

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

September 12, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

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

HDRB Members Not Present:

Gene Hutchinson

SDRA Staff Present:

Lise Sundrla

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-07-3784-2  
PIN No. 2-0016-04-003  
501 West Bay Street  
New Construction Part I Height and Mass –  
Hotel/Condominium

- RE: Continued Petition of Nancy & Erik Duncan  
H-07-3831-2  
PIN No. 2-0032-48-014  
440 Habersham  
Alteration to the Front Porch and a Balcony  
Addition
  
- 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
  
- RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture  
Keith Howington  
H-07-3842-2  
PIN No. 2-0016-36-010  
148 Montgomery Street  
New Construction of a Five-Story Hotel, Part I
  
- RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects  
Patrick Shay  
H-07-3862-2  
PIN No. 2-0016-03-008  
23 Montgomery Street  
Demolition/New Construction

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Continued Agenda items as submitted. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. The motion passed 7 to 1. Mr. Meyerhoff abstained on H-07-3784-2 and H-07-3862-2.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

- RE: Petition of Robin Restoration  
Brian J. Robin  
H-07-3885-2  
PIN No. 2-0016-24-004  
313 – 315 East Broughton Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

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

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Petition of Bates Lovett for  
Nina Cooper et al  
H-07-3882-2  
PIN No. 2-0031-24-006  
342 Purse Street  
536 West Jones Street  
Demolition

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Bates Lovett.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish 342 Purse Street and 536 West Jones Street, two structures listed on the Historic Buildings Map within the National Historic Landmark District.

**FINDINGS:**

536 West Jones Street is a one-story gable roofed cottage built between ca. 1888 and 1898. Although the window openings to the west of the entry have been altered, and all of the original windows have been replaced by awning type windows, and the stoop has been replaced, it was placed on the contributing buildings list based on its age and that it is one of the few surviving structures from the Frogtown neighborhood.

342 Purse Street is a two-story gable roofed three-bay-wide house. Although its siding has been covered with artificial siding and original windows have been replaced, it was placed on the contributing buildings list for the same reasons as 536 West Jones Street. Both these nominations were based on exterior examination.

On June 19, Staff obtained permission from the owners to go into both structures. There is no evidence of any original contributing interior features including walls, fireplaces, plaster, etc. Both structures have been completely remodeled at some point in time.

A study was done of the soils beneath the buildings and toxic substances were reportedly found on the sites. (See attached reports.)

The purchaser did meet with the Coastal Heritage Society to offer to give them the houses if they could be moved to lots owned by the Society to form a workers village. However, only one structure could be accommodated and an agreement could not be reached.

A second inquiry came to Staff about possibly moving the buildings to another nearby lot. He was directed to the applicant. No further word has been received as of the time of this Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish the structures based on the cost to remediate the toxic substances in the soil, the loss of historic fabric, the failure of attempts to give the houses away to be moved to nearby lots, and on hardship for the owners who have to move and are counting on the sale of these structures in order to purchase new homes.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

It is regretful to lose these houses even though they have been altered, however, if no alternative such as storing or rehabbing the structures on a nearby lot can be achieved. Staff recommends approval to demolish based on economic hardship, and with the condition that the local vernacular architecture society be given the opportunity to record the buildings by measured drawings and photos.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Executive Director of Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that he was pleading for time for the two houses that were the last three buildings in Frogtown, a neighborhood that provided worker housing for the Central Georgia Railroad complex. He said they understood the problems and that negotiations were still pending to save the buildings, and that there was very little public notice about the plight. If the Board approved the demolition, the pending negotiations to move the buildings would be thwarted and they would lose both structures. In addition, other parties who could possibly move the houses would not receive notice that the houses would be demolished. He said there was no economic hardship, that the standards were outlined, and the potential profit by a property owner was not a hardship. A hardship was defined as a building that could not be saved if the cost of saving the building places a hardship on the property owner, and not whether the property owner could lose profit from the sale of the building. He asked the Board to delay it 30 days to give HSF and the preservation community time to save the buildings.

**Mr. Steffen** asked about the pending negotiations and to give a background about what was involved.

**Mr. McDonald** stated he was not party to the negotiations and he understood that the negotiations were to move one of the buildings to property that was nearby, there was some land swap, and it took time. He said if it was approved today, the petitioner would have a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the buildings, and there would not be an incentive to continue the negotiations.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there were toxic remediation's if the structures were moved.

**Mr. McDonald** stated that if the structures were moved, the soil contamination was still a problem. He said he did not know if the toxicity was in the soil underneath or just around the perimeter of the buildings. If it were only around the perimeter, the buildings would not need to be moved. The buildings were built approximately at the same time as the roundhouse, and the soil could be cleaned up without moving the buildings. It would have to be cleaned up whether the buildings were or were not moved.

**Mr. Scott Smith (Executive Director of the Coastal Heritage Society)** stated that they had not voted on the issue of demolition, but voted to see if there could be an agent to save the buildings. He said a committee was appointed to work with Staff and they were willing to make some property available. Thousands of dollars would be needed to bring them up to code. The society was willing to do this, but needed other things done to the side of the seller or purchaser that would change the financial picture. The society would like to see the buildings preserved, was willing to play any role, but they did not have the resources to go any further.

**Mr. Ramsey Khalidi** stated that members of the public were concerned that safeguarding the structures were a risk. He said he hoped that the ordinance was clear in stating that if a developer bought property with historic structures that it would not be incumbent on the seller, but on the buyer who wanted to take the property to the next level. They were concerned that

the vernacular architecture in Frogtown was going fast, the property values were increasing by the square foot, the houses were important structures, and there were other reasons too numerous to mention. He met with individuals willing to save one structure, said the community was known for their preservation efforts, and to consider demolishing the buildings because they lack detail...the bones and flooring were there. They could be affordable housing if the City would find lots to move them to, they had intrinsic value, and should not be dismantled.

**Mr. Steffen** asked that the public keep the discussion to the issues at hand.

**Mr. Khalidi** stated that he had moved major structures within the city and was aware of the economics, but it was getting more difficult because land and moving was much more expensive. He said the Board could stop and make it incumbent on the purchaser to give a budget of saving and moving the houses, work with the developer, mandate demolition be denied, and let the agencies come together with a plan to help find lots while keeping the buildings close to the roundhouse complex; or move them into an affordable housing situation.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Seiler** stated she was familiar with the houses, and said that the Cooper family had raised generations in both of the houses, and the families were outstanding community citizens. She said she had to take difference with Mr. McDonald regarding the economic hardship because the family was trying to move and it would be an economic hardship to delay what needed to be done. The houses had been greatly altered, have been sitting there a long time, and no one had stepped up and offered to move them before. She was concerned with holding the family up or jeopardizing what the Coopers' needed to do for the good of the entire family. Staff recommended that the Board move ahead by providing an opportunity of the buildings to be recorded with drawings, photographs, etc. to preserve (a record) of them.

**Mr. Lovett** stated that the Cooper families were wanting out of the properties because of the hazardous chemicals found on the site such as lead and barium. He said the purchase of the future home was contingent on the sale of the present house in order to afford the new house. The Cooper's cannot afford to remediate the property, it was an economic hardship, and it was not about the profit the family was making but that the family needed to get out of the property now because of the chemicals. It could go on the hazardous waste site of Georgia and the family would be forced to move from the property without a means of going elsewhere. He said they have tried to work with others to take the houses and it did not work out. They would be happy to have the properties moved to different locations, but did not know what was under the houses and if there would be remediation under the house. They had attempted to accomplish what everyone was asking to be done, but they could not get it done.

**Mr. Steffen** asked about the nature of the remediation as being a part of the structure or the soil, and if moving the house would stir it up.

**Mr. Lovett** stated they knew that it was around the house but they had not gone under the house. He did not know if the chemicals were under the house.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there were plans to demolish the structure immediately.

**Mr. Lovett** answered no, and said they would consent to a timeframe if the Board desired.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if they would be satisfied if the Board issued a decision to allow the demolition, but stay the actual demolition for 30 days.

**Mr. Lovett** stated he would ask that the Board not delay it, but if it would make everyone happy.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if Mr. Lovett was familiar with any of the ongoing negotiations.

**Mr. Lovett** stated that he was not. He said he knew about the first negotiations with Coastal Heritage Society but did not know about the second negotiations.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that someone was raising their hand and asked if Mr. Lovett minded them coming back up.

**Mr. Lovett** said that it was okay.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that normally the petitioner had the last chance to address everyone after public comment, and said that in the future when he asked for public comment that is when the public should respond. He said he would allow the individual to come forward since Mr. Lovett did not mind.

**Ms. Ardis Wood** stated that there was a house on Lincoln Street to be demolished that was not demolished and not fixed up. She said at the last moment it was given a chance and looked wonderful today. It bothered her that HSF was not cognizant of this situation and said there should have been an earlier effort to partner with those concerned and who were able to save buildings. We all want to be concerned about people in Savannah, but under the law and concern for the general welfare, it cannot be used as a guiding principal. There were ways to work with people and not hurt them and let them do what they want.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that applicants were required to post signs on the properties more than a week ahead of time, and that was done. It was the public notice and was incumbent on Historic Savannah and neighbors to be aware of this. The Board sends out the packets four to six days before the hearings.

**Mr. McDonald** stated they pick up their packets on Friday afternoon and do not get any special privileges.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he did not mean from a special access standpoint, but that was when the information was available to everyone. He wanted to make sure that everyone knew that the Board and Staff did not have any interest in keeping any information from anyone. The Board receives the packets on the same day. The postings do not provide all of the information about the projects, but it does let you know there was a project-taking place and it was true for every project the Board dealt with.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated there was the unique situation of the August meeting being held late in the month rather than on the second Wednesday, and there was a short period from the last meeting to the deadline.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it used to be the policy of the Board to approve or deny the project, and the Board now had the ability to continue it on their own motion, which was a power they allowed themselves for situations like this.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that demolition was a unique creature, that the City Council reserved the right to review any demolition request, and whatever was done today could be appealed to the City Council of Savannah. He said there were four possible motions of either approving the demolition, denying the demolition, continue the matter to the next meeting, or approve the demolition and stay the demolition for 30 days.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition for 30 days with the condition that the parties work toward a solution. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. Ms. Seiler and Mr. Judson were opposed. The motion passed 6 to 2.

**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**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**

Present or the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of Part II, Design Details for a mixed-use office and condominium building at 217 West Liberty Street.

**FINDINGS:**

The demolition of the existing non-historic structure and Part I Height and Mass were approved February 14, 2007.

A change from the initial submission is that the first and second floors will now possibly provide 17,240 square feet of office space. Floors three through five will contain 16 condominiums. According to the applicant, these numbers are subject to change.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<b>Windows and Doors:</b>	Peerless double-hung and Crittle steel windows with fixed light. The Peerless windows are model No. 432H double-hung windows with historic grid profiles, muntin width 7/8 inches with spacer bar.  Cast stone headers and brick sills the color of the cast stone headers are proposed. The windows will be recessed a minimum of three inches.  The solid entry doors will be wood painted Forest Black.	These standards are met.

	The glazed doors will be wood painted “Almond Wisp”. The garage door is a flush, hollow metal door painted to match the brick masonry. The rear utility doors will be flush, hollow metal painted to match brick masonry.	
<b>Roof Shape:</b>	Flat with parapet. Wood cornice and brackets. There is an elevator penthouse on the roof. It will have a sand finish stucco painted to match the color of the brick masonry.	This standard is met.
<b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:</b>	Rubbed, painted concrete balconies with 5/8-inch metal pickets and brackets below. The balcony slab edges and undersides will be rubbed and painted to match the stucco color. The brackets will be made of a ferrous metal painted “Forest Black”.  The steps on the Tattnall Street side are cast-in-place concrete and the posts are ornamental cast stone.	The stairs and balconies are compatible.
<b>Fences:</b>	A solid 7'-7" brick fence is proposed for the east and lane elevations, and a portion of the Liberty Street elevation. Part of this wall on the lane encloses a service yard with two metal doors.	The fence encloses the service area.
<b>Materials:</b>	Brick: Carolina Brown wirecut 420 with Polyblend “Light Smoke” mortar. Cast stone Base: Arriscraft “Pecan”; Stucco	The materials are compatible.
<b>Color:</b>	Stucco: Match Arriscraft “Pean” Windows, columns, and trim ICI Almond Wisp Metalwork ICI Forest Black.	The colors are compatible.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval.



**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects)** stated he was present with his client, Mr. Julius Bennett and Mr. Bennett's attorney, Mr. Jonathan Hart. He said he had nothing further to add.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the Board had any questions for the petitioner. He asked if any member of the public wished to comment on the petition.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Dolly Chisholm (Representing the Beehive Foundation)** stated that at the last meeting there was a lawsuit pending in the Superior Court of Chatham County with regard to the project. She said she asked for a continuance at the last meeting because they were waiting for a hearing of the suit in front of Judge Brennan with regard to their action for injunctive relief. The hearing had been set for September 20, a week from tomorrow. They, therefore, still do not believe that it was right for hearing today. However, if the Board proceeded, the attorney for the developer had assured them that they would not commence any action on the project until after the September 20 hearing if, in fact, it was approved at that time. She wanted to put it on the record and stated that they did not think it was right for hearing at this time, but they had been assured that.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that if there was a member of the public that wished to comment to come right ahead. He said that maybe he did not make himself clear enough last time when he asked if there was any other member of the public that wished to comment, and he said that he needed for them to come forward. Otherwise, he would assume there was not and they would move ahead with the business.

**Mr. Gary Arthur (Beehive Foundation)** stated he was not an architect and was there looking at the petition as a layman. To him it appeared demonstrably sketchy and incomplete. He said they had to ask if it really gave you enough information to make an informed decision. If built as it is it would be the largest building ever erected in Pulaski Ward since the ward was laid out 170 years ago in 1837.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he would have to stop Mr. Arthur, and asked him to stick to the issue of Design Detail because the Height and Mass had already been handled by the Board. He said that it was before the Court and he would entertain anything Mr. Arthur had to say about Design Detail, but would not listen to arguments about Height and Mass at this point because it was before the Court.

**Mr. Arthur** stated that it was because of the dominating presence in the neighborhood that it seemed incumbent that all of the Design Details be provided to the Board so they could really assess what it would look like and determine for themselves that everything fit. He said they did not think the Board had sufficient information regarding the details for the doors, for instance. The principal door on the recessed hyphen on Liberty Street only gave a hint of what it was, it looked completely flat on the elevation, and rather storefront-like in orientation. He asked if it could be a sliding glass door. We really did not know what it was or what it was going to look like and it is the primary entrance. To make sense of it you need to draw in details and the architect does not give them to you. You are being asked to take it on faith. The approach to door treatments on Tattnell Street and on the east elevation look completely different from that of the main entrance. They appear to be paneled wood ones with glass transoms, but once again there were no drawings. Like the door styles, the window styles in the building seemed to compete with one another. Once again, there were not enough details in the drawings for the Board to know how they would really look. Some of them are residential style; a wood clad

double-hung sash type, and a 19<sup>th</sup> Century reference. There was a shift in style about the projecting bay window motif referred to as Crittle. They were more industrial in style and were made of steel. He was not able to make sense of the wall section relating to the Crittle windows shown on Page A16. He asked if it really reflected what was shown on the elevation and without an enlarged detail, how do you know how they were integrated with the masonry surrounding them? The stack of oriels is a big element on the building and he was not at all certain that you could tell what they would truly look like. There was a third style of window contributing more to the schizophrenic approach to the building. If you look at the ground floor fenestration, instead of continuing the pattern of one large double-hung window unit, the architect throws in a transom. The window was not too compressed and the proportions thrown off kilter.

Another big problem was the inconsistencies in the relationships of the facades – the lack of attention to detail continues as you look at how one façade meets another, or rather in this design, how they don't. There seemed to be little attempt to fit one to the other. When you look at the building as a whole, if you walk around it, the details of the facades did not tie together. Look, if you will, at the stone clad ground floor on the main Liberty Street elevation (he referred to the northeast corner). When you walk around to the east elevation, the cast stone abruptly ends to be replaced by brick and there was no attempt to tie the two together. He asked if the cast stone should wrap around the corner and meet the brick properly. Similarly, the façade of the west elevation did not dovetail with the one on the lane. It too, ends cold at the corner of one façade and starts with something different on the other. Once again, he thought the correct practice would be to tooth the cast stone to the brick façade. Look too, at the cast stone base of the south elevation on the lane, which also ends abruptly. He asked if it should extend to the corner and return back toward the face of the garage. It would look odd, otherwise, just ending in midstream.

Another anomaly was the top corner of the elevation with a bracketed cornice on the top of the Tattnall Street elevation, but what happened to it when it came around to the lane elevation, how did it terminate, and where was it? It had disappeared altogether. Not only did the architect not tell you how he ended it, he simply did not show it was existing. Actually, he could not see in the drawings information sufficient to know where the various part of the whole bracketed cornice feature started and ended, or how the architect resolved any of the terminating points.

Another big concern was the elevator penthouse. They felt a serious examination of it was needed, its placement would be way too visible from across Liberty Street, and was confusing on the elevation because the architect really did not draw it as it is if you refer to the roof plan on Page A6. There was a wall there and one-third of it, the stair part, rises right up on top of the hyphen itself. That stair part really should be pushed back so it would not be so overwhelmingly visible from Liberty, and he asked why the whole thing could not be made symmetrical on the recessed hyphen. It was so big that they thought it needed to be treated as part of the architecture. The way the architecture was drawn, it did not show you the true effect and he believed it would stick out like a sore thumb.

Next, regarding the upper part of the south elevation of the lane, because of the height of the building, it was going to be visible from various vantages including Pulaski Square. Though the architect had followed Staff's recommendations to mask the severity and relieve the starkness of the mass of elevation with a brick string cornice, they were still concerned. If the wall above the fifth floor common roof garden, and that of the private roof garden on the north side, if they were going to be stuccoed as they appeared on the drawing instead of brick, then they fear they would draw even more attention to themselves.

There were other questionable things about the design like the placement of the building's bank of electrical and gas meters right on Liberty Street, open on the main façade. He asked if they wanted ugly meters in full view on the principal side.

Another jarring element back to the west elevation, and then to a little spur of bracketed cornice. It looked cartoonish and tacked on. Surely, there was a way to finish the top of the building in a less awkward fashion and tie it together with its other parts, either by continuing to run the bracketed cornice around the hyphen or by substituting it with a simple brick relief cornice.

The next item was already addressed by Staff. In sum, he would like to say that he felt there were too many elements in the building design, big and small, that have not been thought through properly. There were too many inconsistencies and unknowns. The lack of details in the architect's drawings makes it extremely hard for you to make an informed decision because it was all too vague. He thanked Mr. Steffen for letting him make such a long delivery.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there were any members of the public that wished to comment, and thanked Mr. Arthur for mostly sticking to the Design Details. He asked Mr. Hart if he wanted to come forward. He apologized to Ms. Dolecki and asked her to go ahead.

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated she was speaking for the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and they agreed with the comments that Gary Arthur made for the Beehive Foundation and for himself, and said she was not going to go through a long list because he covered a lot of the things they had. She said she wanted to point out three things that he did not talk about although he talked about the historic...the different types of elements being from different periods. He did not talk about the different materials that were being used. There was a wood cornice and bracket, metal railings, metal copings, brick veneer, cast stone, and stucco. They thought that was an awful lot of materials. He talked about the cornice line, but they were concerned about the interrupted cornice line from the towers that look unfinished. She wanted to say that the building had a modern massing with faux historic detailing, the large panels at the top of the tower element and the tower element seemed out-of-scale with the rest of the building, as do the Crittle windows when you compare them with the two-over-two windows on the rest of the building.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that was the way it was supposed to be done. He said when you came forward you were not to just reiterate what someone else said, but indicate if there was other new information, and he thanked Ms. Dolecki for doing that. He asked if there were any other members of the public that wished to comment before he let the petitioner come back. He asked if the petitioner's representative wanted to come back.

**Mr. Jonathan Hart (Representing the Petitioner)** stated he would leave the architectural comments to somebody that knew something about architecture. He wanted to address the continuance issue and said it was their sixth or seventh time before the Board. He was not present at the last meeting and understood that the matter was continued. There is a lawsuit in the Superior Court, and their original was an appeal from the Height and Mass issue that was now dismissed from the Superior Court, and the issue was not there. The only issue there, was the interpretation of the City's ordinance and they would like to move forward for two reasons. One, that lawsuit did not really have anything to do with what they were doing there today. Two, if by some chance or should the Board approve them today they could appeal that and get it into Superior Court with the other claim so that it could be dealt with in an efficient manner one at a time. Otherwise, if you continue it you will put the applicant one foot in Superior Court and one foot down here, and that was not an efficient way to do anything. We had a meeting with the judge to talk about how to do that. They would very much like for the Board to move forward and act, and would like to point out that yes, there were changes in the drawing with the exception of the stories, which was what the lawsuit was about. This applicant has complied with every request that had been made by Staff since the beginning. At one point, they had uniform windows, which they were told by Staff they prefer the windows to be broken up. He

really thought the Board had a report of professionals by you, and at the last meeting there were some considerations and they came back and met with them, met every one of the criteria, got a recommendation from Staff, and they would appreciate the Board's vote. He said he would let the architect address the rest of the issues.

**Mr. Steffen** stated to Mr. Hart to let him ask one thing before he leaves. He said that Ms. Chisholm had indicated that Mr. Hart had made a commitment to them to not go forward with anything until the court hearing. He knows that both are extremely honorable people, but it would probably be good for the record to have that on there for everybody else.

**Mr. Hart** stated they understood that, and everybody has laid the cards on the table here. He said they have a situation with strong differences of opinion that were going to have to be resolved, and you have to get everything in a place where it can be resolved. He did not want to fight a war over there, win, and then have to come back here and to face another appeal on almost the very similar type of legal setting; it's not fair.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to come back and choose to address which parts of the comments of Historic Savannah and Mr. Arthur that he wished to address.

**Ms. Shay** stated that he would leave it up to Mr. Steffen, said he tried to make a list of the concerns, and would answer whatever questions that he might have.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if anyone had any questions for the petitioner.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Ramsay** asked about the details as they wrap the corner and the bays, and she asked if it was wrapped. She said that was her own question not repeating Mr. Arthur's question. The cornice on the rear elevation, what...

**Mr. Shay** stated as they presented last time, this area was all brick and was not intended to be stucco, but they wanted to show that this plane was very, very much more close to the view. There would be a cornice detail there, and the cornice in the back was much less pronounced than the wood cornice that was on the two main street sides. He said they tried to add more detail to the sides that face the main through streets; Liberty and Tattnell, and reduce the amount of detail on the lane side.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated her question was how does it terminate, the cornice; how does it terminate. She asked does it wrap the corner and stop two feet, in or does it just end at the corner, or does it...

**Mr. Shay** stated the intention was that it would end at the corner.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that part of it in the elevation was...looked like it was projecting outward so that it would have at least some profile.

**Mr. Shay** stated for example, this side...this was the Liberty Street side and since this cornice would be highly visible from Liberty Street, we decided to have it come around and wrap.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if it did?...on the real elevation since it was not drawn on there, how does it come around the corner.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it turns the corner and terminates.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated okay, but it comes in...

**Mr. Shay** stated that it was far enough to have a bracket.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated and then on the other question...

**Mr. Shay** stated the bay windows, of course, the details that were on their drawings show what's there, which is that this is not brick, so the heads, ?, and brick don't show brick in this area.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated right, and asked if it was stucco.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated if Mr. Shay would move the drawing over a bit, they have the profile of the bay there and it's the two lines under the windows. She asked if it wrapped the bay or...

**Mr. Shay** asked, the two lines under the window?

**Ms. Ramsay** said over to the Crittle windows...see that line, and asked where was that line or was it on the bay that you just ? and profile.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it returned and died against the cast stone cornice, and because that was a shadow line that was further up. He said it was not in the same plane as this, it did not show all of the detail.

**Ms. Ramsay** said okay.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there were other questions for the petitioner. He said at this point then he would entertain a motion from the Board and that this one was pretty self explanatory as far as what the Board's options were. The Board could approve it or continue it. They were in a little bit different situation than they were last time because he thought last time they were operating a little bit in the dark over what would happen if this matter was approved. He thought at that point they knew what was going to happen to it, and there had been commitments made by people as to how to proceed. He thought whatever the Board decided to do was appropriate.

**Mr. Johnson** stated that he was concerned about the designs, and that he was not completely satisfied with the designs and so forth that the audience brought out. He said he thought they should re...some more designs and what not because he was not satisfied with it.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if there were any other comments or did anybody want to make a motion. He said there were folks who were sitting there wondering why he was sitting there saying nothing; the Chair does not make motions.

**Mr. Johnson** stated that he would go ahead a make a motion that the Board should continue the approval of the designs and what not.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that Mr. Johnson made a motion that the Board should continue it for further review of the Design Details, and asked for a second to the motion.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she would second it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it was moved and seconded that the matter should be continued for further review of Design Details, and asked if there was any further discussion.

There was none.

**Mr. Steffen** asked for all who were in favor to indicate by raising their hand. He counted one, two, three, and four. He asked for all those who were opposed to the motion. He counted one, two, and asked Mr. Law if he was not voting.

**Mr. Law** stated he voted for the other one and was not opposing it.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Law if he was in favor of the continuance.

**Mr. Law** answered yes.

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Johnson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and Mr. Hutchinson and Ms. Seiler were opposed. The motion passed 5 to 2.**

**Mr. Steffen** stated five votes in favor and two opposed, and said the matter would be continued until the next Board meeting.

**Mr. Hart** stated regarding the new rule about continuances, he wanted to make a motion that set a definite time certain for the Board to take the matter.

**Mr. Steffen** stated yes, sir.

**Mr. Hart** stated, and to design the matter. He said that they felt at this point that they had met every one of the requirements under the ordinance. They were compelled to raise to this Board and preserve their rights under the constitution to have due process of law. This organization was placed here to make decisions. The Board had made a rule and he would respect the rule because that was the way things were. But, he thought his client was entitled to have a hearing, entitled to know when a decision would be made. He did not know how to meet the ordinance any better than to meet what the Staff asked them to do. When you do everything Staff asks you to do they have no direction about being able to do anything else. Nobody up there had given them any guidance to do anything else, so right now, they were in a situation where they have a petition appearing before the Board that met every requirement of the ordinance, you have given them no further direction about anything, and you have not given them a time when it would be taken up finally. Now, there were other...he would ask that the Board entertain and set a day certain that you would decide this matter.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that part was easy. He said when the Board makes a motion for a continuance and there was no date specified, it was continued until the next meeting.

**Mr. Hart** asked if it was going to be decided then, or would they entertain another motion for a continuance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board did not have a policy. The only thing that I, and I would...let me respond to the second part of your question because I think it was an extremely legitimate question. The most proper motion the Board could make for a continuance was one that specified exactly what the issues were to be continued. It was a general motion of continuance made in this case, and it was seconded and approved. The only place he could tell Mr. Hart to look was the comments and questions that Ms. Ramsay asked because those were the only ones that came from the Board. The rest of the comments were made by the members of the public. He shared Mr. Hart's concern as to whether there was enough specificity in that motion, but he was left with the motion as it was at this point, and that was what the Board's pleasure was.

**Mr. Hart** asked if he heard the Chair say that he would not give him a definite time. He asked if they heard that.

**Mr. Steffen** answered no sir.

**Mr. Hart** asked if they would hear it on the merits and not continue it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he could not tell Mr. Hart that it would not be continued because he did not have the power to tell them that it would not be continued again.

**Mr. Hart** stated that basically he was in front of a Board, charged with the responsibility to make a decision, and they could not tell him when they could make a decision when they have a petition pending in front of them that met every one of the requirements of the ordinance. He asked if that was correct.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that this matter...

**Mr. Hart** asked if that was correct.

**Mr. Steffen** stated to Mr. Hart that he was Chairing the meeting, that they were good friends, and asked Mr. Hart not to force him to answer it that way. He said he was telling Mr. Hart that the Board had made a decision to continue it. The Board still had the authority to continue it as many times as they wished to continue it. He understood Mr. Hart's objection and he understood exactly what Mr. Hart was referring to and he might even agree with him, but he cannot change the policies nor could he change the statute.

**Mr. Hart** stated okay, let me ask this then. He said Mr. Steffen just made the statement that the Board had the right to continue it for as many times as it chooses, and asked if that was the position of the Board then.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the position of the Board was that their guidelines indicate that they could continue a matter if they believed that it should be continued.

**Mr. Hart** asked as many times as the Board felt was necessary.

**Mr. Steffen** answered yes, sir.

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

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Ronald Erickson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report and passed out drawings of changes being made on the stoop.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The petitioner is requesting approval for Part II approval for three row houses along West Taylor Street, and four row houses along Berrien Street. The Taylor Street rowhouses have a raised

basement with two stories above. The Berrien Street rowhouses have two stories with the third story under a gabled roof above. The project received Part I approval on July 11, 2007.

**FINDINGS:**

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

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<b>Windows and Doors:</b>	<p><b>Taylor Street</b>--Windows (6/6 and 9/9) and French Doors—Vetter Wood clad as per ordinance; Cast stone lintels/sills “sand” color Doors—raised panel wood Garage Doors—Nine feet in width, wood with applied trim, to simulate swinging hinged doors Shutters—Operable louvered composite shutters</p> <p><b>Berrien Street</b>- Windows (6/6) and French doors—Vetter wood clad Doors- raised panel wood Dormer windows- hardiplank siding; pilasters—materials not specified Awnings above door--canvas</p>	<p>Meets the standards. Ironwork on parlor level windows needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Verify pilaster materials. Canvas color to be provided later.</p>
<b>Roof Shape:</b>	<p><b>Taylor Street</b>- Parapet concealing low slope roof and roof mounted HVAC equipment; has metal-coping-- 6” high and overhanging approx. 1”. Stringcourse—6” wide and 1 3/8” deep.</p> <p><b>Berrien Street</b>—Gable roof asphalt shingle; to have max slope of 8:12 to meet standards.</p>	<p>Standards call for at least four inches in depth for the stringcourse. Applicant states code creates discrepancy. Must be verified with Codes Enforcement.</p> <p>Meets the standards.</p>
<b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:</b>	<p><b>Taylor Street</b>—High stoop with wood balustrade, newel and columns; doors have transom and flanked with fluted wood trim; rear has metal spiral stair</p> <p><b>Berrien Street</b>—Low stoop with wood balustrade and columns with trim and sidelights.</p>	<p>Stoop height should not exceed 9’ 6.”</p> <p>Staff recommends restudy of front door detailing to make front stoop in proportion with front facade of house—removal of trim and sidelights; smaller transom recommended.</p>
<b>Fences:</b>	Wood fence with lattice panel on top; wood gate.	Meets the standards.



	Scored stucco garden wall; metal gate.	
<b>Materials:</b>	Brick <b>Taylor Street-</b> "Monte Vista" queen size; Ivory buff mortar. <b>Berrien Street</b> Carolina Collection Old Savannah queen size; premium light gray mortar.  Copper scuppers and downspouts.	Meets the standards.
<b>Color:</b>	As noted on sheet A-6 and A-11.	All paint samples should be provided.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval with restudy of front door detailing and narrower porch width on Berrien Street townhouses, and verification of pilaster materials, ironwork, and color samples. Awning colors to be approved at a later date. The architect provided a revised drawing with a simplified door and narrower porch within. It was pointed out that the color samples were on the materials board.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) objected to the garage door openings on Taylor Street in the three large townhouses. She said if a lane was created for the Berrien Street homes, HSF would strongly recommend placing the garage door openings on the rear of the homes in lieu of the proposed courtyards.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Erickson** stated that they had fought the same battle on three different projects regarding garage door openings on Taylor Street. He said when they are landlocked they have to have an entrance to a garage, and that it was not a new idea.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Review Board approve the amended petition with the condition that the awning colors come back to Staff. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion. The motion passed 7 to 1. Ms. Ramsay was opposed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay  
Pat Shay  
H-07-3838  
PIN No. 2-0015-34-001  
15 East Liberty Street  
Alterations and additions**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations to the DeSoto Hilton as follows:

1. Add a glass and metal enclosure over the existing patio to the east of the Liberty Street entrance. The enclosure will have a flat modified bitumen roof and Marvin Ultimate sliding French doors with a medium bronze finish.
2. Remove existing cantilevered canopy on Liberty Street and replace with curved steel and glass canopy with signage on top. Glass is fritted glass in anodized aluminum frame with new signage on top (signage not a part of this petition). Spandrel glass is used at the bottom of the canopy.
3. Add new revolving entry doors by Boon Edam Tomsed Model TQA in Lt. bronze, and two side doors Kawneer Model 190 Narrow stile entrance doors light bronze anodized, with projecting curved metal tee panel medium bronze awning.
4. Relocate terra cotta architectural ornament to Liberty Street end of new ramp.
5. Improve ramp to be ADA compliant.
6. Add new metal picket guardrail with applied metal medallion to enclose the patio to the west of the Liberty Street entry, and install Kawneer Model 190 narrow stile entrance doors to access patio.
7. Add exterior light fixtures on new café per drawing.
8. On Harris Street elevation reclad existing porte cochere in three-coat Portland cement over the existing precast panels. Add light fixtures and planters.
9. All balcony railings to have applied metal ornamental medallion.

**FINDINGS:**

The historical marker is the property of the State of Georgia. Its relocation will be coordinated through the Savannah Chatham Historic Site and Monument Commission.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with continuation for signage. The relocation of any historic plaques must be coordinated through the Site and Monument Commission prior to their removal.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects)** stated he agreed with the Staff report.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if Mr. Shay considered placing the ornamental work on the corner room balconies.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it would be on the balconies and said that the drawing made reference that it would be. He said they did a drawing of what it would look like on a flat balcony, and when the elevations were drawn because it was slanted, the draftsman did not know how to model it.

**Ms. Seiler** asked what material would be used on the Liberty Street side next to the door.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it would be brick.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does approve the petition and the signage be continued. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed 7 to 1. Mr. Meyerhoff recused.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The petitioner is requesting Part I Height and Mass approval of a New Embassy Suites hotel on a site bounded by Oglethorpe Avenue on the north, Papy Street on the east, Turner Street on the south, and the Thunderbird and a vacant lot on the west.

**FINDINGS:**

1. Staff has met with the applicant on April 24, 2007, and July 2, 2007. The petition was continued at the July 11 and August 22 meetings of the Historic District Board of Review. Since the HDBR meetings, Staff met with the applicant on July 17, 2007, July 30, 2007, August 14, 2007, and August 27, 2007 and there were several e-mail exchanges.
  
2. The following summarizes the substantive revisions to the previous submission:
  - On the Oglethorpe Avenue side, the building has been set back 24 feet from the curb to permit the planting of substantial trees such as oaks. The lost rooms have been relocated on the Turner Street side of the building, thus narrowing the rear court entry.
  
  - A portico with recessed entry has been added to the Oglethorpe Avenue side, which enters into a lobby area for both the lease space and hotel.
  
  - The cornice has been reduced six feet to lower the overall height of the building.
  
  - The pilasters have been aligned with the ground floor pilasters.
  
  - The Papy Street elevation has been setback two additional feet to allow more depth on the Papy Street sidewalk.
  
  - There is 115 feet of lease space on the Oglethorpe/Papy Street corner. There are doors along the Oglethorpe Avenue side of the lease space that can be opened to a small outdoor seating area.

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

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<b>Setbacks:</b> No setbacks are required in the BC zone.	The proposed structure has been set back from Oglethorpe Avenue to allow for the planting of oak trees and has been setback on Papy Street to allow for a wider sidewalk.	This standard is met
<b>Entrances:</b> A building on a Tything Block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street. For large-scale development, primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street. Buildings less than 60 feet wide located on a corner Tything lot abutting a north-south connecting street shall locate primary entrances on both the east-west and north-south streets unless a corner entrance is	The entrance is on Papy Street, which is a secondary street to Oglethorpe Avenue. The City Traffic Engineering Department has requested drop off to be on Papy due to the traffic congestion on Oglethorpe. A second significant pedestrian entrance has been added to the Oglethorpe Avenue elevation, as well as several doors, which can open out of the lease space for outdoor dining nooks. A corner entry	This standard is met.

<p>utilized. Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances.</p>	<p>to the leased space is “celebrated” architecturally.</p>	
<p><b>Building Height:</b> The site is located in a five-story zone.</p>	<p>Five stories are proposed. A 20-foot first story, four 10-foot stories above, and a 7'-10" parapet is proposed. The plan is an H shape with a one-story entrance section on Papy Street. The parapet is taller on the corner of Papy and Oglethorpe to accentuate the corner.</p>	<p>The height zone standard is met. Although a Part II design issue, the materials have been varied to accentuate and break the building into sections and to reference the historic railroad building in the area.</p> <p>Although the building is significantly taller than the Thunderbird, changes in material and addition of windows on the west façade help the transition and frame the historic motel. The side and rear of the Thunderbird are covered with pipes and conduit and are now screened by the mass of the adjacent hotel.</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. Buildings greater than four stories shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15 feet, nor, more than 20 feet in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets or be less than 4:12 with an overhang. If pitched the roofs shall be bracketed, corbelled, or have an entablature.</p>	<p>Through groupings of windows and manipulation of the façade and materials, there are architecturally distinct sections to the building. The roof has a parapet.</p>	<p>The amended design successfully breaks the building into distinguishable parts which helps mitigate the mass.</p>
<p><b>Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:</b> Also, Historic District Ordinance Visual Compatibility Factor general paragraph states New construction shall be visually</p>	<p>A one-story covered center entry is proposed. Motifs have been taken from the Landmark railroad buildings to the south.</p>	<p>The extensions of the brick to the upper portions of the façade have brought cohesion to the design and helps divide the building into architecturally distinct</p>

<p>compatible with structures ...and places to which it is visually related. The (visual compatibility factors) shall be considered in determining the visual compatibility of such a building. Greater weight shall be given to adjacent historic structures.</p>		<p>sections.</p>
<p><b>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</b></p>	<p>The street elevations have a rhythm created by change of material and surface treatment. The bays are delineated by vertically aligned pilasters.</p>	<p>There is a rhythm established along the street fronts.</p>
<p><b>Walls of Continuity:</b></p>	<p>The building maintains a wall along Oglethorpe and Papy, however, the set backs now allow for significant street tree planting which increases the “walkability” of the two main streets. Turner Street provides the entry to a landscaped courtyard. This will be further defined by the parking garage and its ground floor leased space.</p>	<p>There is the potential for pedestrian interaction with ground floor uses in a landscaped pedestrian environment.</p>

The applicant has included a schematic of the proposed parking garage, which will include more ground floor leased space as well as parking for the Hampton Suites, the hotel, and the ancillary uses. It will be brought to the Board for review in either October or November.

Staff’s concerns have been addressed by the revisions.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval Part I Height and Mass

**Ms. Reiter** commended the petitioner for meeting with Staff on several occasions to look at the drawings again and for revising the plans for a better building.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Steffen** also commended the petitioner for the work that had been done.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that what was done on Oglethorpe Street was commendable, but they did not study the Papy Street side more. He said the building was 274 feet long and needed more articulation on the east elevation. There seemed to be plenty of room but it was not done. The center portion between the two end wings on both the north and south sides were one-story and added to the fact that it was one continuous wall.

**Mr. Howington** stated that they had a 24-foot-wide sidewalk on the Papy entrance. He said they took an additional two feet out to increase the sidewalk and walkability, and that was what was done on the Oglethorpe side for the corner entry would create a nice, viable street.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the one-story element with the pediment entry was very continuous.

**Mr. Howington** stated the inspiration came from the train sheds and to create a corner building. It was set back four feet more than it was previously, and it allowed an 18-foot sidewalk.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Howington to turn to Page 3.2. She said that the ordinance stated that large-scale development shall be designed in varying heights. She did not see a variation in height.

**Mr. Howington** stated they varied the Papy Street side to relate to the ordinance. The Turner Street elevation made up the additional room they pulled out to give the large Oglethorpe sidewalk. They put the additional rooms on the Turner Street side and closed up the gap in the courtyard. With the varying rhythm and materials (Ariscraft and brick), it would be a nice street.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that did not answer her question. She said the ordinance asked for varying height and she did not see a height variation. She repeated what Mr. Howington said about lowering the overall height to help the building.

**Mr. Howington** stated that in respect to the ordinance it was one building and that it was better to read as one building. He said they lowered the cornice, and on Papy Street, the cornice was higher than it was previously.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that it looked good and that was what her question was about. She said it would look nicer with more rather than it being long.

**Mr. Howington** stated they thought about it on the other corner, but there was not enough there. He said the architecture needed to read more on the Turner Street elevation as one building architecturally.

**Mr. Deering** stated if you look at the building in three dimensions and not just a flat elevation and come down Turner Street, you would see the corner five-story section and the one-story section. Coming the other direction on Turner there was a four-story garage with the entrance space, and a short 63-foot-wide section with a one-story section and modulations as well. With everything coming into play visually there was height modulation. He agreed with Mr. Howington that they tried to keep the elevation as one building to read as an anchor on the Turner Street side. There were book-ended buildings and it was important to keep it the same.

**Mr. Judson** commended the petitioner on the outcome, and said in the first presentation he was quoted as describing it as a prison wall. He said if you look forward to the intent and spirit of the Master Plan, what they were looking at fit and that it would now be an inviting space in the future.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** commended the project architects for the design and said that Papy Street had no identity, and that this would be an interesting street.

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

(Mr. Gay arrived at 3:30 p.m.)

**RE: Petition of McCorkle, Pedigo & Johnson  
 Phillip R. McCorkle  
 H-07-3869-2  
 PIN No. 2-0032-07-001  
 342 Drayton Street  
 New Construction of an 18-Unit Condominium,  
 Part II Design Detail**

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

Present for the petition was .

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report .

**NATURE OF REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting Part II Design Detail approval.

**FINDINGS:**

Drawings have been submitted indicating that the parapet has been removed from the porches per the discussion at the August Part I meeting.

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Windows and Doors:</b>	Andersen Narrowline Permashield double-hung windows with Manchester style Atlantic louver shutters were shown on drawings. Limestone headers and sills and brick headers and sills.  The porch doors are Andersen 15 light, French, wood-hinged, and the front doors are solid six panel mahogany with sidelights 7804.	The windows meet the standards. The catalog door sample is an error – it will be solid six panel mahogany.
<b>Roof Shape:</b>	Flat with parapet. The parapet has been removed over the porches.	The roof shape is compatible.
<b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:</b>	Recessed porches with wood shuttered ends are proposed. (This is a change from the previously proposed molded urethane louvered panels)	A sample will be at the meeting.
<b>Fences:</b>	The dumpster enclosure is a brick lattice fence with wood gate.	
<b>Materials:</b>	Brick: General Shale Brick “Natchez” Raised panel: Painted wood Column: Fypon	Please erect a brick sample panel prior to final selection.



<p><b>Color:</b></p>	<p>Trim: Sherwin Williams SW 7005 Pure White and columns                  Front Doors: Poinsettia SW 6594                  Shutters: SW 6258 Tricorn Black                  French Door: SW 7005 Pure White                  Iron Gate: SW 6258 Tricorn Black                  Brick: Geneal Shale "Natchez"</p>	
----------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with final selection of brick to be made with on-site panels.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Phillip McCorkle** stated that he concurred with Staff’s recommendation, including the brick.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Walter Hartridge (Representing Mrs. Hartridge, the National Society of the Colonial Dames, and Mr. Dryden)** stated it was good that the project was moved to the west, that it was lowered, and that the Height and Mass was good. He said that the lot coverage submittal for the previous meeting showed 69 percent and the documents he received from Staff showed 9,127 square feet, which was 52 feet over 75 percent. There was a submittal by Cadman Designs with a recalculation, and they wanted to be certain that if a submittal showed over 75 percent that there was not a glitch. He said he spoke with Mr. McCorkle and they anticipated it would go forward, and said that the architect was a registered architect although it was not the case before. The brick color and mortar would be of the utmost importance and could not be passed off lightly.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** commended the architect, the developer, and the Review Board for their patience and said that they support the design. He said Savannah has the most important urban Historic Landmark District in America, and it should take some time to build a large building. Any petitioner who was impatient with the process should take stock of it because it was an important process.

**Mr. Lee Meyer (Architect)** stated they were only dealing with the exterior details and what happens on the inside affects the outside. He said that code stated there needed to be two exits with one to the exterior and the other ending in a basement. That does not comply with the building code. There were some underground parking issues where you had to make a 90 degree turn to park. There were issues of exiting inside of the building, the health of the building, and the plans should be worked so the building reflected the exterior. It was a handsome addition to the streetscape but needed to be safe, too.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the concerns were given to the City Engineer who passed it on to the Inspections Department. She said when it was time for permitting they would address any issues that may arise, and that the architect was aware that changes to the design would have to come back to the Board.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he made the comment last month on another project that although they did not have purview over the interior, if it did not meet the code, he suggested that it be put in the motion that it come back to the Board. He felt it was in order unless it was written that...

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it would be the day for arguments and said he was going to say the same thing...

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if he could finish his statement, please.

**Mr. Steffen** said he was not going to clutter up the motions because it was already the procedure that if something did not meet code it had to come back to the Board. He said he would not allow provisions to be put in motions that the Board did not have authority over, or require items that the Board could not require. If it came back, the Board would deal with it then, but it was already the law.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated what he was saying was if the Board members saw something like that, it needed to be recognized and put on the record that the Board discussed those items and that they should be placed in the motion. He felt it always been done that way in the past.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he was a bit tired of hearing that it had been done in the past from individuals, because if it had been done in the past and did not follow the law, it would not be done now. He said the Board would follow the law as long as he was Chairman and that the Board would have a new Chairman next year. They could decide what they wanted to do then. He supported what Mr. Meyerhoff said about if it did not make sense on the inside it could be put on the record, and say it won't make sense on the outside, but he would not allow the motions to be cluttered up with items that dealt with the inside because it was not in the Board's purview. He said they could use their common sense, say it, put it in the record, and make a decision based on it, but he would not put it in the motion. That was the end of the discussion on that issue.

**Mr. Ronald Coleman (Architect)** stated he had been in practice in Savannah since 1960, had served on many boards in Chatham County and Savannah, and helped put the Chairman's position into existence through Mr. Meyerhoff's design. He told Mr. Steffen that he was out of order...

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he was out of order and he would not allow Mr. Coleman to take up issues.

**Mr. Kolman** stated that Mr. Steffen could not stop him because he was a citizen and he had a right to speak. He said that Mr. Steffen was out of order and had made a point earlier of saying that he could not necessarily be required to vote. The Chairman was also not supposed to enter into a debate.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if he could please get someone to remove the gentleman from the room.

**Mr. Kolman** stated that it was absolutely absurd.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Coleman to have a seat and said he was not in order.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler stated that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does approve the petition with the bricks and mortar come back for final approval. Dr. Elmore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Toly Siamos  
H-07-3877-2  
PIN No. 2-0004-47-004  
216 East State Street, Apt. 9  
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends denial.

Present for the petition was Mr. Toly Siamos.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for replacing an original wood banister divider with a wood partition that has been constructed. The partition is 6' 2" tall and 9' 2" long. The partition is currently an unpainted, board and batten style wall.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The partition is located on the third floor south façade of a rated structure within the National Landmark Historic District. It is visible from the public right-of-way.
2. Section 8-3030 6 states that, "New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the Historic District which are constructed shall be visually compatible with structures to which they are visually related." The partition is constructed of rough unpainted wood, in a design which does not relate historically nor visually to the architecture of the structure.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the partition be denied and that it be removed and the original banisters be replaced.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Toly Siamos** stated that there were not two but one condominium that had access to the balcony. He said it was Unit 9 and the other side was common use, which was part of the problem that the petitioner sought to address, and that the partition was barely noticeable from the right-of-way. He showed photographs of the site, displayed a typed document of an outline, said that the design related historically and visually to the architecture of the building, and that it was appropriate for the Historic District. It was 20 feet or more above the public right-of-way, was barely noticeably, and said that the staff of the Owens-Thomas house had indicated they approved. It was made of...

**Ms. Seiler** stated that no one could read the information that he was displaying.

**Mr. Siamos** stated that it was his outline. He said the partition was not of a rough wood design as Ms. Reiter indicated but unpainted. They intend to paint it if the Board approved the petition. There was a banister that divided the two balconies and it was temporarily removed to construct the partition, but it would be put back in place. The three primary interests were the security, sight, and noise pollution. The common area users routinely cross the dividing banister to borrow patio furniture, consume alcohol, and look into the windows of Unit 9 invading privacy. The partition has eliminated the behavior and reduced the threat of a break-in. The common use side was worn out, poorly maintained, and attempts from the Condominium Association to

curb the behavior on that side of the balcony were ongoing. The partition has discouraged late night parties since the placement of the partition. If there are small gatherings, the partition blocks the noise because of the barrier and the setback of the balcony. He asked the Board not to let the After-the-Fact petition taint their findings.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it was the same living quarter on both sides of the partition.

**Mr. Siamos** answered no sir. He stated that there was a unit on one side and the other side was the termination of the stairwell.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it was not a separation of two living units.

**Mr. Siamos** answered correct.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that when the Board saw something after-the-fact that they get upset when someone has moved forward. He said that in this case he was glad they did it because the Board members had seen it and it was visually incompatible. He agreed with Staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Siamos** asked if there would be a suggestion on how it could become more visually compatible.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** suggested lowering it to the size of the previous banister and make it solid, then it won't be visible.

**Mr. Judson** asked if they were going to reinstall the banister. He said he assumed it would be lowered.

**Mr. Siamos** stated that it would be on the common use side because someone had stored personal items there.

**Mr. Judson** asked to what was it abutted.

**Mr. Siamos** stated it would abut to the side of Unit 9 and did not take away from the common area.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated they did not want the tenant to use the space for parties; they could do it at the banister height by putting cross members there that would not be visible. He said the partition as it stands was visually incompatible.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that the building had been there a long time and the need for a partition had not been there. She suggested that the petitioner be more selective regarding the tenants.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board had seen worse items come to them without someone seeking approval, and the Board understood that the petitioner did not realize they had to come before them. The Board still had to deal with the situation.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Bill Gillespie** stated he was a neighbor and lived in a townhouse next to the condominium built on east State Street. He said most of the units had absentee landlords with the wrong kind of owner-occupied density, they were irresponsible, and the Condominium Association struggled. He has lived there for four years, watched countless SCAD students terrorize the neighborhood with constant partying, and had called the police 25 times in the last year for this

balcony. He said that Mr. Siamos had asked him if the partition was offensive because he could see it out his bedroom window, the balcony, and the front porch, and they did not find it offensive. He had sat in a Planning Commission presentation regarding stopping crime, noise, security issues, and unsightliness through design, and said the design was not offensive and that it had stopped the noise problem. He said people were not respectful after 11:00 p.m. with excessive noise at 2:00 and 4:00 a.m., especially on Thursday through Saturday. He has picked up beer bottles and everything else thrown off the balcony because it was offensive. The wall was not distasteful, no one had complained about the partition out of the 12 residents. There was one person who did not show up today who was not an owner and he wanted it stated for the record. The individuals of the Owens-Thomas House did not think it was a problem and said if it were painted white, it would blend. He said if we believe nothing that we hear and half of what we see that the picture did not represent what he sees. It had stopped one of their problems with the noise, appreciated what Mr. Siamos did, asked Mr. Meyerhoff to take another look at it, and said that he supported it.

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that the ARC agreed with Staff comments, said it was not a problem for the Review Board, and that the problem was the design issue.

**Mr. Siamos** stated that he agreed with Ms. Seiler about the building being there a long time. He said if the Board or Staff could suggest an alternate design he would be happy to look at it or ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that since noise and misbehavior had become an issue, which was one of the reasons for the wall, he suggested locking the door to the balcony and said it would eliminate the noise, they would not need the partition, and all things would be solved.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Ms. Reiter if she knew what could be done to bring it into compliance.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that she would put it back with the new banister railing and said it was an issue for the condominium association.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the petitioner requested the possibility of a continuance to spend more time with Staff. He said Staff had indicated that they could not do much, but the continuance was an option as well as Staff's recommendation.

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition with the condition that the petitioner meet with Staff for further suggestions. Mr. Gay seconded the motion Ms. Seiler was opposed. The motion passed 8 to 1.

**RE: Petition of Bacha Koslosky Design Works, LLC  
H-07-3883-2  
PIN No. 2-0032-14-009  
119 East Jones Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Bacha Koslosky.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to a townhouse to include: repair/restoration of existing front facade; construction of a porch for the front stoop using existing stoop stairs, piers, and base; renovation of rear façade to include removal of existing vinyl siding, and construction of a new rear porch and rear balcony. The footprint of the structure remains the same.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The structure is one of a pair of 1854 Greek Revival attached rowhouses constructed in 1854 for Eliza Jewett. The structure is a three-story masonry structure with a raised basement and stucco finish.
2. Front Façade — The existing windows (6/9 on first floor and 6/6 on upper floors) are to be repaired and restored to working order. Front door transom and sidelights to remain. Iron railing to be replaced with wood balustrade and newel post. New door for basement level entry not indicated on plans. New single pane wood 6/6 window to be installed on basement level of front façade (Marvin Wood Ultimate Series). Shutters are to be wood louvered operable shutters.
3. Front Stoop Detailing - Front stoop covering has wood box columns with simple wood caps. Balustrade has simple wood pickets and posts with copper caps.
4. Front Façade Stucco — Plans indicate that the stucco is to be repaired/patched only where necessary with new stucco to match existing in color. The new stucco shall match the existing stucco in composition (hardness) and color.
5. Rear Façade — Demolition plans call for removal of vinyl siding and removal of existing non-compatible pergola. On the basement level a window is to be removed. On the upper level windows are to be removed and replaced with 6/6 aluminum clad double-pane, double-hung windows (Marvin Ultimate DH Magnum Series). The wall surface is to be changed from vinyl to stucco. The rear is minimally visible to the public right-of-way due to the two-story carriage house to the rear of the main structure.
6. Rear Porch/Balcony — Both the rear porch and balcony have a wood balustrade with simple posts. Newel caps are copper.
7. Copper downspouts are to be installed.
8. Colors:
  - Stucco to match existing where repaired/patched.
  - Benjamin Moore—Monterey White HC-27--front porch railing, columns, window trim, door trim.
  - Benjamin Moore—Devsen Blue HC-156--front door
  - Benjamin Moore—Black Forest Green—shutters, basement level door (front façade)
  - Benjamin Moore—Mayflower Red (to match existing brick color)—rear window lintels
  - Benjamin Moore—Philadelphia Cream HC-30 –brackets on front and rear

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Bacha Koslosky** stated that they had noted two different options for the shutters and that the owner wanted to use the solid type.

**Ms. Reiter** asked if it was a wood shutter and if it was on the front or back.

**Mr. Koslosky** stated that it was labeled wood panel or louvered on the key note.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if Mr. Koslosky would have a problem if the Board made a motion to approve the project with the exception of the shutters coming back to Staff for review.

**Mr. Koslosky** answered no sir.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Saseen** asked if it was the tabby house at 119 East Jones Street. He said it was the only house left in Savannah with the tabby stucco and said the Board had to be careful with it.

**Ms. Reiter** stated the stucco was just being patched.

**Mr. Koslosky** stated that they were not going to paint the stucco.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the shutters going back to Staff for final approval Dr. Elmore seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture  
Keith Howington  
H-07-3884-2  
PIN No. 2-0005-15-008  
535 East Congress Street  
Demolition/New Construction**

The Preservation Officer recommends **continuation for revisions.**

Present for the petition was Mr. John Deering.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report and passed out a letter to Board members. She stated that they had received a site plan and there were a number of buildings across from the site instead of one building.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for demolition of an existing structure, and Parts I and II for new construction of the replacement structure. The replacement structure is a mixed-use structure consisting of one floor of offices and two floors with four condominiums.

**SITE PLAN REVIEW:**

The site plan review is taking place on September 6. The comments were not available by package delivery, however, a parking variance will be required and an encroachment from the City for a hatch from the public right-of-way to the basement. The location of a live oak tree within the tree lawn on Houston Street may impact the design of the building.

**FINDINGS:**

**Demolition**

1. The structure is a 1966 one-story masonry structure. The building is a non-rated structure within the National Landmark Historic District. The applicant states that the building is in fair to poor condition. The demolition includes removal of existing false tabby sidewalk and replacement with brick sidewalk to match similar sidewalks. All existing trees within the right-of-way are to remain. The rear stucco and masonry fence to be removed.

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Setbacks:</b> No setbacks are required in RIPA zone; meets 75 percent lot coverage required.	No setbacks on north, east, west sides; consistent with surrounding setbacks. South--setback to allow for existing parking spaces.	This standard is met.
<b>Dwelling Unit Type:</b>	Mixed Use structure using low stoop attached townhouse form.	
<b>Street Elevation Type:</b> A proposed building on an east-west connecting street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front, or on an immediately adjacent tithing or trust block.	Two low stoops are proposed on Congress Street with a low stoop side entry on Houston Street.	Low stoops are found on other historic structures on this block.
<b>Entrances:</b> A building on an east-west connecting street fronting a square shall have entrances at intervals not to exceed 50 feet. A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.	Two recessed office entries are proposed to face Congress Street. A recessed condo entry is proposed on the Houston Street side.	This standard is met.
<b>Building Height:</b>	Three stories plus roof elevator shaft/stairwell. 40'8" overall roof height (to top of parapet). Roof unit approx. 6' over parapet Height.  Floor-to-floor height-first floor 13' high; second and third stories 12' high; higher than adjacent and surrounding floor-to-floor heights.	Adjacent and surrounding structures are one, two, and three stories. Staff recommends restudy of floor-to-floor height to bring building in scale with surrounding historic houses.



<p><b>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:</b></p>	<p>Approx. 58' wide by 40'8" high.</p>	<p>It is proposed to make the structure appear as two semi-detached townhouses.</p>
<p><b>Proportion of Openings:</b> Individual sashes shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 3:5.</p>	<p>Double- and triple-hung windows are proposed. 6/6, 6/6/6, and 2/2 windows on the rear Houston Street portion of the structure. French doors with transoms are proposed for the south elevation.</p>	<p>This standard is met</p>
<p><b>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</b> The distance between windows shall not be less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows.</p>	<p>On Congress St. façade, each townhouse has a three-bay rhythm with windows and doors aligning vertically. The northern portion of the Houston Street façade has five bays, and the southern portion has single and paired windows in strongly delineated bays.</p>	<p>Staff recommends a restudy of the rear building façade including solids-to-voids. The false windows are visually incompatible.</p>
<p><b>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</b></p>	<p>The proposed structure has been designed to look like attached townhouses with a separate attached building facing Houston Street.</p>	<p>The inspiration for the design of the rear portion of the building along Houston Street is not clear. It may relate to the design of the Mulberry Inn across the square. It appears incongruous with the design of the front portion of the building. Staff recommends a restudy of the design of the rear building mass to simplify it and to modulate the mass more perhaps by decreasing the width of the front building to create an offset here. This could also help in pulling the balconies away from the oak if that turns out to be a problem.</p>
<p><b>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:</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>On the Congress Street elevation, metal balconies by King Architectural metals with IPE decking are proposed across all the windows at the second floor level, and on each of the middle two windows on the third story. On the Houston Street side, metal balconies are proposed for the two northernmost windows at the second and</p>	<p>Clarify that the projection of the balconies is three feet.  Consider wrapping the parlor floor balcony around from front to side as on the building behind at 530 East Broughton Street.  Eliminate the rear wood porches.</p>

	third floors. On the lane elevation, a two-story wood porch is proposed supported on wood brackets.	
<b>Walls of Continuity:</b>	No fences/walls; structure spans the lot.	Screen the parking from the sidewalk with a wall.
<b>Scale:</b>	Existing scale of surrounding area established by one, two, and occasionally three-story low stoop dwelling units.	The combination of the height with the footprint, which is larger than the average historic dwellings in this ward, creates a very massive building. Staff recommends reconsideration of the height and modulating the mass more.

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Windows and Doors:</b>	3/3/3 triple hung and 6/6 double-hung on Congress Street Façade; Houston St. 2/2 double-hung with blind windows with flat arches on first floor.	A specific model and specification for the windows is required.
<b>Roof Shape:</b>	Flat with parapet	Meets the standard, however, there are a number of walls, penthouses, etc., on the roof that appear to be very visible from the square and streets. More information is needed on these roof structures.

**Materials/Colors:**

1. Wall Materials—"Front" building Old Carolina Brick Company, Savannah Grey, oversized engineered. Mortar Ivory Buff; "Rear" building: Triangle Brick Company, Windsor. Mortar Laforge Red.
2. Shutters—Hinged, operable, composite material, painted (Need specific brand and model).
3. Color-Abalone.
4. Utilities/Refuse—screened in southwest corner in rear with wood board gate. Please describe the front meters: Are they in ground meters or above ground meters?
5. Doors—rear aluminum clad French door with transom above; rear solid metal panel door.
6. Ironwork—(No color given).

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Continuance for reconsideration of the height; the design of the “rear” building including exploring the modulation of the mass by perhaps inseting the “Front” building; elimination of the rear bracket supported wood porches; further information on the roof projections; details regarding the windows and doors; more information on the front meters; screening of the rear parking; and moving the hatch to the rear parking lot rather than placing it in the public right-of-way.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if Staff was okay with the demolition.

**Ms. Reiter** said that she was.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. John Deering (Greenline Architecture)** stated that he wanted Staff to consider his response to Staff’s concerns. He said that there were two structures facing Congress and Houston Streets on that site for a long time. The site was more built at that time than with the 75 percent with this petition. An 1891 bird’s eye view of Savannah showed a two and one-half-story building facing Congress Street, with a three-story structure facing Houston Street. This was where they got the inspiration for the design and were trying to follow the historic building patterns within the neighborhood.

The height at the house was at 40 feet, and they could lower it one-foot on each floor to reduce the height to 38 feet. At Houston and Broughton Streets there was a three-story masonry house with elaborate iron porches and brackets with an eave height at 36 feet, and the height would be about the same.

They had added windows on the rear façade. With the elevation on the lane they had taken the false openings and placed windows there.

The separate building in the back has historic examples at Bull and Liberty Streets and behind the house on Charlton Street, along with an early 20<sup>th</sup> Century apartment house on Abercorn Street. The wooden porches on the back were typical of the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century apartment houses with wood porches. He said the porches had been modified and that the original wood porches were nice. It was where their inspiration was taken from.

The balconies were mislabeled on the section at four feet deep, but they intend for them to be three feet deep because they do not want them to project over the sidewalk. On the back of the house the balcony projection would be three feet. He said that Staff made a suggestion to wrap the iron balcony on the Congress Street side around the corner to the two windows on the Houston Street side. He thought it was a good idea and that they should follow it.

He said the owner would be happy to place a brick wall along Houston Street to screen the parking from Houston Street.

On the drawings there was a window designation of a Kolby and Kolby simulated divided light wood window that they had used on many projects, and said if the contractor submitted another window they would definitely bring it back.

They wanted to place the electric meters inside the wooden doors on the back of the structure, and place the gas and water meters in the sidewalk so they would not be visible.

He asked that the Board consider the petition with the conditions that they bring the items back to Staff.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that they did a nice job on the Congress Street side with the balconies and shutters, and that it had a strong horizontal movement. He said by wrapping the balconies around the corner it would be expressed more. He agreed with Staff that the building on the south end of the Houston Street side elevation was a strong difference from the projected three-story high pilasters, and thought it needed to be restudied to make it more compatible but still be different. The illustration that was shown had one building one-story higher than the other, and he was suggesting that the horizontal feeling that was given to the building around the corner from Congress Street should be continued, or that the expression of the verticality should be subdued. He said it was a strong difference but it was the same building. He did not have a problem with the demolition.

**Mr. Judson** stated that two things he did not hear addressed were what was on the roof and what was proposed for an entry to the basement.

**Mr. Deering** stated that the owner preliminarily discussed a sidewalk access to the basement for storage. He was not sure why because they could have a stair on the interior and they had not decided to do that yet. There was an elevator tower on the roof, that portions were set back from the Houston Street side, there was a stair leading to the roof, and the mechanical equipment, etc.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that on Page 3.1 it looked like a whole playground on the roof.

**Mr. Deering** stated it was just four areas of roof terrace for the roof deck that was for the occupants.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if that the major centered one was the reflection of the...

**Mr. Deering** stated that the stairs came up from the back of the building. He pointed out the elevator, the separate roof terrace areas for the occupants of the units, and the mechanical units. He said that the mechanical units would not project above the parapet.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she was referring to 3.1.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they were restricted gates to each of the private roof areas.

**Mr. Keith Howington** stated that they were missing a note that should say, "stair corridor beyond." He said that happened beyond the lane and the idea was to bring a useable green space to the roof instead of just a roof. There were seven existing parking spaces in the rear and wanted them to remain for the tenants with the commercial space. They also wanted them to have a green space with a patio on the roof deck. It was setback from all sides and you would not see any of the rooftop terrace. The rear elevation would be the only elevation it could be seen from, they had tried to minimize it by light color stucco, and it was setback inside of the parapet wall to minimize any visual from the street. He said they intentionally did the two elevations with strong differences to help break up and minimize the mass. They also submitted two separate brick samples to help delineate them as two different buildings.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the roofline above the parapet with the dashed angled wall was a patio cover.

**Mr. Howington** stated it was a separation between the tenant spaces. He said they had four condominiums, that the angled line was to help minimize the visual from the street, and that it was a partition/patio wall.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if it was masonry.

**Mr. Howington** said it would be very light stucco.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he had read somewhere about a patio cover and asked if it was a roof.

**Mr. Howington** answered that it was not a roof. He said there was no covering except for what they would have over the stair corridor.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if there was a patio partial roof beyond on the east elevation.

**Mr. Howington** answered that was correct. He said that everything you see would be beyond the setback as with the first floor plan, and showed where the only actual roof covering would be. He said everything else that was open was on the lane side, and from every street angle would not be seen.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Roland Williams (Washington Square)** stated that at a meeting with the neighbors, that the architects and owner agreed that they could reduce the overall height by three and one-half feet, and would like to have it memorialized. He said otherwise they agreed with Staff's recommendation and thought it was an attractive addition to the square.

**Mr. Johnson** asked about the letter that was addressed to the Board, and asked if they should respond.

**Mr. Steffen** read a letter from Mamie Catherine James as follows:

"I am property owner at 537 East Congress Street and this letter is to express my objection to having the western windows covered on my home by your new construction. Thank you. Mamie Catherine James, 2507 East Derenne Avenue."

**Mr. Gay** said that she was the property owner and asked if she was renting or lived there.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that she owned it and wanted to have a bed and breakfast in the future. She said the building had not been restored yet.

**Mr. Steffen** asked Mr. Deering or Mr. Howington if they wanted to address the letter or Mr. Williams comments.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they were committed to reducing the height of the building down three and one-half feet. He said that Downtown Savannah was a zero lot line living environment and that it was unfortunate. There were many houses with other houses built up against them for hundreds of years, that the Zoning and the Building Codes supported it, and was sorry that her windows were going to be covered.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if Staff felt comfortable having them come back to Staff.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that there was much that was said.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that Part I could.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that what was suggested by the Board was potentially approval of the demolition and Part I Height and Mass, and to come back at the next hearing for Design Details where the issues could be addressed.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they would be pleased for the Board to consider Part I and the demolition, and resubmit detail for the Board meeting next month.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that if there were minor issues concerning Part I that it would still be discussed.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that he would like to see the Board approve the demolition but there were objections by Staff that he concurred with regarding the elevation on the Houston Street side that effected Part I.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he would separate them into two motions and let the second motion be made.

**Mr. Deering** stated that he would like the three and one-half feet in height reduction be included in the motion. He said that he would look at the designs on Houston Street, but stated that it was not part of the Height and Mass approval. They would be happy to look at the directional architectural elements, but that they were more design issues.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the wooden porches was not an issue that was not addressed.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that whether they existed or what they were made of was Design Detail.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that Staff recommended moving them.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that the petitioner addressed them to say that there were similar ones that existed.

**Mr. Deering** stated he wanted the Board to consider keeping them because they add something to the lane elevation.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she did not like the wooden ones.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they could remove the porches.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the approve the demolition of 535 East Congress Street. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion. Ms. Ramsay was opposed. The motion passed 8 to 1.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that on Part I Height and Mass one issue the Board questioned was the porches, which have been removed. He asked Mr. Meyerhoff if there were other issues he would like addressed under Height and Mass.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that Staff mentioned that the south end of the Houston Street elevation with a strong three-story pilaster condition was a part of the visual height and part of the mass, and wanted to continue both Part I and Part II.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he was given information during the break regarding the Board's efforts months ago to give them the power to continue items at their volition, and it was not compatible with the code as it existed. He said it was like a lot of city codes that were not clear or were vague. He had read it and it appeared that the Board was constrained by the idea that they

could continue matters when the petitioner agreed. He heard that some of the Board appeared ready to vote in favor of Part I with Part II coming back to Staff, and some had expressed continuing the whole thing. It could only be continued with the acquiescence of the petitioner. He asked the petitioners if they wanted it continued as a whole, in difference to the opinion that Mr. Meyerhoff expressed.

**Mr. Deering** stated that pilasters were decoration on a building, and did not think they were part of the mass, and asked the Board to consider Part I Height and Mass.

**Mr. Judson** asked if they were removing the porches from the design and that it wasn't a matter of materials.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that if they were reducing the height by three and one-half feet and eliminating the porch without consideration of what Staff had said regarding the elevation, then he thought both items were part of the Height and Mass. Therefore, he thought Part I and Part II should be presented again so the Board could see the project.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he could not allow a motion to continue Part I because the petitioner had stated they did not want to do that. He said Mr. Meyerhoff could vote against the motion for approval of Part I Height and Mass for those reasons and that it was in order, but he could not allow a motion for continuance.

**Mr. Deering** stated they would accept a continuance on Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Details.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the continuance of Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Details. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Dawson + Wissmach  
Neil Dawson  
H-07-3886-2  
PIN No.  
110 & 120 West Bryan Street  
New Construction**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Neil Dawson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

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

1. Change the stair tower material from cast stone to galvalume metal panel.
2. Change all window sizes and configuration.
3. Reduce the penthouse roof to half of the original size and alter design.
4. Remove metal screening on the lane side.

5. Add balconies on the Bryan Street side over the Bryan Street entrance.
6. Change parapet and cornice from zinc cornice to galvalume cornice, reduce depth of cast stone cornice, and change floor to floor heights as follows:  
First from 13'-6" to 13'-8"  
Second stays same at 12'  
Third through sixth from 12' to 10'-8"  
Parapet 4'-2" to 4'-4"  
These figures equal an overall reduction in height of 5'.
7. On the Whitaker Street side the windows will be smaller with awning windows. The storefront doors will be reduced from two pair to one pair in each storefront. A fabric awning is proposed.

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed use has changed from office to condominium. The residential use requires operable windows, hence the change to Weathershield clear anodized aluminum clad windows with casements. The glass area is not as large as before, and the area between the windows now consists of metal panels.

The metal panels on the tower retain the subdivisions similar to the cast stone, thus helping to maintain the more finely grained detail of the previous materials.

The awning color and fabric will need to come back to Staff.

Clarify if the rear wall material is changing.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval with clarification of rear wall material and awning to be brought back to Staff.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Neil Dawson (Dawson + Wissmach Architect)** stated that changing from an office building to a condominium mandated several changes, and the biggest change was the window type and configuration. He said they were smaller but they tried to maintain the overall look, and as the building decreased the five-foot four inches in height, it seemed appropriate to modify the windows to make them smaller. With the smaller height the windows were overly exaggerated. He said it was integrated with the parking garage, there needed to be something over the big hole in the ground, and he was trying to make the project viable. He wanted to clarify that the proposed windows were the Anderson vinyl clad windows instead of the clear anodized weathershield windows. They were the same windows approved on the News Place project, and they had used Anderson successfully before. The stucco on the back wall was part of the developers effort to reduce cost and thought it would be more successful to do stucco on the tower element. He displayed photographs to show the downfall of large buildings downtown with the quality of stucco being used. He said the stucco they used was a hand-rubbed cement stucco that had two or three different colors integrated into the mix, and requested permission from the Board to use a hard coat stucco with a patina. It yielded a more authentic look than some of the more contemporary stucco that had an artificial look to it, and he requested the use of stucco on the ground floor, but not in the back.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the petitioner had a problem with the awning being brought to Staff.



Mr. Dawson answered no.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Mr. Joe Saseen stated that the building had more of a traditional feel to it and that the louvers did not have a connection with the building because it was not a modern building.

Mr. Dawson stated that he had several people say that to him so he printed it without the louvers and it looked horrible.

Mr. Steffen asked Ms. Reiter if she was satisfied with the stucco and the rear wall material, or if there was an issue there.

Ms. Ramsay asked if he was going to use stucco on the rear wall.

Mr. Dawson said that was correct.

Ms. Reiter asked if they wanted to change the capstone on the bottom, the stucco, and the metal panel. She said that it was diminishing the quality of the building.

Mr. Steffen asked if Staff's position was to have the project remain as submitted and not be allowed to change the stucco on that portion of the building.

Ms. Reiter answered yes.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the ground floor on the lane side was to be stucco and everything else above be brick.

Mr. Dawson stated that everything would remain brick as indicated on the amended proposals.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Dawson to clarify where he wanted the stucco.

Mr. Dawson stated that everything currently clad with Ariscraft would be the tower element and the first floor on the corner piece.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the awning coming back to Staff. Mr. Law seconded the motion and it passed 7 to 1. Mr. Judson was opposed.

**RE: STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of Mercy Housing Southeast, Inc.  
H-07-3874(S)-2  
322 East Taylor Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Cathedral of St. John the Baptist  
Reverend William O. O'Neill  
H-07-3785-2  
324 Abercorn Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

3. Petition of Kayak Kafe`  
Brendan Pappas  
H-07-3876(S)-2  
1 East Broughton Street  
Sign  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
4. Petition of RE: Think Design, LLC  
Joel Snayd  
H-07-3878(S)-2  
222 Drayton Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
5. Petition of June Candy  
H-07-387(S)-2  
502 East Jones Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
6. Petition of Chris Dagenhart  
H-07-3880(S)-2  
308 East President Street  
Color Change/Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
7. Petition of Coastal Canvas/Red Clover  
Laura Mouhot  
H-07-388(S)-2  
53 Montgomery Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
8. Petition of Savannah College of Art & Design  
Martin Smith  
H-07-3887(S)-2  
201 Barnard Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
9. Petition of Genevieve Dragalin  
H-07-3888(S)-2  
709 East Broad Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
10. Petition of Bloomquist Construction  
H-07-3889(S)-2  
401 East Gordon Street  
Color Change/Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

11. Petition of Susan Mason  
H-07-3890(S)-2  
602 Habersham Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**G. MINUTES**

Approval of Minutes – September 12, 2007

**Mr. Judson** stated that he was not present at the last meeting.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does approve the petition with the modification of Mr. Judson being absent from the meeting. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**H. OTHER BUSINESS**

**Ms. Reiter** stated that alterations were approved for 210 East Taylor Street with the removal of an existing stucco addition, replacing it with a new addition, and adding a side window on the residence. She said that in the execution the contractor removed the roof, rear wall, and the entire interior. At some point in a previous renovation, the architect at that time for the building had done interior work and removed a portion of the rear wall on all three stories, and she did not know who had the drawings. The Review Board did not have purview over what happened with the interior of a building, but if everyone in Downtown Savannah approached restoration in this manner, there would not be a Historic District.

**Dr. Elmore** asked if the entire interior was gutted.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that everything was gone, passed around photographs, and said she knew the Board did not review interiors.

**Mr. Steffen** asked whose home it was.

**Ms. Reiter** stated it was Mr. Martin Melaver's home.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if anything was done to the outside that was in contravention with what was approved.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that she did not think so. She said she did not know if the front door was existing or was there before.

**Ms. Seiler** asked Ms. Reiter if she had spoken with them.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Dawson if he had any comments.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that it was a drastic approach to the renovations, asked if there was a picture of the existing back, and said it was shocking.

**Mr. McDonald** showed photographs and pointed out the back wall, a picture of a wall that used to be there, and said the sunlight could be seen through the building because the whole roof had been removed. He said that was not on the plans and that it was an exterior feature.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that the roof would be visible from the right-of-way.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that it was not visible because it was behind the parapet.

**Mr. Dawson** stated there was nothing in the proposed design when completed that was misrepresented on their drawings. He said it would look like what the drawings showed when completed, and that everything from the public right-of-way would be done as indicated. They submitted the permits for review to Staff and they were sealed and signed, and it clearly indicated removal of interior frame and features. It was probably distasteful to the Board but was not against the standards in place, and they did not misrepresent what the construction was. He said that despite the fact that it was a shell, when it was completed, it would look exactly like what was shown on the drawings.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that it would be a new house and not historic.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that it would be new on the interior and not historic.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if it would be a LEED demonstration.

**Mr. Dawson** answered yes, and said it was a LEED Platinum project that had incorporated significant technology. He said it did not justify doing one thing or the other, but the renovations that were done in the 70's did justify it.

**Mr. Gay** asked what they did with the materials.

**Mr. Dawson** answered that they had been salvaged and would be reused. He showed a photograph of the original addition that was removed, said there was a brick wing wall on each side that came in 18 inches 2 feet, there was a steel beam at the top that framed it, and that there was no historic back wall for this house. He said the framing on the interior when it was altered in the 1970's was not the original stair location because it was a double-back stair. Some of the mantels were original and were salvaged, and would be reused as well as the hard pine flooring. Because of the alterations the trim, the interior layout, and the doors were non-historic. The house had lost most of its historic integrity before they started the project, and all of the elements that were original would be reused. There were two fireplaces removed, but they were non-historic fireplace elements.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked what was the rationale in removing the floors and floor joists.

**Mr. Dawson** stated when it was renovated it was a side hall plan and most of the walls were bearing on that side hall layout. He said Mr. Melaver wanted to do an open floor plan, which would remove the wall and bearing point. That forced them to reframe the house with a clear span structure. Some of the joists were spliced and they contemplated reusing them, but it did not make sense when the back third of the house had new framing. It made more sense to redo it with the wood trusses to integrate the mechanical system into the architecture.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the masonry walls still had the indents for the crossbeams.

**Mr. Dawson** stated they did but they would not go with the wood truss configuration. They wanted the wood truss to integrate the mechanical systems into the flooring.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they were going to have to go through a wall to make a ledge.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that they were doing a continuous ledger blocking around the perimeter in the masonry.

**Mr. Johnson** asked if the sills in the garden level had to be taken out.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that the frame was only a few inches above grade and most of it was deteriorated.

**Mr. Tony Hensley (Dawson + Wissmach Architects)** stated that the first floor was poured-in-place concrete after excavation, and then sleepers were added on top of it creating a new floor.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated they questioned the process and did not know it was going to happen. He said the submitted plans did not talk about the rear wall, but there was a portion of the rear wall that was there formerly. There was a small deviation from what was presented, was upset about it because history was lost, and had a hard time understanding how it could meet environmental standards with the energy expended and lost. If this met LEED's standards then they needed to reexamine their standards. He intended to ask LEED about it and send them copies of the pictures to let them know how the program was being represented in the community.

**Mr. Steffen** stated there was some hypocrisy and that it was his reaction. He said there were two dangers that go beyond the project and their ultimate goal might have been genuine, but anyone might think they could come in without a plan and gut historic buildings. It was a horrible precedent and he realized how impotent the Board was.

**Mr. Johnson** stated he was concerned because in order to get the permit for demolition they had to have plans. He said the inspector was supposed to look at the demolition and the plans, and asked how it got through.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that the house was not historic when it was gutted.

**Mr. McDonald** stated that the house was historic because the floor systems, floors, and mantles were there.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that substantial items had been replaced like the poured concrete.

**Mr. Gay** stated that it seemed as if they presented it and tried to hide the fact because they knew everyone would be upset if people knew. He said they did not say anything about taking everything out of the house and that was what bothered him.

**Mr. McDonald** stated that Staff was correct, that they needed to learn from the situation, and that there were some changes that could be updated on the ordinances. He said they might need to have a review over interiors and scrutinize plans so it would not happen again.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that it bothered him because it had happened before where a presentation was made to the Board, the Board voted for approval, and then the petitioner did more, less, or different than what was approved. He said this was major from what was approved and the Board had no legal recourse to do anything. They cannot go to the Building Department and ask them to put a stop work order on it.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the Board did not have purview over what was done and that was the problem.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that the Building Department was supposed to give a building permit based on what the Historic Review Board had approved. He said it was a horrible situation from every effort with no legal recourse.

**Mr. Johnson** stated it should have been stopped at the Building Department when the plans were presented for the Historic District.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that there was nothing that could be done about that.

**Mr. Dawson** stated he would strongly disagree with the implications or outright statements that they mislead the Board or did more than indicated. He said that within the Board's purview of the exterior of the building that the building would look like the plans when they were done. The fact that the Board did not like that the interior floors were removed was not their purview, was legal, was submitted on the demolition plans to Staff, and was clearly indicated. They were stamped and delivered to the Building Department and were inspected according to the standards that the Board operated by. He strongly objected to the implications that they acted inappropriately.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that he heard people react to the availability of the brick and parts of the building, and said that a Staff person made a comment to an applicant and the applicant accused them of seeking favors in order to get approval on something. He said that you want to be careful on the record with those statements. He was not as serious as the person who had turned it around on him, and it took him about three months of paperwork to clear it up.

#### **I. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

There was none.

#### **J. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**Mr. Steffen** stated that in light of what Mr. Thomson had said that he wanted to apologize to everyone, but the Board was in a far more litigious atmosphere than the Board previously when Mr. Ronald Kolman told him that he was a former Chairman. He said that people would sue over anything and part of the reason he tried to frame the issue and to decide what they had to decide was because he was trying to make sure the Board did not get sued over technicalities and brought into court. He was not trying to cut people off or make decisions for anyone, but whoever chairs next would need to be careful. A good example was the mistake he made in the interpretation of the Board changing the continuance, and said there was a part of the State statute that says, "the Board shall act upon all applications meeting the requirements at the next scheduled meeting if a quorum is present...and nothing herein shall prohibit a continuation of the hearing on an application where the applicant consents." He said the only continuance could be when an applicant consented to it, and the Board did not have the right to continue something even if the By-Laws were changed if they don't want it continued. The section did not give the Board the authority to consider Part I and Part II either.

**Ms. Reiter** stated they were addressing that in the Zoning Ordinance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he was warning the Board that someone with a lawyer could come in and say they wanted a hearing on all of it, it cannot be divided into Part I and Part II because they were entitled to the hearing today. He said if it did happen, then the Board needed to be ready.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the Board could turn them down.

**Mr. Steffen** agreed and said that he needed the Board's consent because he made an error with his ruling, and that he would have to contact the City and County Attorneys and ask them to accept a continuance to the next meeting with the issue that was wrongfully continued. He did not think they wanted further lawsuits, but if they heard that matter again, a decision needed to be made at the beginning. If the Board did not like it the way it was, then they should vote against it. If you like it vote in favor of it so the Board could move on.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that with a continuance if they vote for it then it would happen, and if they voted against it then it would not happen. He said they would get legal redress but it would not be on the Board.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that was a good point because it almost died completely when no one wanted to make a motion or second it, and she had only seen that happen one other time. She said it was a very controversial project and there was a chance that the Board could just sit.

**Mr. Gay** stated they had asked once before whether they wanted a continuance and they said no, they wanted an answer today. He said that the Board said you could not do it but there was not a quorum and it had been brought back.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board had been dealing with the project for nine months and people were anxious to go to court on the case regardless of how the Board decided. He said he came to the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting and heard two people walk out and state that they had a lawsuit. If he sounded like he was trying to put words in people's mouth, he was not. Sometimes he had to tell the Board what the options for motions were because if he didn't, then Board would be drawn into it whether they liked it or not.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that from a petitioner's point-of-view if he came as an architect and was asked if he wanted a continuance, the Board needed to say why they were giving the continuance. He said they made a continuance on a project today without saying why, and the architect did not know what the Review Board wanted changed. The Board must give the petitioner a reason why.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she thought it was understood because Ms. Ramsay had made a comment earlier about Design Details, and it was brought up in the motion that it was because of Design Details.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that Mr. Meyerhoff was correct that if the Board were more specific, it would get them out of trouble.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that Mr. Dawson was upset and said that he did not imply or think that they were enjoying gutting a building. He said his personal view was to make it look like the rest of the buildings on the block as per the perimeters of the guidelines.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that it was not Mr. Dawson's fault. He said what was presented to the Board and what was done were two different things.

**Mr. Thomson** asked if it was a lie if you do not tell the truth, and said the Board was on point. He said that Mr. Blackburn informed him that there needed to be more detail with the reasons instead of continuing it, then it could be denied or approved. If the Board could not continue the petition, then a decision would need to be made, and if the decision was to deny, then it was a decision.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board tried to change the policy because it left them in an uncomfortable situation where some items needed to go back to Staff, but it was a dilemma. He said when someone wanted to push them from the other side and wanted the item heard, then they had to hear it. He said the Board had to have the guts to stand up and say if they did not like it, then it would be denied and they would have to come back.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that he had promised not to deliver incomplete applications and he heard something that sounded more incomplete than complete today. He stated that there was a way to stop having to continue it by not letting it get on the agenda. He said if Mr. Blackburn said that it had to be placed on the agenda because of code, then he would state that it would be placed on the agenda when the application was complete. There were things the industry was trying to get by Staff to get to the Board, and only to get the Board's comments.

**Dr. Elmore** stated that the clear and eminent danger would be someone who just wanted to sue the Board.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that happened when Mr. Ronald Coleman got up and would not leave. He said the Board needed an answer for it because someone younger and stronger might come and they would have to have a mechanism to remove them.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that Mr. Steffen asked someone to remove him and there was no one to remove him.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that Staff had made recommendations on the project at Congress and Houston Streets where the petitioner agreed to them. He said the Board was going to approve Part I and Part II. They had agreed to lowering the height of the building, eliminating the porches on the south side, and wrapping the porches on the north around the building. There were major visual changes and he did not think the Board should leave it in the hands of Staff when the petitioner agreed to changes like that, but bring it back to the Board. The Board should have a continuance on Part I.

**Mr. Steffen** stated if the petitioner did not want the continuance the Board had to hear it. It could be decided if the Board was satisfied with the promises and make a decision.

He said at the next meeting he had to appoint a three-member team to decide who the next Chairman and Vice-Chairman would be. He could not serve more than two consecutive terms, that his term was up, and that you could not serve two terms in the same office. Ms. Seiler was coming off the Board and unless Council appointed someone for the position or it languished, that he and Ms. Seiler were not qualified to Chair and two other experienced members would be coming off. He was not suggesting who it should be but would be appointing the members to make the selection, and asked the Board to keep in mind that the meetings were getting harder to run because there were more lawyers that would hold the Board to the law. He suggested that whoever take the position take it very seriously.

**Dr. Elmore** stated it should be a person who was a lawyer and if they don't have legal training they should not be Chairman.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that unless the Council placed another lawyer on the Board there would not be one.



**K. ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

**BR/jnp**