

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

**ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM**

**October 8, 2008**

**2:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**HDRB Members Present:**

**Brian Judson, Vice-Chairman  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Sidney J. Johnson  
Richard Law, Sr.  
Linda Ramsay  
Swann Seiler  
Joseph Steffen**

**HDRB Members Not Present:**

**Dr. Malik Watkins, Chairman  
Ned Gay  
Gene Hutchinson  
Eric Meyerhoff**

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

**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**

**RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

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

**Mr. Judson** introduced Mr. Robert Allen's Historic Preservation class from the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD).

**RE: REFLECTION**

**RE: SIGN POSTING**

All signs were properly posted.

**RE: CONTINUED AGENDA**

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

**Continue to November 12, 2008, at the petitioner's request.**

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

**Continue to November 12, 2008, at the petitioner's request.**

**HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Review Board continue the items to the November 12, 2008, meeting. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: WITHDRAWN**

**RE: CONSENT AGENDA**

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

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Jewelry Consignment Network  
Mitchell Hankin  
H-08-4056-2  
139 Bull Street  
PIN No. 2-0015-09-024  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Savannah College of Art and Design  
Martin Smith  
H-08-4058-2  
115 East York Street  
PIN No. 2-0015-07-001  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Michael Volen  
H-08-4061-2  
416 West Liberty Street  
PIN No. 2-0031-10-003  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

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

**RE: REGULAR AGENDA**

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-08-4030-2  
0 Barnard Street  
PIN No. 2-0016-01-004  
New Construction/Part II – Design Details of a Six-  
Story Office Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends a **continuance**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part II, Design Details of a six-story mixed-use building on the northwest corner of Barnard and West Bryan Streets. The Historic District Board of Review approved the petition for Part I, Height and Mass, on August 13, 2008, with the following conditions:

1. Increase the amount of glass on the four-story portion of the building;
2. Extend the glass element on the corner portion at the ground floor and on the Palladian storefronts;
3. Recess the balconies within the building plane;
4. Provide articulation in the walls adjacent to the galleria where the six-story portion meets the four-story portion;
5. And restudy the design of the pediment at the roof.

### **FINDINGS:**

The property is zoned B-C-1 (Central-Business) and is currently vacant. A portion of the neighboring parking garage will be demolished and the property used for the current development, portions of which will contain a four-story structure and part of the six-story commercial – office building. New plans and elevations showing the east elevation and the entry for the parking garage have been submitted with the Part II, Design Details in a separate petition. A recombination subdivision plat will need to be submitted and approved prior to issuance of a building permit.

Most of the Board conditions have been met with the exception of the changes requested to the Palladian storefronts and the gabled pediment at the roof. In addition, the following changes have been made since the Part I submittal:

1. Entire ground floor is surfaced in cast stone, including ‘Galleria’ on west end of development;
2. Cornices on west portion, ‘Galleria’ are now made of metal instead of brick;
3. Simplification of rooftop gabled pediment;
4. Curved corner canopy redesigned;
5. Mullions on curved corner storefront and entrances have been reconfigured to align with other design elements; and
6. Street level canopies have been changed from glass to fabric with ornamental brackets and end panels.

Staff’s comments on the proposed project and the standards are provided in full in the table below. In summary, Staff is recommending that the applicant eliminate the Palladian storefront and incorporate a more rectangular or multi-arched (similar to the old Savannah Hotel and others) storefront design reminiscent of the galleria and redesign the gabled pediment to meet the board’s conditions of the Part I approval. In addition, there are several design elements that are recommended to be restudied and resubmitted. The petitioner will return in the future to seek approval for exterior lighting and signage.

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Commercial Design Standards:</b> The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront. Retail storefront glazing shall be not less than 55 percent. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18”-24” base of contrasting material, to the lintel. Storefront glazing in subdivided sashes shall be inset a minimum of 4” from the face of the building. Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel, or copper as part of a glazed storefront system; bronze glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront.</p>	<p>Palladian window groupings comprise the storefront on Barnard Street, Bryan Street, and Bay Lane. Double-door entrances and side lights are proposed on the Barnard and Bryan Streets facades. A full glass storefront is at the northeast corner entrance and on the four-story portion to the west. The storefront is aluminum made by YKK.</p>	<p>The proposed Palladian storefront is not typical of the historic district and is not stylistically an appropriate commercial ground floor treatment in an urban setting. Elevations indicate arched windows with brick header surround within the storefront. Staff recommends eliminating this additional brick material from the storefront. The storefront glazing must cover 55 percent of the ground floor and be recessed a minimum of 4” from the face of the building.</p>
<p><b>Windows and Doors:</b></p>	<p>Peerless 432H Historic Profile Metal windows are proposed. Some windows feature double header rows, others feature a single header row of brick soldier courses. All feature rowlock sills.</p>	<p>Provide information on muntin width and spacer bar. Provide consistency in the window header types.</p>
<p><b>Roof Shape:</b> The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>The roof is flat behind a parapet wall with gable and hipped pediments.</p>	<p>Staff recommends redesign of the gabled pediment and entablature to meet the Board’s conditions of Part I. Continue the modern approach evident in the curved corner section throughout the building and eliminate the Federal style elements that conflict.</p>
<p><b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:</b></p>	<p>Recessed balconies feature 12” round fiberglass Tuscan columns and ornamental metal railings with 5/8” pickets, 3’-6” in height. Fiberglass turned balusters 3’-6” in height are used on the sixth floor</p>	<p>The round posts on the curved corner portion do not meet the standards as they do not have a base and cap. The use of metal railings adjacent to the Tuscan columns is an awkward pairing. Typically buildings with metal railings and columns are made</p>

	<p>projecting balconies. The columns feature a base and capital. The metal ornamental railing is also proposed on the top of the western “Galleria” portion. The curved corner portion features squared off balconies on the second and third floors with columns and railings as noted above. The top floor features 8” round posts with a 3’-6” metal railing to match the others.</p>	<p>of the same material. Round metal columns are generally more slender and are fluted. Staff recommends eliminating the columns if they are not needed for structural support.</p>
<p><b>Materials, Textures, and Colors:</b></p>	<p><b>Brick:</b> Carolina “Old Savannah” 431.  <b>Cast Stone:</b> Arriscraft smooth textured “Tan”  <b>Mortar:</b> Holcom “Light Cream”  <b>Window Frames:</b> Anodized Aluminum “Medium Bronze”  <b>Metal Cornices and Roofing:</b> Powder coated metal to match “Pale Clover”  <b>Plaster, Fibercast Columns, and Balustrades:</b> “New Divine White”  <b>Fabric Awnings:</b> “Downing Street”</p>	<p>Staff recommends eliminating the brackets in conjunction with the fabric awnings. Cloth awnings are a lightweight material and do not need bracketed supports. Reduce the height of valance or resubmit with sign application. Staff recommends against using white for the metal railings. Rarely used in historic buildings, white metal railings on new construction can give the appearance of vinyl.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Continuance for the following to be addressed and resubmitted:

1. Eliminate the Palladian storefront design to meet the board conditions of the Part I approval. Eliminate the brick storefront surrounds within the cast stone base. Demonstrate that the storefront glazing encompasses 55 percent of the ground level and recess the storefront 4” from the face of the building;
2. Provide information on the muntin width, profile, and inclusion of a spacer bar and simplify the window header type;
3. Redesign the gabled pediment to meet the conditions of the Part I approval;
4. Redesign of the round posts on the sixth floor curved corner element to meet the standards (to have a base and cap).

5. Address the metal railings juxtaposed with the 12” round fiberglass columns;
6. Eliminate the proposed brackets with the fabric awnings and reduce the height of the valance;  
and
7. Provide another color for the metal elements proposed to be painted white.

**Ms. Seiler** asked Ms. Ward about the Palladian storefront and wanted to see the comparison again.

**Ms. Ward** stated that there were other examples in the city of ground floor commercial buildings having large arched entries. She said that there were no Palladian entries that Staff had seen. There is a building that is attributed to John Norris next to the Gamble building on Bay Street that has repetitive round arches. She thought both solutions would be more appropriate than the Palladian window if the applicant still wanted to use the arch in the design.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the Federal Building also had them.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. She showed an image and said that they were more Romanesque because they were round but that it showed the continuous repetitive arch as a treatment.

#### **PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff and Shay)** stated that he presented the Board with a book that included some of the other revisions that were made and that they were not included in the motion to be approved. He recalled that Staff did not say that the elimination of the Palladian details were a condition of approval. He said that they would simplify the pediment and eliminate the Greek Revival elements.

On the Bryan Street elevation if you measure from the cornice down, the total storefront glazed area is 56.54 percent. On the Barnard Street side they are short at 49.54 percent and proposed the area at the side entrances with the double door and a single pane of glass. They would add another pane of glass to increase the area of glazing on the façade to exceed the 55 percent requirement.

Regarding the elimination of the brick surround, if the color that was disturbing or disconcerting, then they would be willing to change it from red brick into bricks of the same size but made out of cast stone.

There were two previous designs for buildings that were on the corner, but they were only one lot wide. He said the difference between the two previous designs was that they were now able to build on two lots. The previously approved design had the pedimented element at the top of the façade.

There are a number of buildings in the ward that have elements that alter the silhouette by introducing a pediment into the parapet. He showed an example of a new building with a flat pediment and the HVAC equipment on the roof was highly visible. That was why they decided to create a highly articulated silhouette. They refined the earlier pediment and stripped it down to minimal ornamentation with the four columns disengaged from the wall. The elements like the stair would have to protrude up and would be set into the middle of the volume so they could not be seen from the street.

He said they had previously submitted plans with projecting balconies within an inset so that the wall stepped back and the balcony projected forward. They were told that it would be more appropriate to have a loggia style balcony so that the wall plane was in the same plane. The columns aligned with the columns above and reinforced the verticality of the composition. They were not there for structural purposes. The round, simple column with an attached railing was copied from another building that had fluted Corinthian columns with a railing and had precedence in Savannah. In order to emphasize the top level, the porches had turned balusters as opposed to the iron railings down below that emphasized the heroic nature of the pediment at the top. They wanted them to be the light color that matched the columns, but as shown in the renderings, the lower levels would be medium bronze to be the same as the windows and other metal elements, and they agreed with Staff's comment. If the round Tuscan columns were objectionable to the Board, then they would propose that they be made square because it took away the issue of whether it was Tuscan, Corinthian, or fluted.

The windows on upper floors were oversized and were setback three inches. He said that the reason there were varying patterns over the header had to do with the placement of the cornice that was above. The cornice extended down a little bit into the plane that was normally the window head height, and if the Board agreed, they would reduce it from two soldier courses high to one soldier course high. They liked it better the way that it was.

The problem with the storefront issue was in how it was labeled. They showed three inches from the face of the stone to the front of the sash, but it was four inches to the glazing. The drawing they showed met the standard but wasn't labeled properly; he apologized for it, and said that he would provide Staff with a copy of the document. He said that the glazing would be offset to the inside of the plane of the front of the window sash. They intended for the muttons to be 1.031 inches wide from the Peerless manufacturer.

Their intention on the awning was to introduce a bracket to frame the entire awning so that the canvas could not be seen on the end. He said they agreed with Staff's recommendation and would bring the awning back for approval.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that based on Mr. Shay's comments that there was a resolution to Number 6 and Number 7 and those items would come back to Staff. He asked if the square columns and design addressed the issue on Number 4.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the square columns were to address Number 5. She said that they would suggest it as a solution to address Number 4 because it fit better with the metal railing and kept it contemporary.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they would make the columns with capitals and bases rather than being straight.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if they were discussing Numbers 1, 2, and 3.

**Ms. Ward** stated that Number 2 had been addressed. She stated that Staff would recommend that if the Board moved to approve Part II, that the applicant erect a sample panel on-site with all of the materials and details to be approved by Staff prior to installation.



**Mr. Steffen** stated that he recalled a comment about not being as concerned about the mass of the pediment but that he wanted it to reflect the curved elements, or the rectangular massing at the corner, or a combination of the two. He said that his issue was the design.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she did not hear the answer to eliminating the Palladian storefront.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they liked the storefront the way it was and that they would like to keep it. He said that the standards allowed glazing with black on the inside and that there were a number of examples. The elements were repeated in the Palladian pavilions at the top, and the gallery that goes through the building. The examples that Staff used of other arched openings were examples of openings that lead to doors, and theirs were not doors but storefronts.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that her objection to the Palladian storefront window was that it was like cut-and-paste architecture. She said that they have taken some Classical elements and placed them on a building where it was inappropriate. In the time that they had done this they had time to research other uses of Palladian windows on the first floor of a six-story building.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he did have enough time but, although Staff and Ms. Ramsay had an objection to it, he had made it clear that they liked the element and wanted to see it in the design.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she would like to see the Palladian windows designed better. She said that she may be the only Board member that had an objection to them and that there was a correct design of a Palladian window that was not reflected.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to retain the Palladian windows, the additional brick materials, the pediment, the columns, the metal railings, and if they would hold off on the awnings.

**Mr. Shay** stated that he did and that he was willing to change the brick from red to the same color as the cast stone. He said that the awnings would be deferred until the next meeting.

**Dr. Henry** asked if there was anything he agreed with Staff on.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they agreed with the idea that the metal railings butting into columns might be objectionable, but they agreed to change them to square pilasters. He said that someone asked a question about the remaining issues that were unresolved on items Numbers 1 and 3, and they had come to compromises on Number 2, which was addressed. They agreed to eliminate the round posts and make them square for item Number 4, they explained that the railing color would be medium bronze rather than white, and they have agreed to come back with item Number 6 when they bring back the signage element of the awning.

**Dr. Henry** asked if Staff agreed to the square columns.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the Board agreed that the pediment or the projection on the parapet was to be made of the same material and that a dissimilar material.

**Mr. Shay** stated that the one element that showed a triple pediment had the cornice of a different material than what was shown on the façade of the building.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that it appeared to her that the triangular pattern in three of the pediments was of the same material.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation/Architectural Review Committee – HSF/ARC)** stated that HSF agreed with Staff's comments, especially with recommendations to eliminate the Palladian storefronts and redesign or eliminate the gabled pediment. She said that the curved corner section was modern and that the gable element and Palladian windows were out of place. HSF recommended eliminating the unnecessary decorations to simplify the entire structure.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she agreed with the architect and that the Palladian storefront did not bother her. She said that in relevance with the whole design of the building, that what had come back to them, the compromises that were made, how far they had come with the building, and that by taking a look at it in the entire context with regard to the square, she thought it was a good-looking building, that it was fine in its entirety, and that she appreciated what had been compromised.

**Dr. Henry** stated that Mr. Shay made some compromises and that it was not a bad-looking building, but he agreed with Staff's report that it could be improved.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he agreed with Ms. Seiler regarding the Palladian storefront, but the one issue that bothered him was the pediment itself. He said that his preference would be to approve the rest of it and review the brackets and fabric awnings because there might not be another chance to review it. If there was a better design to the pediment it would pull everything together in the building.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that they needed to get that in a motion.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that the Palladian windows were designed with a half wagon wheel that was prevalent in the suburban design of a Palladian window. She said that she could point out a number of things that were wrong with the windows, but if they were going to put up fake Palladian windows in an inappropriate place in Savannah, they should be reasonably well-designed.

**Dr. Henry** asked what was wrong with Staff's suggestion of the arches.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that it would answer the increase in the storefront for the percentage of glass and that she preferred the arches.

**Mr. Judson** asked Mr. Shay if it was clear with the Board in his consideration of retaining the Palladian windows. He said that Mr. Shay was not obligated to but asked if he had an answer for Ms. Ramsay's comments regarding the design of the windows.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they tried to use the element of a window with a round arch in the center because they wanted to have the glass. He said if they did a single arch, then the arch had to project higher and into the second story, or the arch had to sit very low over the opening to make the arch shape work. Although Ms. Ramsay was not pleased with the proportions, the design allowed them to have the arched opening in a smaller proportion than the main arched opening and reflect the same pattern with the arched opening in the portal area. They did not go into all of the elements that they incorporated into the design, which were items discussed during Height and Mass, but he wanted the arched-top windows in the storefront. It met the standard, had the required amount of glazing, and they could not make it one big arch because they would have to increase the ground floor to a 24-foot height or have the springline of the arch come down to seven or eight feet above the floor.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that in defense of Mr. Shay, that as a non-architect it was not helpful to him to have something described as poorly designed. He said that he did not know what that meant.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she did not mean to insult Mr. Shay and apologized. Ms. Ramsay stated that she could take the time to explain but she thought it was a moot point.

**Dr. Henry** asked what if there were no arches and if it would be disproportionate to the whole project.

**Mr. Shay** stated that it looked clumsy. He said that they tried other approaches but the shape would also be expressed on the interior of the building and give a wonderful view from the inside out to Ellis Square and across Barnard Street. It framed the view from the inside to the outside just as much as it expressed itself on the façade.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he described what his thoughts were regarding the pediment. He said that it was shared by some and that he had confidence that Staff understood his recommendation. If they came back with something that Staff was comfortable with, he did not see why it had to come back to the Board. He would like to see them take one more look at the pediment.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the conditions that:

1. The storefront is to be recessed 4-inches;
2. Columns on the top floor of the curved portion will have a base and cap;
3. Square posts to be incorporated instead of 12-inch round Tuscan columns;
4. Railing color to be bronze instead of white;
5. The fabric awnings and brackets and the gabled pediment are to be restudied resubmitted to Staff for final approval.

**Ms. Seiler** seconded the motion. **Mr. Steffen, Ms. Seiler, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Law** were in favor of the motion. **Dr. Henry and Ms. Ramsay** were opposed. The motion passed 4 to 2.

**RE: Petition of Lominack, Kolman and Smith  
Jerry Lominack  
H-08-4054-2  
7 East Jones Street  
PIN No. 2-0032-15-002  
Color Change/Stucco Repair/Existing Windows  
Doors/Rehabilitation/Alteration/Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Jerry Lominack.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of repairs and alterations as described below:

**FINDINGS:**

**Main House Front (North) Elevation:**

1. Replace concrete stair, metal railings on stair and stoop with a wood stair, and turned balustrade to match the 1912 photo. The area below the stair will be stucco over concrete block. The present doorway under the front of the stoop will be infilled to create a window with closed shutters. The opening on the west side under the stoop will be enlarged into a 3'-0" wide door opening.
2. Remove glass panel on the existing front door and infill with raised wood panels.
3. Replace the existing stuccoed concrete block garden wall, metal gate, and metal fencing with a stuccoed concrete block wall set back from the property line 14 inches to allow for a planting bed in front of the wall. Install an arched wood gate with an arched iron gate in front of it. The new wall will have quoins and a water table to match the main house.

**Main House Garden (East) Elevation:**

1. Remove porch infill at the parlor level and restore side porch to its 1912 appearance. All new columns and balustrades that are needed will match the original. Additional cast iron supports that match the existing are located throughout the property and will be relocated to the side porch.
2. Replace the existing doors to the porch at the garden and parlor levels with double glass and wood doors.
3. Remove and replace small window on second floor wall beyond porch with two 1/1 wood windows to match the size of the rest of the parlor floor windows.

4. Rebuild chimney at top of the parapet wall to match sister chimney.

**Main House Rear Garden (South) Elevation:**

1. Remove existing screen porch. Place iron railing across existing second floor door. Replace door with double glass and wood door.
2. Remove exposed brick portion of kitchen chimney.

**Main House (West) Elevation:**

1. The gate to the alley will be replaced with a wood panel gate and relocated to allow for the relocation of the gas service from under the stoop to the alley.

**Carriage House Garden (North) Elevation:**

1. Remove existing metal stair in its entirety. Replace with wood stair, balustrade, and stoop.
2. Replace pedestrian doors with wood panel doors. Replace window and T-111 siding with a wood louver. Infill below with brick reclaimed from the property.
3. Use four new cast iron columns similar to side porch to support new stair and stoop.

**Carriage House Lane (South) Elevation:**

1. Remove all existing windows and T-111 siding from ground floor.
2. Restore arched carriage opening with double wood panel carriage doors.
3. Enlarge rectangular opening to 12'-0" and install wood panel overhead door. Install new wood surround with engaged columns.

**Garden Wall Lane Elevation:**

1. Remove an 8'-0" section of the wall and install sliding wood panel door. Replace existing wood gate with a wood panel door.

**Colors:**

Main house field stucco: Pittsburg Paints 530-4 Gray Marble

Quoins, water table band, concrete or wood sills: Pittsburg Paints 530-5 Antique Silver

Window shutters and porch shutters, doors, front alley gate, garden gate, carriage door, garage door, sliding wood gate: Pittsburg Paints 518-7 Black Magic

Trim, columns, balusters, cornices, stoops, trim at overhead garage door: Pittsburg Paints Bright White.

Remove paint from stone lintels on front elevation. Seal lintels.

**Windows:**

Replace any 6/6 windows with 1/1 wood windows to match 1912 photograph.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval.**

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

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff and Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-08-4057-2  
200 Block of West Bryan Street  
PIN No. 2-0016-01-001  
Demolition/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting preliminary approval to demolish an 80-foot-wide portion of the east side of the existing parking garage on the 200 block of West Bryan Street. A new two-story stucco addition to match the existing garage, approximate 12-foot wide, is proposed on the east side for elevators and restrooms. The rest of the space that is created by the demolition will be used for a new office building at the northwest corner of Barnard and Bryan Streets that is currently in the review process (File No. H-08-4030-2).

**FINDINGS:**

The parking garage at West Bryan Street is not historic and does not contribute to the historic integrity of the Savannah Landmark District. The applicant is only requesting preliminary or Part I approval at this time to be in compliance with the conditions of the application for H-08-4030-2 referenced above. While mostly complete, the submittal does not include building sections which are required on the application.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with final details to be submitted to Staff for final approval.**

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the petitioner had any objections to Staff’s recommendation.

**Mr. Shay** stated that they did not. He said they intend to bring back wall sections as soon as they could get them done.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with details to be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Ogletree Design for  
Blackwood Partners, LLC  
Roy Ogletree  
H-08-4059-2  
515 East Hall Lane  
PIN No. 2-0043-02-014  
New Construction of a Single-Family Residence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Roy Ogletree.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval (Part I and Part II) to construct a new two-story single-family residence at 515 East Hall Lane.

**FINDINGS:**

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Development Standards: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone. 75% Maximum Lot Coverage.</b>	A ten-foot side yard setback is being provided to accommodate parking for two cars. The proposed building covers 56 percent of the lot.	The standard is met.
<b>Dwelling Unit Type:</b>	A detached single-family structure is proposed.	Similar detached single-family structures are nearby.
<b>Street Elevation Type:</b>	A low stoop townhouse is proposed.	This is typical of this block.
<b>Entrances:</b>	The main entrance faces the lane.	This is compatible with other entrances on the lane.
<b>Building Height:</b>	A two-story structure, 28'-7" high is proposed.	Two-story structures are allowed on lanes. The height is compatible with nearby two-story structures.
<b>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:</b>	The structure is taller than it is wide.	This proportion is found on other historic structures in the area.

<b>Proportion of Openings:</b>	The openings are rectangular. The windows have a 3:5 ratio. The windows and doors are vertically aligned.	The proportion of the openings is compatible.
<b>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</b>	A two-bay rhythm is proposed.	Based on the small scale of this lane dwelling, the rhythm is compatible.
<b>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</b>	The proposed structure is situated between two vacant lots.	The siting of the proposed structure helps re-establish the block face along the lane.
<b>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:</b>	A one-bay low covered stoop is proposed. It does not encroach into the lane.	Covered stoops are typical of the Beach Institute.
<b>Walls of Continuity:</b>	See rhythm of structure on the street.	
<b>Scale:</b>		The scale is similar to other new construction on the lane.

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

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Windows and Doors:</b>	A four raised panel wood door is proposed. The windows are 2/2 SDL aluminum clad wood double hung windows by Norco with 7/8” simulated divided lights and a spacer bar.	The windows and doors are compatible.
<b>Roof Shape:</b>	A side gable roof is proposed with Owens Corning Williamsburg Gray shingles.	The roof shape is similar to adjacent roofs.
<b>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:</b>	A hip roofed stoop with concrete stop slab and 6” by 6” wood posts and 2” by 2” wood pickets is proposed.	The stoop is compatible.
<b>Fences:</b>	There are existing adjacent fences. No new fences are proposed.	
<b>Materials:</b>	Siding: 6” smooth Hardi siding; Hardi trim, wood columns and pickets; stucco foundation.	The materials are compatible with historic buildings in the Beach neighborhood.
<b>Textures:</b>	Smooth Hardi siding.	
<b>Color:</b>	Siding: Devoe Paint No. 5W15-3 (Gentle Gold) Front Door: Devoe No. 3WA25-3 (Prada Red) Stucco: Master Wall No. 475	The colors are compatible.



	(Chalk) Windows and exterior trim: Brilliant White	
--	--	--

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval as submitted.

**Ms. Seiler** asked about the square footage of the house.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she did not know and said that Dr. Henry asked if it was two parcels. She said that it was a detached structure and not related to others. Historically, it might have been its own parcel but it was two parcels now for a single-family residence.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Roy Ogletree (Ogletree Design)** stated that it was approximately 1,200 square feet; 600 per floor. He said it was a compact house on a small lot that was intended to be oriented toward affordable housing. In response to the neighboring property owner there was a vacant lot next door, he wanted some softness added to the façade, and they proposed to do a trellis to help.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that because it was on the property line that the wall had to be one-hour rated and it showed a louver in it.

**Mr. Ogletree** stated that it was a false louver to add some false relief on the façade because it was a one-hour wall.

**Mr. Judson** asked if the trellis was part of the petition.

**Mr. Ogletree** answered yes. He stated that it was as a compromise with the neighbor and the petitioner did not have a problem with it.

**Mr. Judson** asked if the trellis was acceptable to Staff and if it could be approved with the petition.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. She said that they should submit the drawing to Staff.

**HDRB ACTION:** **Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review hereby approve the petition with details for the trellis and building sections to be submitted to Staff for final approval. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS**

**RE: STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of City of Savannah  
H-08-4051(S)-2  
Robbie Robinson Bryan Street Garage  
Ms. Shawn Emmerson  
Screening Generator at Stair Tower  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products  
H-08-4052(S)-2  
Ms. Jennifer Wall  
325 Tattnall Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Peter T. Kusek  
H-08-4055(S)-2  
524 East Jones Street  
Stucco Repair/Existing Windows/Doors  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

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

**RE: Petition of Michael Porterfield  
H-08-4037-2  
401 East Hall Street  
Roof Repair/Windows/Doors  
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

**Dr. Henry** stated that he thought that the Hall Street project was supposed to have monthly reports and he felt that nothing was being done.

**Mr. Tiras Petrea** stated that it was in court and was continued 30 days for them to explain to the judge what the status was.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the judge was giving them another 30 days before making monthly reports and if there had been any monthly reports, or would it be another 30 days before giving the first report.

**Mr. Petrea** answered yes and stated that they went to court the Monday after the last meeting to explain to the judge what the status was, that it was continued for 30 days, and that after the 30 days passed the monthly reports would be required.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that someone reported a ground floor door was being replaced on Gaston Street, that Staff wrote a letter to the owner, but they have not heard anything yet.

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

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

**a. Unfinished Business**

**b. New Business**

**RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS  
MEETING – September 10, 2008**

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that on Page 11 of the minutes she had asked about a structural engineer or an architect being involved in the project, that Mr. Heilig answered yes, and said that the drawings were done by an architect, Heilig Design. She said she thought Mr. Heilig said Dalu Design.

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the minutes with the condition that Staff review the recording of the name and that it be recorded correctly. Mr. Johnson 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 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

**BR/jnp**