 76 percent.

Mr. Steffen stated it was all the more reason the Board should render the opinion if they approve Height and Mass.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Board approved the moulded urethane shutter panels before. She asked what they looked like, and asked if they were louvered panels.

Ms. Reiter stated they had approve PVC shutters of a certain brand, but not these, and said they were louvered panels.

Ms. Ramsay stated they were showing louvered shutters, but the drawings do not meet the detail.

Mr. Steffen stated there were substantive changes in Part I from the previous submission, and Staff had asked the Board to approve Height and Mass based on the flipping of the unit and one change. They have been asked to make a Part II Design approval with 12 conditions with 10 of the 12 conditions the applicant agreed to do, and two that he would not do.

Ms. Seiler stated the Board asked the petitioner to flip the building and he did as asked.

Mr. Steffen stated that the comments coming from the floor were inappropriate, that the audience was showing disrespect for the Board, but they were there to enforce the regulations

of the City of Savannah and the guidelines. He said the Board was going to follow the law and when the Board was in discussion, the audience must stop speaking.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part I Height and Mass as submitted. There was not a second motion and the motion failed.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and the motion carried 6 to 1. Ms. Seiler was opposed.

**RE: Amended Petition of Zunzi's
Gabriella T. DeBeer
H-07-3795(S)-2
PIN No. 2-0004-60-001A
108 East York Street
Ground-Supported Awning/Lattice Screens**

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

Present for the petition was Ms. Gabriella DeBeer.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a ground supported awning to cover an outdoor dining patio on the parking lot on the side of the business. The awning will be 20 or 30 feet long by 13 or 13.6 feet wide (The drawing shows 20 by 13 feet and the written description says 30 by 13.6 feet.

Also after-the-fact approval of lattice screens. Tables, chairs, and umbrellas are already in place.

The applicant has submitted a letter of consent from the property owner.

FINDINGS:

1. The historic building occupied by Zunzi's was constructed in 1859, and is a rated building in Savannah's National Historic Landmark District.
2. The awning application is the same as previously submitted with the exception that there will be only one sign on the valance. The previous recommendation for denial of the awning has not changed. The awning is visually incompatible with the structure to which it is attached and creates a type of addition on the parking lot.
3. The erection of lattice screens is visually incompatible and creates a type of addition. If this were a request for a fence, the material would be required to match the existing building (i.e., brick or masonry). The wood lattice is incompatible in design and material with the existing historic structure to which it relates. Although located on private property this outdoor seating area is not in a rear yard, but is readily visible from the public right-of-way in the same sense as an outdoor café. Such a structure would not be permitted under the outdoor café ordinance, and any structure would have to be removed at the close of business under the café ordinance.

4. The Historic District Ordinance states that “Refuse storage areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.” The blue dumpster next to the outdoor seating area is unscreened.

RECOMMENDATION:

Denial of the ground supported awning. Denial of the lattice screens. An appropriate screen for the dumpster needs to be presented for review.

Mr. Steffen stated the issue was presented to the Board two meetings back and asked about the discussion of the lattice screens and if they were denied.

Ms. Reiter said the petitioner stated they could do it but they were not presented.

Mr. Steffen asked about the screens.

Ms. Reiter stated the screens were made and put into place.

Mr. Gay asked if there was an affect for parking spaces and if they needed a variance.

Ms. Ramsay stated on that side of Oglethorpe there were no parking requirements in a B-C 1.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Ms. Gabriella DeBeer stated they put the screens together so the Board could see how they looked, and it would only take ten minutes to take the lattice down. She said some of them were on rollers and could be placed in front of the dumpster, or they could put all of them on rollers. The planters could be left and they could take the walls down.

Ms. Seiler asked if they kept the lattice screens up overnight.

Ms. DeBeer stated the ones on rollers go inside and the ones with the planters are stationary, but they could put them on rollers and take them in at night.

Mr. Gay asked why the petitioner put them up without coming before the Board first.

Ms. DeBeer stated she wanted the Board to see how they looked. At the last meeting no one knew what she was talking about.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that the foundation held a preservation easement on the building, they objected to the awning being mounted to the building, and they ruled that it not be allowed. He said they did not have any purview over the lattice panels because they were freestanding and asked the Board to deny them because they were visually incompatible.

Mr. Saseen asked why was the petition back to the Board.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board could not prevent or discourage people from bringing things back to them. He said the awning does not belong on the building, does not go with the building, and would not be good for Historic Savannah to have buildings on an old building.

Mr. Gay stated that if there was no latticework, he understood that they could still have the tables without the screening.

Mr. Steffen stated that one of the greatest compliments that Savannah receives was that it was one of the most European city in the United States. The beautiful umbrellas attract people and he did not understand why they wanted the awnings.

HDRB ACTION: Ms Seiler made a motion to deny the petition as submitted on the basis that the awning and screens are visually incompatible with the main historic structure, and further request the permanent removal of the lattice screens. A plan to screen the dumpster shall be brought back to staff for review. Mr. Gay seconded the motion. Mr. Gay, Mr. Judson, Dr. Watkins, Ms. Seiler, and Ms. Ramsay voted in favor of the petition. Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Law were opposed. The motion to deny passed five to three.

Mr. Law asked what did the ordinance state and asked about the awning.

Mr. Steffen stated there was a café ordinance that states planters could be put up during the daytime and brought in during the evening. The Board does not have purview over them and if they choose to place something out in the daytime and remove it in the evening it was up to them. The Board was discussing a permanent structure. With the awning Historic Savannah holds the preservation easement and if the Board did approve it, that Historic Savannah had the right to decide if it was appropriate.

Ms. Seiler stated she would argue compatibility during daytime hours and it was in the motion.

**RE: Continued Petition of Design Reese Architects
& Assoc., P.C.
Gray Reese
H-07-3806-2
PIN No. 2-0015-42-001E
9 – 17 East Macon Street
New Construction of
Condominiums/Townhouses Part II Design
Details**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Gray Reese.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

Part II Design Review was continued from the last meeting in order to provide a section and plan of the at-grade step down; the dimensions and design of the metal railing; and dimensions and design of the brackets and staircase and door transom.

FINDINGS:

1. The balcony projections have been reduced to three feet to meet the ordinance.
2. A plan and section of the step down has been provided. Enlarged details have been provided.

3. Enlarged details of the iron railing have been provided.
4. Dimensions and design of the transom have been provided.
5. Details of the staircase and balcony brackets have been provided.

The design details meet the Historic District ordinance and are consistent with previously approved units in the row.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the Part II design details.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the drawings were improved but pointed out that the shaft of the column should line up with the bottom of the landing on the last page of 4.3.

Mr. Reese stated it was noted.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Joe Saseen stated that he disagreed with Ms. Reiter regarding the garage doors being a part of Height and Mass, and with design, the garage doors should not be excluded.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated he wanted to commend the petitioner on the design because it was an improvement over the last submission. He commended Mr. Saseen's for his dedication and love of the city, but he disagreed with him and said it was more orderly to have the front doors lined up. They support the design and he said with the pressure of off-street parking, it was the only solution that made sense, and asked the Board to approve it.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Seiler stated Mr. Saseen had a valid point with the number of doors. She asked if the petitioner considered one instead of multi-doors.

Mr. Reese stated they did consider it and because it was a new style door they were asked to go back and do what was historical, which was single. He said the floor-to-floor was much lower, the door would be recessed with brick pilasters, and will maintain the activity of the balconies. He said it was important to maintain the tithing lot plan and the two garages pertain to each townhome.

Mr. Judson stated he wanted to acknowledge Mr. Saseen's passion and asked if the doors had been ruled on for Part I, and asked if the motion would be about design changes.

Mr. Steffen stated he allowed Mr. Saseen to talk in length because he comes to the meetings on a regular basis, and the issue was not specifically discussed as part of the Height and Mass.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted with the condition that the vertical dimension of the shaft of the column align with the edge of the landing. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: Continued Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.
 Donna Swanson
 H-07-3808-2
 PIN No. 2-0004 -30-007
 102 West Congress Street
 Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Doug Bean.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to install two projecting illuminated principal use signs on the corner of 102 West Congress Street.

FINDINGS:

The sign comes under the Historic District Sign ordinance. The zoning is B-C-1.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Historic Sign District		
<p>Principal Use Requirements: Section 8-3121 (B) (11): For each nonresidential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. For non-residential zoning districts, the maximum size area for projecting signs is 30 square feet. The maximum projection of outer sign edge for projecting signs is six feet in non-residential districts.</p>	<p>The proposed signs are each 30 square feet. They are 10 feet tall by three feet (less in places) wide. The total projection is 4.5 feet.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
<p>Clearance: Sec. 8-3121 (B)(2): Adequate sign clearance shall be provided to assure that pedestrian or vehicular traffic movements and safety are not adversely affected. Minimum clearance shall not be less than 10 feet above pedestrian ways.</p>	<p>The proposed projecting signs are located 12 feet above the pedestrian sidewalk.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
<p>Location: Sec. 8-3121 (B)(2)(a): Projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the</p>	<p>The sign will be located on the corners of the building on the brick face between windows.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>

structure and shall not project over the roofline or parapet wall elevation of the structure.		
Lighted Signs: Sec. 8-3121 (B) (3): Lighted signs of an enclosed lamp, neon or exposed fluorescent design are not permitted within any “R” zoning district. However, such lighted signs, are permitted within the non-residential zoning districts. Such signs shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open spaces.	White exposed tube neon lettering over brushed silver is proposed for the word “Lady”. The words “Hey Ya’ll” and “Sons” are internally illuminated red. The property is zoned B-C-1 and is surrounded by commercial establishments.	This standard is met. Please clarify whether the top and bottom copy is exposed or covered neon.
Design:	Matte finishes are proposed.	There are two other neon signs on this row,

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Doug Bean stated that the neon was exposed in keeping with a more traditional neon look.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the Architectural Review Committee concluded that the petitioner may have a right to do this, but it was inappropriate for the building. There might be controversy, letters to the newspaper, and it would bring bad attention and misunderstanding, to allow two neon signs of this scale on an 1820 building. It would communicate to the public that anything goes. He did not think it was compatible with an 1820 building and asked the Board to deny both signs.

Mr. Alexandro Santana stated he agreed with Mr. McDonald and felt the sign was inappropriate for a building of this age, and it gives a 1920’s look that was inappropriate.

Mr. Bean stated the building was built to be a commercial building, there were signs on the building since the beginning, and did not understand the premise that the 1920’s look was not appropriate on a building that was there in 1920. He asked if there were supposed to ignore any period of existence of a structure between when it was built and now. He felt the sign was appropriate for the business in the building, it was reminiscent of others in the area and the past, they have met the ordinance with the scale, and said it was a small sign for a large building.

Ms. Seiler stated that Mr. Bean made a good point with the purpose of the building. She said if the sign was not characterized with the particular letters or the in-your-face sign, would Mr. McDonald have any concerns.

Mr. McDonald stated it was the design of the sign and the size that was being objected to because it was too large for the building. He said the sign does not speak to 1820 or 2007 but an attention-grabbing cartoonish sign for a dignified building.

Ms. Seiler stated that was a point well taken. She thought the “Hey Ya’ll” was not in keeping with the Historic District, but she saw no problem with the location of the sign.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Sapphire Grill sign passed easily.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Sapphire Grill sign involved a color scheme that was more subtle. It was the only distinction between the two, however, the discussions were essentially the same discussions regarding the appropriateness of the size and type of signage on a historic structure.

Ms. Ramsay stated her concern was because of the neon flashy signs.

Ms. Steffen stated there was a precedent for neon in the corridor, and the Board could not disapprove based on neon being involved. The Board had the charge to make sure what was done was appropriate with its surroundings, and it may go beyond what the Sign Ordinance may say.

Mr. Judson stated that Mr. Bean made an effort to use muted colors, and said he did not have issues with the colors because they were muted and appropriate to the brick on the building.

Mr. Steffen stated he wasn’t addressing whether they were appropriate because they may be the signature colors, but he was stating that certain colors were more subtle as far as vision.

Dr. Watkins asked if the picture was to scale.

Mr. Bean stated it was not exact but it was very close with a six-foot tall window. He said he tried to present it in proper scale and proportion although it was a perspective. They chose the colors because of existing colors and that the awning colors would be a softened red and gray to match the mortar. He said they did not design it to stand out because they were using a matte finish, but the applicant wanted something significant and fun. They tried to make it period correct with the neon. He said the colors were muted, and felt they had met Staff’s concerns.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Johnson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. Mr. Johnson, Mr. Judson, Dr. Watkins, Mr. Hutchinson, and Mr. Law voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Gay, Ms. Seiler, and Ms. Ramsay were opposed. The motion passed 5 to 3.

**RE: Continued Petition of Igor Fiksman
H-07-3810-2
PIN No. 2-0045 -25-003
312 Lorch Street
New Construction of Single-Family Residence
Part I Height and Mass**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Igor Fiksman.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a three-story single-family residence. Two concepts were submitted Plan A and Plan B. The petitioner prefers plan A. The Staff review is for Plan A.

FINDINGS:

The parcel is currently vacant and is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). There is no access to a lane and, as such, a garage door is proposed on the front of the building. All standards appear to be met and are outlined in the table below.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIP-A zone.	The front elevation is consistent with the adjacent front elevation.	The standard is met. However, the applicant needs to verify that windows can be installed on the east elevation. The east side yard setback is not clear but appears to be less than three feet from the property line. Two windows are shown on this wall. Whether windows can be installed on this elevation will have to be verified by the City's building permit department.
Lot Coverage: 75 percent maximum building lot coverage in RIP-A zone.	The parcel is 48' deep by 21.5' wide for a total of 1032 square feet. The proposed building is 20' wide by 38.5' long for a total of 770 square feet; covering 74.6 percent of the lot.	The standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type:	A detached single-family townhouse is proposed. This is consistent with other historic structures in this block.	The standard is met.
Street Elevation Type:	Due to the configuration of the lot and the desire for a garage, an at-grade entrance is proposed. There are low stoop entrances in this block.	The standard is met.
Entrances:	The entrance faces the principle street.	This standard is met.
Building Height: Three-story zone	The proposed building is three stories tall. The height matches the adjacent structures. The first floor height is 9', the second is 11',	The standards are met.

	and the third is 10'-6".	
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:	The proportion is consistent with the adjacent properties and other historic structures within the block.	The standard is met.
Proportion of Openings:	The window openings are rectangular, taller than they are wide and vertically aligned.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:	A three-bay rhythm is proposed. The rhythm of solids-to-voids is similar to other historic structures in the block.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Structure on Street:	A detached townhouse is proposed. This is similar to other detached historic structures on the street.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:	A ground supported front porch is proposed at the second floor level. There are full-width porches in the block. The height and design is consistent with the adjacent stoops. The drawings indicate double-hung windows.	The standard is met. Clarify how the porch will be accessed.
Walls of Continuity:	The front façade is level with the adjacent front facades. The wall of continuity along the street is maintained.	The standard is met.
Scale:	The scale is similar to the adjacent structures.	The standard is met.
Garage openings:	The lot is narrow with no rear access. A front facing swing out front garage door is proposed. This is recessed four feet under the porch to allow for a turning radius.	The standard is met. The proposed garage is appropriate due to the special circumstances of this lot.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of Part I Height and Mass, with the condition that the applicant confers with the City building permitting office about windows on the east elevation.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Igor Fiksman stated the eastside elevation windows were provided to allow natural light to the stairwells and if it created a conflict they could be removed or changed. He said the lack of access to the porch was an oversight because a French door should be in place of the window to the right at the same height. It would look like the window would extend to the floor of the porch to be submitted with a door and window schedule for Part II approval.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass, with the condition that the applicant consult with the City's Building Inspections department with regard to the windows on the east elevation. Ms. Seiler seconded the petition and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Alexandro Santana
H-07-3816-2
PIN No. 2-0004 -48-001
323 East Broughton Street
Addition of a Balcony**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Alexandro Santana

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to add a decorative cast iron balcony at the second floor front elevation, painted Benjamin Moore India Ink Black.

FINDINGS:

1. The installation is based on an historic photograph. It is not clear whether the proposed railing design replicates the original. The iron is from the Tennessee Iron Works Company. Please provide a catalog cut of the proposed design.
2. Steel angle brackets are proposed to support the balcony. The projection is three feet.

COMMENT:

There are a number of cracks in the façade of this building. Has an engineering report been done to determine if the façade can support a balcony?

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the iron pattern be verified with Staff, and that there is a determination by a professional engineer that the façade can support a balcony.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Alexandro Santana stated the pattern should replicate the original balcony, he would submit a cut sheet of the exact original balcony, and a letter would be provided from a structural engineer analyzing the wall.

Ms. Seiler stated that the Board was curious to know what the owners wanted to do with the building.

Mr. Santana stated the owners intend to relocate the current Davenport House gift shop to the ground floor and move the current office of the directorial staff from the basement of Davenport House to the second floor of the building. They would return the basement level of Davenport House to the original kitchen.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the bottom of the bracket appeared to penetrate the piece of roofing shown.

Mr. Santana stated that it would not and it might be a drawing error.

Mr. Steffen asked if the plan was to keep the signage on the glass.

Mr. Santana answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald stated the plan was the dream plan for the building, and it was based on fundraising, that it might not happen soon, and it may not be the exact permutation because they were still discussing ways to make it happen.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that a catalog cut of the iron pattern and an engineering report be provided to Staff. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Joan & Gary Levy
H-07-3820(S)-2
PIN No. 2-0032-16-002
17 West Jones Street
Alteration to a Stair Railing

The Preservation Officer recommends **continuance for restudy**.

Present for the petition was Ms. Joan Levy.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to replace the wooden railing on the front entrance stair of the building at 17 West Jones Street with an ornamental cast iron railing. The proposed railing is to match a railing on the rear balcony of the building. It is 28 ¼ inches tall and each ornamental interval is 11 ½ inches wide. The wood stair and portico are to remain.

FINDINGS:

The historic building at 17 West Jones Street was constructed in 1883 as an attached Italianate townhouse. The building is a rated structure in Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The existing wooden stair and landing are not original and were erected sometime after 1980. Similar buildings of this style and time period on Jones Street feature turned masonry side staircases with iron railings. While an iron railing may be appropriate for the building, iron railings on wooden stairs do not appear to be appropriate. Historically, iron was used in conjunction with masonry stairs and landings and only appears with wood on balconies.

RECOMMENDATION:

Continuance to either restudy the material of the stair or incorporate a wooden railing.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Ms. Joan Levy stated the original Historic Savannah book showed an entrance that looked like a fire escape or a very ugly stairway. They did not want to go back to the original and showed several neighborhood wood stairs with iron railings. She said she spoke to Mr. McDonald and the photograph taken at 118 West Gaston Street was more appropriate and would be happy with it. There was a façade easement on the building.

Mr. Steffen asked if Ms. Levy would be satisfied if the Board approved it with the condition that it go back to Staff.

Ms. Levy said yes.

Mr. Judson stated in looking at the pictures many were painted with the risers and contrasting light, the wood on the stairs were heavy looking, and asked if Ms. Levy would consider painting them.

Ms. Levy said she would.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated he wanted to confirm his conversation with Ms. Levy and would approve the stair design as suggested with the paint and ironwork.

Mr. Steffen stated on a normal project Historic Savannah provide the Board with guidance and opinions from its Architectural Review Committee. He said Historic Savannah owns and holds a façade easement on certain projects, and they have the power and ability, in addition to the Board's power, to decide if some things take place. The Board could approve an item, but it also must be approved by Historic Savannah if there was a façade easement.

Mr. McDonald stated they did not like having two different bodies telling a petitioner what to do because they want to be in agreement with the Board.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that the railing be simplified. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: 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 I**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Alexandro Santana.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass, of a two-story carriage house at 219 East Charlton Street.

The applicant will resubmit at a later date for Part II and for a rear porch addition and alterations to the main building to modify the rear openings to access the porch, install skylights on the roof, remove all surface paint from the brick exterior walls, to modify the entrance stoop by adding an iron railing, to install a gas lantern at the entrance door, paint exterior windows and doors, and reopen ground level windows.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 219 East 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). Only the Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed Carriage House was reviewed; more detailed information will be submitted for the proposed addition and alterations at a later time.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIP-A zone.	The proposed carriage house has no setbacks and is built to the property line.	The standard is met.
Lot Coverage: A 75 percent maximum building lot coverage in RIP-A.	The carriage house 698 SF, the existing building is 1464 SF, and the future proposed porch addition is 144 SF. The total building footprint is approximately 2306 SF. The lot is approximately 30 feet wide by 101 feet (3,030 SF) for a building lot coverage of 75 percent.	The standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type:	Garage with living space above. This dwelling type is common for carriage houses within the district.	The standard is met.
Street Elevation Type:	Carriage House. This elevation type dominates lanes within the district.	The standard is met.
Entrances: Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.	Proposed garage door openings are 9 feet wide.	The standard is met.
Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:	The proportion of height to width is compatible with lane buildings.	The standard is met.
Proportion of Openings:	Dormer openings are smaller in scale (3:3) than average window openings but are compatible for dormer	The standard is met.

	windows. The trash side pedestrian openings are 7.5 feet tall by 2.5 feet wide.	
Rhythm of Solids to Voids:	The rhythm of solids-to-voids is compatible with neighboring buildings.	The standard is met.
Rhythm of Structure on Street:	A neighboring contemporary garage exists to the east and a wooden fence is to the west. The proposed building fills in a void along the lane.	The standard is met.
Walls of Continuity:	The proposed carriage house is built up to the lane. A neighboring garage is also built to the lane on the east, and a wooden fence is at the lane on the west. The building maintains the wall of continuity.	The standard is met.
Scale:	The scale is in proportion with the surrounding lane buildings and other carriage houses in the district.	The standard is met.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of Part I, Height and Mass, as submitted.

Ms. Ramsay stated the drawings show a window on the property line and wanted it verified that a window could be placed on the property line because it had come up on a couple of earlier petitions.

Ms. Reiter stated they were not allowed unless they were fire rated.

Ms. Ramsay stated there could be a fire shutter inside but it was usually cost prohibitive.

Mr. Santana stated that the window in question was seven feet above finished floor. He asked if the issue of the window on a property line was the visibility through the window.

Ms. Reiter stated it was fire.

Ms. Ramsay stated no, because if there was a fire it would go to the other property and that it had to be three feet. She said they could have rated glass or a fire shutter, and asked about if the other windows would meet egress requirements.

Mr. Santana stated it would be addressed in the design submittal.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part I, Height and Mass. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Petition of Valrie Honablue M.D.
H-07-3826-2
PIN No. 2-0032-58-005
611 Whitaker Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration

The Preservation Officer recommends approval of upper porch, denial of front porch with conditions, denial of Palladian window, approval of colors with conditions, and continuance for rear work and fence.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval for alterations and color change made to 611 Whitaker Street, a contributing structure to the National Historic Landmark District and built in 1894. Also approval of future alterations and additions.

FINDINGS:

611 Whitaker Street was built in 1894 and is a high-style Queen Anne Victorian residence with character defining details such as butt shingles in the gable; bracketed eaves, turned fretwork on the porch, turned columns, and turned balusters. Originally there was a long two-story porch on the south side. The Sanborn Maps clearly indicate that a two-story porch was extant in 1916, 22 years after the construction of the house. This infilled with siding and 2/2 windows upstairs and at one point, French casement windows downstairs some time after 1963.

The following changes have been made without a Certificate of Compatibility:

1. Removal of eight turned front porch columns. These were replaced with four fiberglass round columns. Some of the columns appear to have been reused in creating a portion of the upstairs side porch. Workmen on the site stated the rest were thrown away.
2. Removal of all turned fretwork from the front porch. Some of this was reused in creating a portion of the upstairs porch.
3. Removal of the corner brackets on the porch.
4. Removal of the turned porch and stair railings and balusters.
5. Installation of a Palladian window on the east façade of the downstairs side porch. No materials given.
6. The colors are Olympic Paints "Biltmore Estates".

In addition the petitioner has indicated that it is intended to add fretwork found in the attic back between the classical columns and changes have been made to the rear, however, no photo was submitted for the rear and no description of the rear work was submitted.

The petitioner has also indicated the intent to erect a front fence, however, no plans or elevations have been received.

Section 8-3030, subsection (f) of the City Zoning Ordinance requires that a Certificate of Appropriateness, approved and issued by the Board of Review, shall be required before a permit is issued for a material change in the exterior appearance of existing structures located in the Historic District by additions, reconstruction, or major alterations.

Section 8-3030, subsection (k) of the City Zoning Ordinance states in part: “An historic structure 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 house.”

The applicant justified the replacement of the Victorian Columns with classical columns and the installation of the Palladian window by citing A Field Guide to American Houses that states that “About 35 percent of Queen Anne Houses use classical columns, rather than delicate turned posts with spindlework detailing, as porch supports.

The applicant has removed original character defining architectural features and replaced them with conjectural classical features that were never on the building, thus, diminishing the buildings historic and architectural significance.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Approval of the change to the upper side porch.
2. Denial of the changes to the front porch. The original woodwork shall be returned or remilled to match the exact appearance of the original porch features by a date certain as set by the Board. Plans and elevations of porch restoration shall be approved by Staff before work begins.
3. Denial of the Palladian window.
4. Continuance for plans and elevations of proposed work to rear, and fence.
5. Approval of the colors, however, please provide a list of the color names keyed to a photo for the file.

Ms. Reiter stated Staff spoke with Dr. Honablue and she agreed to remill and return the porch to its original appearance. She said the Board needed to state they deny and deplore what was done, and that it would be continued for plans and elevations to be brought back to the Board for restitution of the woodwork and other details.

Ms. Seiler asked if there had been a cease and desist order.

Ms. Reiter stated a stop work order was placed on the building and it appeared to have been honored.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the petitioner had given reasons for making the changes.

Ms. Reiter stated the petitioner felt it was an improvement to the building. Staff would not say that such details were not used on some Queen Anne buildings, but to remove original fabric to put on conjectural fabric was not how it should be done.

Ms. Seiler asked if the worker did not get a building permit.

Ms. Reiter stated they had a permit for interior work and they went beyond to the exterior.

Ms. Ward stated she intended to remove the Palladian window and restore the ground floor porch.

Ms. Reiter stated that before anything was done Staff needed plans to see what it would look like when it was completed.

Mr. Steffen asked if the structure was occupied and if the petitioner owned other property in Savannah.

Ms. Reiter answered no and said it had not been occupied for seven years, and did not know if the petitioner owned any other property.

Mr. Johnson asked if the adjacent house belonged to the petitioner.

Ms. Reiter stated that a neighbor lived on one side because he had called regarding the scaffolding being on his property, and there was an inn on the other side.

Mr. Judson stated in the absence of the petitioner and with several issues being unclear asked if it was appropriate for the Board to move for a continuance.

Mr. Steffen stated if it was suitable for Staff.

Ms. Reiter stated the Board should deny what had been done and continue the petition for a submittal of complete drawings.

Mr. Gay stated she should be directed to put it back as it was.

Ms. Reiter stated the drawings should be approved first because Staff does not want any more work done on the building until there was a set of drawings showing everything proposed.

Mr. Steffen stated that Staff made recommendations for approval to change the upper side porch and colors and the Board may do that, but today everything that had been done in the past should be denied and direct any further consideration to Staff. He did not think the Board should approve anything today until the petitioner was present.

Ms. Reiter stated the realtor who sold the house told the petitioner that it was not in the Historic District, but was in the Victorian District, none-the-less, there was still a design review process even in the Victorian District. She said she asked for the name of the realtor and found that the realtor was no longer in business.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald stated he wanted to commend Staff for their vigilance and the City for the stop work order before more damage was done. He said the applicant called Historic Savannah's office and their staff informed the applicant they had to come before the Board. They agree with Staff that drawings need to be submitted so the details were like they were before.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition as submitted, and further request that plans and measured elevations be submitted for the restoration of the front porch to its previous existing condition, and that plans and elevations be submitted for all other completed and proposed exterior work including replacement of the Palladian window; upper porch, rear alterations, and fence. No further work is to proceed until the approval of these plans and elevations by the Savannah Historic District Board of Review. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Ciphers Design Co., Inc.
H-07-3827-2
PIN No. 2-0031-27-001
339 Tattnall Street
Two-Story Addition, Rear Porch Addition, and
Covered Parking**

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

Present for the petition was Ms. Sarah Kepple.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for an addition, rear porch, covered parking, and a shed at 339 Tattnall Street.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 339 Tattnall Street was constructed in 1895 as part of an Italiante Revival style 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 following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Lot Coverage: 75 percent maximum in RIP-A.	50 percent lot coverage is proposed on a double lot.	The standard is met.
Additions: shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.	The addition is located on the south elevation (side) towards the rear of the building. A rear porch addition is proposed on the back of the main building. The parking pergola is attached to the additions and is at the rear of the property facing Jefferson Street. Currently, a masonry wall with iron gates create a wall of continuity at Jefferson Street and at Tattnall Street.	The standard is met. While the proposed style of the additions mimics the original house, their siting is such that they are distinguished as additions.
Additions: shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without	A two-story addition is proposed for the side/rear with a rooftop garden above. The addition appears to extend to	Staff recommends reducing the height of the addition to expose the original eaves and brackets of the main

<p>damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including, but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, brackets. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building.</p>	<p>the full height of the existing building covering window openings and obscuring the decorative brackets in the eaves.</p>	<p>house and to make the addition subordinate to the existing structure.</p>
<p>Additions: including multiple additions to structures, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.</p>	<p>See Above.</p>	<p>See Above.</p>
<p>Additions: Designs may be either contemporary or reference design motifs of the historic building. However, the addition shall be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible...</p>	<p>The design of the addition is meant to blend seamlessly with the original house matching historic stylistic detailing of the period. The addition will be faced in brick to match the main house with a stucco dogtrot extension to the south.</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the height as stated above in order to further distinguish the addition from the main building.</p>
<p>Covered Parking:</p>	<p>An open wooden pergola is proposed at the rear of the property off the existing vehicular iron gate fronting Jefferson Street. It is comprised of 8-inch square wood columns with a trellis above.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Shed:</p>	<p>A 7-foot-wide by 12-foot-deep wooden shed with a sloped roof surfaced in standing seam metal is proposed at the southwest corner of the property. It will be minimally visible, if at all, from view.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Side Porches: Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between shall not exceed four inches. For one- and two-family dwellings, the height of the railing shall not exceed 36 inches.</p>	<p>Side Porch: Two-story side porch with six inch turned Victorian wood columns with a decorative bracket above, and 2.75-inch wood turned balusters with a top rail and bottom rail to match the historic columns and railing on the building are proposed. The railing is three feet tall. Fixed wood louvers are proposed on the south end of the side porch to screen a spiral stair providing access to the roof. A parapet with a</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

	<p>protruding cornice and decorative wooden brackets to match the main house are proposed.</p> <p>Rear Porch: One-story rear porch with a shed roof surfaced in standing seam metal. Eight inch square wood columns on a low brick lattice foundation.</p>	
<p>Windows and doors: Residential windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian. Double-glazed windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided, however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8-inch; the muntin profile shall simulated traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement, and top-story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3...Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building...windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>Three-foot by six-foot Anderson window 400 series, double-hung sash, wood clad windows with two-over-two simulated divided lites are proposed in the new addition. Sashes to be white to match main house.</p> <p>Three feet and four feet wide by two feet tall, Anderson window 400 series awning windows are proposed on the rear of the addition facing Jefferson Street and over the French doors. They are wood clad with simulated divided lites in white.</p> <p>Four-foot by seven-foot Anderson Door 400 Series single-light French doors.</p> <p>Surrounds will feature segmental arch brick headers to match the main residence.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval upon submittal of window specifications. The muntins should be no wider than 7/8 inches and feature a spacer bar. Windows and doors should be inset no less than three inches from façade.</p> <p>Staff recommends that the windows on the ground floor addition have a 5:3 ratio or be eliminated as they face Jefferson Street, which is visible through the iron gate.</p>
<p>HVAC: units shall be screened from the public right-of-way</p>	<p>The HVAC will be relocated to the rear porch area and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Color:</p>	<p>Trim: Benjamin Moore White 00 Accent: BM Black Forest Green 46 Stucco on side bay: Benajamin Moore Richmond Bisque 54</p>	<p>Staff approval.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. Reduce height of addition to expose original cornice and bracket detail on historic residence and to make the addition subordinate in height.
2. Provide window specifications and note that windows will meet the aforementioned standards for muntins and placement within wall.
3. Enlarge or delete three-foot by two-foot window on ground floor of addition fronting Jefferson Street.
4. Clarify the brick.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Sarah Kepple stated with reducing the height of the addition to expose the cornice and bracket she wanted to show they would maintain the brackets but was concerned about changing the scale of the addition. She wanted to continue the finished floor heights on the first and second floor, and thought the only place they could be affecting brackets was where the wall intersected with the existing parapet on the roof. She said all other brackets would currently remain. If someone would want to remove the addition, it could be easily removed. The change in the openings in the inside used to be a window and it would be the link to the addition. They would get the muntins and spacer bar to Staff, and said they put transom windows in the back because the pergola would intersect the window in a strange place, and the pergola beam was only six inches off the wall. She suggested it might be more desirable to do a recessed faux window with cast stone sill to match the existing with recessed brick, and they would find a brick that matches.

Ms. Ramsay stated one window does not have the pergola across it.

Ms. Kepple stated the pergola would be at an angle by the time it reached the deck.

Mr. Steffen stated Staff recommended approval with four specific conditions going back to Staff. He said two would be easy to resolve and to would require work with the petitioner and Staff.

Mr. Judson asked if Part I and Part II were combined into one.

Mr. Steffen stated yes, and said that with the more modest-size projects it would be the case. He said Part I and Part II were usually separated on the larger projects.

HDRB ACTION: **Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the final details going back to Staff. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

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

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Erik Duncan

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a porch rehabilitation and addition of a second floor porch on the building at 440 Habersham Street as follows:

1. Replace existing porch columns, 5” turned wood columns on wooden bases, with 5” by 5” decorative wood turned columns. Turned wood.
2. Replace existing 2” by 2” square pickets with 2.25” decorative turned spindles. A beveled handrail and bottom rail are proposed.
3. Install fretwork spandrels between the columns at the top.
4. Construct a balcony/porch on the second floor above the main entrance.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 440 Habersham Street was constructed in 1902, and is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. The building is a well preserved example of a high style Queen Anne residence similar to several within Wesley Ward. Almost all of the similar buildings within the ward feature turned columns and balusters with decorative brackets and fretwork. Some also exhibit porches over the entry similar to what is proposed. It is probable that the original building displayed many of these typical Queen Anne elements and have been replaced and simplified over time. The second-story side porch does exhibit decorative turned columns similar to what is proposed. It also appears that another column would have existed on the front facing façade if the turned columns did originally exist. The existing columns possess a more Colonial Revival or Craftsman style spacing.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval with final detailed elevation drawings and section to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval. While in concept the proposed alterations appear compatible and historically accurate, drawings that are more detailed are needed to ensure that the execution is correct.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Erik Duncan stated there were two types of columns on the porch that do not match. He said the second floor on the upper left was square at the bottom and top and then turned in the middle, and a classical column was on the large porch. They could not imagine they would go together and would like if the second floor was original, but it was difficult to say. In their research, they found the builder had built five houses within ward and only one had featured classic columns and the others had turned balusters.

Mr. Steffen stated that Staff felt there should be more time devoted in the concept of what was being done. He said one of the options was to request the petition be continued to July 11 and to meet with Staff with the answers and a more specific proposal. It was not a requirement because they could make a decision based upon what was presented.

Mr. Duncan stated the last thing they wanted to do was to destroy any original features. He thought a continuance was good but was apprehensive because with their own research the records go back to 1900 and difficult to find.

Ms. Reiter stated if the house was built by the Home Building Company, there were drawings from the company that might have been published in the newspaper.

Ms. Seiler asked if the petitioner had gone to the Georgia Historical Society.

Mr. Steffen stated Staff had many resources, and in a month the applicant could come back with what works. He said since there was no objection a continuance would be a good idea and Staff could work with them to obtain records and get a solution.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to July 11, 2007, pending additional historic research. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
H-07-3812(S)-2
119 Martin Luther King, Jr., Blvd.
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of Leslie Ann Wallace
H-07-3813(S)-2
520 – 522 Nicoll Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-07-3814(S)-2
310 – 312 Drayton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
4. Petition of Albert Nordine
H-07-3815(S)-2
101 East Jones Street
Shutters/Existing Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
5. Petition of Sign Mart
Cosentino's
H-07-3817(S)-2
44 Martin Luther King, Jr., Blvd.
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas
John Casteel
H-07-3819(S)-2
415 Tattnell Street
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Ross Harding
H-07-3821(S)-2
209 West Gordon Street
Fence
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Petition of Jason Bishop
H-07-3822(S)-2
107 West Perry Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

9. Petition of Coastal Heritage Society
Patricia Davenport
H-07-3823(S)-2
601 West Harris Street
Roof Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: MINUTES

Approval of Minutes – May 9, 2007

Ms. Ramsay said that on Page 4 it was stated that she said that she understood that if the shed was built in the back yard the applicant would not need a permit. The correct statement she made should read, “Am I to understand” and not, “I understand”, because she thought they would need a permit.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the minutes with corrections. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

Petition of Ralph C. Anderson
Savannah Restoration, Inc.
H-05-3378-2
PIN No. 2-0015-36-009
120 West Harris Street
Request for a one-year extension for New
Construction

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Ms. Reiter stated that the applicant was requesting approval of a one-year extension to erect a two-story carriage house that was approved on October 12, 2005. The petition expired October 12, 2006, however, Staff recommended an extension to October 12, 2007. The only change was the addition of a spiral stair on the courtyard side that won't be visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Ramsay stated Staff's recommended reducing it to one bay and asked if it was reduced.

Ms. Reiter stated that on September 14, 2005, the three garage doors were approved.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve to extend the petition to October 12, 2007. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: 536 West Jones Street & 342 Purse
Request to Move**

Ms. Reiter stated these were 19th Century structures located near the roundhouse that were built between 1888 and 1898. The owner was selling them to a developer who is willing to give them to Coastal Heritage Society to move to an adjacent lot to create a worker's village. She asked that the Board comment on the idea because Mr. Scott Smith was submitting the idea to his Board soon. The Board members indicated support for the concept to move the structures to save them and give them better context.

Ms. Seiler stated she knew the houses and she felt it would be good.

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

RE: INFORMATION ITEMS

❖ Beehive Foundation Suit

Mr. Steffen stated the Board had officially been sued for the project on Liberty Street by the Beehive Foundation with regard to the interpretation of the Height Map.

❖ Historic Preservation Board Retreat - Friday June 15, 2007 – 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Steffen stated there would be a Board retreat and he asked the Board members to be present to learn more about the procedures, answer questions, etc.

❖ Process Workshop for MPC Boards – Wednesday, June 27, 2007 – 11:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Mr. Steffen stated the workshop would deal specifically with rules and regulations, how they could accomplish things, and how the Boards interact with each other.

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