

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

November 14, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

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

HDRB Members Not Present:

Brian Judson

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Thomas L. Thomson, P.E./AICP, Exec. Director  
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director  
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: CALL TO ORDER

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

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 Details for a  
Condominium Building

Continued to December 12, 2007.

RE: Continued Petition of Houston & Oglethorpe  
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

Continued to December 12, 2007.

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-07-3862-2  
PIN No. 2-0016-03-008  
23 Montgomery Street  
New Construction Part II, Design Details – Hotel

Continue to December 12, 2007, at the petitioner's request.

RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-07-3916-2  
PIN No. 2-0015-01-001  
225 East President Street  
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass for a  
Five-Story Condominium

Continued to December 12, 2007.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Continued Agenda items as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and the motion passed 8 to 0. Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from H-06-3711-2, H-07-3862-2, and H-07-3916-2.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Petition of Unitarian Universalist Church of  
Savannah  
Ardis Wood  
H-07-3913-2  
PIN No. 2-0032-01-001  
313 East Harris Street  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.  
Donna Swanson  
H-07-3914-2  
PIN No. 2-0031-20-001  
321 Jefferson Street  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

**RE: REGULAR AGENDA**

**RE: Amended Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects  
Neil Dawson  
H-07-3611-2  
PIN No. 2-0032-13-013  
210 East Taylor Street  
Extend Addition and Material Change**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Neil Dawson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting to amend a previously approved application as follows:

1. Install fire-rated Heat Barrier series transparent windows by Technical Products behind previously approved Weathershield Legacy 1/1 windows.
2. Addition: Extend addition and reduce deck.
3. Change material on rear addition from zinc to copper.

**FINDINGS:**

The following standards apply:

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
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 main structure.	The addition is on the rear of the structure. By material and placement, it is distinguishable from the main structure. The originally approved addition was 14 feet with an 8-foot deck. The proposed change is for a 16'-8" addition and a 6'-6" deck. Change material from zinc to copper, which will age a brown color.	The rear addition extends 2'-8" beyond what was originally approved. The building lot coverage is 72 percent.
Double-glazed (SDL) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction. The centerline of window	Because this is a zero lot line, fire rated windows are required.	The new windows will be installed behind the previously approved Weathershield windows. The window sashes will not

<p>openings shall align vertically. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.</p>		<p>be set less than three inches from the façade of the building. The addition windows will be fire-rated metal and glass, and will have the storefront appearance as approved.</p>
--	--	---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as amended.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that Staff had said that the windows were changed on the submittal but had gone back to what was originally approved.

**Ms. Reiter** showed what the Board approved in June and what the petitioner was requesting.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there was an additional two-foot eight inches than what was originally approved.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that it was still within the 75 percent lot coverage.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there were drawings submitted that contained additional footage and were approved.

**Ms. Reiter** answered yes. She said when she stamped the permit drawings she did not see the additional two-foot eight inches, and it was built to the additional two-foot eight inches.

**Mr. Steffen** asked about the change from zinc to copper.

**Ms. Reiter** pointed out the section on the plans.

**Mr. Steffen** asked about the window openings on the zero lot line.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the approved windows would be on the exterior and the fire-rated windows on the interior behind them.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she had done architectural work on the block and was currently doing work for the neighbor. She said that in terms of the visual compatibility standards she wanted to know how the copper siding was visually related.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the copper would age to a brown tone. She said the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation encourage that additions be distinguishable from the main building, not to be confused with the historic structure. On several occasions in the past modern additions to the rear have been approved on historic structures.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the Board had approved any copper additions.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that they had approved copper and zinc. She thought copper had been approved on Whitaker Street.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if it was used as an exterior siding or roofing material.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he could not recall ever approving a metal siding on a historic residence for a wall covering.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that it was approved on Lorch Street on the Jerry Lominack project that was an addition to a historic structure, and on Selma Street.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that it was a new freestanding building in an undeveloped zone and this was in a very historic zone.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that with new residential construction the windows should be constructed of wood or wood clad and asked how it applied to the windows on the addition.

**Ms. Reiter** stated they were metal and that there was discussion about cladding the fire windows in wood. She said it could be addressed to the architect.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he did not remember seeing the elevations where the Board approved five windows. He recalled the first submission with only one window.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that there were five window openings on the drawings that were approved for Weathershield windows.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he did not recall the clear anodized aluminum storefront windows on a residence ever.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the Board approved them on June 2006.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the drawings that were stamped had windows that were substantially changed and were not long, but were short.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that they had been shortened and she did not see it on the drawing. She said that normally when things came in and had been changed they would be bubbled or brought to her attention. She looked at the front and it had the same windows. She had stamped the plans, but it was a mistake.

**Mr. Gay** stated the Board approved one thing and then something else was presented to be stamped and it bothered him.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he did not think the Board approved the storefront windows.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the storefront windows on the rear were on the drawings that the Board approved.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Neil Dawson (Dawson + Wissmach Architects representing Mr. Martin Melaver, owner, and Dana Braun, Legal Counsel)** stated there were a number of issues circulating regarding the project. He said the drawings that were approved by the Review Board in June were what they wanted to go back to. The only substantial deviations were the additional two-foot eight inches, and the difference between them was a minor issue. When the Board initially approved it, it was a unanimous decision with accolades and no comments from the public regarding the addition. To say that the Board did not like the aluminum anodized windows or the metal cladding would fly in the face of the previous approval. They relied on the accuracy of that approval to proceed with construction.

Regarding the permit set that was approved, he said that he would normally sit down and go through them with Ms. Reiter if it was different from what was approved by the Board. When they realized the difference they were happy to bring them back, however, they did them by the book. They were brought for approval, made what they felt were minor modifications, and it was approved by Staff. They felt that was Staff's approval, they were issued a building permit, and then proceeded based on that. When they realized that Ms. Reiter had concerns and wanted to rescind the approval, they brought it back even though they felt they did not need to because they relied on the accuracy of the permit. When they realized that it was different they decided to go back to the originally approved design except for the two-foot eight-inch extension that was in place. They went back to the same sized windows with the same material, and the only change they were requesting was going from the zinc to the copper. The zinc was a shiny material that the Board had approved several times as wall material on three of his projects. The zinc existed on a house on Jones Street down the street from the proposed project. They felt that the copper was a positive change over the zinc, a more sustainable material, and less shiny with a dull brown appearance that would fit better.

When the windows were initially submitted they were Weathershield. He thought he could do a fire shutter in the head of the window, but after code investigation he had to use a fire-rated window. The Weathershield window would be in front of the fire-rated window and you could not see a difference from the street. Other items concerning the project from sustainability to settlement and other issues he would like to wait on addressing them and confine it to the three issues on the agenda. The fire-rated windows would be clad with true divided light wood windows, the change from zinc to copper were minor modifications, and they requested approval.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he was confused because the drawings indicated they were originally approved but the windows were storefront windows. He asked if they were making a change in the windows at the present time and if it was correct.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that was exactly what the storefront windows were called in the drawings and it was not true that they were changing the windows. He said that on the wall section there would be clear anodized aluminum window framing.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he thought Mr. Meyerhoff was referring to the size of the windows.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the package was confusing and it took her a long time to figure out exactly what the petitioner wanted because there were plans with the small windows and the proposed.

**Mr. Dawson** apologized and stated that the small window was not in his packet.

**Mr. Gay** stated it was the one that was stamped.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that it was the one that was approved in permitting. He said the approved plans consistently showed aluminum storefront windows.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it was not approved by the Board.

**Ms. Dawson** stated that it was approved in permitting and that they were taking it back to what it was originally approved.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the original drawings approved by the Review Board showed the existing rear brick wall as remaining. She said it did not remain and asked what happened.

**Mr. Dawson** stated they thought the original brick wall would be behind the addition but when they took the addition off there was just a stub of a brick wall. He showed photographs of a short stub wall that had been cut out and a steel beam that was put in at the head with the brick removed on the back wall.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked how much the windows would be recessed.

**Mr. Dawson** answered three inches as required by the guidelines.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Edward Brennan, Jr. (Neighbor)** stated that the notice that was posted prior to the June 2006 hearing was placed inside of the house in the parlor floor window. He said they never noticed it until the hearing had taken place. The requirements state that at least ten days prior to a public hearing to request a Certificate of Appropriateness that the posting notice shall be erected on the premises and not inside. The face of the house was 15 feet from the street and it was impossible to comply with the requirement of the notice being erected within ten feet of the public right-of-way. It was also required that the lower edge of the sign be a sufficient height to be read from the roadway. He said that he brought it to the applicant's attention and they said that it was posted legally. He asked who posted it and the petitioner said the MPC. He asked if the MPC had keys to the house and asked how it got inside of the house in the window. He was not happy that the sign was posted where no one saw it and that it was never brought to anyone's attention before anyone had time to react. Mr. Neil Dawson stated that there were no comments from the public at the June 2006 meeting was because they did not know it was taking place.

He requested a copy of the Certificate of Appropriateness from the MPC and they gave him a copy of what was approved, including the 14-foot deep addition. When the architect drew the plans, for some reason he made it 16 feet 8 inches. He asked what possessed the architect to increase it from the approved 14 feet to 16 feet 8 inches and the architect said that the plans were approved by the Board. He noticed the rear wall coming up and you could see it was much deeper into the yard than what was approved. He contacted the MPC and they contacted the architect. Between the MPC, Mr. Peter Shonka the City Engineer, and the architect, they had agreed to stop work until the matter could come before the Board. With the applicant already having approvals, their coming out of courtesy was not genuine. They were present because they had to stop the work and needed the Board's approval of a deeper addition to go forward. Ms. Reiter had fallen on the sword and taken the responsibility for the mistake. He quoted her November 1 letter to the City Engineer that read, "...the permit drawings presented for the HRB approval stamp were purported to be consistent with the plans presented to the Review Board and were stamped as such. However, after an interested party inquiry was brought to my attention, it was brought to my attention that the permit drawings differed from the drawings approved by the Historic Review Board as follows..." He said that Ms. Reiter went into depth with areas that were non-compliant, including the exceeding 14 feet. He read, "...the changes were never brought to Staff's attention when the drawings were submitted for HRB stamp". The drawings were massive and for the MPC to go through the drawings to catch the architect at taking liberties would be impossible. They would have to hire five or six more people to flyspeck the drawings and make sure they represented what the Board approved. There was cooperation to stop the work, it was appreciated, and the architect said there would be no more work done above the garden level, however, when he came home from work they were laying steel. He contacted the MPC, the City Engineer, and they stopped the work again. The petitioner cannot go forward without the Board's approval and that was why there were here today. The applicant was indicating that they were victims of a mistake made by the MPC. The MPC did not make a mistake and did not draw the plans up three feet deeper than what was approved.

In his opinion, the project was incompatible and substantially out-of-scale. He said that rear additions were generally 8 to 12 feet and the largest ones were his and Mr. Martin Clark's house with a full 12 feet that was big for a rear addition. Their additions were much more compatible than the proposed project where the additions were only half the width of the house. The roofline was lower and the setback was approximately four or five feet. The large 12 feet additions do not have carriage houses like 214 and 216 East Taylor Street. There was plenty of air space, it was compatible, and a great deal of the lot coverage was not used. If you use less than 75 percent lot coverage, it did not mean that it was visually compatible unless the Board deemed it visually compatible. It was not visually compatible because it was out-of-scale, was too big, and had a minimal setback that was one-foot from the property line. He requested that the Board deny the petition to extend the rear addition to propose a new depth of 16 feet 8 inches based on it not being visually compatible in accordance with the ordinance. He said if the Board decided that the application could be heard, then he would request that the Board amend Staff's recommendation on depth of the rear addition to be no more than 12 feet to adhere the ordinance's visually compatibility factor. The Board should hear the petition as new since everything had changed and it was a project the Board had not heard before in terms of the size, materials, windows, and a new design that looked like the original design. It must have been written in the last day or two because he had received updated information from MPC of a new design. The current sign posting notice prefix number is somewhat different.

He requested that the Board deny the applicant's petition to install fire-rated, heat barrier series, transparent window behind the previously approved Weathershield, based on it not meeting the design standards under the ordinance. The ordinance also stated that windows with new residential construction shall be constructed of wood or wood clad. To punch out the existing historic wall on the east elevation and install windows was rare on a historic building and impossible for a citizen to get an approval, and to get approval for four new windows was unusual. He requested that the four new windows be denied. The house was gutted in violation of L(12)(d) of the Design Standards, and the ordinance stated that additions shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material, and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including but not limited to roof line, cornices, eaves, and brackets. It says that additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building. When the Board gave the approval in June 2006 the Board did not know they were going to gut the building, and on this basis, everything had changed and it was a new, situation to be heard new. If the Board decided to hear the application new then he would encourage the Board to consider that punching four new windows would eliminate what was left of the historic building. He felt that he was losing his privacy.

He said the petitioner wanted to change from zinc to copper and that both materials seemed inappropriate and visually incompatible with the neighborhood. He did not understand why someone wanted a metal addition to their house in the Historic District when everything around it was wood, stucco, and brick that were the traditional historic materials. The ordinance stated that the addition shall be visually compatible with the structures to which they relate. The definitions in the back of the ordinance define the word shall, it was always mandatory and not nearly discretionary.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that this might be one of the few Board's within the City that does not time limit people on their comments. He asked those who spoke after Mr. Brennan to confine their comment to a new issue or an expansion on the existing issue and to keep comments from being personal or toward items the Board did not deal with to eliminate repetition.

**Ms. Jamie Brennan** stated that she never saw the posting for the original additional work that was being done on the house.



**Mr. Tom Filbrick (East Jones Street)** stated that his house backed onto East Jones Lane and they look upon the proposed structure. He said they were never aware of a posting and urged the Review Board to give the neighbors a better notification system. He asked the Board to use the color rendering because it gave a better visual concept. They enjoy their backyard and neighborhood and this would be a detraction.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation Executive Director)** stated that the process in this case broke down, there was confusion about what happened, and it was shocking to the neighbors and HSF to see the building totally gutted with the loss of the historic fabric. He said the rear wall was removed and the plans did say that 18 inches would stay. He did not remember anything about the windows but understood they were approved. Looking at the property, there were a variety of window types like 6/6 windows on the front façade that might be the original windows. On the upstairs there were the 2/2 windows that might have snap-in muntins, some 2/2 windows down the side, and they are putting back in the 1/1 windows. On Greek Revival buildings and buildings of the mid 19<sup>th</sup> Century they normally ask the petitioners to put back windows that were consistent with the original architectural fabric of the building, which would be 6/6 windows. He said if the petitioner was going to restore the envelope to its true appearance than the windows should be 6/6, and with the fire-rated windows on the inside it should not make a difference. It would do a lot to marry the jarring modern addition to the historic front part of the building and the neighborhood.

**Mr. Bill Steube (Downtown Neighborhood Association)** stated that the dimension on the plan is 14 feet 6 inches and not the 16 feet that was being proposed. He said that it was not consistent with the new proposal. The window had clip-ins that were in violation of the standards and should be changed.

**Ms. Karen Jenkins (220 East Taylor Street)** stated that she concurred with Mr. McDonald on the windows being consistent, along with the front door of the property.

**Mr. Ted Coy (208 East Taylor Street)** stated that he agreed with what everyone else said.

**Ms. Pam Edwards (Manager of 208 East Taylor)** stated that the exterior addition on the back seemed out-of-scale and she was concerned about the siding and how large the building would be. She said it blocked all of the light, air space, and everything from them, and that an additional three feet was a lot to ask for everyone in the courtyards.

**Mr. Patrick Shay** stated that if there was a process that allowed a contributing historic structure to be gutted from the inside and all of the historic fabric removed, he suspected that it was not a contributing historic structure. He said that at the end it would look similar to the building that was once there. It concerned him regarding the precedent it would establish for other historic structures and others might use this as an example of how someone could take a significant historic building and use the same technique. It might not be presented today as being an addition and felt it was not the complete story because he thought it was more than an addition. He said that in the future when petitioner's come forward, they not be treated as additions but as something else.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that at the last meeting it was brought to the Board's attention that the Board did not have any jurisdiction over the interior of a building. He said Mr. Shay had raised an issue that there should be a process for this and that he believed there should be one. He said the Board would do their best to address the issues that were before them.

**Mr. E. T. Smith (General Contractor)** stated that he agreed with Mr. Shay and said that the walls, the floors, the substructure, and everything had been taken out back to the bare brick walls; they were gone. He said the historic structure was lost. The materials, the rear of the house, the windows, and the addition were different, and the Board of Review and neighbors were confused. It seemed that it should start new with the Historic Review Board and they should start from scratch. He said that the Historic District was one square mile of 750 square miles in Chatham County, 100 plus square miles in Savannah, and one square mile they were trying to protect and this was how it could be lost.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he did not know if he had the power to decide if it was a new petition or not, but if the petitioner or the attorney wanted to address the issue it would be allowed.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that he would let Mr. Braun address it. He said the Board approved it last June and all they wanted was the two-foot six-inch gap. If it was completely inappropriate he did not know where the fine line was drawn between 14 feet and the 16 feet 8 inches. He asked if one-foot or two-foot more was ok because when he looked at both of them they seemed the same. He showed a rendering of what it would look like from the street for both the approved and proposed plans of the copper siding. He could not see any modification that would throw out a decision the Board made on last June.

He said they agreed concerning the windows and were not pleased with the snap-in mullions. They would prefer to put in a new true divided light wood window in 6/6 to match the historic configuration in all of the windows. The front façade on the third floor was also a snap-in grid window they would like to change. The firm believed anything new would be differentiated from the old unless it was a true restoration project. They did not consider that the new windows would be a restoration of an existing opening and used a window that was similar but slightly different. He said if it were the preference of the Board to do 6/6 they would be happy to do them.

He said he had been kicked out of several meetings because of improper postings and knew firsthand that the Board took it seriously. He recalled that they had posted it on the stoop, it was torn off, and they got a new sign and put it inside of the house. They did not normally put the signs inside of the house, but they would have had to repost it every couple of days.

The difference between what was proposed and approved was negligible. He said that most of the other houses in the neighborhood were over 5,000 square feet. The house as it existed was approximately 2,400 square feet and with the addition they barely get the 3,000 square feet. The difference the two-foot eight inches made was about the size of a conference table at 50 square feet. That was what they were talking about adding to each floor, and if 50 square feet kicked them over the limit and could not be approved the Board, they would go back to what was approved. He felt that it was a nominal request to the Board.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the three existing windows on the east elevation were wood frame and if the five new windows would be wood frame on the outside.

**Mr. Dawson** answered yes and said that the fire-rated window would be set inside. Because of the thickness of the wall, they would have to be set back to maintain the three-inch setback on the wood windows.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they would be a 1/1 wood frame as shown.

**Mr. Dawson** said yes, unless the Board chose to use 6/6 or some other configuration.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the windows in one elevation should all have the same look.

**Mr. Dawson** stated they would be happy to do that but he felt that the new window should look different from the historic windows.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he wanted the attorney to address whether it was a new hearing or not. He said they did not have to but someone raised the legal issue and wanted to hear what they had to say.

**Mr. Dana Braun (Legal Counsel for the Petitioner)** stated that he did not believe that it was a new hearing and that it should not be considered a new hearing. He said what was before the Board was the changes to the back. The Board approved the changes to the side last year but they were talking about a hearing in June 2006 that was a year and a half ago. To raise a notice now that had not been raised until this time cannot restart the process all over. Even if someone did not observe the sign, the sign was posted and the construction started months ago and no one raised the issue. He asked how the project started without notice. He said that people couldn't sit on their hands until this day and say it had to start anew. They were there because there was a difference in what the Board approved and what was submitted by the architect. The difference was the change in the windows and the addition of the two-foot eight inches. They were not there to point fault because it was not picked up but they relied on it and a permit was issued by the City of Savannah. Certain property rights attached to the client that he started, relied, and incurred costs and expenses started upon it being built. Now it had been brought back because Staff felt it should have been a Board decision for the change to the back of the addition. All they were present for were the two changes from the zinc to the copper and the additional two feet eight inches that was the issue for the Board to deal with. With the interior the jurisdiction was clearly under Section 8-3030 in the ordinance and limited to the exterior and the way it looked from the streets.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that they showed a soldier course above the windows and asked if they intended to move the historic brick and insert soldier course over the new windows.

**Mr. Dawson** stated they did and that it would look more compatible. He said if it created a hardship for Mr. Brennan, he did not think that a running or soldier bond would make a huge difference. He thought it looked more appropriate visually and was the same for the sills.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that he would ask the Board to support Staff when there was a change made to a set of plans that had been previously approved, that they needed to be resubmitted directly to HBR. He said the City Inspectors who give permits do not look at historic features and that it was the petitioner's responsibility as architects to make sure that it was done. They know what the rules were for downtown, there was enough of a difference where the original submittal was different from this submittal, and he asked them to follow the process. There might have been an error in missing that fact, but it did not give them a valid permit to go ahead with the work and from that point on it was at their risk and not MPC's. He said their attorneys could advise them on it because the case law was clear on that point.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board was thankful to Staff for reviewing the drawings in a meticulous way. He said that in any situation errors could happen and he did not feel that anyone should take what had happened as an indictment on Staff.

He said the issues before them were the request for an additional two feet eight inches, the change from zinc to copper, and the windows being changed back to the original approved design. The petitioner indicated that they were willing to make changes to the windows on the primary structure to be more historically compatible if the Board chooses to vote on it, or it could be referred back to Staff. There was a suggestion from the public that it could be treated as a

new petition and as Chair, he was not going to weigh in on it because it would be a question of how much was being changed. It was more subjective than an objective opinion.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that with changing zinc to copper that copper does not turn brown but turns green as it erodes. He said they were looking at something that would be a greenish color for a long time. He again did not recall the storefront windows in the new addition and that they would like to have the additions look different from the original building. He also could not recall any residential building in the Historic District that had storefront windows in an addition.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she agreed with Mr. Smith that if there was substantial deviation from the original submission in terms of scale and materials, that with the Standards of Compatibility it should be heard as a new petition.

**Mr. Law** asked if they could take it to Staff, get it worked out, and come back.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that Staff had made a recommendation to the Board for approval. Whether or not it was heard as a new petition was incumbent on the Board to support Staff's recommendation, deny it, or amend it. He did not think Staff would want the Board to send the whole thing back and it would not exercise the authority the Board was given. The Board needed to decide to approve, deny, or amend it and those were the three things they could do.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the other aspect of confusion was that the original was submitted and the rendering showed windows and not storefront windows. He said it was penciled in that the windows were approved by the Historic Review Board and the Board was told they approved full-length storefront windows.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Ms. Reiter if she could clear it up for everyone. He said that Mr. Meyerhoff stated when the Board first approved it there were windows on the back instead of the storefront and he could not recall.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the Board approved the storefront windows and those who were present at the meeting were still on the Board.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board had drawings that showed windows and not storefront windows. He asked what the origin of the drawing was.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that initially there was approved drawings and then there were permitted drawings. She said that subsequently the drawing showing other windows were produced and subsequent to that, they came up with what was seen today, which was number three on the list. What was being proposed today was not what was approved by the Board. It was very confusing with the labeling of all of the drawings and the date on them and it was number three out of four.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that was his recollection and he did not know why it was included. He said that it was confusing.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that it was dated 10-25-07 and everything else was dated 06.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that would have been four months subsequent to the Board's initial approval and that it did not bear any relationship to anything the Board approved or disapproved. He felt the best thing to do to eliminate confusion was to ignore the drawing with the windows because the Board never approved it, and it was not being presented today.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that with the amount of confusion and the fact that there had been more than one neighbor that came before the Board, that it should be heard as a new petition.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that whether the Board did or did not was the Board's decision. Hearing it as a new petition would presuppose that the Board would make an amendment in the original approval. He said if someone made a motion to that effect it would be a defacto in treating it as a new petition. There would have to be a second to the motion and there would have to be a vote on it. He was not going to make a ruling whether it was or was not a new petition because there was a question of whether there was substantial change to treat it as a new petition. It was the Board's decision and not the Chairman's decision.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that the Board's job was to deal with certain aspects and the building was not a historical structure because it had been gutted. He said the Board should adhere to the things they could deal with and move on.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board was authorized to deal with the exterior of the structure and the historic compatibility, which could be voted on.

**Mr. Johnson** asked about the petitioner getting a permit because it was approved without the Board's knowledge.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that was why they were back today to seek an approval. He said they could say they received the approval because it was stamped and signed off on; therefore, that was the end of it. They came back and Staff brought it back appropriately with the extension on the addition being approved mistakenly because it was not looked at. It was before the Board to decide whether they would approve it.

**Dr. Elmore** stated what was approved initially whether there was a mistake or not needed to be acted on.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that was what Staff had asked the Board to act upon.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the Board had solved the window problem. She agreed with Mr. Meyerhoff about the zinc to copper and that copper does turn green and that compatibility aspect concerned her. She said she understood what the Board approved regardless of whether or not it was a mistake. The Board did not approve the square footage of what was done. She was not saying that Ms. Reiter was rightly falling on the sword, which was a great thing for her to do, but the Board did not approve it and asked what they were going to do. There were two big issues and she asked if they should stop the project because of it. She did not believe the Board would have approved the copper.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he got the impression that neither the petitioner nor the neighbors were making a huge plea that it go from zinc to copper. He said he got the impression that the petitioner was offering it as a salve for the neighbors to make it look softer, and if it accomplishes it that was great. They were hearing from people that were experts that stated it would not accomplish it. He did not think the issue was contentious but that the real issue was the extension of the addition.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that a move to deny would accomplish both of them.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that a move to deny would place it back to the original approval.

**Dr. Elmore** asked if that was placing it back to 14 feet.

Mr. Steffen answered yes.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the petition as submitted with the windows going back to Staff for further review. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. Mr. Meyerhoff, Mr. Gay, Dr. Watkins, Ms. Seiler, Ms. Ramsay, and Dr. Elmore were in favor. Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Law abstained. The motion passed 6 to 0.

Mr. Thomson stated that those who abstain must state their reasons.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Law what his reasons were for abstaining.

Mr. Law stated that he was on the Board because of the history of the City of Savannah and it disheartened him when the building was gutted. It sets an example and it distorted the truth.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he believed Staff had done a great job in the past and the Board should support them. He said at the same time he felt that Staff could sort some of the issues out like the windows. The two feet eight-inches did not make a significant difference in terms of the lot coverage.

Mr. Steffen stated that the petition was denied on those two elements and it would go back to Staff regarding the composition of the windows on the original structure.

**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**

The Preservation Officer recommends a continuance.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, of a seven-story hotel building in a six-story height zone at the southwest corner of Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard and West Bay Street. 201 rooms are shown with three meeting rooms, one restaurant/bar, and a seventh floor penthouse.

**FINDINGS:****Site Plan Review:**

- Traffic Engineering has requested a one-way entry off Bay onto Ann Street with a cul-de-sac turn around off Bryan Street on Ann Street.
- The site is located in a six-story height zone. A one-story height variance is required. A Finding-of-Fact is necessary regarding the proposed variance.
- The Bay Street drop off is subject to DOT approval.
- The parking plan was not submitted with this proposal. 170 parking spaces are required for both the hotel and restaurant.

**Changes from October 10, 2007 submission:**

- The eighth floor has been eliminated and the seventh floor reduced to the cylinder at the corner of Bay and MLK and a continuous portion along the lane; however there is a discrepancy in the drawings as stated below.
- The cylinder portion of the building has been contained within a masonry framework leaving a rounded edge at the corner of MLK and Bay.
- The building has been set back further from Bay Street to provide a wider sidewalk and the number of entrances has increased.
- The two-story base has been reduced to a single floor, 14'-6" tall

**New Construction:** The project is sited on two parcels zoned B-C (Community-Business). The findings below summarize staff concerns.

- **Height:** Staff is concerned about the overall height of the building and the variance request. The proposed height is 83'-6", and although it is lower than previously submitted, this is the equivalent of a seven-story building in a six-story height zone. The floor plans indicate seven floors; however, the height lines on sheet A-9 indicate a short eighth story or a tall glass parapet. Floor-to-floor heights are 14'-6" on ground floor, 12' on the second, 10' on floors three through seven, and a 7' tall parapet or floor. The applicant has submitted pictures of historic tall buildings in Savannah. Staff notes that most of the tall buildings built in downtown Savannah occupied 60 to 120 feet frontage, not 303 feet. The building forms for the proposed site do not relate to any tall historic building in downtown Savannah. These historic buildings demonstrate a closer ratio of voids to solids, fine intricate detailing, human scale, and quality materials that have endured through time.
- **Tall Building and Large-Scale Development:** The nearest historic buildings are a block away, including the Landmark Scarborough House, First African, and First Bryan Baptists churches. Even if there are no immediately adjacent historic structures, the historic land pattern is critical to maintaining the character of downtown Savannah. The 1888 and 1898 Sanborn maps indicate that this site was occupied by as many as 14 separate structures. This fine-grained lot subdivision, while not a part of Oglethorpe's Tything lot and squares plan was, none-the-less, a character-defining feature of this part of the downtown. The mass of the proposed building, even though it is broken into three

parts, does not reflect any traditional siting pattern in the District. The three parts are larger than the 60-foot maximum in the Large-Scale Development standard. Staff has concerns that even if the height were reduced to meet the standard, the mass and scale of the block long building would still not be visually compatible with the Landmark District, which is comprised numerous individual structures with varying heights, rooflines, building materials, and fenestration patterns and detailing. Historic hotels and large buildings within the Historic District were big buildings made up of small parts. These buildings, while large, had a human scale in proportion of bays, windows, materials, and detailing. The proposed building should use these elements.

- **Entrances:** The number of entrances has been increased from the previous submittal to include four entrances along Bay Street, a corner entrance at Bay and MLK, and another entry on MLK. The proposed structure is 303 feet long and an additional entrance is required on Bay Street to meet the standard. Staff recommends that the central entrance on Bay Street be enlarged to be in proportion with the scale of the curtain wall and awning that are proposed. The building has been stepped back from Bay Street, as it is a heavily traveled thoroughfare as previously recommended by Staff and the Board.
  
- **Solids-to-Voids:** The building form at the corner of MLK and Bay has been restudied and now better corresponds to the rest of the building form. The structure stands at a prominent entry point into the Landmark District. Openings have been added to the recesses along Bay Street. The amount of void to solid in the punched opening sections is less than in traditional Savannah buildings. Additional independent openings and separation of wider openings in the middle section on Bay could help break of the massive solid walls of the building. While curtain walls can be a good tool to define mass, it appears visually incompatible here. It is not possible to discern what clear glass is and what opaque spandrel glass is. It is unclear how the exterior vents will be integrated into the design of the building. The large void at the corner is visually incompatible.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p><b>Building Height:</b> New construction shall be within the height limits as shown on the Historic District Height Map. Six stories (1997 and 2003).</p>	<p>The cylindrical form is seven or eight stories tall at an overall height of 83'-6" (<b>drawing A-12 shows height of 86'-6"</b>); the main height of the building along is six stories with a seventh story along the lane</p>	<p>The standard is not met. The six-story height zone, stepping down to five across the former Olive Street, is an appropriate transition to the historic structures to the south. A three-story height limit is adjacent across Ann Street and across MLK – seven stories is not an appropriate transition to these neighboring sites. The height is excessive for a building of this mass. It may be compatible to have portions of the building at higher elevations if the building were broken into separate parts to allude to a more traditional fine-grain</p>



		<p>building pattern characteristic of the historic district and historic commercial buildings on MLK and Bay St.</p>
<p><b>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development:</b> The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60 feet in width with each section taller than it is wide...shall use window groupings, columns or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet nor more than 20 feet in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang...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 east façade extends 78'-2" along MLK, and is comprised of a base with a recessed corner entrance. It is vertically divided into the curtain wall form at the corner and a 40' wide three tier rectangular form at the lane broken into three 13' wide bays.</p> <p>The north façade along Bay Street is 303 feet long and is broken into three distinct sections by 24.5' wide recesses.</p> <p>The first section is 83 feet wide at ground level on Bay and 78 feet wide on MLK. The corner entry creates a 37' void on both MLK and Bay Street. The former cylinder has been encapsulated in a rectangular form and as on the Bay Street elevation; it is vertically divided into the curtain wall form at the corner and a 40' wide three tier rectangular form at the lane broken into three 13' wide bays.</p> <p>The middle section is 110 feet wide +/- and is comprised of a curved wall divided into three bays; a 55' + wide curtain wall in the center and two 27.5-inch bays on either side.</p> <p>The western section is 66 feet +/- wide and divided into two 26' wide bays by a central recessed balcony bay.</p>	<p>The standard it not met. The sections of the building are all greater than 60'. Bays within are either smaller than 15' or wider than 20'. Bays could be further articulated with the use of window groupings, columns, or pilasters. The main roofline is all at the same height. On the western side of the building, there is no entrance for approx. 71'.</p>
<p><b>Directional Expression of Front Elevation:</b> A structure shall be visually compatible with the structures to which it</p>	<p>The building is comprised of three building forms. They have been restudied to better relate to one another.</p>	<p>The building, although seven stories tall has a strong horizontal nature creating a massive heavy structure.</p>

<p>is visually related in its directional character, horizontal character, or non-directional character.</p>		<p>Developing stronger vertical elements within 60' wide sections could help break up the building into a more human scale – i.e. adding more window bays, making windows taller than they are wide, restudying the curtain wall, restudying the sixth floor bands. The openings on the sixth floor should align with openings below and the materials could be brought through from the middle to the sixth floor.</p>
<p><b>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</b> The relationship of solids-to-voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure, shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>The building contains large amounts of glass curtain wall as well as punched openings with storefront type windows. There are no contributing buildings directly related to this structure.</p>	<p>Although there are no contributing structures directly adjacent to this proposed building the Scarborough House, a National Landmark, the First African Baptist Church, the First Bryan Baptist Church, the administration building for the Yamacraw Village, and other historic commercial buildings are within one block of this structure. The pictorial references of the Old DeSoto Hotel submitted by the applicant show deeply set windows and porch recesses. The historic elevations are broken into interesting and finely detailed compositions by the fenestration. More voids in the form of window/storefront openings should be incorporated on a building of this size as was done on all of the historic hotel photos submitted.</p>
<p><b>Proportion of Openings:</b> The relationship of the width of the windows to height of windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>Glass curtain walls are used in the curved corner and central section on Bay Street. The ground floor features storefront glass in the three building sections.</p>	<p>The cylindrical tower has been redesigned to better relate to the other forms in the building; however, they do not relate to other openings within the Historic District. Openings appear wider than they are tall in the</p>

		central portion of the Bay Street façade. They should be separated and be taller than they are wide.
<b>Entrances:</b>	The primary entrance for the hotel is located in the center curvilinear façade, with a cut in the sidewalk for vehicular access along Bay Street. An entrance for the ground floor restaurant is within a recessed corner at Bay Street and MLK. Secondary entrances are placed along Bay and MLK.	The 303-foot-long block essentially has four public entrances. Another one is needed to meet the Large-Scale-Development standard. The central entrance on bay should be enlarged to be proportionate to the curtain wall with which it is contained.
<b>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, and Balconies:</b> The relationship of entrances, porch projections, and walkways to structures shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are visually related.	A recessed corner entrance is provided at MLK and Bay. Recessed balconies are proposed on the central and western sections of the Bay Street elevation. Recessed balconies are also proposed along the lane facing elevations.	There is no discernable rhythm to the balconies and entrances, etc. The sections of the building do not relate.
<b>Setbacks/Lot Coverage:</b> No setbacks are required in B-C zone. Lot coverage can be 100 percent.	Recesses proposed along the Bay Street elevation have been increased in size and the building has been further set back from Bay Street increasing the amount of sidewalk.	The standard is met. The applicant has restudied the set back and recesses as per the Staff and Board's request.
<b>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:</b> The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front façade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is related.	The width and height of the structure create a very massive building.	The proposed subdivision of the structure into three segments does not mitigate the mass and height of the building.
<b>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</b> The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjacent structures shall be visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing structures to which it is related.	Although there are proposed setbacks and recesses, there is no open space between structures. The proposed building takes up the entire city block.	The proposed segmentation does not mitigate the mass and scale of the structure. Staff recommends breaking the building into separate structures. In the commercial areas of downtown, there is little open space if any between structures. However, historically, there were multiple buildings with multiple addressable entries on this block and throughout

		the neighborhood.
<b>Scale:</b> The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches, column spacing, stairs, balconies, and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is related.	The mass of the structure is very large for the Historic District, consuming an entire city block. There is very little fine-grained detail on the building to mitigate the mass and scale.	The use of large areas of curtain wall, walls without openings or few openings, and lack of surface detail emphasize the massive scale of this building. The use of high quality materials and intricate detailing should be used in Part II.
<b>Parking:</b>	Parking information was not provided.	170 spaces are required and must be shown in plan or shared parking must be stated.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

(March Recommendation): Continuance for Part I, Height and Mass, to restudy the height, division and width of bays, creating independent windows from paired windows, forms of the three facades, vehicular entrance, and drop-off on Bay Street. Pedestrian connectivity along Bay Street to future development west of Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard should be a strong consideration. Building forms should more closely emulate forms within Savannah. The curved element of the former DeSoto, for instance, was also curved at ground level and not set on a podium. It featured a hierarchy of bays and openings that extended the full height of the building with recessed and projecting balconies creating a base, middle, and top.

(October Recommendation): Denial of a height variance and continuance for Part I Height and Mass to reconsider form including the deletion of the cylindrical form, reconsideration of the scale of materials, restudy of solids-to-voids, and division of structure into parts that have more entrances. Consider setting building back from Bay Street to allow for a wider sidewalk.

**November Recommendation:** Continuance for Part I, Height and Mass to restudy the height, scale, solids-to-voids, and bay spacing. Parking needs to be addressed and provided in plan or written description/agreement.

**For Part II, Design Details, Staff recommends that the building feature high quality materials and intricate detailing. A building of this size and scale should not use stucco exterior walls. The use of quality materials, including stone, cast stone, and masonry may help mitigate some of the compatibility issues with regard to scale. If this is going to be a landmark building in size, it should be a landmark building in design and materials as well.**

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he had not seen parking in the site plan submissions before and asked Mr. Thomson to explain why the Board was looking at the issues now.

**Mr. Thomson** stated they had a discussion with the applicant’s agent and architect about parking and the requirement of 175 parking spaces, a reduction for hotels that was approximately 25 to 30 percent, along with other issues. The proposal had 70 parking spaces inside with no indication of what would happen to the other 90 or 70 parking space need that would be required for the building. He said if they had to revise the plans to accommodate it that it would affect the Height and Mass and it was not answered. If it was answered it might affect the building mass and he was recommending a continuation on it. The Board did not have any purview over deciding the number of parking spaces that were needed, but the MPC

also did the site plan reviews and a part had not been answered that might affect the mass of the building. The Board might want to consider it before going forward.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it answered his question but still begged a question. He said the Board had been trying hard over the last year and a half to make a decision based on purview and not wait until they decided what other boards or agencies did. He said those were the orders from the City and from Staff, and it appeared that the Board was asked to do that and he was concerned about giving mixed messages. He understood the reason and did not question it but he wanted to know that they wanted the Board to do. He had been lecturing the Board members on making their decisions and not concerning themselves with what other boards and agencies did whether it was related to height or whatever. The Board had also been telling members of the public that parking was not within their purview because whenever an issue came up involving a townhouse on a residential street, the first thing people want to discuss was would there be enough parking. The Board had always said that parking was not within their purview and he was concerned about it sending a mixed message.

**Mr. Gay** stated that if the Board approved the Height and Mass then it was the petitioner's responsibility to get the parking within the Height and Mass. He said as long as the Board was ok with Height and Mass, then the petitioner had to worry about the parking and it would not affect the design.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he understood that it was an issue the MPC wanted to see resolved and why they wanted it continued. He wanted it to be clear that the Board's position and what he had been preaching over the last year was that the Board decided based on what their authority was and that they don't step into other jurisdictions on what traffic and parking did.

**Mr. Thomson** stated there was a process for downtown development that included a site plan review and comments. He said the process was intended to provide the Board with information about the review, not that it be in their purview, but that it was another piece of data about the project that could be understood as the Board dealt with Height and Mass and Design Details. He thought Mr. Gay was correct with it becoming the petitioner's problem if later on they have to get 140 spaces inside the mass on what the Board approved. If that were the only issue today, then they would go ahead with Mr. Gay's suggestion. It was one of many things Staff wanted to make the Board aware of.

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

**Mr. Patrick Shay** stated that as an architect they had to be sensitive to the environment they design in and try to understand context in different layers. He said that some layers were relevant to today's deliberation and some were not. He thought that Savannah had developed some prejudice against hotels because there were many and more were on the way. Hotels have always been a part of the history and a part of the success of the city in terms of commerce, and there were full block long hotels that would not have met all of the rules presented today. The proposed site in a bird's eye view from approximately 100 years ago provided more of an idea about the historical context. He agreed with Staff that the block being designed had an assemblage of small buildings in 1891, and that the old West Broad Street had large buildings that were associated with shipping and trade. This area of Savannah had some elements of smaller buildings and was also home to large-scale industrial buildings. He pointed out the boundary of the National Landmark Historic District and said that the structure was not within the National Landmark Historic District, although the surrounding hotels and the parking area were within the National Landmark Historic District and they were full block buildings. To say there was not precedent would not be correct. He said that it was the right place for a large-scale hotel, not in the middle of the district, and was in the context of the larger structures in the

area. He asked the Board members to look at the model to get an idea of the context in the immediate vicinity, and said that the area had a large number of large-scale buildings.

When talking about compatibility, to some extent they were talking about beauty. No one came to the Board and asked to make their building compatible if it was ugly, they wanted to make it look better than what was there before. There were examples of unity with the historic hotel where no one would mistake it for a group of small buildings because the DeSoto Hotel has enough unity to be read as one thing. He said that this was one entity and not ten or fifteen small buildings, but a hotel that would be owned, operated, and managed by one entity. They came up with something that was not entirely unified like the historic hotels, was not entirely chaotic like the small buildings that occupied the site, and the industrial buildings that would occupy the area later. They brought something that was divided into many segments and had a collection of architectural expressions that were both unified and harmonious.

This project had been through the Site Plan Review (SPR) process and when the building was brought to the Board in March, it was why they voluntarily took it to SPR. It had been scrutinized for all of the elements that SPR looked at, and what was recommended was that the area be left at the historic width that the Sanborn map showed 100 years ago. The entrances to the hotel were put off to the side and the back not to tie up traffic on the heavily trafficked main thoroughfares. Otherwise, they would have been having an automobile entrance for the general patrons located on the same frontage as the heavy traffic areas. It was also requested that Ann Street be made into a cul-de-sac so that if someone came into the area and did not want to go into the hotel they could turn around. It had created two levels of circulation in addition to the heavy traffic. Part of the project would be a restoration of the lane, which was a pattern that disappeared historically, and the lane was wiped out. The same partners working this development owned the adjacent property and they had voluntarily agreed to restore a portion of the lane. Another portion was already an easement, and this would cause circulation around the back of the building so the service vehicles and items belonging in the lanes that were owned by the city could happen in the back. In addition to restoring the lane, it liberated the sidewalk and frontages for a place of easy and free flowing pedestrian traffic flow.

The diagram of the floor plan showed how much area had been conceded within the property lines at street level by the developer so that there would be a freer flow of pedestrians in the area. On the two frontages, there were six entrances with glazed doors and he said that the entire segment was open. The building itself was divided into segments and they were not more than 60 feet across the buildings. He pointed out that there was a base that was 65 feet, and an indent shown on the upper floor plan that subdivided into segments, as well as in the back. He said the guidelines in the ordinance say that as long as you have a change of plane that it was a change of segment. In the three dimensions, they were not subtle and it could be seen in the model. The changes of plane were dramatic and deliberate in breaking the mass up into a variety of segments.

The total building area with all floors, including the half-story seventh floor height was approximately 134,000 square feet. If the total footprint were taken to the edge, which was allowed, and did not go six stories high at the recommended height, then it would be approximately 152,000 square feet. The developer was giving up approximately 12 percent of the allowed lot area in order to break the building into multiple segments, and give the area back to the sidewalk and the street to create activated pedestrian entrances.

He said that as you go up the floors, that some of the segments on the ground floor plan less than 60 feet were subdivided and articulated with balconies and other divisions, which according to the ordinance were in different wall planes and were segmented.

They went through a very rigorous SPR process that cost the developer four months to go through at a time when half a dozen of the hotels were competing for the next opportunity to develop. He said that when they draw the area and say the parking would be down below that it was there. He pointed out that there were two layers of underground parking, and without double-stacking they could go to 144 parking spaces below grade and a few at grade. There were devices used on other projects that take one floor level and stack cars two high within the spaces. The parking spaces were all valet parking and whatever the number of spaces that were determined at the end, they would get there. There should be no worries about the parking.

Part of the reason they liked the design was that it allowed them to have a roof terrace above the sixth floor at the level of the roof. They thought it would be a spectacular place for hotel guest to go to and look out on the river, and on the seventh floor they were asking for a variance because it was crowded on the back side adjacent to the existing hotel on the other side. The area of the seventh floor in elevation would be the same side as the backside of the hotel. It was designed as a backside and was never intended to be one of the frontages of the building. He would argue that the building was an evolution and a marked improvement from a design improvement over the two adjacent buildings because he designed them. He said Mr. Saad Al Jassar had taught him how to design buildings that were more responsive than ones that were done in the past.

The cornice line of the six-story portion of the building that was the vast majority and almost all that could be seen from Bay Street was actually lower than the cornice of the six-story building across from it, which was the Double Tree Inn. The height of the cylinder was there for architectural reasons. The cylinder was controversial, Ms. Seiler did not like it, they restudied it twice, and he felt they came up with a good solution. They had not given up the wonderful object that was at a corner that was a landmark corner in Savannah, but it had been embedded in some rectangular elements. They would like for the top of the cylinder to read so when driving by you do not lose the fact that it was once a cylindrical shape. They would like it to be high and said it was not a story but just one of the seven floors they were asking for. It was a gathering space that they call the penthouse.

There were some options with the material, and what they presented was a building that was composed of brick masonry, cast stone, glass, and stucco at the top. After discussions and after meeting with SDRA they suggested trying modern materials. They went back and restudied it by asking the question, "what if it was a very modern material and what would it look like if they were cast panels?" He said they presented a project in terra cotta and gave thought to metal panels. It was something that could be worked out in the Design Details. They felt comfortable with what was presented and they wanted to commit that with Staff's direction and the opportunity to go forward, they could do the facades in all masonry without doing a six-story stucco wall.

He said they had met the standards, designed the right building in the right place and at the right time. There were going to be hotels in the area and there were large-scale buildings already. They felt the building addressed the concept of breaking it up so that the massing was not overpowering. They were outside of the National Landmark Historic District and in the heart of the tourism district. They would restore the lane that was part of the Oglethorpe plan, although they were outside of the area that Oglethorpe originally planned. They had sacrificed a lot of floor area for pedestrians to have an enhanced pedestrian experience along the street. The height was relatively in scale with the surrounding buildings, and they had a deeply articulated massing. He said they had done all of these things against all odds, and came up at the end with a piece of architecture. It was not easy to meet all of the rules and standards and still come up with something to look at. Whether the Board liked it the way it was or not, he did not think they would mistake it for something that happened by chance.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that the Bay Street elevation showed that there were five entrances instead of four.

**Mr. Shay** stated there were six multiple entrances.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that under the main entrance the full color picture in the back under the Sheraton sign, that a door was not shown. She said she agreed with Staff that they would need a significant door. She asked if they had not designed it yet.

**Mr. Shay** stated they had not yet and that it could end up being a round door with a couple of flanking doors.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if it would come back with details.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes.

**Mr. Hutchinson** stated that he wanted to take the opportunity to commend Mr. Shay for the work that was done from an architectural point-of-view. He said he was not a preservationist but an architect, and wished that all of his students in the fourth year studio were present to hear and see the project. He appreciated the fact that the developer had given up as much as he had in order to break up the building into sections. He thought it was a glass pyramid that fell from heaven and stuck in the ground. He said that putting architecture and historic preservation together that he termed it conservation, and it was a task that they had done a wonderful job on.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that as he looked at the building he saw the DeSoto Hilton.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it was because they deliberately chose the curbed element. They felt it was an appropriate way to turn a corner that was one of the most heavily traffic corners in Savannah.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the paired windows in the central element would come back to the Board.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the ordinance allowed it.

**Mr. Gay** asked if the Board was doing Height and Mass.

**Ms. Ramsay** said they were but it was interpreted and Staff had mentioned it.

**Mr. Shay** stated that paired or group windows were permitted provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than five to three. He said if what they were talking about was moving them so they looked more distinct that it was fine, but he did not want them to think that they had not thought them through carefully in breaking it down.

**Mr. Law** asked if they had decided what they were going to do with the penthouse.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they had not because it was an architectural element at this point.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation Executive Director)** stated that he wanted to commend Staff for a thorough and excellent report. He said he counted seven violations of the design standards that were cited in the report. It was a major landmark building that was much larger than the buildings that were already controversial, that the Savannah



community was in an uproar about, and that it would be completely transforming if not ruining the entryway to the historic city. A one-story height variance was requested. Since the revisions of 2003 there had been only one occasion where the Board had said that five stories might be too much on a five-story zone at this site. The building was turned down, it came back to the Board, the Board was told they had no authority but to approve it, and that was only one case. There had been seven variances granted by this Board and the Board of Appeals for buildings that were taller than the height ordinance. Downtown residents, the preservation people, and people who care about the city and long-term viability were concerned and upset. They wondered what had happened to the predictability. He said there was no predictability because there were seven revisions and he implored the Board not to grant another height variance. Especially now with the litigation and the discernment that was taking place about how tall buildings should be in the city. A very important site demanded a great building. The proposal lacked detail and he asked what assurances they had that the huge bands of plainness...it was what was overwhelming their intricately staid district in blandness, which was corporate architecture. It bore no relationship to Savannah, to the building tradition, or to Bay Street. The pictures the petitioner provided showed historic buildings where the older, larger buildings had fine-grained details like cornices and balconies with craftsmanship in them. He asked the Board to continue the petition and asked the petitioner to restudy it. Tweaking a few details would not get the job done because it was a major building that needed to be restudied and redesigned by looking at the city, and not by taking a look at three or four other buildings that had been built.

**Mr. Bill Steube (Downtown Neighborhood Association)** stated that they were opposed to large, over-scaled buildings such as this, and there was no justification given other than greed regarding the seventh floor addition. He said that he strongly recommended that it not be approved. The building should step down to the three-story structures on the height map to the west of the proposed project and not exceed the height variance by another story.

**Mr. Joe Saseen** stated that he wanted to thank everyone for the hard work done for the community but that he had a problem with Old Savannah. He said that he was in preservation before most of these people were born, that he was a pragmatist, and was sick and tired of the same old things. He said that people wanted the building to step down and the windows changed, but when you do that, you end up with a box again. He has found that people were afraid of any new design at all and they say that it was not Savannah. When he hears it he wonders what was Savannah and asked if it was 1850, 1950, or 2007. This was the third time that they had been before the Board, asked when did they draw the line, and said that he was surprised at Staff and did not understand what they meant by three separate buildings. He pointed out that he saw four separate buildings. He said the architect had done a superb job by not designing the same old building, that people in this town were in an uproar about boxes being built, and that was what was happening today. He disagreed with Staff regarding changing the windows and said if they make them vertical instead of horizontal they would run into each other and lose their individuality. There was a combination of old and new buildings and you could not expect the architects to come before the Board and put up boxes. He said there were many windows on Bay Street with little indentation and if someone wanted to use Savannah Grey brick than it would be approved. There needed to be some new life in the community and he did not want the 15- to 20-story buildings. The City Alderman could have but did not have to adopt the five-or six-story statute and say build what you want with your money. He said there had to be some different designs in the buildings and they could not use the same block buildings because people would complain. The proposed building was the opposite of what people were complaining about. It was interesting, eye appealing, not boring, and was not the same old design. He implored the Board to think about the design and realize that it would be a credit to Savannah. They cannot keep going back to the 1850's and tell the architects this was not Savannah, and that they cannot get off by saying it. He asked the Board to let their art come through, said that architecture was the first art but they were stymied, and that they could

not do certain things but could not get through the Board. It was a new Board and it should be looked at as a compromise with a little bit of this and that. The architect took the time to give them the old and the new and that was what Savannah was about today. As long as the architect could give some of the old with the new, they have done a favor because it was not the same.

**Ms. Ida George** stated that the building had been improved by coming before the Board over and over again.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that people talk about history and who has been here, that his family went from slavery to freedom, and that progress could not be stopped. He said that approximately seven million plus tourists come through Savannah each year and that was why they were building so many hotels. Nothing lasted forever and nothing remained the same.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he did not think Mr. McDonald intended for his remark about corporate architecture to be taken wrong. He said he did not want anyone to think that it was anything like any prototype design that was done before because it was an unique building that had become better by going through the process. It was not a cookie cutter design that came from somewhere and just had windows tweaked or skin added to it. There were other hotels that were like that and this was not one of them because it was a real piece of architecture.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board had been presented with an extremely detailed petition and thought the Board was aware that the request from Staff was for a continuance. He said the Board could not vote to continue it unless the petitioner asked the Board to continue it. He asked Mr. Shay if he wanted the petition continued or voted on.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they did not want a continuance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board could approve or deny the petition, or approve the petition with amendments. He said if the vote was to approve or approve with amendments, that there were two issues with questions asked by the Board, that they would ask for further clarification, or it could go back to Staff.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that although they had made significant improvement and she appreciated all of the work that Mr. Shay had done especially in terms of the cylinder that was something she was concerned about, she echoed Mr. McDonald's concern about the height. She said the Board needed to be concerned about the height and the motion that was discussed did not enter into the height. If the Board approved it, they were also approving the height.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it was a good point that in making a motion the Board had to word the motion to make a specific Finding-of-Fact to allow the additional story, and he asked that it be put into the motion to make sure that it was a proper motion.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that he was fully aware of that fact.

**Dr. Watkins** stated that it was brought up before about looking at the additional story in terms of compatibility and that some issues were discussed in terms of preserving and how it fit into the overall context of the area. He said they kept ignoring how it added or took away from the value of the district because of the additional height. At some point it would be nice to listen to a discussion or receive information, or have someone present something that actually put forth a justification for going past the height map as if it did not exist.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she was echoed Dr. Watkins in that she was concerned about it continuing to be ignored by saying that they could get another story and there was no justification except that economics justified adding another floor.

**Mr. Law** stated that it came up last month about the height and that if the Board passed it that it would come back to haunt them when someone came again, and it would be a continuous thing.

**Dr. Watkins** stated that there needed to be some form of consistency versus any arbitrary submission in terms of did it arbitrarily pass one or two above or one or two below. He said that the project had evolved nicely, but as a Board member, it would be nice at some point that Board decisions about the height map go beyond being arbitrary and capricious. They actually should get to a specific formula, viewpoint, or rationale for going beyond the height map.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the motion was for approval and for recommending that the one-story height variance was compatible. He asked those in favor to indicate the motion by a show of hands.

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with a Finding-of-Fact that the additional story was visually compatible, and with the condition that the windows and door go back to Staff for final approval. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. Dr. Elmore, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Law were in favor of the motion. Mr. Gay, Dr. Watkins, Mr. Steffen, Ms. Ramsay, and Ms. Seiler were in opposition. The motion failed 5 to 4.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to seek a continuance before the Board took a vote for denial.

**Mr. Shay** stated that economics was never presented as a justification for the height variance. He said he went through a series of reasons why they were giving up a significant amount of floor area and floor area ratio. They had been through sessions with SDRA and they had come up with their idea of what the guidelines were for granting things that had to do with pedestrian activated retail on the ground floor. The standards did exist and may not have been codified. It was not as if the only reason they stood before the Board was that they wanted the seventh floor for economics.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he did not hear Mr. Shay say that. He said the Board had a tie vote and he broke the tie. Not because he was convicted on either side of the scope but because he felt they were close and one more continuance would get them there. He wanted to give Mr. Shay an option of asking for a continuance before there was a denial.

**Mr. Shay** stated no, thank you.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the petition as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion. Mr. Gay, Dr. Watkins, Ms. Seiler, Ms. Ramsay, and were in favor of the denial. Mr. Johnson, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Law, and Dr. Elmore were opposed. The motion failed.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Shay if he would consider asking the Board for a continuance at this point. He said he did not want the project to be denied because they would have to start over.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he received almost no guidance and it was difficult for him to walk out and tell his client that they would come back in another month. He said they would look at nobler materials on the outside of the building and if the Board wanted the little windows that were grouped in fours to be grouped in pairs of twos, they would exceed to that. It was the only guidance they have gotten from this.

**Mr. Gay** stated that they had received guidance that the Board did not like the seventh floor.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he received a four/four vote on that.

**Mr. Gay** stated that it was obviously a problem.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she would amend that as her guidance too.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it did not have to be at the level of guidance because the motion was that it would not be historically compatible. He said he was just sharing his reason for breaking the tie because they had two tie votes. If he did not vote at all they would have two tie votes and nothing would happen.

**Mr. Shay** asked if he could be granted a couple of minutes to discuss it with his client.

**Mr. Steffen** answered yes.

**(Five-Minute Break)**

**Mr. Steffen** stated that before Mr. Shay spoke that he asked for guidance and the Chairman was reluctant to give it because he was supposed to offer his opinions when the issue was very close or when it was one that was urgent. After speaking with fellow Board members, one of the concerns was the total use of the seventh story. He thought that with more work with Staff that if portions of the project could be stepped down he did not think there would be as much objection to the corner element as there once was and that many of the Board members liked it now. As he said previously, he thought they were very close and he would give an opportunity for a continuance.

**Mr. Shay** stated that after discussing it with his client they would like to eliminate the seventh floor except for the round architectural element at the corner of Bay Street and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard. He said it would eliminate 90 percent of the seventh floor, and subject to the conditions of the amendment, they would like to ask for approval of Height and Mass and a Finding-of-Fact for the little tower on the corner.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he would ask Dr. Elmore to remake the motion with the change that Mr. Shay offered, asked if there was any discussion about the change, and if everyone understood. He stated that the seventh floor was being eliminated with the exception of the tower element.

**Ms. Seiler** asked what Staff's feeling was.

**Ms. Ward** stated that concerning the height it would be appropriate because Staff had said that some height might be appropriate in some areas. She said she still had concerns with the solid-to-void rhythm on the façade.

**Ms. Seiler** asked what they would do with the observation area that was going to be on the seventh floor.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they would like to explore ways to access it though the penthouse so they could have some area of a roof garden. He said the element would be tall enough and they heard no objection to the roof garden.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the roof garden was going to be on the seventh floor.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the roof garden would be above the sixth floor and that it was not floating.

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with a Finding-of-Fact that the seventh floor tower was visually appropriate, with the condition that the windows and door go back to Staff for final approval. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Greenline Architecture  
Keith Howington  
H-07-3839-2  
PIN No. 2-0016-33-001  
201 Papy Street  
New Construction, Part II Design Details for a  
Hotel**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Part II Design Detail approval for the Embassy Suites Hotel at 201 Papy Street.

**FINDINGS:**

Since the Part I Height and Mass approval the following modifications have been made to the structure:

1. The West parapet along Oglethorpe Avenue was raised at the corner to provide height variation and area for signage.
2. The stair corridor along Oglethorpe Avenue has been relocated to the far west bay, eliminating the need to have exit stairs outside of the building.
3. The stair on the courtyard side of the Turner Street elevation was relocated to the west elevation thus changing the rhythm of the bays at ground level from 4 to 5 on this elevation as you turn from Turner Street into the courtyard. Where the stair had previously been there is now an indent, however this is not visible from a public right-of-way.
4. The balconies along Turner Street have been removed and the base material changed from brick to Arriscraft to provide a continuous base.
5. The stucco infill around the ground floor windows on the courtyard drop-off entry elevation has been changed to brick.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p><b>Windows and Doors:</b> Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.</p>	<p>Peerless or capitol aluminum window system; panning brick mould detail; frames to be “Mills House Green”. On the Oglethorpe Avenue and Papy Street corner of the building, one window on each façade over the entry to the corner business will have a decorative precast stone surround and precast stone veneer.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Roof Shape:</b> 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 a half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two-inch overhang.</p>	<p>A parapet roof is proposed with a coping with a minimum two-inch overhang and a greater than six inch stringcourse that extends greater than four inches from the face of the building.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:</b> Residential balconies shall not extend more than three feet in depth from the face of a building, and shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.</p>	<p>Decorative metal balconies are proposed on the Oglethorpe Avenue elevation, extending three feet and supported by decorative metal brackets.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
<p><b>Fences:</b> Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; provided; however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure. Masonry copings shall be used with iron fencing.</p>	<p>A 12-foot-high solid brick wall is proposed for the Thunderbird side of the pool deck. A brick and metal fence is proposed for the remaining sides of the pool deck.</p>	<p>These standards are met.</p>
<p><b>Materials, colors and textures:</b> The relationship of materials, colors, and texture of the façade of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are visually related.</p>	<p>Brick: Old Carolina Brick Company Chatham Gray (current Savannah Gray equivalent) Mortar: Lafarge Ivory Buff Cast Stone Arriscraft Renaissance Tan smooth Standing seam metal roof with less than one inch seams, Valspar Coating: “Fluropon</p>	<p>The materials are compatible with contributing buildings and paving in the area, however, it is not clear where the bluestone paving is to be used.</p>

	Charcoal” Paving: Entry drive: Herringbone pattern brick pavers, brick to match architecture; sidewalk: Basketweave brick pavers; Pool deck: Travertine; Papy Street drop off Cobble pave or street print; Motor Court: Cobble pave.	
<b>Textures:</b>	Smooth Arriscraft; Stucco: No. 402 PAR “Perfect”	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Keith Howington** (Greenline Architecture) stated that the blue stone was more of a slate that was seen around Savannah, and that the owner wanted to place it in the front on Papy Street but not in the street itself, with variation in the brick and stone and around the pool deck. He said it had to go through street traffic approval as well.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that on Sheet A3.1 on the elevation that in one area they point to the same spandrel under the windows and say that it was Arriscraft, and then point to the same area and it was metal panels or glass. He asked if the windows were going to be full glass or a solid spandrel and asked how they would get Arriscraft in between two metal frames.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the Arriscraft arrow should have been extended to the pilaster next to the glass.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the spandrel under the glass could be either a metal panel, glass, or what.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the reason he added it was that they had not fully developed the construction drawings and would have spandrel glass or a metal panel there. On the construction drawings, it would be glass.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if there would not be a metal panel or Arriscraft.

**Mr. Howington** answered no.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the little decoration on the corner window looked silly. She said it was fake stone that was supported by nothing.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the idea was to take the stone that corbelled up to give a more pronounced entry similar to the picture that Staff had shown. He said an impression of what it might look like was in the rendering.

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

**RE: Continued Petition of Dawson + Wissmach  
Architects  
Neil Dawson  
H-07-3861-2  
PIN No. 2-0005-06-009  
10 East Broad Street  
Color Change/Roof Repair/Stucco Repair/  
Windows & Doors/Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Neil Dawson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting alterations to the Three Gables Building and Bishops Court building within the Trustees Gardens development as follows:

**Three Gables Building**

1. Replace non-historic metal porch on south and west elevations with new wood two-story covered porch with 14-inch wood box columns with PVC louvers between columns. The second floor has a horizontal wood slat railing.
2. On north elevation, add new porch to match porch on south and west elevations.
3. Install standing seam Galvalume metal roof, color “pre-weathered Graphic Gray”.
4. Open historic window/door openings on north and west elevations and install wood true divided light windows including removal of non-historic windows, and replacement with wood true divided light windows. Windows to be by Weathershield, Marvin or Andersen. Install mahogany wood stile and rail doors with true divided lights.
5. In the large openings on the north elevation install clear anodized aluminum storefront.
6. Repair and repoint masonry to match existing as necessary.
7. All colors to be provided to Staff.

**Bishop’s Court Building**

1. Recover roof with standing seam Galvalume metal roof, color “pre-weathered Graphic Gray”.
2. Re-open historic windows and doors on north elevation. Fill openings with clear anodized aluminum storefront windows.
3. Create new openings on east elevation and infill with clear anodized aluminum storefront windows.



4. Infill all non-historic openings to match existing wall finish on west and south elevation.
5. Add steel canopies at all entries.
6. Stucco all exterior wall surfaces with true Portland cement stucco.
7. All colors to be provided to Staff.

**FINDINGS:**

1. Railing and column detail provided.
2. PVC louver is for shading.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval as submitted.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that her packet did not contain a south elevation but two east elevations.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that she had an east, west, north, and south.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the east and the south were the same.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that on item number one on the Three Gables building that they were adding a new wood, two-story, covered porch; item number two they were adding a new porch; item number four they were making new window openings on the north and west elevations; and on item number five they were installing clear anodized aluminum storefront. He said that on the Bishop Court building that item number two was for filling the openings with clear anodized aluminum store windows; item number four was for infilling non-historic openings to match the existing; item number five was to add steel canopies at all entrances; and item number six was covering all brick with stucco. He said in all fairness to the Board that they needed new drawings before they could vote yea or nay on it. They could not have it on paper and not have drawings to see what the building would look like, and that the Board needed a full submittal of the changes to see what it was.

**Mr. Gay** stated that it showed the new porches.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the Board had existing conditions and proposed conditions.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that they still saw brick where there would be stucco on item number six. He said there was not enough information with all of the changes.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that it was in the packet and the architect could make it clear.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Josh Ward (Dawson + Wissmach Architects)** apologized for not including the south elevation and showed a rendering for what the elevation would look like. He said the drawings pointed out all of the areas that were being stuccoed, as well as the brick areas. Three buildings had been combined together at one time. Bishop's Court would be restuccoed and the Three Gables with the painted brick would remain as brick. He said that it was called out in the elevations that had been provided.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she was troubled by the destruction of some of the historic fabric. She said that on the Bishop Court building that it appeared they were taking out all of the windows and doors in different locations. She asked if the building was non-historic because they felt comfortable doing that.

**Mr. Ward** stated that the buildings were used primarily as industrial and that historic openings had been filled in, new ones added over time, and that they were keeping some of the original openings. He said they were cleaning up the north façade and were trying to keep the same rhythm with the three-bay openings, but there would be some adjustment to the openings. Over time the building had been filled in and taken apart and they did not feel there was any original or historic opening.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the same was true for the Three Gables building on the north elevation where they changed four openings that were completely reconfigured.

**Mr. Ward** stated that they took liberty with it because it was one of the additions that came later that grouped all of the buildings together, and they felt they could clean it up a bit to make it more readable as an entryway.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that they were going to stucco all exterior walls surfaces of the Bishop Court building with true Portland cement and asked if the building was all brick.

**Mr. Ward** answered yes and said there was stucco on the exterior.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked where they could see how long the two canopies over the windows extended from the building.

**Mr. Ward** stated that they had already been approve previously by the Board.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion. Mr. Gay, Mr. Johnson, Dr. Watkins, Ms. Seiler, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Law, and Dr. Elmore were in favor of the motion. Mr. Meyerhoff and Ms. Ramsay were opposed. The motion passed 7 to 2.

**RE: Petition of Paul Ard James  
H-07-3912(S)-2  
PIN No. 2-0032-41-016  
448 Tattnall Street  
Stucco**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval of shutters and color. Denial of stucco removal.

Present for the petition was Mr. Paul Ard James.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting to remove the stucco from this unit and recoat in Acrocrete to be scored as existing color “Locust Tan”; also, to install Atlantic shutters Manchester style (Louvered) painted Charleston Green. Paint trim Pittsburgh “Wheat Sheaf”.

**FINDINGS:**

Staff is referring the petition to the full Board for a discussion about the removal of the existing stucco and replacement with a synthetic stucco coating. Staff is not familiar with the product Acrocrete. It appears that the existing stucco has been painted and the paint is failing. Preservation best practice would suggest that the paint should be removed by the least invasive method, and the existing stucco patched and covered with a true stucco skim coat. If the existing stucco cannot be saved, we would need to see an actual sample of the material and color, and have an explanation of how the coating would be applied and what the impact would be on any façade details such as lintels, sills, and the door hood. Explain the breathability of the Acrocrete.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of color change and shutters. Discuss stucco and view sample.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if Staff knew why the petitioner wanted to use this particular replacement.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the contractor said he had used it in other places.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if it was in the Historic District.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that he said he had but she could not recall ever seeing it.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Staff had any objection to the shutters and the color changes.

**Ms. Reiter** answered no.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Paul Ard James (Owner)** stated that the contractor was out-of-town and that he would answer the questions the best he could. He said he approached the contractor about the situation with his house about the paint cracking and the failing stucco and asked for a permanent solution to keep from repainting the house. The contractor suggested this process. He was unfamiliar with Acrocrete, did not know why the contractor chose it, and that the contractor said he had used it with success before and trusted the contractor’s word.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that if the contractor was out of-town that there would not be any work done. He suggested that Mr. James allow the Board to approve the shutters and the color on the shutters, continue the stucco issue, and have the contractor speak with Staff for an appropriate solution when he returned.

**HDRB ACTION:** **Mr. Gay** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition for the shutters and the color. **Ms. Seiler** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Catherine Colasanto  
H-07-3917-2  
PIN No. 2-0004-42-010  
419 East Congress Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Ms. Catherine Colasanto.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for a second story addition to the rear of the building at 419 East Congress Street.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic residence at 419 East Congress Street was constructed in 1839 and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. A one- and two-story rear addition was constructed in the 1970s. The proposal is to construct a 14' by 11'-4" room over the existing one-story addition. Due to the close proximity of the adjacent buildings, the addition will not be visible from Congress Street, but will be visible from the lane. The property is subdivided with no lane access; the HRB has approved Part I Height and Mass for a different development at the lane, which would render the addition not visible.

The proposed addition meets all of the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) Design Standards for additions and windows. The proposed addition features a low shed or flat roof subordinate to the main house that features a gable. It will be clad in wood siding with an 8-inch exposure. Eight-light (double-pane glass) with ¾-inch muntins and spacer bar, paired casement windows with wood frames to match existing are proposed. The colors are to match the existing paint color with Benjamin Moore Natural Cream (OC-14) for the siding and BC Simply White (OC-117) for the trim and sashes.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval as submitted.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that the Board had approved another development for the area. She asked if some of it was residential development and if some of the residences would open on the lane.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes and said that they were lane dwellings with the front door opening onto the lane.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she wanted to make sure it would mesh because she was concerned how it would look.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she did not think it would be seen because it would be built directly behind there.

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

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
Jim Morehouse  
H-07-3906(S)-2  
7 West York Street  
Color Change for Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
2. Petition of William Armstrong  
H-07-3907(S)-2  
145 Habersham Street  
Sign  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
3. Petition of Small Business Assistance Corp.  
Tony O'Reilly  
H-07-3907(S)-2  
111 East Liberty Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
4. Petition of Ross Harding  
H-07-3908(S)-2  
209 West Gordon Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
5. Petition of AAA Sign Company, Inc.  
Bobbie Stephens  
H-07-3909(S)-2  
15 Bull Street  
Sign  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
6. Petition of Urban Communities, LLC  
Dwayne Stephens  
H-07-3910(S)-2  
520 – 530 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Color Change/Roof/Awning/Stucco/Windows & Doors  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
7. Petition of Inglesby, Falligant, Horne, Courington & Chisholm, P.C.  
Dorothy Courington  
H-07-3911(S)-2  
17 West McDonough Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

8. Petition of Paul Ard James  
H-07-3912(S)-2  
448 Tattnall Street  
Color Change/Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
9. Petition of A. Christine Wiggins  
H-07-3915(S)-2  
534 East Gordon Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**RE: MINUTES**

Approval of Minutes – October 10, 2007

**HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Minutes as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

**RE: Petition of Dawson Wissmach Architects  
H-05-3494-2  
News Place Amendment to Condominium  
Building**

**Ms. Reiter** stated that it was new construction on Bay Street that was part of the News Press project. She said the flanking masses facing Bay Street were originally approved with a five-foot setback from the façade on the sixth floor, which was on the each side of the building. She said that during construction, the concrete subcontractor proceeded with pouring the structure and slab flush with the façade and there was no recess. It negated the opportunity to create a setback and the architect was proposing a field solution. Because the concrete was post-tintured concrete, there was no way to modify the structure to the approved configuration. However, it could be setback two feet.

**Mr. Neil Dawson** showed a photograph of how it was modified in the field and said they were able to recess the bulk of it back approximately two feet, but had to hold the sill and parapet out in order to pour the concrete.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the parapet on the left side would be extended to the end of the building.

**Mr. Dawson** said no, that it would stop there. He said on the original submittal they had the parapet step to create interest on the façade and stepped it back at the same time. He showed the approved submittal with flanking elements set back approximately eight inches, and the sixth floor setback again to create a little more depth and perception.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the parapet would have a capsule as shown and then return.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that it would return and that it was one of the other issues they were taking about.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the approve the amendment submitted by Staff. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

**Dr. Elmore** stated that he wanted to decline from being on the Nominating Committee.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Dr. Watkins, Ms. Ramsay, and Mr. Hutchinson if they would be on the Nominating Committee. They all stated that they would be willing to serve on the Nomination Committee. He said they needed to have a recommendation by the next meeting and said that the office of Chairman and Vice-Chairman had to be filled. He would not be able to serve as Chairman because he served two terms. They could also fill in the office of Parliamentarian if they wished and said they did not have that office for the last two years because they only one attorney on the Board. They would have to have new officers in January.

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

**RE: UPDATE ON HISTORIC DISTRICT TEXT AMENDMENT**

**Ms. Ward** stated that at the MPC meeting the matter was referred to City Council to reinstate the ordinance.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the (inaudible).

**Mr. Thomson** stated that the discussion was if it was an incorrect procedure for the one sentence, it was incorrect for all of the proposal in front of them. He said the judge took the perspective that all the rest of the language had been before the MPC and was properly on file at the clerk's office. There was a disagreement about what it was that remained in the ordinance at this point. The MPC forwarded it to City Council with a recommendation in favor of restoring what was there before, and both bodies heard a lot of people speak on it and they decided to continue it with directions to the Mayor to convene the parties involved to see if there was acceptable wording.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that in the pre-meeting they wanted to have the meeting before the end of the year. She said there was one letter challenging an approval that was made on the hotel on Oglethorpe Avenue and it was sent to the City Attorney.

**Mr. Thomson** stated they were waiting for the City Attorney's advice on how to respond. He said that the City and the property owner had appealed and he assumed they had appealed the entire decision but he had not seen the appeal documents yet. They received an application for a text amendment suggesting different wording from the Beehive Foundation and it would be put on the November 20 agenda for consideration, and Staff was preparing a report. They would probably recommend a continuance because they want to defer to the Mayor's effort to bring people together to talk about it.

**Ms. Reiter** stated they were going to propose a process that City Council could use to reconvene the revisions committee to hear all of the suggestions. She said they were working on a map that would show all of the soft sites within the Historic District and the heights of contributing buildings surrounding them to have something to work from with the wording. There were three on the floor now.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if there was an effort made by MPC or the Board that compatibility was part of Height and Mass. He said with compatibility being subjective how could they legalize the wording to a point that they still had the option.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that was the task and the City Manager said to come up with relational rules. She said they were working on it.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that compatibility was a guideline and the height limitation was an ordinance.

**Ms. Reiter** stated they went back to Chadbourne and it had a lot to say about it in the original document, all of it was being compiled, it would be given to the committee that was reconstituted, and they would work from that.

**Mr. Steffen** stated despite Mr. Blackburn's potential belief that the judge threw out the whole ordinance they had to continue and proceed as if he did not. He said if they believe he threw out the whole ordinance on height than the whole discussion on Mr. Shay's project would be moot.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the height map was the same on his.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he did not know what they changed on the ordinance because there were other things in there.

**Ms. Ward** stated that it was about the height.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that he suggested that Staff should go as if the ordinance was still in place, and if someone wanted to challenge the decision...

**Mr. Steffen** stated that there were methods to do that.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that the meeting on November 20 would start at 11:00 a.m. to avoid conflicting with the City Council meeting.

**RE: INFORMATION ITEMS**

**RE: ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

**BR/jnp**