

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET**

**ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM**

**December 10, 2008**

**2:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**HDRB Members Present:**

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

**HDRB Members Not Present:**

**Eric Meyerhoff**

**City of Savannah Staff Members Present:** Tiras Petrea, Zoning Officer

**HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:**

**Thomas L. Thomson, P.E./AICP, Executive Director  
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director  
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner  
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant**

**RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

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: Petition of Ramsay Sherrill Architects  
Linda Ramsay  
H-07-3928-2  
214 East Taylor Street  
PIN No. 2-0032-13-012  
One-Year Extension of a Wood Screen Wall Lattice  
Trellis**

The Preservation Officer recommends continuation until court order is issued.

**RE: Continued Petition of Abraham Scott  
Bruce Floyd  
H-08-4053-2  
320 – 322 Lorch Lane  
PIN No. 2-0045-26-005  
Demolition/New Construction**

The Preservation Officer recommends continuance to January 14, 2009, for insufficient submission.

**RE: Petition of Peter Thompson for  
Deborah Smith  
H-08-4087-2  
202 East Gwinnett Street  
PIN No. 2-0044-06-007  
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends continuance to January 14, 2009, for insufficient submission.

**RE: Petition of Coastal Heritage Society  
Alexis Aubuchon  
H-08-4086-2  
301 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
PIN No. 2-0031-47-001  
Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends continuance to January 14, 2009, at the petitioner's request.

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

**RE: CONSENT AGENDA**

**RE: Amended Petition of Lynch Associates Design, Inc.  
Rebecca Lynch  
H-08-4016-2  
233 Abercorn Street  
PIN No. 2-0015-30-003  
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Savannah College of Art and Design  
Martin Smith  
H-08-4074-2  
212 West Taylor Street  
PIN No. 2-0032-18-007  
Sign/Color Change**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Richard Nelson  
H-08-4077-2  
426 East St. Julian Street  
PIN No. 2-0004-29-001A  
Rear Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Adam P. Cerbone  
H-08-4079-2  
302 East Oglethorpe Avenue  
PIN No. 2-0015-05-013  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Marley Management Co., Inc.  
Michael Brown  
H-08-4080-2  
10 East Broughton Street  
PIN No. 2-0004-38-006  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Papillote, LLC  
Ann Marie Apgar  
H-08-4081-2  
218 West Broughton Street  
PIN No. 2-0016-14-011  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture  
Gretchen Ogg-Callejas  
H-08-4083-2  
130 Houston Street  
PIN No. 2-0005-27-001  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Witmer, Jones, Keefer, LTD  
Dan Keefer  
H-08-4088-2  
419 East St. Julian Street  
PIN No. 2-0004-35-003  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of J. T. Turner Construction Company, Inc.  
Matt West  
H-08-4089-2  
101 East Oglethorpe Avenue  
PIN No. 2-0015-15-001  
Rehabilitation/Alteration/New Construction –  
Originally Approved in 2003**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

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

**RE: REGULAR AGENDA**

**RE: Amended Petition of Greenline Architecture  
Pete Callejas  
H-07-3631-2  
19 East Gordon Street  
PIN No. 2-0032-44-009  
Alterations to a Carriage House**

The Preservation Officer recommends **additional discussion based on turning radius diagram**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Pete Callejas.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting to amend a previously approved petition for a new carriage house as follows:

1. Change the exterior material from brick to a three coat Portland cement stucco with exposed brick jack arches and sills. The color of the stucco will be similar to the main house and the accent bricks will be salvage brick from the old carriage house.
2. Originally three 9-foot-wide garage doors were approved for the carriage house. The applicant now proposes a 9-foot-wide false door and a 20-foot-wide overhead garage door.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The main house is stucco with contrasting cast iron and brick lintels and sills.
2. The 20-foot-wide garage door does not meet the door standards of the Historic District Ordinance. Please provide a turning radius diagram to scale to substantiate that a nine-foot door cannot be used. The door cite that exist on the lane may predate the ordinance and are not in character with the historic carriage houses.
3. If it is substantiated that a larger door is needed, the style of the door should resemble two doors. Please bring catalog samples. One long vertical plank overhead door is not visually compatible. A Finding-of-Fact that an alternative proposed door and opening is compatible will be needed in order for the Zoning Board of Appeals to grant a variance from the design standards.
4. Delete the false garage door.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Further discussion for the need for a variance based on to-scale diagrams.**

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Pete Callejas (Greenline Architecture)** stated that they made minor revisions to the elevations showing a 20-foot garage door with simulated double doors from the Carriage House Door Company, and another door instead of the false garage door. He said that the 9-foot garage door would not work because of the narrow lane, the limited turning radius, and the inability to push the garage back because of existing structures on the site. He provided a turning radius for a 20-foot garage door for two 12-foot garage doors, and the most ideal was the 20-foot garage door.

**Mr. Gay** asked if it was impossible to park in 9-foot garage doors.

**Mr. Tracy Young (Homeowner at 19 East Gordon Street)** stated that after they laid the garage and poured the slab, a couple of days later he went to the site and it was impossible to get a car into the turning radius with a 9-foot door.

**Dr. Henry** asked if it was impossible and if they could not back up.

**Mr. Tracy Young** stated that it was impossible when backing up because of the building behind it. He said it was possible to do, but it would take six different reverse and forward attempts to get into the garage. It was very difficult to get into the 9-foot garage door. They found a garage door company to make a double garage door that looked like two singles so it wasn't just a typical garage door, but a special make garage door that would emulate two separate garage doors. The only difference would be no stucco in between the two garage doors.

**Mr. Judson** stated that he had not seen the fence in any of the drawings.

**Mr. Callejas** stated that the fence was an existing brick garden wall, but it would be cut off, filled in, and repaired where it would meet the new construction.

**Mr. Judson** asked if it was a new proposal.

**Mr. Callejas** stated that it was more realistic showing it with the fence because it was what is seen from the lane.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that there appeared to be a number of doors that were less than 20 feet. She asked what was the objection to the 12-foot door because it was a perfect compromise with the ordinance and allowing them to not have to wiggle into the 9-foot.

**Mr. Young** stated that ideally an 18 or 20-foot door on a double garage door was much easier to maneuver into a space. He said that with a double garage door you don't have to worry about the mull in between them. They would pay for the additional expense for having a company build a double garage door that looked like two garage doors. Cosmetically, it is more functional with a wider space and he agreed that it did not need to be one door but that it needed to look like two garage doors that emulate single of 10 feet versus two at 12 feet wide. The turning radius is not more functional at 12 feet wide because with the 20 feet it goes in 3 feet further and you get more radius.

He displayed a turning radius with dimensions with a standard-size car. He said there was the ability with a 20-foot garage door to pull in safely, enough space on both sides of the car to open the doors, and it was enough space to get out. The 12-foot garage doors were not the most ideal concerning function.

**Mr. Judson** asked if it was an overhead door.

**Mr. Young** answered yes. He said that the whole door would come up. He said that the only difference was 12-inches of stucco between the two doors. He said with the current turning radius that the car almost hugs the wall.

**Mr. Young** stated that there were other variations of single doors that appeared to be double that were made by the same company.

**Mr. Callejas** stated that the door they picked was the best because it emulated two doors. He said the company specialized in making these types of doors. It would not look good with a 20-foot door that was all panels and it would be more expensive to buy a 20-foot door that was custom-made to look like two doors rather than putting in two single-paneled 12-foot doors. It was not a cost consideration.

**Ms. Ramsay** suggested that the curved lintel contribute to the appearance of being one 20-foot wide door.

**Mr. Young** said that they wanted to emulate the lintels over the windows on the back of the house.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that it made it look like one opening regardless of the shape of doors that were put in.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the arch made it look like one door as opposed to two. He said it accentuates the fact that it was one door.

**Mr. Callejas** stated that if you eliminate the arch and have it straight across, it might separate in the middle.

**Mr. Young** stated that he agreed and that it would look better than having one eyebrow. He said the door at the bottom had the curve and it would not need to be done again.

**Mr. Johnson** asked about the function of the door.

**Mr. Young** stated that it was a paneled door and that it folds up. He said it was a wood door and was in character to the older doors in the alley. He said that it would remain closed most of the time so that a passerby would think it was two doors.

**Mr. Judson** asked if what the Board saw was what they would be looking at and not the previous drawing, and if it would not have an arch over the door.

**Mr. Young** answered yes. He said they could forgo the arch and he agreed that the arch made it look like one door.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated that the ordinance states that the garage door opening shall not exceed 12 feet in width. She said that if it was impossible to get the car into the garage she could understand a variance approval. A large percentage of the downtown population had to do two turns to get into the carriage houses.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Gay** stated that until they get a variance that the Board could not do much with the garage door with what they were proposing because it was not acceptable.

**Dr. Watkins** stated that they were looking for a Finding-of-Fact and then it would go to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**Dr. Henry** asked about the process because he thought they were coming to the Board for a variance.

**Dr. Watkins** stated that the Board did not grant variances. He said that the Board provided an opinion or a Finding-of-Fact, and then they would go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance. The Board was giving a statement on whether it was viewed as compatible.

Mr. Steffen stated that he agreed with Ms. Ramsay that when a Finding-of-Fact is made it was not based on issues such as functions or aesthetics but on historic compatibility. He said that from a historic compatibility standpoint that no one persuaded him that the 20-foot door was compatible with anything historic. His preference would be for them to come back with two 12-foot doors.

Ms. Seiler stated that she agreed with Mr. Steffen.

Mr. Callejas stated that they had another option if the Board would not approve a 20-foot garage door, in order to expedite the construction process, he would concede with two doors that were 12 feet wide.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if what was presented was sufficient.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was compatible and met the ordinance.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition to change the wall material to stucco and, as amended, for two 12-foot-wide garage doors. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Branson Design  
Clay Branson  
H-08-4069-2  
315 East Charlton Street  
PIN No. 2-0032-09-006  
Addition**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Clay Branson

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of an 18-foot deep two-story rear addition on the building at 315 East Charlton Street. The addition will not be visible from Charlton Street but will be seen from the lane. An existing carport at the lane will be demolished.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building at 315 East Charlton Street is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. The residence was constructed from 1852 to 1853 as a two and one-half-story double residence with each unit being approximately 15 feet wide. The property is zoned RIP-A-1 (Residential, Urban) and the following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<b>Development Standards:</b> Maximum 75 percent lot coverage in RIP-A-1.	The lot is 16.5’ wide by 100 feet deep. The proposed addition is 16.5’ wide by 18’ deep for a total building lot	The standard is met. The addition is large for the building; however, no carriage house is proposed. Letters stating no objection have been



	coverage of 61 percent.	submitted from immediate neighbors.
<b>Additions:</b> Additions shall be: located to the rear of the structure...and distinguishable from the existing structure; constructed with the least possible damage or obscuring character defining features, and; subordinate in height and mass.	The addition is on the rear and is proposed to be below the existing roof line. It will cover a non-historic one-story rear addition that currently exists.	Staff recommends approval as the addition will not be visible from Charlton Street and only visible from the lane.
<b>Windows and Doors:</b>	Window openings are 3’ wide by 5’ tall. Windows and doors are Kolbe & Kolbe Heritage Series Sterling Double Hung wood frame windows with true-divided lights.	Muntins should be no wider than 7/8”.
<b>Porches, Balconies, and Porticos:</b>	The rear entrance is elevated by three stairs with a powder-coated extruded aluminum hand rail.	Staff recommends approval.
<b>Roof Shape:</b>	A low slop shed roof is proposed to tie into the base of the existing side gable roof so as not to obscure the original roof line. It will be surfaced in standing seam metal.	Staff recommends approval. A metal drip edge should be used on the lane elevation.
<b>Materials:</b>	The lane facing wall will be brick to match the main residence. Side elevations will be stucco.	Staff recommends approval. The neighboring property to the east is stucco and the proposed wall will be facing their courtyard.
<b>Color:</b>	Brick and mortar will match the main residence.	Stucco color to be resubmitted to staff for final approval.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with stucco colors to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval.**

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if it had been ascertained that not more than 75 percent of the lot was covered.

**Ms. Ward** stated that he was covering only 61 percent of the parcel. She said that all of it was open and they provided measurements on the bottom of the drawing.

**Dr. Watkins** asked Mr. Branson how he felt Staff’s request for the resubmittal of corrected drawings.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Clay Branson (Branson Design)** stated that he did not have any objection. He said they would provide a stucco sample and color in an updated drawing providing a detail for the metal drip edge.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association)** stated that there were no expansion joints shown on the stucco wall and was wondering what the patterning would be. He said that the write up stated that the new roof would be below the existing roof line, but it would be above the roofline and the true roofline is not readable. He wondered if it should be dropped down so that it tucks under the edge of the roofline.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Judson** asked if the petitioner could address the expansion joints on the stucco wall.

**Mr. Branson** stated that it was difficult to read the pattern on the submitted drawing. He said they normally indicated expansion joints on the drawing and he agreed that he could not see them. He would provide a detail to the Staff.

They would have to go to a lower than normal ceiling to accommodate the roofline. He said that they propose a one-half in twelve pitch to tie it into the existing roof and come in underneath the dormer. He would provide a drawing to show the site line from an average person’s height from the lane, but you would not be able to tell whether it was one-foot or two lower from the lane.

**Ms. Ward** stated that Mr. Stuebe was correct that it came over the roofline, and it was a mistake in the Staff report. She said that it was up to the Board to determine if it was visually compatible and Staff would be alright with it because it was minimally visible from the lane and hard to detect from the right-of-way.

**Dr. Henry** asked about the expansion joints.

**Ms. Ward** stated that it was fine if they submitted the detail to Staff for approval.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that her concern was the size of the courtyard and if the neighbors had said that it was alright.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the stucco color and detail of drip edge be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Clay Branson  
H-08-4076-2  
514 & 516 East Hall Street  
PIN No. 2-0033-10-010  
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Clay Branson.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations and a rear addition on the double cottage at 514-516 East Hall Street as follows:

**Alterations:**

1. Remove the asphalt shingle exterior material and repair wood lap siding beneath. Replace as needed with wood siding to match.
2. Replace non-historic concrete block porch with two entrance stoops for each residence.
3. Remove metal covering from foundation and repair brick piers and install brick lattice infill.
4. Rebuilt window trim and replace two double windows with a single window on the front elevation. New windows in the addition will match the existing windows in the historic building (i.e. wood frame, single glazed, true-divided lights).
5. Replace metal roof with asphalt shingles.

**Addition:**

A one-story rear addition connected by a hyphen is proposed to replace the existing series of non-historic one-story additions on the rear. The new addition will feature a side gable roof connected to the main structure by a front gable/hip with a wood frame porch on the rear. The initial connection is recessed two feet from the sides of the main building. It will be clad in wood siding. No new windows are proposed in the side elevations of the addition. The rear porch is 4' deep by 18.5' wide with 6' by 6' square wood posts with wood railings on a wood floor/base with wood stairs. Proposed windows and French doors are wood simulated divided light manufactured by Avalon.

**FINDINGS:**

The double cottage at 514-516 East Hall Street was constructed in 1883 and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. Over time, unsympathetic modifications to the building (asphalt roll exterior and concrete block porch) have altered the original appearance. The applicant seeks to restore the building and provide additional space in the rear. The intent is to retain as much historic fabric as possible and restore existing siding and windows. It is unclear, however, what exists beneath the existing exterior surface with regard to the siding and the foundations. In addition, it is unclear what will need to be replaced or what can be repaired specifically regarding the siding and the windows.

The properties are zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density) and the following standards apply:

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Development Standards:</b> Maximum 75 percent lot coverage in RIP-A.</p>	<p>The lot is 53.4’ wide by 89.5’ feet deep. The proposed addition and the existing building will be 2,695 square feet for a total building lot coverage of 56 percent.</p>	<p>The standard is met. The addition is large for the building; however, the change in roof shape and connection through a modified gable roof is subordinate to the main structure and distinguishable as an addition.</p>
<p><b>Additions:</b> Additions shall be: located to the rear of the structure...and distinguishable from the existing structure; constructed with the least possible damage or obscuring character defining features, designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building and; subordinate in height and mass.</p>	<p>The addition is on the rear of the building and is proposed to be below the existing roof line and steps in 2’ at the initial point of contact. It will replace existing additions which currently obscure the rear of the building.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p><b>Windows and Doors:</b> Historic windows, frames, sashes, and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented that they have deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement windows shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material.</p>	<p>Existing window openings will be maintained and new headers, surrounds, and sills will be constructed where missing. A pair of double windows within the porch will be altered to be independent openings.</p> <p>Specifications for new French doors in the addition are proposed for Avalon simulated divided light wood frame double-hung windows.</p>	<p>All historic windows must be retained and preserved where possible. Replacement windows on the historic building must replicate the original historic windows (wood, true-divided-light, single pane glass).</p> <p>The rear windows and doors will be minimally visible with a porch addition. Windows in the addition will match the existing windows in the front/historic portion of the building (wood, true-divided-light, single-glazed).</p>
<p><b>Porches, balconies, porticos:</b> Stoop piers and base walls shall be the same material as the foundation wall facing the street. Infill between foundation piers shall be recessed so that the piers are expressed. Front stairs...shall be constructed of brick, wood, etc... Wood portico posts shall have a cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch</p>	<p>The non-historic continuous porch will be replaced with two separate stoop entrances. They feature a wood base and stair on brick piers with 6” by 6” square wood posts with a 1” base and a wrapped cap with and a 3’ tall wood railing. It will be covered by a shed roof surfaced in asphalt shingles.</p> <p>A 4’ deep 18.5’ wide rear porch is proposed with the</p>	<p>A fascia or beam should be exposed and located above the column posts below the shed roof. The columns should feature a traditional capital that projects forward of the fascia or beam.</p>

<p>architrave. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between balusters shall not exceed 4". For one and two family dwellings the height of the railing shall not exceed 36".</p>	<p>same details.</p>	
<p><b>Roof:</b></p>	<p>A complex gable roof addition is proposed to the rear of the building to break up the mass of the addition and respect the original roofline and pitch. The existing metal V-crimp roof will be replaced with fiberglass asphalt shingles.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p><b>Materials:</b></p>	<p>Wood siding with corner boards and trim around openings is proposed for the entire exterior of the building.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Any historic siding that can be salvaged should be preserved and matched on the original part of the building.</p>
<p><b>Color:</b></p>	<p>Siding: Ivory Tower Trim: Blanched Pine Roof: Cedar Blend</p>	<p>Approval</p>

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with the condition that the porch details be resubmitted to Staff for final approval and if it is found that much of the historic fabric cannot be preserved, the applicant must consult with Staff before the materials are removed.**

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the kitchens were in the middle of the house.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Clay Branson (Branson Design)** stated that the proposed kitchen would be in the middle of the house so that the breakfast area could be eliminated by the light and the glass.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if the exhaust would go straight up and out.

**Mr. Branson** answered yes. He said it would go up and out.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if each house would have a single bath so they would have to go all the way down the hall past the kitchen to the bath.

**Mr. Branson** answered yes. He said that the intention was to leave the original structure unaltered and it was the existing bedrooms with existing windows. To keep from altering the existing structure they decided to put them back.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if it was originally one house or was always two houses.

Mr. Branson answered yes, that it was always two houses. He said that it was the owner's childhood home and it was his intent to restore it with a modern kitchen.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the porch details be resubmitted to Staff for final approval, and if it is found that much of the historic fabric cannot be preserved, the applicant must consult with Staff before the materials are removed. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and the motion passed 8 to 1. Mr. Law was not present.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects  
Patrick Shay  
H-08-4084-2  
423 East River Street  
PIN No. 2-0004-12-004  
Rehabilitation/Alteration/Awning**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the building at 423 East River Street, comprising of four storefront/commercial spaces on River Street and five storefront/commercial spaces on upper floors fronting Factor's Walk as stated below:

1. Replace existing non-historic metal windows and sliding glass doors. Doors will be replaced with wood clad windows and doors by Weathershield. Replacement windows are to be one-over-one, single-glazed, double-hung sash, wood frame windows.
2. Installation of a two-story metal frame storefront at the western most entrance for access to the upper floors. It is comprised of tubular steel beams surrounding an aluminum YKK storefront system with sliding glass doors on the ground floor. It will be flat plate, ground smooth and painted.
3. Installation of a new ground floor entrance to the east of the proposed storefront where a window opening currently exists. Metal clad warehouse doors are proposed on either side of the entry with an awning above.
4. The non-historic rolled asphalt roofing is to be replaced with a standing seam metal roof with a metal gutter on the slope edge. A metal cap and flashing will be installed on the existing parapet at the sides.
5. Eleven condenser units are proposed to be installed on the north slope of the roof.
6. Install an elevator dormer above the new storefront.

7. New canvas awnings are proposed over the upper floor door openings fronting River Street to be striped in ICI “Tinder Box” cinnamon red and “Swiss Coffee” creamy white.
8. Existing stucco to be repaired, cleaned, and painted.
9. The proposed color changes are as follows:
  - a. Stucco: ICI “Moonstruck” bright yellow ochre
  - b. Clad doors, windows, storefront, aluminum railings, metal shutters and trim: ICI “Grapevine Wreath” chocolate brown.
  - c. Roof, gutters, downspouts, sliding doors in storefront: “Swiss Coffee” creamy white.
10. Signs are indicated on the drawings but are stated to be resubmitted for approval at a later date.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building located at 423 East River Street is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. Also referred to as 402-410 East Bay Street, this building was constructed in 1835 as a warehouse, occupied by Dixie Oil Company in 1898 (Sanborn Fire Insurance Map). The building has undergone non-historic alterations overtime including roof, window, and door replacements. The following standards apply:

**Windows.** Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material. Double-glazed windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building.

*The standard is met. While the original design of the windows is not known, the original windows would have been single-glazed wood frame windows. Staff recommends approval of the one-over-one design.*

**Utilities and Refuse.** HVAC units shall be screened from the public right-of-way.

*Staff recommends approval. The units should be minimally visible from River Street only provided that the size of the units is minimal.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with the following to be submitted to Staff for final approval:**

1. Provide dimensions for condenser units; and
2. Provide swatches for awning material and color.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay)** stated that they agreed with Staff and would agree to change the windows that were proposed as clad windows to be wood-framed single-glazed windows.

**Mr. Judson** stated that he visited the site and wasn't clear on the flow inside of the building pertaining to the two-story entrance. He wondered if the elevator was to access the only adjacent unit or would it provide access to the central hall.

**Mr. Shay** answered yes. He said that the elevator would come up to the second floor and they would place a corridor along the north side of the building so they could divide it into five retail bays. The owner did not know how it would be parsed out and it might be one retail tenant from end-to-end and was why they have not proposed what the treatments would be on the Factors Walk level. Depending on the disposition of the tenants, it might affect what the look is.

**Mr. Judson** asked if the intent was to gain access to the second floor.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the idea was to draw the people off the narrow sidewalk on River Street across from the flea market up into the upper levels of the building making them rentable.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation - HSF/Architectural Review Committee – ARC)** stated that all of the buildings on River Street were important historic resources that represent Savannah's unique and varied industrial history. She said that River Street had undergone a vast transformation from the cotton trading times and the changes made to the warehouse buildings along the corridor have been made to promote the shift from industrial to commercial for Savannah's blossoming tourist industry. Some changes have not been sensitive to the historic integrity of the buildings and that 423 River Street had undergone non-historic modifications since 1835 from warehouse to retail and residential space. The existing metal windows, balconies, and storefronts were not original, but along the full River Street façade of the structure, the rhythm and scale was consistent. The proposed changes to the western bay of the building shatter the consistency by creating an oversized glass storefront on the first and second floor where none currently exists. Historic Savannah Foundation did not feel that the break in the rhythm of solids-to-voids was appropriate. The buildings on River Street should be held to the same standard that was in any part of the landmark district and if non-conforming changes were made to only one portion of a two-family row house, the effect would be chaotic as was seen on Oglethorpe Avenue. They wanted to encourage the petitioner to take into account the existing rhythm of the rest of the building and a restudy of the storefront because they feel that the project violates visual compatibility factors C, D, F, G, H, and J as stated in the Historic District Ordinance Section 8-3030.

**Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association – DNA)** stated that the Historic District Ordinance provided that replacement windows in historic buildings should replicate the original historic windows in composition, design, and material. He said that the proposed 1/1 windows do not replicate original windows in design since 1/1 windows did not exist in 1835. The 6/6 true divided light wooden single-glazed windows that existed in 1835 should be installed instead of the 1/1 windows.



An elevator dormer was proposed over the new storefront and would be used as signage shown on the drawing A5. He said the elevator dormer was not necessary as a proposed hydraulic elevator was shown in the drawing in A6, and that it did not go higher than the roofline. The dormer violates the original profile of the roofline and should not be permitted. Metal clad warehouse doors were shown to the left of the proposed new storefront and entry, and details were not provided for the design of the doors or the surrounding area. Detail drawings should be submitted prior to approval of the project. On a prior project they looked at the detail on a porch and the entablature was not correct with the posts, and there was nothing at all to see if this aspect of the project conforms to what should be there.

The ordinance further provided that the HVAC unit should be screened by the public right-of-way, the submitted drawings did not dimension the size of the HVAC units, and they did not show how they would be from the public right-of-way.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she agreed with the HSF that it interrupts the flow of the rhythm of the solids-to-voids for an elevator lobby and there did not appear to be a good reason for taking out a part of the historic structure and replace it with a two-story storefront.

**Dr. Henry** stated that they both raised some serious concerns and asked if Staff agreed.

**Ms. Ward** stated that Staff agreed that they had raised some serious concerns and was unable to find any historic documentation of what the building originally looked like for the windows and the fenestration pattern. She said it was hard for Staff to say that it was a consistent rhythm that existed now and doubted that there were door opening on the second floor.

**Dr. Henry** stated that they did not make 1/1 windows in 1835.

**Ms. Ward** stated that it was true but she did not have any historic documentation and that it had lost a lot of historic fabric.

**Dr. Henry** asked if Staff was not sure that there were any windows.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she was not sure.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the reason for the glass opening was so that it would be an elevator with the glass front so that passersby could see that there was a way to the second floor. He said that the problem now was that the second floor of these buildings was not visible and not well understood that it was part of the building. They wanted to make it obvious, and that they would reinforce it with the design of the interior of the space.

Because they did not know what the tenant composition would be for the upper floor, it wasn't possible to present the exact size of the mechanical units. They did not have a problem coming back when the details are known and they would submit drawings at that time to demonstrate that they were either not visible or screened. His original instinct was to put the mechanical units on the other side of the building, but on that side you were looking at that building at grade because at Emmett Park it was a full story higher than the building. To the east and west were properties that were littered with huge mechanical units. He said that there was a unit there that could not be seen.

He brought an earlier petition to add two-stories on one side and one-story on the other side of the existing building. The people who owned the building became disheartened and decided to sell it and the current owner wanted to leave the building as it was but the masonry on the inside was so adulterated that it was mostly modern masonry. The building was damaged by fire twice, the slab on the floor was a concrete slab that was poured over fire-damaged wood joists, and the structure was converted from timber joists to steel. There was very little historic fabric to work with in restoring or renovating the building. It was problematic to say that 1/1 windows did not exist in 1835, he was not convinced that the present windows were in the same places or were the same sizes they might have been in 1835, especially since they were framed in with new concrete masonry on the inside.

He said that there was wisdom in trying to go back to what historic construction might have looked like, and if the Board felt strongly about the 6/6 true divided light windows with wood frames, he did not think that the client would have a problem with it. It appeared to add more to the hodge-podge appearance because the other openings were sliding glass doors and they were proposing those be replaced with swing doors so that the building would have a consistent look. You could say there was a rhythm there but if you look at the elevation there was no discernable rhythm because the window openings were cut into the building to accommodate residential apartments on the second floor that had no bearing to the four bays of the original building on the ground floor. The openings were added in order to accommodate the residential construction put in approximately in the 1950's and he guessed that they were in the general locations of the original windows.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that her objection to the two-story storefront was that it was a big square space in a vertical building and it was jarring to her.

**Mr. Steffen** asked why they would glass it in at all. He asked why not just leave it open.

**Mr. Shay** stated that because on the inside they want to use imaginative lighting and if it wasn't glazed then the Board would be able to vote on it.

**Mr. Gay** stated that what currently existed was very unattractive now and that the changes didn't seem to be improving it very much. He said it was not an exciting project.

**Mr. Law** stated that he was recently in an elevator and you could see out and wondered if it was the same type of elevator.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it was similar. He said they weren't looking at an elevator that had glass doors but one with a glass wall that the doors were in so that when it rose and set you would see the equipment on the inside. It would be transparent to see how the elevator moved up and down in the shaft.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she understood what they were doing but did not see a modern working elevator. She said she could see the whimsical idea of trying to draw people and it would be fun to see, but she did not see it in a historic setting on River Street. She was also one who voted against the flea market on River Street because she did not see it as the proper setting. She agreed with Mr. Gay that it was not an attractive building now and she did not see how it would improve, but rather that it would stick out like a sore thumb. With a historic building she did not want to see a clear glass elevator that showed the grooves. She said that the elevator by the Hyatt looked awful because it was always dirty, had fingerprints all over it, and the last things she wanted to see was another gross elevator.

**Dr. Henry** stated that he understood that Mr. Shay was not under constraint to make it rhythmic with the street and that there was no historic standard. He asked what was wrong with doing it any way.

**Mr. Shay** stated that if he had a magic wand and a budget that was unlimited he would blow up the whole wall and start over again. He said he had a client that wanted to make a sow's ear a little bit less.

**Dr. Henry** asked if they were planning to change any window openings.

**Mr. Shay** answered no, the window openings would remain where they were.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she did not think that the Board was excited about it and didn't know what to tell him.

**Dr. Watkins** asked if there was a motion since the sentiment was going in the other direction, a commentary from another view, or a motion to go another way.

**Dr. Henry** stated that philosophically that it was unfair to put extra expense on someone for something that was already there, that there was no precedent, but that he did not like it either. He said that Mr. Shay brought forth a building a couple of months ago that he felt would have been appropriated to have had changes to it because the Board had some idea of the building and area. This was not in that category.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that if the desire of the people back in the late 1800's was to draw people to the second floor for retail reasons, and he could have imagined that it could have been the case, they would want to draw attention to people with activity taking place on the second floor, and maybe do it with a large opening with the use of windows to see in. What would be seen would be something different than what the Board was looking at. The logical progression to that thought takes the Board up against the American Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines because they were looking at the situation where you have to get people to the second floor who cannot walk the stairs. The elevators back then were primitive to what we have today. He thought there might be a solution, but that he wasn't seeing it yet. He thought there should be a way to open it up enough to allow people to know that there was activity on the second floor and to be open so that what you see did not compete with the historic character of the area. He said they might not be there yet, but it seemed that there was a way to open it up and see it without seeing something boldly modern in the middle of the facade.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she agreed with Mr. Steffen.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that there was an issue raised about the type of elevator and that it might not need the overrun and the dormer. She asked Mr. Shay to address the mechanics of it.

**Mr. Shay** stated that until they get the actual manufacturer that he could not answer the question. He said that you have to have overrun space above the top of the shaft in the elevator.

**Ms. Reiter** asked even if it was the smaller hydraulic type.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the reason was that if someone was repairing the elevator, standing on the top, and someone made the elevator go to the top level, that was why there was an overrun at the top.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Dixie Oil Company was there in 1898 from the Sanborn maps. They did not know what was there before or after, but if it was used in 1898 then consider what someone would have done to the space in 1898 to invite people to the second floor. He said it might be a different type of elevator.

**Mr. Shay** stated that with all due respect that the Board did not have jurisdiction over what was on the inside of the building period. He said that once it was on the inside of the building, even if it could be seen, but as a Board they did not have the opportunity to restrict what happened on the inside of the building.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the purpose of this change was to draw people to the inside of the building and that was why he was offering it as a thought. He said that Mr. Shay was right that the Board did not have jurisdiction over what happened inside, but some of the objection raised was because of the nature of the changes being made.

**Mr. Shay** stated that if it made a difference and they did not like the idea of seeing the elevator cab going up and down that it was fine. He said they would make the elevator shaft opaque, then you will only see the doors open and close. There was also a monumental stair inside so that you would visually see that the stairs connect the first to the second floor, and it probably would have been the way it was done in 1835 or 1898.

**Mr. Judson** stated that it wasn't so much what the elevator looked like inside, but his concern was the large, rectangular opening of glass on the outside of the building. He said that his initial reaction was that anything would be an improvement, but the treatment was a very prominent break in the façade of the building that could be treated in some other way and still have the function of drawing people into the building. It was too much glass on a solid wall.

**Dr. Watkins** stated that there were six different members who expressed a lack of support for the current direction, and he said they could leave it open for a continued request from the applicant to do a restudy and get back with Staff, or entertain a motion to go either way.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the primary objection was the big glass unit in the middle and the elevator.

**Mr. Gay** stated it wasn't the elevator, but the massive entrance.

**Mr. Judson** stated that it was not in the middle, but at the west end of the building.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that they needed to ask the applicant if he wanted to request a continuance.

**Mr. Shay** stated that regarding the feedback that he had heard today, he would ask for a continuance to the next meeting.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve a continuance of the petition to the January 14, 2009, meeting at the petitioner's request. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Newfield Construction  
Lou Thomann  
H-08-4085-2  
312 East Charlton Street  
PIN No. 2-0032-03-001  
New Construction/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Lou Thomann.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to add a roof deck with one-story enclosed room.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The deck includes conditioned inhabitable space and thus meets the definition of a story.
2. The addition will be located on the western half of the roof between the main gable and existing chimneys. (See sheet ST-1.0).
3. If the deck is visible at all it will be possibly visible from East Macon Street.
4. The one-story enclosure will have HardiPlank siding stained to resemble aged Cedar.
5. The windows and French doors will be custom built wood.
6. The deck will have a three foot high railing with 4 by 4 wood posts and horizontal steel cable railing.
7. A 7'-1" tall trellis will be built over a portion of the deck stained to match aged cedar.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval**

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the Board was not provided with a site plan with the property lines and she was unable to determine if there was a property line dividing the two buildings.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that it was all one building. She said that it was one condominium building and that the petitioner owned the condominiums on both sides of the deck.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she was concerned about the property lines and the windows on the property lines. She asked if it was supported on the existing roof and sat on top of the existing roof.

**PETITIONERS COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Dan Reel (Reel and Company)** stated that it would be supported by the roof framing, and that they were bringing it all of the way down onto the existing load-bearing walls.

**Ms. Seiler** asked what the purpose was for the request.

**Mr. Grikitis (Owner of the Property)** stated that it was a roof deck and entertaining area on the roof.

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

**RE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS**

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects  
Patrick Shay  
H-06-3711-2  
217 West Liberty Street  
PIN No. 2-0031-16-006  
One-Year Extension for New Construction**

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for a one-year extension of a mixed-use office and condominium building at 217 West Liberty Street. The original decision was approved by the Historic Board of Review on January 9, 2008, and is set to expire next month. Demolition of the existing non-historic structure and Part I Height and Mass were approved February 14, 2007.

**FINDINGS:**

**Demolition:**

The property at 217 West Liberty Street is not listed as a rated structure within Savannah's National Landmark Historic District. The two-story commercial building lies on two individual parcels. The smaller lot to the west contains a portion (approx. 1/3) of the overall building, and appears to predate the newer portion to the west. Neither are historic. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps indicate that the portion to the west may be over 50 years old; however, subsequent alterations have resulted in a loss of historic integrity. Sanborn maps reveal that the building to the west, and most likely the alterations on the portion to the east, was constructed sometime after 1973 and, therefore, is not 50 years of age. As such, the existing building at 217 West Liberty Street does not appear to possess any historical significance that would qualify it for inclusion as a contributing building within the Landmark Historic District.

**New Construction:**

The parcels at 217 West Liberty Street are zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). A recombination subdivision plat will need to be filed and recorded prior to issuance of a building permit. The Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance from the lot area standards to allow for 28 condominium units within the building. According to the applicant, the City Zoning Administrator has determined that this project does not require a variance from the lot coverage requirements.

**The following Part I standards apply:**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p><b>Development Standards:</b> No setbacks are required in RIP-A zone. Maximum lot coverage is 75 percent.</p>	<p>The building will have a 0' front yard setback on Tattnall and Liberty Streets, with an approx. 26'-8" wide 12' deep recess in the center portion of the building fronting Liberty. 10' and 11'-8" setbacks are proposed on the east and south sides of the property.</p> <p>Combined the parcels are 99'-8" deep by 121'-10" (12,142.7 square feet). Prior to revisions, The building is approximately 9,841 for a lot coverage of 81 percent.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p> <p>The City Zoning Administrator determined that the project as proposed does not require a lot coverage variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.</p>
<p><b>Street Elevation Type:</b> A proposed building located on an east-west through street shall utilize a historic building street elevation type fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward.</p>	<p>Five-story condominium building.</p>	<p>Brown Ward, adjacent to the east, contains the historic DeRenne Apartment building also on Liberty Street which is a similar building type. Boulevards, such as Liberty Street, are wider and can better manage larger buildings. Pulaski Ward contains a couple of apartment-type buildings including the SCAD owned Pulaski House and the building at 339 Whitaker Street. These are not, however, five stories and are modest sized in comparison due to the differences in the size of the parcels. Four-story buildings within the ward are typically townhouse buildings approx. 20'-30' wide with elevated entrances and stairs projecting forward of the building plane.</p>
<p><b>Entrances:</b></p>	<p>A ground floor central entrance is located on the Liberty Street elevation. This</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The central recessed entrances help to reduce the overall massing of the</p>

	<p>elevation spans 111'-8". An elevated central entrance is located on Tattall Street, which spans 99'-8".</p>	<p>building and divide it into proportional bays. This configuration is similar to other historic apartment-type buildings in the historic district.</p>
<p><b>Building Height:</b> Five-story maximum height zone. A crawl space or partial basement that is 4' or less above grade shall not count as a story. <u>Residential Buildings:</u> First floor shall not be less than 11'; each story above shall not be less than 10'.</p>	<p>The proposed building is five stories with a 3'-6" elevated basement level for underground parking. The overall building height is approx. 60' to the top of the parapet. A 36' deep by 31' wide portion of the building facing Tattall Street is four stories tall for a height of 49'-6". Proposed floor heights: 3'-6" partial basement; 11' first floor; 10'-6" second, third, fourth, and fifth floors with a 4' parapet and finials above.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Neighboring historic buildings are approximately 24' to 42'-8" tall.</p>
<p><b>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development:</b></p>	<p>The building is divided into bays by groupings of windows, projecting bay windows, and use of balconies of approximately 17' to 24' wide. A flat roof with a parapet is proposed.</p> <p>The widest continuous wall plane is 34'. Varying heights are incorporated into the Tattall Street Elevation of four and five stories. Decorative parapets and changes in the cornice create small variations in height along Liberty Street.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The petitioner has explored a wider window bay to meet the standard as Staff previously recommended.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p><b>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:</b></p>	<p>Liberty: The 111'-8" wide 60' tall building is divided into three distinct bays with a 26'-8" wide central recessed entrance and balconies above. The bays on either side are 42'-6" wide with projecting bay windows in the center.</p> <p>Tattall: The 99'-8" wide 49' to 60' tall façade is also</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Historic buildings within Pulaski Ward are generally divided into units of 20' to 30' in width and are up to four stories in height.</p>



	divided into three bays with a 31'-8" wide central recessed entrance. The bays on either side are 34' wide.	
<b>Proportion of Openings:</b>	<p>Entrances: The ground floor entrance opening on Liberty Street is approx. 11' wide and extends 16'. The opening on Tattall St. is approx. 12' wide and 18' tall.</p> <p>Window openings are both paired and independent of one another, with a 3:6 ratio of width-to-height. Those on the ground floor feature transoms, creating a taller window. Projecting bays within the side bays on both facades contain paired multi-paned windows with a 4:7 ratio.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval of the typical opening size and bay windows. The elongated ground floor openings are a good transition to the upper floors.</p>
<b>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</b>	There is approximately 5' or less of solid between window openings on primary facades	Staff recommends approval. The use of window openings and projecting bay windows divides the facades into bays and helps reduce the overall mass.
<b>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</b>	The proposed building maintains approx. 18' of open space between it and the historic structure to the east. The neighboring 3.5-story historic duplex fronts Liberty Street and maintains a 0' front yard setback with an entrance porch encroaching on the sidewalk. The building across the lane is a two-story carriage house that is setback from the sidewalk. The proposed building steps down in height to four stories at the lane.	Staff recommends approval. Historically, buildings within the ward were adjacent to one another with small amounts of open space between the structures which typically maintained a courtyard in the rear and a carriage house beyond.
<b>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, and Balconies:</b>	Entrances are within a central bay on both the Liberty and Tattall St. facades. Each are recessed about 4' to 12'. The Tattall Street façade features a raised entrance with stairs projecting forward of the building plane. The Liberty	<p>Staff recommends approval. The petitioner has created a larger recessed entrance to help break up the façade and be more typical of historic U-shaped apartment buildings of this size.</p> <p>Staff recommends approval.</p>

	<p>Street façade entrance is accessed at grade.</p> <p>Residential units above feature balconies and bay window projections. They project approx. 3’ and are approx. 8’ and 12’ wide. Four-story bay windows project approx. 2’ from the face of the building.</p>	
<p><b>Walls of Continuity:</b></p>	<p>Setbacks along the street are consistent with neighboring historic structures. A partial coping wall has been incorporated into the Liberty Street elevation at the recessed entry to create a wall of continuity at the street. A brick fence is indicated on the site plan on the east and south sides of the property to provide privacy to the owners and screen trash from the lane.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Verify treatment of electric meters along Liberty Street.</p>
<p><b>Scale:</b></p>	<p>The scale of surrounding historic buildings are 2 to 3.5-story residences. They are typically 20’ to 30’ wide, both paired and individual buildings.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The scale of the proposed building is much larger than the surrounding historic buildings. Non-historic buildings, like the Civic Center and Liberty Street parking garage, have changed the scale of the area by their height and footprint size. The building should look toward historic precedent for large structures in the area. Typically, apartment buildings within the historic district featured a U-Shaped plan to help break up the mass of the building at the street and provide an interior semi-private courtyard for the residents.</p>

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Windows and Doors:</b>	<p>Weathershield double-hung and Crittall steel windows with fixed light. The Weathershield windows are the Life Guard model wood clad double-hung windows with historic grid profiles, muntin width 7/8 inches with spacer bar.</p> <p>Cast stone headers and brick sills the color of the cast stone headers (pecan) are proposed. The windows will be recessed a minimum of three inches.</p> <p>The solid entry doors will be wood painted Forest Black. 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.</p>	<p>The windows are visually compatible. The Crittall window system is a solid steel window system which is located within the multi-paned bays. This window material is visually compatible for a window of this type which is more contemporary in design and resembles a more industrial look which historically featured solid metal windows.</p>
<b>Roof Shape:</b>	<p>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</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
<b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, and Porches:</b>	<p>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”.</p> <p>The steps on the Tattnall Street side are cast-in-place concrete and the posts are ornamental cast stone.</p>	<p>The stairs and balconies are compatible.</p>
<b>Fences:</b>	<p>A solid 7'-7" brick fence broken into bays with piers is proposed for the east and lane</p>	<p>The fence encloses the service area.</p>

	elevations, and a portion of the Liberty Street elevation. Part of this wall on the lane encloses a service yard with two metal doors.	
<b>Materials:</b>	<p><b>Brick Body:</b> Carolina Brown wirecut 420 with Polyblend “Light Smoke” mortar.</p> <p><b>Cast stone Base:</b> Arriscraft “Pecan” with a band course separating the body from the base.</p> <p><b>Wood Cornice and Brackets</b></p> <p><b>Stucco</b> on window bays with metal coping; elevator penthouse.</p>	Staff recommends erecting a sample panel to include the brick, cast stone/stucco, and cornice detail prior to installation of these materials.
<b>Color:</b>	<p><b>Stucco:</b> Match Arriscraft “Pecan”; Match brick on elevator penthouse.</p> <p><b>Windows, columns, and trim:</b> ICI Almond Wisp</p> <p><b>Metalwork:</b> ICI Forest Black.</p>	The colors are compatible.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval for a one-year extension to expire on January 9, 2010, for demolition of the existing building and new construction with the condition that a sample panel containing the proposed brick, Arriscraft or stucco, and cornice detail to be erected and reviewed by Staff prior to installation.**

Mr. Gay asked if the Board did not grant the extension did they have to start over.

Ms. Ward stated that the Board was required to grant the extension unless there was a change in the design or the ordinance. She said that she was just walking the Board through because she was not sure that everyone was present when the project was originally approved.

Mr. Gay stated that if the Board did not have an option what were they debating.

Ms. Seiler asked if the petition was in litigation.

Mr. Ward stated that the City had an outstanding suit and she was not sure how it was resolved. She said that it wasn't the actual project that was under suit, but the ordinance and the language in the ordinance that was under litigation.

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the request for a one-year extension for the demolition and new construction to expire on January 9, 2010, with the condition that a sample panel containing the proposed brick, Arriscraft or stucco, and cornice detail to be erected and reviewed by Staff prior to installation. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the authority of requiring a one-year approval on anything was part of the Savannah regulations or of something bigger.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that it was a policy that the Board adopted.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if it was statutory with the City ordinance.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that she did not believe that it was in the ordinance now but was being drafted in the Unified Zoning Ordinance.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that assuming that it was not in the ordinance that he would suggest that approvals last for two years instead of one. He said that the Board was entering into a time where they would get one every meeting if not more because money was being pulled from projects, condominiums, hotels, development, and people would be sitting on their money. It would not change for another year or so and the Board would be wasting a lot of their valuable time granting extensions for people when it was simply a case of not having the money right now. He suggested that the Board have the authority assuming it was not in the City code.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that as long as nothing changed.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he wouldn't change the standards, but the approvals should be for two years instead of one because a lot of people would be coming back.

**Mr. Gay and Ms. Ramsay** stated that the Board did not have an option any way.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board did and that the Board did not grant it for whatever reason.

**Mr. Judson** stated that the point was that if the Board had to grant it every time when there was a number of extensions, then it was a waste of time.

**Mr. Gay** stated that only if they explain the whole project again instead of just saying that the petitioner wanted an extension and then give it to them. He said there would not be any changes and nothing to discuss.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that on the last item that what Staff was saying about the Board approving it was that if nothing had changed, then why deny it. He said that there would be a written response on whether the Board could, and that he understood about making it a two-year extension. The timeframe for Historic District Ordinance revisions was before April 1<sup>st</sup>, and the major change was for large-scale development. He preferred that if there were any large-scale development that come in for renewal that the new ordinance be in place and there would be an opportunity to look at the plans if it had not been developed yet.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that if they changed the rules that they could only change them prospectively and they could not go back and change them for people who had been given a one-year permission to build, change, or whatever. He said that he was suggestion that when the Board granted new projects from today forward, that they be granted for two years as opposed to one.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that if it would be the renewals that came in.

**Mr. Steffen** said that was right. He said that the ones that come back would still be under the existing ordinance.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that if a renewal came in that was a large-scale development the Board could say no and ask them to go back and restudy it or give the Board an option.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that when someone comes in and says they want approval to build a project and the Board grants it, the Board was granting the approval for one-year. He said that it should be for a longer period.

**Ms. Reiter** asked if they wanted to extend it for two years.

**Mr. Steffen** answered yes.

**Mr. Gay** asked that if nothing had changed and the Board approved it the first time then why wasn't the Board approving it now. He said that a year had passed, they had one year to do what they were supposed to do, they did not do it, things had changed, and with this particular project it was very contentious. A year later the Board should be able to change their mind, and he was being told that they could not say it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it was a separate issue.

**Mr. Judson** stated that a lot of it hinged on Staff researching from the statute and it could be discussed when it came up as New Business.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that his point was why waste time if they don't have to.

#### **RE: STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of Coastal Heritage Society  
H-07-3929(S)-2  
303 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
2. Petition of Wayne Gierke  
H-08-4075(S)-2  
116 East Oglethorpe Avenue  
Awning/Windows/Doors  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
3. Petition of Deanworks Restoration  
H-08-4078(S)-2  
W. Dean Reuther  
416 Habersham Street  
Fence  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

4. Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects  
Bill Cox  
H-08-4082(S)-2  
201 West Bay Street  
Windows/Doors  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

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

**Ms. Seiler** asked about the status of the Habersham Street building.

**Mr. Gay** answered that nothing was happening. He said that it was still the same.

**Dr. Henry** stated that he did not understand it because they came with a court order saying that they had to start construction and they have not done anything.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she goes by and that nothing had changed.

**Mr. Petrea** stated that it was still being worked on, that he had spoke with the Zoning Administrator today and was informed that the Inspector responsible for that project would be asked about the status. He said that there should be a response tomorrow.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she was not present last month and it was taken up one month prior to that. She said that she keeps watching, but nothing had changed.

**Dr. Henry** stated that it had been three months.

**RE: NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND  
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. Unfinished Business
- b. New Business

**Nominating Committee**

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

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she would be glad to serve, but that she had served a year past her time and she would like January to be her last meeting.

**Dr. Watkins** stated that Ms. Ramsay, Mr. Gay, and Dr. Henry have agreed to serve as the Nominating Committee.

**Ms. Reiter** spoke with Ms. Tanet Taharka from the Clerk of the Council's office and she hoped that City Council would be recommending members on December 18<sup>th</sup>. She said that if Council did not recommend members she hoped that Dr. Watkins could talk with the Mayor, because it had been one year.

**Dr. Watkins** asked if the Council was considering anyone.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that there were names because Staff hand carried them over to the City. She said that Mr. Hutchinson's term would be up for renewal in January, that it was not working, and they needed to have it done in a timely manner.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that there were individual Council members that were vetoing names. He said that was part of what was happening and that it was not fault of the whole Council but individual Council members because they did not like a person.

**Ms. Seiler** asked whether it had to be 100 percent approval.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it did not have to be, but it was a courtesy they gave one another. He said that they don't appoint someone when a Council member had a strong objection to it and some were exercising that prerogative.

**Mr. Judson** asked if the Nominating Committee was nominating new members or the Chair and Vice-Chair

**Ms. Seiler** stated that it would be a Chair and Vice-Chair.

**Mr. Thomson** stated that it would be helpful to get a meeting with the Mayor ahead of the December 18<sup>th</sup> meeting because it would be the last Council meeting for the year. He said they spoke with Mr. Jon Todd, the MPC Chairman, about appointments, but they focused on the MPC Board in terms of process and not names. Mr. Todd stated that it was difficult to get lists, but did not mention vetoes. If there was anyone on the Board who wanted to be reappointed that it was a good idea to submit an application.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that there was not an actual veto. He said that if one of the Board members said that they absolutely could not have a certain person for whatever reason, that other Board members would find a way to accommodate him.

**Ms. Ward** stated that there were Historic Preservation calendars for 2009 for Board members with County and City resources listed. She said it was offered as a gift, but they were also for sale for five dollars if anyone wanted to give them as a Christmas gift.



**RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS  
MEETING – October 8, 2008 and November 12, 2008**

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

**RE: ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

**BR/jnp**