

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

May 9, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

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

HDRB Members Not Present:

Gene Hutchinson
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: CALL TO ORDER

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: INTRODUCTIONS

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 June 13, 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 June 13, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

RE: Continued Petition of H. O. Price LLC
Richard Guerard
H-07-3785-2
PIN No. 2-0032-07-001
342 Drayton Street
New Construction Part II Design Details –
Condominiums

Continue to June 13, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

RE: Continued Petition of Coastal Canvas
John Casteel
H-07-3795(S)-2
PIN No. 2-0004-60-001A
108 East York Street
Awning (At the rear of this property)

Continue to June 13, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the Continued Agenda items to June 13, 2007. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from H-06-3711-2 and H-07-3784-2.

Mr. Steffen acknowledged and welcomed Professor Mr. Bob Allen and the Historic Preservation class from Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD).

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs
WECCO Construction, LLC
Ms. Donna Swanson
H-07-3804-2
PIN No. 2-0045-04-009
528 Selma Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Graphic Systems International, Inc.
Ray Linder
H-07-3807-2
PIN No. 2-0005-04-003A
520 West Bryan Street
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Ciphers Design Company
Sarah Kepple
H-07-3809-2
PIN No. 2-0032 -42-024
101 West Gordon Street
Addition/Alterations to a Carriage House

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Petition of Tom MacDonald
H-07-3800-2
PIN No. 2-0032-06-003
24 East Jones Street
New Construction of Accessory Shed at the
Rear

The Preservation Officer recommends denial.

Present for the petition was Mr. Charles Perry.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval to erect a storage shed at the rear of the property at 24 East Jones Street, on the northwest corner of Jones and Drayton Streets. The shed is behind the main residence visible from Drayton Street. The wooden shed is 6'-8" long, 5' wide, and 7' tall placed on a concrete slab with a corrugated metal shed roof.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 24 East Jones Street was constructed in 1858, and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). The accessory building at the rear has been subdivided from the main property, reducing the overall size of the original lot and limiting access to the lane.

1. The maximum lot coverage in RIP-A zoning districts is 75 percent. The parcel is 30 feet wide by 63.3 feet long for a total of 1,899 square feet. The historic building is approximately 1,754 square feet and the new shed is 33 square feet, for a total lot coverage of 94 percent.
2. The wood frame shed does not correspond to any materials on the exterior of the main residence. The shed roof surfaced in corrugated sheet metal does not meet the standards for roof shapes or allowed materials.

RECOMMENDATION:

Denial. The shed, as erected is not visually compatible with the main residence or the district and exceeds the maximum allowed lot coverage in the RIP-A district. The shed should be removed within 15 days of this public hearing date.

Ms. Ward stated that Staff received a letter from an adjacent property owner who was in opposition of construction of the shed.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he did not understand how the Building Department gave a permit if they did not check on property usage and if it had not been before the Board.

Ms. Ward stated the applicant did not apply for a permit and was not issued a building permit.

Ms. Ramsay said was she to understand that if you build a shed in the back yard at the size the petitioner requested that they would not need a permit.

Ms. Ward stated she was told if it was less than 120 square feet it did not require a permit to meet the building code. It did need zoning approval because it exceeded the lot coverage requirement.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Building Department should know that anything built in the Historic District needs to come before the Board. However, they did not know that the shed was being built.

PETITIONER'S COMMENT:

Mr. Charles Perry (Agent for the Property Owner) stated he agreed with Staff and the Board, and the shed would be removed. He said the person who built the shed is no longer in business, did not get a permit, and the shed was not built correctly.

Mr. Judson asked if there was a reasonable period of time to remove it.

Mr. Perry stated he had spoke with someone in regard to moving it and he did not think it would take long.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Gay** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition as submitted because it is not visually compatible with the main residence or the district. The shed shall be removed within 15 days of this hearing date. **Mr. Judson** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen introduced and welcomed the three new Board members, Mr. Brian Judson, Mr. Richard Law, Sr., and Ms. Linda Ramsay to the Historic Review Board.

**RE: Petition of Design Reese
 Gray Reese
 H-07-3806-2
 PIN No. 2-0015-42-001E
 9 – 17 East Macon Street
 New Construction of Residential
 Condominiums/Townhouses Part I and Part II**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of Part I and Part II with conditions.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Gray Reese.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of a four-story, eight-unit condominium building with ground level enclosed parking.

FINDINGS:

All standards are met with the exception of the balcony projection. The balconies need to be reduced to a three-foot projection.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	No setbacks are proposed.	
Dwelling Unit Type	Condominium Building (Apt type)	The exterior is configured to appear as townhouses.
Street Elevation Type	High stoop	High stoop townhouses are located in this block.
Entrances	The entrances face Macon Street the principal street.	This standard is met.
Building Height:	The height matches the previously approved adjacent double townhouse. The first floor is 9'-6"; the second floor is 12'-4", the third floor is 11'-4" and the fourth floor is 10'-4"	This standard is met.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	The façade is divided to appear as four townhouse units. The proportion is similar to other units in the block.	The proportion of the front façade is compatible.
Proportion of Openings	Rectangular openings vertically aligned. The upper windows are 3:5, the parlor floor windows are longer.	The proportion of openings is compatible.
Rhythm of Solids to Voids	A three-bay rhythm is proposed.	The rhythm of solids-to-voids is compatible.

Rhythm of Structure on Street	A row-house form is proposed.	Almost all the houses in this block are attached.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	Metal balconies are proposed projecting five feet. Metal high stoops are proposed.	Residential balconies shall extend only three feet.
Walls of Continuity	The facades align with the adjacent structures. The stoops encroach similar to other buildings in the block.	The wall of continuity along Macon Street is maintained.
Scale	The scale is similar to other structures in the block.	The scale is compatible.

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards	NA	
Windows and Doors	<p>Eagle windows are metal clad e-tilt double-hung. 7/8" mullions with spacer bar. Color Mystic Gray # 157; insulated glass with light gray tint.</p> <p>Doors: by Caoba; six-panel, stained cherry. Beveled glass transom above.</p> <p>Metal clad French doors with 7/8" mullion and spacer bar in Mystic Gray #157.</p> <p>Garage doors: wood, barn door style design 203 overhead by Carriage House door company, Mystic Gray # 157.</p>	These windows were previously approved for the Columbia Place condominiums'.
Roof Shape	Flat with Parapet.	This standard is met.
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches	Wood balcony with steel railing. Steel brackets. Similar steel railing on steps. Metal posts. Metal steps.	<p>See comment above regarding projection of balcony.</p> <p>Stoops and balconies are compatible. Depth of balcony needs to be corrected.</p>
Fences	NA	
Overlay District Standards	NA	
Materials	Brick veneer: Millbrook Signature series "Savannah Gray" queen size with gray flush joint. Jenkins Brick Company.	The brick is compatible. Savannah Gray row across the street.
Textures	Wood mold brick	The textures are compatible
Color	Metal – Duron Black	The colors are compatible.

HVAC	Units are to be located on the center of the roof.	
Parking	16 spaces are provided with access off Charlton Street. The cars are screened from the front sidewalk by storage rooms.	Applicant has met with City Traffic Engineering.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of Part I, Height and Mass and Part II Design Detail with the condition that the balconies be reduced to three feet to meet the ordinance standard.

Ms. Ward stated she noticed the property was in an R-I-P-A zone and appeared to exceed the 75 percent lot coverage requirement. However, almost all of the adjacent rows along the block and rowhouses exceeded 75 percent because the lot is narrow that goes from north to south, as opposed to being used as a traditional trust lot that would provide more room. She said Staff recommended that the Board make a Finding-of-Fact that the proposed lot coverage is visually compatible, and noted that the petitioner had applied for a variance.

Mr. Gay asked if the doors were six-panel.

Ms. Ward stated the doors were two-panel wood doors.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Gray Reese stated that he was representing Mr. Montis, and said the door was a misprint because it was intended to be for the interior. He said a cut sheet was included that showed a custom two-panel exterior door, similar to the door indicated on the elevation. The six-panel doors were for the inside of the building.

Mr. Gay stated the doors on the other houses were six-panel.

Mr. Reese stated that the company that makes the doors could make any type. Right next door are two-panel doors that are the same type and further down the street was a six-panel door. He said they liked the look of the two-panel door better, but if everyone felt strongly about changing the doors then they would modify them. They have agreed to modify the five-foot balcony to three feet.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the plans and the north elevation do not match because the north elevation shows a step-down.

Mr. Reese stated the dotted line where the floor line was showed there was a step-down.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the floor plan does not show the step-down, and that they needed to show the stairs and how far it projected.

Mr. Reese stated they intended for it to be exactly like the one next door. He said their step-down does not have to be deep because of the way the site flows.

Mr. Meyerhoff recommended they present Staff with the step-down on that section along with the dimensions on the floor plan to see how far out it projected.

Mr. Reese stated the intent was to keep it under the stoop.

Ms. Ramsay asked the petitioner to identify the metal for the balcony.

Mr. Reese stated it would be a steel material similar to the existing piece on the corner of the stoop.

Mr. Ramsay stated the material and the width were not identified.

Mr. Reese stated Sheet 4.2 showed a large picture but they needed to add dimensions to show that it will be nine or ten inches.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if Phase II was being approved today then they need a drawing of what the balcony railing design will be.

Mr. Reese stated that Sheet 3.2 showed a simplistic steel design with a light diamond infill that was similar to the others on the block.

Mr. Gay stated it looked larger than the one next door.

Ms. Ramsay stated she felt it was a traditional building with a fire escape on the balcony.

Mr. Reese stated they were just trying to emulate what was in the neighborhood, but they would eventually like to do more.

Mr. Gay stated he did not see the design of the metal staircases anywhere downtown and it did not match what was next door.

Ms. Ramsay stated if you look around downtown most balconies and railings have vertical elements rather than a pattern, with the exception of the one next door.

Mr. Reese said they built a sample panel of the wall and will build a sample panel of the brick and the window. They will include a piece of the balcony for the Board to see. They did not have a problem working with Staff.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the stair was a solid metal stair.

Mr. Reese said that it was heavy steel with rounded edges. He said they wanted to repeat what was in the neighborhood without copying it, and with the building being brick and of a different style the elements will be different.

Ms. Ramsay asked if it was not going to be solid.

Mr. Reese stated it would be a heavy steel piece with the tread being solid, but the vertical piece is a very ornate riser. He said they were being marketed as luxury condominiums.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the bracket under the balcony looked approximately one-foot to one and one-half feet, which was a vertical dimension at the wall line. On the drawing of the elevation on Sheet 8.2, it looked like it was three feet.

Mr. Reese stated there was a vertical leg that extended down and would be bolted, which could be seen in the elevation. He said it would be fastened to the wall.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the brackets did not look strong enough to hold the railing.

Mr. Reese stated it was a structural balcony and not ornamental because it will be part of the structure.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how it was going to be part of the structure. He said he did not realize it was Part II and that Part I was covered as far as Height and Mass. On Part II the step-down was not shown, the steel railing, balcony, door paneling, and the transom over the door were not detailed, and there was a conflict on the drawing. The Review Board needed the details to know what they would be approving, and the drawings were incomplete for Part II.

Mr. Reese stated he thought with the photos and their response that it was very clear what was happening with the entry.

Mr. Steffen explained that the Board had the option to decide whether they want to approve Part II Design Details and allow the concerns to come back to Staff or not to approve it and allowing it to be continued. He said he did not know what the Board wanted to do but they should proceed, get the questions and public comment, and decide as a Board. The Board understands Mr. Reese's position that he thought there was enough detail to go back to Staff, but the Board must decide.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) applauded the petitioner for breaking up the mass into four rows. However, they agreed with members of the Board that the porch detailing be restudied, specifically the solid iron railing above the ornamental steel columns because it contrasts with the heavy columns below. She said the details have not been properly expressed for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Part II, Design Detail.

Mr. Steffen asked if HSF took a position on the lot coverage issue.

Ms. Dolecki answered that they did not.

Ms. Kay Ford (Neighboring Resident) agreed that the design resembled the townhome she lives in and that when she purchased the townhome it was with the design the Board reviewed for single-family. She said that was not the case with the four single-family units that were now being proposed as eight, with 16 parking spaces and eight trash cans. She was concerned because trash cans are not kept inside during the summer.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board does not deal with the issues of parking and what goes into the projects, whether they were condominiums, single-family, apartments, etc., but they deal with the design and historic compatibility. He said there were three separate motions to decide whether Part I, Height and Mass was compatible, Part II, Design Details would be taken as a separate motion, and there needed to be a determination that the 100 percent lot coverage was visually compatible. The Board did not sit as the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and do not make the final decision. The decision goes to the ZBA to review and they do require a specific finding from the Review Board that it was compatible.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he wanted to make a motion for Height and Mass pending the approval from the ZBA for the 100 percent lot coverage.

Mr. Steffen stated they would have to come back to the Review Board if the ZBA did not approve it, and that it was not necessary to put it in a motion because there will be a separate motion that would determine whether it was or was not compatible.

Mr. Judson asked if the third motion would be about the Finding-of-Fact.

Mr. Steffen said that was correct. He said the Board was asked to make them separate to keep them clear.

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

Mr. Steffen stated there needed to be a motion for Part II, Design Details with it being approved as submitted, with the four conditions going back to Staff for consideration, or the Board could deny the petition. He said if the Board denies the petition and they have to come back, then he would ask Mr. Reese if he would like a continuance.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he wanted to ask Mr. Reese if he wanted a continuance because too many details were missing.

Mr. Reese asked what was the difference because he would have to come back either way.

Mr. Steffen stated if it was continued it would come back to the Board, and if they approved Part II, Design Details with the conditions coming back to Staff, then it would be done at the Staff level and it would not have to be heard.

Ms. Ramsay stated she thought his question was what was the difference between denying and continuing the petition.

Mr. Steffen stated if it was denied it would have to be a new petition.

Mr. Reese asked if they would have to resubmit everything if they asked for a continuance.

Mr. Steffen stated that he was being vague because not every Board member spoke and he did not know how they felt about the concerns Mr. Meyerhoff raised. He said the Board could not force anyone to continue a matter because the petitioner had to request a continuance.

Mr. Reese asked if he requested a continuance would the Board vote on whether they might get an approval with Staff review. He said he was concerned because only three Board members said they reviewed the petition and they did not know Part II was being presented and they did a lot of work to present it. There were contractors, owners, and people that had to wait another month.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board understood all of the concerns, that it was given to the Board as Part I and Part II, and that Staff did not make a mistake but some of the Board members did not read it correctly.

Mr. Reese stated it comes back on them. He said if the question was whether there should be a continuance or a vote taken to approve the petition or come back to Staff that either way they would still have to come back to Staff. He asked if they were still going to take a vote, or if they denied the whole petition would they still have an opportunity to continue.

Mr. Steffen stated that if Mr. Reese said he wanted a continuance he was sure the Board would approve the continuance. If Mr. Reese decided to wait and see if there was a motion to approve Design Details with the conditions going back to Staff, the motion could be made and seconded. He said he could not make the motion as Chairman and could not tell if the motion would be made.

Mr. Judson asked if they moved for denial would the petitioner would have to come back and resubmit. He said the other options of moving for approval with Staff review and moving for a continuance was procedural differences on whether or not the Board reviews the details.

Mr. Steffen said that was correct and that very often with minor issues the Board approves the petition and then sends it back to Staff. For example, with one or two conditions it would probably go back to Staff, but in this case, four or five items have been questioned.

Dr. Elmore said if those four or five things could be completed and the petitioner would be finished he was for it. However, he had the same concerns as Mr. Meyerhoff.

Mr. Steffen stated that Mr. Reese was not required at that moment to ask for a continuance because he could wait and see what the Board does with the motion. He said Dr. Elmore may make the motion to send it back to Staff and it might be approved then he would not have to worry about a continuance.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked Mr. Reese if he had construction documents.

Mr. Reese stated they were at 50 percent and had gone forward based on what was approved in the past.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what he meant by approved in the past.

Mr. Reese stated the adjacent building that currently existed.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the Board could not approve something if they claim it would be similar to an adjacent building.

Mr. Reese stated that if it he worked with Staff he would be back in one week and would meet all of the conditions. He said that they have three different ideas for the railing and would let Staff select them. They have worked out the issue with the parking garage, have added the step-down, and the columns were drawn but they had omitted the dimensions. The contractor and the builder were present and could state that the design would not fall down.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated since the construction documents were only 50 percent complete he did not see where they would lose time if they asked for a continuance.

Mr. Reese stated they would lose a month with the project because they were ready to apply for a permit in approximately four weeks.

Mr. Steffen stated it was not the function of the Board to decide if the projects were timely and that it was not their concern. He said they were sympathetic to their position but it was not part of the guidelines but that it was their guideline to make sure that Design Details were followed. By having more and better details when coming before the Board, the better chance the petition would be approved and would not have to go back to Staff to be reconsidered.

Mr. Reese asked if they were denied today would they be able to come back next month.

Mr. Steffen stated if the petition was denied, no. He said yes, if there was a continuance or an approval with conditions going back to Staff. He did not hear a motion for denial, and said Dr. Elmore wanted to make a motion for approval with the conditions going back to Staff.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that they were asking for motions when they were still having discussion.

Ms. Ramsay suggested that if Mr. Reese was going to use construction drawings that they get coordination between the balcony detail on Sheet 3.2 and the elevation. She said the three-foot plaque coming down to support the balcony came down in front of the window.

Mr. Reese stated the bracket was the strapping that came down between the windows with the piece being set back and could be seen in the elevation. It was a very thin line, which was why it did not show in the section drawing.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was unclear what was happening. He said if Dr. Elmore made a motion and the motion was seconded it would be approved with the five items going back to Staff. If the motion was voted against because Mr. Meyerhoff felt it needed to come back to the Board after the motion failed, he guaranteed that Mr. Reese would ask for a continuance because he did not want the project voted down. The Board had to operate from proper procedure and could not legislate from their positions and tell people what to do.

Dr. Elmore stated that he was ready to make a motion.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it was not proper procedure during Board discussion for the Chairman to designate someone whose opinion agreed with the Chairman's to make the motion.

Mr. Steffen stated he could ask anyone to make a motion and asked Mr. Meyerhoff to make a motion.

Ms. Ramsay stated there was a motion on the floor.

Mr. Steffen stated that the motion had not been seconded.

Mr. Meyerhoff wanted to make a motion to deny the petition until the Board was presented with a complete set of documents.

Mr. Steffen stated that was not a proper motion and said Mr. Meyerhoff could make a motion to deny the petition based on it not being compatible, and could not make a motion for denial contingent on something else being provided.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby recommend that the petition be denied due to improper submittal. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. Mr. Meyerhoff, Dr. Watkins, and Ms. Ramsay voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Gay, Mr. Judson, Mr. Law, Dr. Elmore and Mr. Johnson were opposed. The motion failed 5 to 3.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part II, Design Details with the condition that the following details be resubmitted to Staff for further review.

1. To provide the step-down details at grade.
2. To identify the materials and dimensions of the metal railing.
3. To identify the design of the metal railing.
4. To provide further design detail of the metal staircase.

5. To provide further detail of the balcony brackets.
6. To provide details of the door and transoms.

Mr. Judson seconded the motion. Dr. Elmore, Mr. Johnson, Judson, and Mr. Steffen voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Meyerhoff, Dr. Watkins, Ms. Ramsay, and Mr. Law were opposed. The motion tied 4 to 4 and failed.

Mr. Steffen stated that Staff had the ability to decide that they could not review the conditions and asked for the Board's input. He said it was possible that the petition could come back to the Board.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it was too much of a burden to put on Staff with the lack of detail and he felt it should come back to the Board.

Mr. Steffen stated there would be a Board retreat next month and hopefully they would understand the procedures more. He apologized to everyone individually for sounding as if he were dictating, but said he wanted to make sure that the procedure was followed.

Mr. Judson asked if the motion were defeated would Mr. Reese have the chance to ask for a continuance.

Mr. Steffen said yes.

Mr. Johnson asked if the door paneling was going back to Staff.

Mr. Steffen stated that the door paneling was going back to Staff for review.

HDRB ACTION: The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue Part II, Design Details with the following to be resubmitted to the Board.

1. To provide the at grade step-down details.
2. To identify the materials of the metal railings.
3. To identify the design of the metal railings.
4. To provide further design the detail of the metal staircase.
5. To provide further detail of the balcony brackets.
6. To provide details of the door and transoms.

All were in favor and it passed unanimously.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby make a Finding-of-Fact that the proposed 100 percent lot coverage is visually compatible. Dr. Elmore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: 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 a **continuation for redesign**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Doug Bean.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

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

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

The proposed sign is incompatible with the 1820 Greek Revival Gibbons range in terms of scale, color, and lighting. Also, the placement of the sign with rods through the brownstone quoins will damage a character-defining feature of this exceptional building.

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 sign is 11'-9" tall and 30" wide. The overall square footage for the projecting principal use sign is over 29.37 SF. The words "Hay Ya'll" and "Sons" extend wider than 30". The maximum projection of the sign from the building is 5'-4". The width of the sign cabinet is 18".</p>	<p>The sign exceeds the 30-square-foot maximum. The applicant has applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a size variance.</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 sign is located 17 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 structure and shall not project over the roofline or parapet wall elevation of the structure.</p>	<p>The sign will be located on the corner of the building.</p>	<p>The corner has character defining features in the form of sandstone quoins. It appears the sign is anchored into these quoins, which will damage the historic fabric of the structure.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Red neon is proposed for the lettering. The words “Hey Ya’ll” and “Sons” are internally illuminated. The property is zoned B-C-1 and is surrounded by commercial establishments. External lighting is also proposed by four floodlights – 2 on an arm at the top and 2 on an arm at the bottom of the sign.</p>	<p>Since the sign is internally illuminated and with neon, the external lighting is excessive.</p>
<p>Design</p>	<p>The sign is aluminum over steel and is attached to the building with metal brackets having a metallic gray finish. The letters will match the red stripe in the awnings and the neon will be red dimmed 30 percent. The contrasting white lettering will match the white stripe in the awning. The background panels of the letters is brushed aluminum with polished aluminum stripes.</p>	<p>The sign is not compatible with the historic structure. It is also not compatible with the historic fish neon sign at the other end of the row due to its size and design. A recently approved sign for the Sapphire consists of single stroke neon letters in keeping with traditional neon signs.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed sign is too large. It is 30-37” wide and 18” thick. The bright red color is inappropriate. The swatch provided is maroon but the awning stripe is red.</p> <p>The “Hey Ya’ll” could be removed and perhaps used somewhere inside the windows of the restaurant. It is not appropriate on so large a sign within the Landmark Historic District.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Continuation for redesign to more accurately reflect a traditional historic single stroke neon sign, and to be more compatible to the 1820 building to which it is attached.

Mr. Steffen asked if the petitioner was in agreement with a continuance after discussing the two signs.

Ms. Ward stated they wanted an approval with details coming back to Staff.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Doug Bean stated that the suggestion of the “Hey Ya’ll” being inappropriate referred to the Supreme Court upholding the fact that signs were protected by the First Amendment. He said the sign ordinance in Savannah was content neutral, and the content of the sign could not be controlled by an ordinance. The entire sign was not illuminated but the words “Hey Ya’ll”,

“Sons”, and the word “Lady” would be illuminated. The words “The”, the ampersand, and “Since 1989” were not internally illuminated but would be softly lit with a floodlight. They would be willing to use subdued floodlighting at the top and bottom and suggested it so that hard shadows would not be cast, as well as dimming the neon. They proposed to soften the finish and weather it a little to make it appear that the sign had been there for some time. They were trying to complement the experience to give the tourists an opportunity to take a picture with the sign. He said with regard to the sign being a non-traditional neon sign that there were elaborate and lighted signs in Savannah’s history. There was more detail on their proposal but it was close to what would be considered a traditional sign. The size of the sign in a scaled-comparison to the Sorry Charlie’s sign was not as large and they were not proposing anything larger. If the tail of the “h”, the exclamation, and the “s” makes the sign oversize regarding the ordinance, the main body of the sign would be within the 30-square-foot allowance. They would be allowed a sign on the Congress and Whitaker Street frontage, but their proposal was to do a single sign, build it a little larger than what would be allowed without a variance, which would be approximately a 30 percent increase in height and would eliminate one sign from one frontage. They designed it with a theatre look in mind, but it will not be a bright eyesore.

Mr. Steffen asked if the historic signs he referred to were flood lit signs.

Mr. Bean stated he did not know.

Mr. Johnson asked if they were going to eliminate the word “Sons” but the “Hey Ya’ll” would remain.

Mr. Bean answered yes and stated there was nothing in the ordinance that says it could not remain. He said he did not propose any change and it was not the desire of the Deen’s or the company to damage the historic fabric of the building. He had hoped that the Board would consider a Certificate of Appropriateness based on the design and allow Staff to determine placement. They would rescind their request for a size variance and place the two signs: one on Congress Street and one on Whitaker Street, but will stay within the provision of the ordinance.

Dr. Elmore asked if they wanted to keep the floodlights.

Mr. Bean answered yes. He said the shape of the sign was significant and needed to be more than letters lit up with a light bathing the overall structure. He said with reverse silhouette lighting or neon lighting where you only see the letters, and they would like to see the size and shape of the sign and not just the letters.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if there were other floodlit signs in the Historic District.

Ms. Ward stated they have approved gooseneck lighting and down lit signs, but generally they are not internally lit. This case seemed excessive to have it floodlit from both directions and having the neon.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked about the sign ordinance and if it gave the square footage, addressed interior and exterior lighting, floodlighting, and designated projection from the building. He also asked that with everything Staff recommended, did the petitioner’s request not meet the sign ordinance requirements.

Ms. Ward answered yes to them all and stated that it met the projection but did not meet the square footage and the lighting. She said the Board still had to find that the sign was visually compatible with the building. It could undermine the integrity of the building by placing the sign on the historic quoins.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the sign ordinance was the duty of the Review Board or was the ordinance under another City Board.

Ms. Ward stated the City Zoning Administrator would also verify that the Zoning Ordinance had been met, but was used as a tool to review the signs for the Historic District.

Mr. Bean stated there was nothing in the Savannah sign ordinance that dictated that a dual use of external and internal lighting were not allowed. The only exception to either the Sign Ordinance or the Historic District Sign Ordinance was the size. He said they do not want to ruin a nice building and were not drilling into the quoins, but could not come up with a nice way to attach the sign and miss, bridge, or go around the quoins. They would do two signs and meet all of the provisions of both sign ordinances to be approved by a structural engineer because the City required they have it certified.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated the ARC was asking the Board to deny the petition because the sign was over what the Sign Ordinance allowed for square footage. He said his calculations made the sign 38 square feet, which would be for each side and that would make it 80 square feet with two signs that would be seen from two directions. They felt it was inappropriate because it resembled an Art Deco theatre design on an 1820's Greek Revival building, and there were no Greek Revival neon signs. They did not feel a neon sign was appropriate for the location or something that was appropriate for the period. He acknowledged that the Matthew's sign existed and said it was there when the City Market era was erected and that it was designated as a historic sign that was allowed to remain. It created an impression that the requested sign was appropriate for the site but it was not appropriate, was out-of-scale for the building, would damage the historic material of the building, and even the brick would create large holes.

Mr. Walter Hall stated there were no other signs with the slogans and wanted to know how it fit with other illuminated signs within the downtown area.

Mr. Bean stated the reference to the two-sided sign being twice the size had no reference in the ordinance. It was based on the size of one side of the proposed sign being 38 square feet, but 30 square feet was allowed. He reminded the Board that he was seeking approval for two smaller signs with no variance.

Mr. Steffen stated the Board was presented with a proposal for one sign that was larger than the allowed, but now the plan was to have the same design with two signs that complied with the size. He said there was still the compatibility issue to consider but the size of the sign was off the table.

Mr. Law asked if the sign would go along with the City ordinances.

Mr. Steffen stated that the proposal had been scaled back to comply with the ordinance for the size of the sign, and that Staff clarified there was only one side to be considered. There were still the issues of the compatibility but if the Board was to entertain the initial proposal it would be larger than what was allowed.

Mr. Bean stated that instead of being turned down he would ask for a continuance.

Mr. Steffen asked for a motion or additional Board discussion since he had not heard from the Board. There was a difference of opinion between Staff’s recommendation, the petitioner’s request, and what was heard from HSF.

Dr. Elmore said the petitioner stated he was going to go to two signs within the allowable square footage, and asked if they were going to use subdued and softened spotlights.

Mr. Bean answered yes and said they would eliminate one set but would like to have some external lighting.

Dr. Elmore stated he felt it should be continued and the redesign be brought back to Staff.

Mr. Steffen stated due to the lack of response from the Board he would allow the request for a continuance and allow the petitioner to work with Staff regarding the conditions. He said it would be helpful to come back with both signs designed to get a perspective.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition to the June 13, 2007, meeting to restudy the design. Dr. Elmore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: 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**.

There was no one present for the petition.

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.

FINDINGS:

Two concepts were submitted Plan A and Plan B. The petitioner prefers plan A. The Staff review is for Plan A.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone.	The front elevation is consistent with the adjacent front 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.
Dwelling Unit Type	A detached single-family townhouse is proposed.	This is consistent with other historic structures in this block.
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 proposed entry is compatible.
Entrances	The entrance faces the principle street.	This standard is met.
Building Height:	The height matches the adjacent structures. The first floor height is 9', the second is 11' and the third is 10'-6".	The floor-to-floor height standards are met.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	The proportion is consistent with the adjacent properties and other historic structures within the block.	The proportion is compatible.
Proportion of Openings	The window openings are rectangular, taller than they are wide, and vertically aligned.	The proportion of openings is compatible.
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.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	A detached townhouse is proposed.	This is similar to other detached historic structures on the street.
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. How will the porch be accessed?
Walls of Continuity	The front façade is level with the adjacent front facades.	The wall of continuity along the street is maintained.
Scale	The scale is similar to the adjacent structures.	The scale is similar to other dwellings in the block.
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 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.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition due to the absence of the petitioner. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Cadman Design
Mark Cadman
H-07-3811-2
PIN No. 2-0004 -44-009
15 West Broughton Street
Sign/Awnings**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Mark Cadman.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for an internally illuminated projecting principal use sign and four awnings for Fuddruckers on the building at 15 West Broughton Street as follows:

1. The projecting sign is proposed above the double entrance to the east. The sign is 5'-11" wide and 3'-4" tall. It is mounted on a 1.5" black galvanized pole and maintains a vertical clearance of 8'-8.5" above the sidewalk. The sign is multi-colored with a black, yellow, blue, and white background in the shape of a bottle cap with text for "world's greatest hamburgers", and a projecting ribbon featuring the text for "Fuddruckers" with yellow and red text on a blue ribbon. The sign itself is 18" deep. White neon tubing illuminates the acrylic letters from within the sign.
2. Four awnings are proposed over the storefront within the individual bays as depicted in the elevation. The cornice and bay pilasters will not be obscured by the awnings, which are comprised of yellow canvas (Sign Tech #1090 yellow) awnings with a black valance (Sign Tech #2025 black). The awnings will be the width of the window bay, 3.5' tall and project 4' from the face of the building on a galvanized metal frame.

FINDINGS:

The historic building at 15 West Broughton Street was constructed ca. 1930, and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The property has undergone extensive renovations in the recent past to restore its historic façade and architectural integrity. Fuddruckers occupies approximately 50 linear feet along Broughton Street, and the property is zoned B-C-1 (Central Business).

The awnings have been broken up to fit within the existing storefront bays, complementing the architectural division of storefronts along Broughton Street. The applicant is proposing a canvas fabric to help mitigate the bright yellow color and give it a richer tone, more in keeping with Broughton Street.

The applicant has referenced the use of Fuddruckers' logo being painted on the glass storefront comprising 14 percent of the glass. While the Historic Review Board does not review window graphics, it should be noted that this element would be reduced to meet the 10 percent maximum allowed in the ordinance.

The following standards from the Broughton Street Sign District (Section 8-3119) apply:

(2) Requirements (c) Principal Use Signs.

1. **One principal use sign** shall be permitted for each business establishment. One such sign may be mounted or erected as a fascia sign or...as a projecting sign...

The standard is met.

2. **Size, height, and location...(i) Projecting Signs.**

- 1) For all principal uses occupying 125 or less linear feet of street frontage, projecting signs shall be permitted one square foot of display area per sign face per linear foot of frontage occupied by each principal use; provided, that a maximum area of 45 square feet shall be permitted per sign face...

The standard is met.

- 2) The outer edge of a projecting sign shall not extend more than six feet from the building to which it is attached.

The standard is met. The applicant shows a 5'-11" wide sign mounted on a bracket. This leaves 1" of space between the edge of the sign and the face of the building.

- 3) The height of a projecting sign shall not extend above the parapet wall of the building, and the lowest point of the projecting sign shall not be less than ten feet above the established grade.

The standard is not met. Staff recommends elevating the sign to meet the ten foot height clearance requirement. This would allow the sign to be visible from above the proposed awnings and be located above the glass transoms.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the sign be elevated to meet the ten-foot minimum vertical clearance requirement for projecting signs.

Mr. Gay asked if it would project off the building and not remain flat.

Ms. Ward said that was correct.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark Cadman stated that the sign would be elevated up to ten feet.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the condition that the sign be elevated to meet the ten-foot vertical clearance standard. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Karen & Don Ringsby
H-07-3802(S)-2
110 West Gaston Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Damon Smith
H-07-3803(S)-2
34 – 40 East Broad Street
Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Nancy & Erik Duncan
H-07-3805(S)-2
440 Habersham Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: MINUTES

Approval of Minutes – April 11, 2007

Mr. Meyerhoff stated on Page 11 in the third paragraph that the word “not” should be added.

Mr. Gay stated that when Board members were absent it should say that they were “excused” by their name and he wanted it notated by his name.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the minutes with the two changes to be made as requested. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

H. OTHER BUSINESS

**Petition of Elizabeth Robinson
Lee Meyer, AIA & Company, Inc.
H-06-3612-2
516 Nicoll Street
Request for one-year extension for an addition and a partial demolition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Ms. Ward stated the petitioner wanted to place an addition on another side of the building and a partial demolition of the bathrooms on the backside of the historic structure. The applicant was requesting a one-year extension of the previous approval.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the one-year extension. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

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

Ms. Ward stated that it came to her attention today that a high style Queen Anne building at 611 Whitaker (between Huntingdon and Hall Streets), had all of the columns removed and were thrown away. They had been replaced with fiberglass ten-inch turned columns, and the windows were being removed and taken out. She said Staff was aware of the situation and were trying to obtain a stop work order for the property.

Mr. Steffen asked who the owners were.

Ms. Ward stated the owner was from Atlanta, Georgia, and she did not know her. She said the HSF brought it to Staff's attention by taking a picture and sending it to her. They did have a permit but it was for interior work only and they have exceeded what was allowed.

Mr. Steffen asked if it was a local contractor.

Ms. Ward stated she was not familiar with them.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff to provide updated information to keep the Board aware and to have a record of people who blatantly violate the guidelines.

RE: INFORMATION ITEMS

- ❖ May 23 – 24, 2007, Public Presentations of the Master Plan
- ❖ May 24 – 25, 2007, Donovan Rypkema, NTHP, Lectures in Richmond Hill and Brunswick
- ❖ Reschedule June 8, 2007, Carl Vinson Institute City Board Training
- ❖ Orientation for Historic Preservation Department, June 15, 2007

Mr. Steffen said that Board members had received an invitation to the public presentation of the City's Master Plan and that it was an important document regarding everything dealing with the Board. The training session for June 8 had been rescheduled but there would be an orientation on June 15, 2007, which would be an extensive all day meeting. He encouraged all Board members to attend because of the need for a retreat to go over procedures and issues, and it would be a great opportunity to meet with the City Manager to give feedback and understand their roles.

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp