

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

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

July 9, 2008

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

**Dr. Malik Watkins, Chairman
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Gene Hutchinson
Richard Law, Sr.
Eric Meyerhoff
Linda Ramsay
Joseph Steffen**

HDRB Members Not Present:

**Brian Judson, Vice-Chairman
Sidney J. Johnson
Swann Seiler**

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

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

City of Savannah Members Present:

Mr. Randolph Scott, Zoning Administrator

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: Continued Petition of Daniel E. Snyder
H-07-3830-2
4 West Taylor Street
PIN No. 2-0032-16-007
Fence**

Continue to August 13, 2008, at the petitioner's request.

**RE: Petition of J. T. Turner Construction Co., Inc.
Bryan J. Robinson
H-08-4008-2
321 East Congress Street
PIN No. 2-0004-41-010
Alteration/Relocation of an Existing Fence**

Continue to August 13, 2008, at the petitioner's request.

**RE: Petition of CNG Signs
Ms. Kathy Dorton
H-08-4018-2
111 West Bay Street
PIN No. 2-0004-13-001
Sign**

Continue to August 13, 2008, at the petitioner's request.

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

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

**RE: Petition of Lott + Barber Architects
Kevin Webber
H-08-4001-2
525 East Broughton Street
PIN No. 2-0005-16-020
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of the Small Business Assistance Corp.
Tony O'Reilly
H-08-4009-2
111 East Liberty Street
PIN No. 2-0015-33-001A
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture
Gretchen Ogg Callejas
H-08-4010-2
457 – 467 Montgomery Street
PIN No. 2-0045-15-002
Rehabilitation/Alteration
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Karel Pruner Associates
Karel Pruner
H-08-4011-2
1 Bull Street
PIN No. 2-0004-14-001
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda items as presented. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

**RE: Petition of Alex Ormond for Martha Mythlo
H-08-4006-2
502 Price Street
PIN No. 2-0033-04-001A
Front Porch Extension/Fence**

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

Present for the petition was Ms. Martha Mythlo.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to erect a five-foot four-inch wood saw tooth picket fence on a one-foot seven-inch brick base with gate along Gaston Street. The total height will be seven-feet one-inch tall. The applicant is also requesting approval to rebuild and expand the existing front stoop from a single-bay stoop with side stairs to a three-bay stoop with front stairs. A storage shed is to be built on the far side of the lot and will only minimally be visible from Gaston Street.

FINDINGS:

1. The existing stoop is one of a matching pair on this duplex. It is featured in an old watercolor in the Telfair Collection. It is a contributing feature of this simple Victorian house and, as such, the best preservation practice would be to not expand the porch. Other houses in the vicinity may have wider porches but each house is individual. Porches should not be expanded to give a simple house a grander appearance. In a duplex, individuality should be achieved through accent colors such as shutters and doors.

However, if the Board approves widening the porch then Staff recommends that the original stoop posts and railing and trim be retained, that the addition only extend over the first window, that the steps be to the side as presently oriented, and that the roof pitch remain as it currently is. Also, the porch should not be expanded in depth so that it continues to match the adjacent stoop.

2. The house is setback 11'-8" from the lot line.
3. There is an existing wood sawtooth fence. The plan is to redesign it to have a brick coping to help prevent rot.
4. The storage building is on the far side of the lot and will be only minimally visible from Gaston Street.

Ms. Ramsay stated that her packet did not include any photographs and asked if there were any photographs submitted.

Ms. Reiter answered yes; they were in the file.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the fence. Recommend leaving the stoop as is.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Mythlo stated that her intent was not a grander house, but one with a front porch living space to gather with the neighbors informally. She said there was no real indication that the original stoop had the same lower existing slope and it was a concern because it has caused rot on the porch. There was an indication on the boards that the original stoop might have had a greater slope.

Mr. Gay stated that the drawing showed the upper windows with more panes than were actually there and the blank door was not going to be changed and was not filled in. He said the door looked plain on the plans but there were panels on the photographs.

Ms. Mythlo stated that the intent for the door was to refinish it and if it cannot be refinished they would find a similar door.

Mr. Gay asked if the panels would match the door that existed.

Ms. Mythlo answered yes.

Ms. Ramsay stated that there was no indication of materials for the shed.

Ms. Mythlo stated that it was to match the clapboard style of houses.

Ms. Ramsay asked about the roof.

Ms. Mythlo stated that it would be the same.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the pressure-treated fence would be painted.

Ms. Mythlo answered no.

Mr. Steffen asked if creating a porch structure at half the size of what was pictured would meet the desire to have a living space.

Ms. Mythlo said yes it would. She said if it was widened by a foot they could put in seating, but with the existing width it was very difficult to walk from one end of the porch to the other.

Dr. Henry asked why the fence wasn't going to be painted.

Ms. Mythlo stated that she was hoping the vines of the Confederate Jasmine would grow back over it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that porches are a main character-defining feature in historic homes. The Architectural Review Committee (ARC) is against the expansion of the stoop because the structure was historically symmetrical and expansion of the stoop would change the look of the vernacular pair of row homes forever. She said that Section 8-3030 of the Historic District Ordinance (11h) states that the stoop height shall be visually comparable to other historic stoops to which they are visually related and should not exceed 9'- 6". The stoop should be visually related to the ones next to them.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Ramsay stated that she agreed with Staff's recommendation in terms of the stoop and the structure behind it.

Dr. Watkins stated that Staff recommended the approval of the fence and leaving the stoop as it was.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff about the wider porches that were referenced that on that block or nearby. He asked if there were houses that were similar to this that had wider and bigger porches and if some were original or was the porches added afterwards.

Ms. Reiter stated that she couldn't answer without doing research. She said her guess was that they were all original to the buildings.

Ms. Ramsay stated that sometimes two paired houses would share the same lawn or porch and that they were generally not associated with one house having the longer porch.

Ms. Reiter stated that there were double houses with full porches, but what makes this unusual was they were ornamental, Victorian, and a matched pair. They must have been considered pretty in the 1930's because they were painted in a painting at the Telfair.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the fence and storage shed as submitted, and deny the porch extension. Mr. Gay seconded the motion. Mr. Steffen was opposed. The motion passed 5 to 1.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Eugene M. Maria
H-08-4012-2
210 Whitaker Street
PIN No. 2-0015-13-010
New Construction/Height & Mass - Part I**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Eugene M. Maria.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction, Part I Height and Mass of a three and one-half story Sunday School Building for the Independent Presbyterian Church. The property is located at the southeast corner of Whitaker Street and Oglethorpe Lane with the primary façade fronting Whitaker.

FINDINGS:

In February 2008, the historic building at 210 Whitaker Street collapsed and subsequently on March 12, 2008, the Historic District Board of Review approved the demolition of the remaining structure on the site at 210 Whitaker Street. The applicant is now requesting approval for new construction of a Sunday School Building for the Independent Presbyterian Church (IPC) on the site. **Comments from Site Plan Review have not been submitted by the city infrastructure departments at this time.** Park & Tree Department does not have any comments. The property is zoned B-C-1 (Central Business) and the following standards apply:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Setbacks and Lot Coverage: No setbacks are required and 100 percent maximum lot coverage is permitted.</p>	<p>No setbacks are proposed and the building covers 100 percent of the parcel.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

Dwelling Unit Type	Monumental building for ecclesiastic and school uses.	N/A
Street Elevation Type	Monumental building designed in the Classical Revival Style in response to other buildings within the IPC campus.	N/A
Building Height: This is a four-story height zone	A three and one-half-story building is proposed.	The standard is met. The former historic buildings on the site were two and three stories in height.
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade	<p>The building features 12' floor-to-floor heights in all floors and is visually divided into a base middle and top with 8' central projecting bays.</p> <p>The building is 46' wide and 48' tall and is divided into three bays with the central projecting bay being 26' wide and the flanking bays 10' wide each. The building extends approximately 60' back along the lane and is also divided into three bays with a larger central bay.</p>	The standard is met.
Entrances	A recessed entrance with transom and sidelights is located off-center in the right-hand bay on the primary façade fronting Whitaker Street. A side entrance is also located on the ground level fronting Oglethorpe Lane.	Staff recommends incorporating a more substantial entrance on the primary façade fronting Whitaker Street. This is a monumental building and should have a more significant entryway on the main façade.
Proportion of Openings	Window openings are 4' tall by 2'-8" wide on the ground floor fronting Whitaker Street. All other window openings are 6' tall by 2'-8" wide.	Staff recommends increasing the height and width of the ground floor windows and the width of all other windows to meet the Design Standards for windows that require a minimum 5:3 vertical to horizontal ratio.
Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids	The central bay within the primary façade features a group of three window openings vertically aligned on all floors with an arched grouping in the gable.	Staff recommends increasing the amount of voids on the primary façade. There is approximately 8' of solid wall between the edge of the central projecting bay and the edge of the outside window grouping.

	Flanking bays feature one opening within the 10’ wide bay. The secondary façade features four vertically aligned independent window openings within the 39’ wide central bay and a single window in the 10’ wide flanking bays.	This is over two times the width of the windows which exceeds the design standards. Increasing the size of the openings as stated in the comment above may also create more voids within the solid wall.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	There is no open space provided between this structure and the existing adjacent buildings.	The standard is met. The connection of buildings on this site provides a wall of continuity on Whitaker Street and along the lane. This is consistent with previous historic development on the site.
Roof Shape	The building features a hip roof with a central projecting gable on the Whitaker Street façade and four gabled dormers on the lane façade.	The standard is met. There are other pitched roofs present in the near vicinity. The use of the pitch roof with dormers also assists in lowering the height of the building and allowing it to relate to the IPC building across the lane.
Scale	Floor-to-floor heights and size of bays are larger in scale than in neighboring structures which are also monumental buildings.	Staff recommends increasing the size and possibly the number of voids to correspond to the wide bays within which they are placed.
Directional Expression:	The building has a vertical character that is existing in other historic buildings within the ward. The horizontal character of the ground floor and cornice correspond to neighboring historic structures.	The standard is met.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that a more substantial entrance be provided for this monumental structure, the size of the window openings be increased to meet the 5:3 ratio, and that the amount of solid wall be reduced to keep the building in scale with neighboring historic structures.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Paul Hansen (Hansen Architects) stated that they had met with Staff and reviewed the comments concerning the window spacing and the entrance on Whitaker Street. He said they were in agreement with it and if they get approval on Height and Mass today they would come back for Part II design and present additional elevations showing the change in window proportion and the design along Whitaker Street for the door placement. The photograph was hiding the door on Whitaker Street, but it gave an

idea of the massing of the building and how it related to the existing architecture. He showed a photograph of how the building would look down Oglethorpe Lane.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she was troubled by the dormers in the design that was shown because the rest was traditionally detailed. She wanted to see the dormers be more traditionally detailed.

Mr. Hansen asked Ms. Ramsay what she meant by that.

Ms. Ramsay stated that they looked like they were peaked, did not have any trim on the front, and that they might be stuccoed. She said traditionally they would have been pedimented or something more traditional looking.

Mr. Hansen stated he agreed that they did not show more detail.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she just wanted to be sure it was brought out now.

Mr. Hansen stated that they would not be stuccoed, but have an additional material and they would look at the detailing.

Dr. David Goebel (Member of the Building Committee, Elder of the Independent Presbyterian Church, and Professor of Architectural History at Savannah College of Art and Design - SCAD) stated that they were pleased and excited about the design because it affirmed an ongoing practice of dignified architecture in Savannah and the Independent Presbyterian Church (IPC). He said the proposal was for a restrained Palladian civic structure espousing not a dead Revivalism, but an engagement with the living tradition involving urban fabric. Its Palladian style connects naturally with the heritage of Savannah whose founding was directly tied to the English Palladian movement and plays the role architects call a background building, but clearly proclaims its institutional character and affiliation. It affirms the 20th century evolution of Whitaker Street and maintains the wall that Staff spoke about. They have been making improvements to all of the facilities and it was their intention to make lane improvements that would be an embellishment to the city as well as to the series of buildings. Despite the incongruity of its site and scale the architecture of the IPC has been universally praised although it doesn't conform to the city plan. The two existing IPC support buildings have also been recognized for their excellence, designed by John Holden Green in 1817, and rebuilt under the direction of William Gibbons Preston in 1891. In the matter of the English Palladian architect, James Gibbs, the church is one of Savannah's most prized architectural monuments. Across the lane on Bull Street and designed by Charles Henry in 1895, the IPC's administration building has been appraised by architectural historians from around the country for its sympathetic yet differential and monumental qualities, employing Doric columns and pediments that link it visually with the church and the square. Equally noteworthy is the Axon Memorial building that is connected to the rear of the church and directly across from the proposed building. The structure was built in 1928 by Ralph Adams Cram, and has restrained nobility that was reminiscent of the early Palladianism of Indigo Jones that sets off the church and embellishes the city. Each of the three buildings is unique, yet together they possess harmony.

He said that the Hansen Architects proposal builds on the tradition with the sensitivity to hierarchy that suits both the church and the city following the classical principles of variety and decorum. In terms of its intended use and situation in the Savannah plan the building is the lowest on their hierarchy, the site was on the back side of a tithing lot facing the lane that suggested the architecture should be simpler and less ornamental than the sister buildings. It employs the ornamental language in compositional

principles of the other buildings, but speaks with a more prosaic purpose in situation. It was an A-styler, a building with no columns or pilasters, that was asymmetrical with entrances less ceremonial than the other buildings, and although it repeats the pediment motif of its sister buildings, it was adorned with a utilitarian thermal window rather than the more decorative motifs of the adjacent buildings. He agreed with Staff that the proportion and fenestration required more refinement and tweaking, but the general Height and Mass of the proposal was very well conceived. He was excited about it because the design suggested that the serious civic-minded practice of architecture that has characterized Savannah over the last two and one-half centuries was still alive and can flourish with this approach.

Mr. Meyerhoff arrived at 2:35 p.m.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted subject to Staff's conditions. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. Dr. Henry was opposed. The motion passed 6 to 1

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Patrick Phelps
H-08-4013-2
412 Williamson Street
PIN No. 2-0003-08-001
Demolition of a Non-Historic Structure
New Construction/Height & Mass – Part I of a Five-
Story Hotel**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of demolition, continue for discussion with SDRA, and reconsideration.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Phelps.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

1. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish a concrete block motel erected in 1962. The building is not listed on the Historic Building Map and is not eligible for listing due to age and lack of distinguishing architectural features.
2. Approval of Part I Height and Mass for a five-story hotel and Finding-of-Fact for a two-story variance.

FINDINGS:

1. The project has been submitted to Site Plan Review (SPR). The deadline for response is July 8. One response has been received at the time of this Staff report. A variance to locate the hotel on a street other than an arterial will be required. The previous use was classified as a motel.
2. A meeting is being set up by Savannah Development and Renewal Authority (SDRA) for the week of July 14 to discuss access issues and coordination with Martin Luther King, Jr.

Boulevard (MLK), River Street, and the Montgomery Street revitalization plans. MLK is considered a primary street as well as River Street. A grand staircase access is proposed to tie Montgomery Street with River Street.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in Bay front Business (B-B) zone:	The hotel meets the property line on three sides. On the Williamson Street side there is a 108’ by 27’-4” setback for a drop-off drive.	Restudy of the setbacks above the first level on River Street. Ranges along River Street typically had no setbacks. An additional story might be added over the retail area to contain the restaurant.
Building Height: The structure is in a three-story above bay or 45’ above Bay zone on the Height Map.	The height of the main structure is four stories above Bay with a fifth story on the west end.	A recommendation for additional height above the height map may be considered in meeting goals such as more pedestrian interface along MLK (see rhythm of structure on street below), and relocating parking access. (See Rhythm of entrances, porch projections, and balconies below)
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development: Factors Walk buildings are exempt from the large-scale and commercial development provisions requiring subdivision of upper floors into bays with differentiated massing.		The Factor’s Walk design feature of bridges ends roughly at Jefferson Street. Nonetheless, the warehouse look of the River Street buildings should be continued to MLK.
Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:	Traditionally the ranges along the river were very horizontal – long-ranges divided into three-bay wide sections.	The proposed building does not follow the traditional range divisions and is not consistent with the historic appearance of the riverfront ranges. Restudy the number and proportion of window openings. Restudy the parapet line.
Proportion of Openings:	There are a number of differently proportioned openings – balcony doors, paired windows, single windows, windows with transoms, and arched openings that appear to be filled with louvers.	There is no consistency in the proportion of the openings. See Rhythm of solids-to-voids below. Reconsider the percentage of openings and arrangement of windows.

<p>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</p>	<p>The percentage of openings as proposed does not follow the typical rhythm of solid-to-void. On Williamson Street for instance there is far more solid-than-void. On MLK there is no interaction between pedestrians and the building. Much of the River Street level is taken up with large vented openings for the parking garage.</p>	<p>Reconsider the openings and how to achieve pedestrian interaction along MLK.</p> <p>MLK and River Street will someday be an important intersection. Putting a parking garage entrance here with no human-scaled interaction with the building creates a dead space. See recommendations for additional retail and relocation of parking garage entry.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</p>	<p>Historically, the Williamson Street block between Montgomery and MLK was taken up with the Lathrop Cotton Warehouse and a three-story carriage repository, along with two-story frame and wood dwellings and a two-story store facing MLK at River Street. There was pedestrian interaction on Williamson, MLK, and River Street. The block was broken up by multiple buildings.</p>	<p>The proposed orientation of the main façade is on Williamson Street. As proposed MLK is used as a service street.</p> <p>Restudy the placement of uses within the building so that a retail space can be located at the southwest corner of Williamson and MLK. This would draw pedestrian traffic down MLK. A second retail space entrance could be located at the northwest corner of the building at MLK and River Street. The trash/housekeeping facility could be moved to the River Street garage level incorporating some of that retail space.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:</p>	<p>On Williamson Street a two door main entry is proposed with only one of the doors operable. A second door leading to an exercise room is located approximately 80 feet to the west and a corridor exit is located about 90 feet to the east.</p> <p>On MLK the entry to the garage is located and what appear to be roll down service doors. On River Street there are nine one-story glass storefront bays and an entry to the elevator tower</p>	<p>Consider allowing the meeting rooms to open onto a balcony along MLK, which could also serve as a cover to the sidewalk below.</p> <p>Consider moving the garage entry to the east wing of the recess on Williamson Street.</p> <p>Maintain the sidewalk surface material continuity across the driveways on Williamson Street.</p>

<p>Walls of Continuity:</p>	<p>A “U” shaped plan is proposed.</p>	<p>Along the Riverfront, with one exception, the ranges were built to the lot line. The wall of continuity is broken by the entry court. On River Street the one-story retail section looks like the Huey’s infill. This could be mitigated by adding a second story which could serve the restaurant.</p>
<p>Scale:</p>		<p>Reconsideration of some of the elements discussed above will help mitigate the large mass of the building. The historic riverfront ranges were large buildings, but they appeared smaller because they were broken up into repetitive bays with storefronts.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the demolition of the 1962 motel.

Continue for reconsideration of parking entrance, parapet line, additional mass on River Street, fenestration and bay pattern, and how to address MLK. Incorporate comments received for City Departments and discussions with SDRA.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it had been coordinated with the plans for the trolley on River Street.

Ms. Reiter stated that Ms. Bridget Lidy would be at the meeting and was in charge of the redevelopment plans, so all three plans needed to be considered. She said that SDRA had comments and ideas which was why Staff felt that it was not ready to bring to the Board yet because there were many outstanding comments. If the Board had additional comments it would be good to be heard today so that they could be taken together.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Phelps (Hansen Architects representing Vesta Hospitality) stated that it was a very prominent site in Savannah that ends the Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK) corridor and begins River Street. He said it was important and they wanted to address everything which was why they came to the Board early hoping to work with the other City departments to expedite the process. They have met with Staff and were meeting with the Savannah Development Renewal Authority (SDRA) and Site Plan Review (SPR). There were master plans that the City had developed and they were not sure of what the stages were, where the funding or the future plans were, but wanted to make sure that they make accommodations for those items so that it could happen.

He said the MLK corridor access, the Montgomery Street extension to River Street, and the River Street trolley and future traffic light would have to be addressed. He displayed plans from SDRA that showed

the view corridors from MLK to the river and from Montgomery Street, then back to a connection to River Street that was overgrown and collapsed.

Mr. Steffen left at 2:55 p.m.

The Georgia Power site should be redeveloped at some point so they could open up views to the river. The SDRA Master Plan completed in 1991 for hardscape and landscaping along MLK was pulled out of the plan because a resolution couldn't be made upon the materials, the accessibility issues, and the existing trees. It has yet to be incorporated, but they were hoping to work with SDRA and the City in getting it reincorporated or provide a scheme with a new structure so accessibility could be resolved.

He showed another photograph of MLK with existing parking, sidewalks, and curb cuts that they were proposing be reused for the new parking entry. It would not be a new curb cut, but an existing one and they were working around the existing trees.

He displayed a view along River Street looking east with the steps coming down from MLK and a transition to a retaining wall of an upper level parking deck with a pool, and compared it to a difficult transition of an existing area that didn't allow pedestrian access. In the background was the beginning of Factor's Walk.

He said in the SDRA Master Plan there was talk about continuing Montgomery Street to create the monumental stair access down into River Street, and then the beginning of Factor's Walk. Williamson Street runs across and the hotel property would abut it, and they would have to pay attention to how they addressed the façade entryway. He displayed an existing hotel that fronted the property line and stated that their hotel would do so as well, and then displayed a photo from River Street looking up, and from Montgomery Street above on Williamson Street looking down. He said that hopefully redevelopment would create a new view corridor out to the river. He showed SDRA's Master Plan with the stair connection up to Williamson Street from River Street.

He said that the borders of the site were difficult to work with and that Williamson Street, as it exists, has double-loaded parking with perpendicular parking in two locations fronting the existing hotel. Their proposal was to bring two bays of the new hotel to the property line to reinstate the property line along Williamson Street, and also to create an entry drive drop-off. They agreed with Staff that they could probably enhance the property line by creating some kind of a permanent wall, fence, or heavy fenestration so it would be blocked and not an open setback from Williamson Street. Given the proximity of traffic and the narrowness of Williamson Street, there needed to be some kind of pull-off or drop-off. They will continue working with Staff, SDRA, and SPR to resolve the issues and incorporate them into the final design. They have a dropped elevation on MLK and would have to look at pedestrian access and accessibility.

When looking at ramps through River Street the ordinance states in the Factor's Walk District that River, Bay, and Williamson Streets in this case, have to be front entrances and they could work with Staff to determine how it operates. Historically, the ramps were service areas and there were larger openings that would have been loading and unloading areas and that Factor's Walk cuts through the area. He could understand the consideration of making it more of a monumental and pedestrian area but historically they were service lanes to the river. They would need to work with the City and Staff to define which way it needed to be manipulated to blend the old with the new.

The north elevation was the River Street elevation and they have setback approximately 30 feet to allow for retail that would not be allowed if they did not have the angular shape. They were proposing a retail area to create a pedestrian connection with River Street, and there would be an open terrace above for the use of the hotel. They will continue working with Staff about increasing the height of the wall or another story in that area to further define the property line.

They were asking for a variance and clarified that on the fourth story the ordinance reads that three stories was allowed in the River Walk District and it was defined as a three-story building or the height of 45 feet. The fourth floor was actually 4' - 4" above it, and they were asking for a variance on the fifth floor which consisted of the penthouse that sits along MLK which was the more prominent façade, and would act as an icon while traveling down MLK and River Street. It was setback from the parapets on each side and provides for roof access, fitness facilities, and a swimming pool on the roof. He displayed the elevation of River Street heading west with the existing hotel and the retaining wall and fence, then a rendering of the proposed hotel with the fifth floor extension, the proposed setback, and the retail space.

He said they would continue working with Staff because there were concerns about the window placement and the bay spacing, and then he showed photographs of River Street buildings with modified smaller openings, large bay fronts, arched openings, and smaller punched openings with double-hung windows. There was a strong precedence for straight facades, delineation of the bays happening with the gutter placement and downspouts or the control joint in the brick, and most of the bays were tripartitions where on a number of their facades they replicated it. There were areas throughout River Street that had extensions or enclosures at the second level for pedestrian access or restaurants that add life to the street which enhanced the pedestrian environment and, therefore, they would like to stay with the single-story addition on River Street to have two levels of interaction, and there were balconies and a variety of openings.

They would love to hear any comments, ideas, suggestions, or observations so they could help make it a successful project for everyone.

Mr. Hutchinson commended Mr. Phelps for his analysis of the project and said that it was a good idea of what was and what will be happening as they go along with the project.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the Board was supposed to consider Height and Mass and vote on it.

Mr. Gay stated that it was just demolition.

Mr. Law stated that he was walking on MLK and growing up in Savannah he could remember the Dunbar Theatre and everything. He said that it was all gone, that this was a good plan, and that he liked the way it was set up.

Dr. Watkins stated Staff's recommendation was to approve the demolition and that the Board could not state a continuance, but the petitioner would have to request a continuance for the Height and Mass, and then the Board could deal with the motion regarding the demolition.

Mr. Phelps stated that they would like to request a continuance on the Height and Mass ruling for the hotel and approval or denial on the demolition.

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

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture
For Deen Brothers
H-08-4014-2
112, 114 & 116 West Congress Street
PIN No. 2-0004-30-004
PIN No. 2-0004-30-005
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. John Deering.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of renovation plans for 112 through 116 West Congress Street as follows:

South Elevation (West Congress Street):

Demolition:

- Remove all existing windows from openings.
- Remove roof structure and parapet.
- Remove stucco on second and third floors where possible.
- Remove infill on storefronts back to original masonry openings.
- Remove extraneous light fixtures, awnings, etc.
- Remove tile sign

Renovation:

- Replace windows with Kolbe and Kolbe 9/6 and 9/9 wood single-glazed true divided-light windows as previously approved for The Lady and Sons on opposite end of building.
- Rebuild brick parapet.
- Repoint brick.
- Install new wood storefront, windows, and columns as previously approved for The Lady and Sons. Where original pilasters remain they will be retained.
- Sand finish stucco will be used on lower commercial bays. Color: Black Forest Green.
- Install awnings in each bay. Colors to be determined.

North Elevation (West St. Julian Street):

Demolition:

- Remove items as above for south elevation with the exception that the existing wood storefront system will be retained in bay 112; one of the existing double-hung storefront windows will be retained in bay 114. All meters and conduit to be removed and put in an interior electrical room.

Renovation:

- As above for South elevation.
- Any fluting uncovered on the pilasters will be stabilized with a masonry agent.

West Elevation (Barnard Street)

Demolition:

- Remove items as above for south elevation.

Renovation:

- As above for south elevation with the exception that the second floor windows will have PVC louvers simulating shutters installed.

FINDINGS:

- Staff recommends that any original window lintels such as on the third-story of the Barnard Street side be retained as is.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval.

Mr. Randolph Scott asked about the sign.

Ms. Reiter stated that the sign had been taken down to be restored and would come back.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. John Deering (Greenline Architecture) stated that they would maintain the lintels on the Barnard Street elevation as they were and put a masonry stabilizer on them. He said the sign was being repaired and would be re-hung with a new name and the neon reworked with whatever the Deen brothers came up with.

Mr. Scott asked if it would be approved through the Board.

Mr. Deering stated that it would come back if the Board deemed it necessary.

Mr. Scott stated that it would have to be approved through Zoning since it was a sign.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the pilasters on Congress Street would be stucco or brick depending on the existing conditions.

Mr. Deering stated that the pilasters on Congress Street were presently stuccoed and they were going to try and remove it without damaging the sandstone. He said if it damages the sandstone they would stop the removal process and restucco it. If it could be successfully removed they would stabilize the sandstone and leave it like the other end of the block that was done at the Lady and Sons.

Mr. Gay stated that originally there was ornamentation at the top of the pilasters.

Ms. Deering stated that there were cypress Corinthian pilaster capitals there and there was some discussion about putting them back. He said they would like approval as it was now and if there was funding for it then they would certainly put them back.

Mr. Gay stated that it might spur some of the others to do the same on the other sides of the building.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the consideration of Staff’s recommendations. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen arrived at 3:20 p.m.

Mr. Meyerhoff left at 3:20 p.m.

**RE: Petition of Greenline Architecture
Keith Howington
H-08-4015-2
205 Papy Street
(Corner of Fahm & West Hull Streets)
PIN No. 2-0016-33-004
New Construction/Height & Mass – Part I of a Five-
Story Parking Garage**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height Mass, of a five-story parking garage with ground floor retail on the vacant parcel at the southeast corner of Fahm and Turner Streets. The garage will provide 596 parking spaces to service the existing Hampton Inn and Suites and the previously approved Embassy Suites to the east of the site, as well as the commercial establishments and restaurants within both hotels and the ground floor of the proposed parking garage.

FINDINGS:

The property is zoned B-C (Central Business), and will also contain the previously approved building for the Embassy Suites (File No. H-07-3839-2). There are no lot coverage requirements. Parking garages have a unique character that is strongly dictated by their use and as such, neither the floor-to-floor heights for residential or commercial buildings applied. The building is five stories with 225’-10” of frontage along Turner Street and 174’-8” along Fahm Street.

Site Plan Review:

The General Development Plan has been submitted to Site Plan Review (SPR) and the comments have been submitted by the City’s infrastructure departments. The most relevant and dominant comment is with regard to the sidewalk, how the entrances meet the sidewalk, and ADA requirements. Staff also has concerns with how the building meets the sidewalk. There is a grade change of approximately five feet from the eastern end of the building to the west end, and it is critical that the sidewalk and building be designed in harmony with one another. A stepped sidewalk or grade is illustrated in the elevations submitted. This would not meet ADA requirements. Historically when a building faced a grade change the building stepped, not the right-of-way. This building is somewhat different in that it is a parking structure above retail.

Staff recommends restudy of the sidewalks with a detailed plan to be submitted to SPR prior to Part II. Staff also recommends that the sidewalk serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in both materials and configuration on the southern side of the property to reinforce the pedestrian nature of the sidewalk.

A remote parking variance will need to be granted prior to construction over the existing parking for the Hampton Inn and Suites to the north, for temporary parking during the construction phase of the project. A recombination subdivision plat of the two parcels fronting Papy Street will need to be submitted prior to SPR approval.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required.	The building is setback approximately 12’ on the south elevation (Turner Street) and 3’ on the west elevation (Fahm Street) providing wide sidewalks with landscaping, and to leave adequate space for the existing Bishop Turner Historical Monument on the right-of-way. The building is also setback 12’ on the north at the location of the Thunderbird Inn.	Staff recommends approval with the conditions stated above regarding sidewalk improvements. The setback along Fahm Street is consistent with the existing setback of the Thunderbird Inn. The proposed setback along Turner Street is consistent with the approved Embassy Suites to the east.
Dwelling Unit Type:	Parking garage with ground floor retail.	N/A

<p>Street Elevation Type:</p>	<p>Commercial storefront. The site of the building once contained the first St. Philip Monumental A.M.E. Church in Georgia. The new building is designed with elements from that historic building.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The character of the area is of commercial and industrial buildings from the Central of Georgia Railroad (CofGA) complex to the south to the mid-20th century automobile corridor to the north.</p>
<p>Building Height: Five-story height zone.</p>	<p>Five stories with an overall height of approximately 68’ to 72’. The brick tower at the east end of the Turner Street elevation appears as six stories to house the elevator run-off.</p> <p>There is a grade change of approximate 4’-6’ from one end of the building to the other on the east-west axis. Floor-to-floor heights vary from 14’ to 18’ on the ground floor and are 10’-8” on all floors above.</p> <p>There is approximately 11’ above the top story with the brick corner element at Turner and Fahm Streets.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the condition that the ground floor height respond to the grade change as stated in previous comments, and that the excessive height above the fenestration at the southwest corner be restudied. While the overall height greatly exceeds the one-story neighboring Thunderbird Inn and the CofGA train sheds, this area is outside of the National Historic Landmark and CofGA Landmark district’s boundaries and is located in the periphery where more massive and taller structures are appropriate within our downtown.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development: Frontage shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60’ in width with each section taller than it is wide; buildings shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15’ nor more than 20’ in width. Roofs shall be flat with parapets.</p>	<p>The building has an approximate footprint of 39,550 square feet and is five stories tall. The building is divided by a central portion 147’ long broken into 12, 12’ wide bays. A sloped roof for parking with flat and shaped parapets is proposed. A gable is proposed on one of the corner elements.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The parking garage use strongly dictates the building form and thus the design. The standards suggest the 60’ lot rhythm present in the Landmark District within the Oglethorpe Plan area. This area was comprised of more continuous facades present in the historic CofGA buildings.</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade: The height of the first story shall be not less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single story above; the exterior visual</p>	<p>Within the central concrete portions of the design, the ground floor is separated from upper floors through the fenestration and a larger amount of solid. Proposed awnings reinforce the</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The vertical glass elements help to break up the façade and the consistency of regular bays within the concrete portion is typical of historic commercial and industrial buildings in Savannah.</p>

<p>expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story. The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course.</p>	<p>horizontal delineation of the ground floor. The upper floors are separated by a flush band. The brick corner elements on Turner Street have a string course on above the ground floor. Some have a band course below the top floor and other portions do not. Additional corner elements at the north side of the building are comprised of glass tower shafts without indication of a base middle and top.</p>	
<p>Entrances: Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60’ along the street.</p>	<p>Entrances along the Turner Street elevation (south) are within storefronts and occur at approximately 30’ intervals. Three pedestrian entrances are provided on the west elevation on Fahm Street.</p>	<p>Staff recommends restudy of the entrances along Fahm Street to meet the 60’ interval standard.</p>
<p>Proportion of Openings:</p>	<p>Storefront glazing is proposed on the ground floor in excess of 55 percent. Upper floors contain paired openings with a 5:3 ratio in height to width. Garage door openings are 9’ wide.</p>	<p>The standards are met.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</p>	<p>A large amount of voids have been introduced within the solid masonry façade. The top floor has a 6’ tall parapet increasing the amount of solid at the top of the building.</p>	<p>Restudy the large amount of solid above the top row of window openings.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</p>	<p>The proposed structure meets the street on the south and west sides without any recesses. A 12’ setback has been created on the north to buffer the Thunderbird Inn.</p>	<p>The standard is met. The building footprint has been setback from the property lines to create ample room for sidewalk and landscape improvements.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:</p>	<p>Vertical vegetative screens are proposed on the rear (north) and west elevations.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Further information will be provided in Part II, Design Details.</p>
<p>Roof Shape:</p>	<p>Overall the roof is sloped for parking surrounded by a parapet with a coping. The main brick corner element has a gabled parapet. The corner</p>	<p>Staff recommends reducing the height of the parapet to 4’ to meet the standards.</p>

	element at the east end of Turner features a side gable.	
Scale:	The scale of the building has been mitigated by the incorporation of ground level pedestrian uses, numerous entrances, and wide sidewalks. The upper floors will be separated from the pedestrian realm by awnings and architectural bands.	Staff recommends approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the following conditions:

- Restudy of the stepped sidewalks with a detailed plan to be submitted to SPR prior to Part II. The ground floor heights should respond to the grade change and this should be illustrated in its exterior expression.
- Staff also recommends that the sidewalk serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in both materials and configuration on the southern side of the property to reinforce the pedestrian nature of the sidewalk.
- Staff recommends restudy of the entrances along Fahm Street to meet the 60’ interval standard.

Restudy the large amount of solid above the top row of window openings.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Keith Howington (Greenline Architecture) stated that they were in agreement with Staff on all points after reviewing the comments. He said that they were in design development and would bring back the stepping down of the sidewalk in Part II. The continuous head height of the structure would remain the same, the sidewalk would meet ADA, and they did not know who would come in the retail space or where the doors would be. The sidewalk was being worked out with the civil engineers and the landscape designers for the exact door placement and it would be a partial continual grade or a partial terrace and continual grade. They would like to pass on this issue today and bring it back in Part II.

He said that Staff recommended reduction of the parapet from six feet to four feet. It would eliminate the white space up over the top window and the brick area above it. The proportions would come down and they were in agreement with it. They agreed to add an entry on the Fahm Street elevation. There was an existing entry and there was a span of 115 feet and they proposed to put in another entry but left it flexible because the original plan was for retail on the sides.

The remote parking has been taken care of by an off-site across MLK.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Hutchinson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass with conditions set forth by Staff. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was a great job and he commended and encouraged them to make a proper acknowledgement of and a monument to St. Philip Monumental A.M.E. Church. He said it was a dynamic and active congregation in the community and was sure they would be interested in seeing their original structure honored in an appropriate way. He encouraged them to continue the efforts.

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

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

Present for the petition was Ms. Rebecca Lynch.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of alterations and addition as follows:

1. East (Front Elevation)
 - Replace shutters with new louvered composite shutters by J&L in Charleston Green.
 - Replace existing wood stair railing with decorative metal railing painted black. Rebuild stoop columns to match existing and replace stoop floor with white granite to match white granite band on house. Final design of metal railing to be submitted to Staff.
2. West (Rear Floyd Street):
 - Add new carriage style overhead doors. Final design to be submitted to Staff.
 - Wood multi-paned glass doors at second floor out to porch.
3. North (McDonough Street elevation):
 - Add new shutters as above.
 - Remove railing at second level rear and remove wood screen wall from one-story brick section.
 - Construct new screen wall of wood with hinged canvas shutter panels (like Bermuda shutters) over 1 by 4 horizontal wood slats. Color Charleston Green
 - Add a flat roofed third-story over the north half of the rear two-story portion. Projecting roof rafters.
 - Extend existing chimney and add a copper cap.
 - Jeld-Wen aluminum clad true divided-lite double-glazed windows with fixed shutter panels on sides and operable shutter (like Bermuda shutter) over center window. Addition set behind original parapet.

- Add connector at third floor center recessed approximately seven feet from outer edge of structure. Metal 5V crimp roof on connector.
4. South (Garden elevation):
- Add two-story hip roofed addition (three stories total), with Jeld-Wen aluminum clad true divided-lite double-glazed windows with fixed louver shutter panels.
 - One-story screened porch with wrought iron railing around flat roof deck (two stories total).
 - Hip roof to be 5V crimp or standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

The alterations and additions preserve the original features of the house and are reversible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with final design of railing and carriage door to be presented to Staff.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Rebecca Lynch (Lynch Associates Design) stated that they have strived to take an approach that the addition would remain secondary to the historic structure. She said it included breaking down the mass of the addition at the third floor from side-to-side to respond to the historic two-story wing that projects along Perry Street. The connector was also setback at the third floor approximately seven feet on both sides to preserve the existing third story windows. The screen porch addition will be setback from the Perry Street elevation with a more significant mass of the addition being along the garden elevation. They would not be increasing the existing footprint of the building. There was a full side garden along the entire depth of the site that would buffer it from the immediate neighbors and the owner intended to restore and enhance the historic portion of the residence wherever possible.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the spiral stair would stay because it was not shown in the elevation.

Ms. Lynch stated that there was an existing spiral stair and they would put in a new spiral stair to the deck that would be back from the existing spiral stair. She said that she did not have it drawn in the elevation.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the intention for the Perry Street elevation bathroom windows was for the middle shutter to be open. She asked why there was a little window at the bottom.

Ms. Lynch answered yes. She said that it was just to give the sense that there would be a window at the center behind there.

Ms. Ramsay stated that normally you wouldn't see the little window.

Ms. Lynch stated that you might not. She said it was more for privacy where they could open or shut it and there would be transom windows open for clear story lighting above.

Ms. Ramsay stated that on the garden elevation the mutton patterns in the bedroom were larger than they were in the house, including the windows underneath. She asked if it was intentional.

Ms. Lynch stated that the intention was to choose a window that had a center mullion pattern and that she did not want to make it too horizontal, but it was to do something similar to the historic structure and not copy it. She said she was trying to use some traditional language but in a slightly different way so that it would be clear what was new and what was old.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the use of the canvassed area by the screen porch was different with the canvasses being down. She said there would not be any circulation.

Ms. Lynch stated that it was something they might revisit and resubmit to Staff.

Ms. Ramsay asked if it would be roofed.

Ms. Lynch stated that it was not going to be roofed but was a privacy screen wall and she wanted to find something that would be more cost considerate by not using louvered and shuttered panels everywhere, as well as finding something that would open and close to give the circulation and visibility with the full privacy.

Ms. Ramsay stated that instead of having the horizontal things straight across, that if they were angled it would give more circulation.

Ms. Lynch stated that it would be more like a traditional louver.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it would keep the same look but give them more circulation.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District of Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the conditions that the final railing design and carriage door design be submitted to Staff. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Coastal Heritage Society
Becki Harkness
H-08-4017-2
536 West Jones Street
PIN No. 2-0001-24-006
Relocation of a Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Ms. Becki Harkness.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to move 536 West Jones Street, a contributing structure to Lot 10, a contiguous lot on Charlton Street directly north of the present location. In addition to the move, Part I Height and Mass approval is requested for the new site.

FINDINGS:

1. The reason for the move is to save the cottage from demolition. On September 12, 2007, the Board of Review approved the demolition of the cottage. Subsequently, the Coastal Heritage Society (CHS) asked City Council to grant a stay of demolition in order for CHS to negotiate further with the owner to move the cottage. An agreement has been reached and the purchase will be closed on June 30, 2008.
2. The new location is to the contiguous lot to the north. The house will front on Charlton Street and be situated next to a one-story duplex of a similar style and era. Both structures are the remaining buildings from the Frogtown neighborhood, a working class residential area that bordered the Central of Georgia railroad shops complex.
3. In order to move the structure a non-historic rear addition and non-historic front porch will be removed. The house will be located on a new brick pier foundation with stucco infill between the piers.
4. The move will save one of the few remaining structures from Frogtown. The height and mass of the building is consistent with other historic cottages in the area. The new context was also part of Frogtown, thus, the cottage will retain its historic and contextual integrity on the new site.
5. Part II restoration plans will be submitted at a later date.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval to move 536 West Jones Street in order to save it from demolition and approval of Part I Height and Mass.

Mr. Gay stated that there were trees in the photograph on the new site and the house was setback some. He asked if they were going to keep the trees.

Ms. Reiter stated that the petitioner could address it.

Mr. Law asked if it was the little gray house on Jones Street.

Ms. Reiter stated that the cottage was on Jones Street and would be moved to Charlton Street.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Becki Harkness (Coastal Heritage Society) stated that there are trees in front of Lot 10 and they have talked to Park and Tree. She said they have been cut substantially because of power lines that run in front of them and Park and Tree was okay with them being cut down. She displayed a photograph of the house and said that the house had a non-historic porch made of concrete block. In the rear addition they had been under the house to look at the joists and sills and believed they were from the 50's or 60's.

There was a historic porch on the rear addition and the front, but the front was much smaller. They plan on looking at the Sanborn maps to help them build a porch and rear with the same dimensions.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she was delighted that the house was saved. She asked about the status of the other house.

Ms. Harkness stated that the yellow house was part of the purchase and they signed the contracts on the house but the developer was out of town last week. She said it was supposed to close on June 30th so they had to FedEx the contract to the developer, she had not heard from him, but she assumed it went through. The yellow house would also belong to Coastal Heritage Society but it would remain where it was and would probably remain a residence. They will be doing restoration work to both houses to return them to their historic appearance as much as possible. There were no existing historic photographs of the houses that she knew of so they would have to investigate.

Mr. Steffen stated that many were present when the issue first came up and he wanted to congratulate Coastal Heritage Society on the work they had done to make something happen because he was told that it wouldn't happen.

Ms. Harkness stated that they worked hard and that a lot of people with the City and MPC had helped them. She said they appreciated their efforts as well.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that HSF wanted to commend the Coastal Heritage Society for their dedication to the project. She said they all knew how hard everyone worked and fought to save the buildings and was pleased with the outcomes that preserves one of the last remaining structures from the working class neighborhood.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay 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.

**RE: Petition of Sara Barczak & Anthony Jernigan
H-08-4020-2
518 East Gaston Street
PIN No. 2-0033-03-042
Alteration/Thermal Water Cooler Panels**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Anthony Jernigan.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to install a solar thermal panel Apricus brand Model No. AP-20 on the south facing pitch of the gable roof of 518 East Gaston Street. This installation will face Gaston Street.

FINDINGS:

1. The panel is six feet long by five feet + wide by six-inches deep and is attached flat on the roof. The array consists of 20 plug-in five-foot-long evacuated tubes.
2. 518 East Gaston Street is not a historic structure.
3. The applicant has presented letters from neighbors in support of the installation.
4. The installation is reversible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval. This is not a historic structure and the neighbors do not object.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Anthony Jernigan stated that the picture was taken from his neighbor's porch across the street and was raised off the street level and the other picture was at the street level picture. He said it might look like flashing because it was a very low profile.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Jack Storm stated that he and his wife own properties on East Gaston, East Jones, East Park, and West Waldburg Streets and have a vested interest in maintaining the historic look of the city. He said he was an advocate for distributed energy, including solar power. He had to balance the requirements of solar power with the appearance of the building and it seemed to work out very well. He supported the petitioner and said one of the considerations the Board would have to make in the future was in being faced with an increasing number of people who would want to put up solar thermal panels on the roofs of buildings in the Historic District. The Board would have to think seriously about line-of-site, how far you have to be away to see it, and did it distort the appearance of the building in any way. In most instances, most of the buildings that have low sloping roofs and when you are close to the building you would not see anything. You would have to be one-half or a block away before you could see it. By the time you were that far away you would not notice it as an obtrusive addition to the building because they would look more like skylights. He raised the issue so that the Board could recognize that it was something that would come before them more frequently now that the State of Georgia has come up with tax incentives to increase the amount of solar energy produced locally.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that she agreed with Mr. Jack Storm and that HSF did not object to the use of solar panels in the Historic District, but would caution the Board that allowing panels to be placed in view of the public right-of-way, even on non-historic homes, may set a dangerous precedent in the future. She said that sustainable energy sources were something to be considered during the planning process of the Historic District Ordinance Revisions Committee.

Dr. Henry asked why the Board was considering something that was not in the Historic District.

Mr. Gay stated that it was in the Historic District but was not a historic building.

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

Mr. Steffen stated that he wanted to congratulate the petitioners for taking an important step toward conservation and renewable energy. He said that as technology moves forward, particularly with this type of energy, he thought that some of the visual issues would decrease. In regard to issues raised by HSF that when the Board redrafts the ordinance to look at these situations. They would have to keep focused on the fact of what could be seen from the public right-of-way and the lanes adjacent to the structure. If you go back a great distance it was not within the Board's purview and that some of the designs were temporary structures. Whether the Board considered them to be permanent additions to structures was a legal question they may end up wrestling with, but it was his opinion that anything like this adds a functionality and beauty to the structure and did a great deal of good for long-term survival.

RE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Allison L. and Gerald F. Connor
H-08-3998(S)-2
506 East Taylor Street
Color Change/Stucco Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of The Carson Company
Brian Haggerty
H-08-3999(S)-2
307 East President Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Julian Weitz
H-08-4000(S)-2
121 West River Street
Replace Door
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of T. Scott Simms
H-08-4002(S)-2
113 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of DC4 Design, LLC
Luke Dickson
H-08-4004(S)-2
208 East Jones Street
Existing Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of J. T. Turner Construction Co., Inc.
Mark J. Fitzpatrick
H-08-4005(S)-2
10 West Jones Street
Porch Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Genevieve Dragalin
H-08-4007(S)-2
626 – 632 Mercer Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Petition of Betsy Perkins
H-08-4019(S)-2
225 & 227 West Hall Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

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

Ms. Reiter stated that the police were going to serve a warrant to the people living in the cottage on Hall and Habersham Streets that was discussed at the last meeting.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Board had approved a sign on the corner of Whitaker Street and Oglethorpe Avenue. She said that she saw them put up a sign called Sport and Spine at the old Paper Moon store. She was not sure that it exceeded the requirement.

Ms. Reiter stated that if it was three square feet or smaller that they did not need to look at it. She said that Staff would take a look at it.

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

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

a. Unfinished Business

- HDRB Board Retreat

Ms. Reiter stated that the latest Staff had heard from City Council was that they would be looking at new appointments at the end of July. She said that hopefully the Board would receive new appointments and then they would have the retreat.

b. New Business

Mr. Steffen asked if there was anything the Board could do to accelerate the process of getting their parking permits. He said it was getting very difficult to visit some of the sites.

Ms. Reiter stated that it appeared the Board would not get any more parking permits.

Mr. Gay stated that he just received a ticket out front while coming in to get quarters.

Ms. Reiter stated that if you bring in the ticket that Staff would take them to the City.

Mr. Thomson stated that they had been informed that Boards who only meet once a month would not be getting parking stickers. He said that people have been instructed to park in the garage and when exiting the garage to sign the back of the card and write “MPC” on it they should let you exit for free. The other way would be to pay for parking because the MPC did not want to pay for the parking tickets because it gets costly. This was what they were informed by the City Manager.

Ms. Reiter stated that Mr. Brown had been taking the parking tickets.

Mr. Gay stated that he had done that a couple of times and they just waived it.

Mr. Thomson stated that Mr. Brown had a different approach to giving out the parking stickers and they were being limited. He said that when he received his parking sticker it was limited to certain meters.

Mr. Gay stated that the Board’s parking stickers were already limited on the meters because you could only use certain meters.

Mr. Steffen stated that the purpose of the parking pass for this particular Board was so the members could visit the sites. He said from his perspective that he was blessed to have good health and could walk to most sites, but it was not true of all Board members. He said that Mr. Johnson would have a difficult time walking back and forth between sites and it was a legitimate concern for the Board. It might be a perk for some other Boards, but for this Board they were supposed to be able to visit the sites.

Mr. Thomson stated that he wrote to Mr. Brown and with the help of Staff developed an argument for why the Board members should receive a parking sticker. He said that his response was that the Board was meeting only once a month or less and there were others that meet every other month. They work with the Chatham County Historic Preservation Commission who took exception to that and significant citizens went to Mr. Brown and directly asked him about it but they came back with the same answer. The MPC can provide parking in the garage.

Mr. Steffen stated that they had done what they could do and he understood.

**RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS
MEETING – June 11, 2008**

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the minutes as submitted. 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 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp