

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

**ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM**

**September 10, 2008**

**2:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**HDRB Members Present:**

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

**HDRB Members Not Present:**

**Brian Judson, Vice-Chairman  
Eric Meyerhoff**

**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 Staff Members Present: Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector**

**RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

**RE: REFLECTION**

**RE: SIGN POSTING**

**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/Design Details - Part II - Five-Story  
Hotel**

**Continue to October 8, 2008, at the petitioner's request.**

**RE: WITHDRAWN**

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

**RE: CONSENT AGENDA**

**RE: Petition of Gonzalez Architects  
Jose Gonzalez  
H-08-4024-2  
13 East York Street  
PIN No. 2-0015-08-004  
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Pioneer Construction, Incorporated  
Graham Cooper  
H-08-4044-2  
2 East Bryan Street  
PIN No. 2-0004-15-008  
Alteration of an ATM**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Coastal Heritage Society  
Amy Ver Beek  
H-08-4048-2  
Northeast Corner of Louisville Road & West Boundary  
Street  
PIN No. 2-0031-47-001  
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.  
Donna Swanson  
H-08-4049-2  
104 West Broughton Street  
PIN No. 2-0004-36-321  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

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

**RE: REGULAR AGENDA**

**RE: Petition of T. Heyward Gignilliat  
H-04-3246-2  
116 East McDonough Street  
PIN No. 2-0045-19-006  
Elevator Screen**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. T. Heyward Gignilliat.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST**

The petitioner is requesting approval to install an elevator shaft veneered in Savannah Gray brick and a louvered-shutter screen to shield rooftop condensers, satellite dishes, and the elevator access landing on the third floor of 116 East McDonough Street.

**FINDINGS**

The screens were previously approved on September 8, 2004. The approval has expired.

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

- (1) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District: An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenances related thereto visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include, but not limited to the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors, and signs.
- (2) Visual Compatibility Factors: New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the Historic District which are moved, reconstructed, materially altered, repaired, or changed in color shall be visually compatible with structures, squares, and places to which they are visually related.

**DISCUSSION:**

1. The petitioner is proposing to use a louvered shutter screen system to hide condensers, satellite dishes, and elevator access. The screens visible from a public right-of-way would be 5'-7" high louvered shutters in wood frames. The shutters would be painted
2. Charleston Green and the timber frame would be painted Ivory similar to the screen approved for 26 East Gaston Street. (Photo included)
3. The elevator shaft will be veneered in salvaged Savannah Grey brick to match the house.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Staff recommends approval.**

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

**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/Design Detail – Part II - 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 II, Design Details, 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 560 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). Updates to the hardscape and landscape of the existing monument to Bishop Turner marking the first site of St. Philip Monumental A.M.E. Church are proposed. Any changes to the marker or for its relocation must be coordinated with the Historic Site and Monument Commission.

On July 9, 2008, the Historic Board of Review approved Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions:

- Restudy of the stepped sidewalks with a detailed plan to be submitted to Site Plan Review (SPR) prior to Part II. The ground floor heights should respond to the grade change and this should be illustrated in its exterior expression.
- The sidewalk is to 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.
- Restudy of the entrances along Fahm Street to meet the 60-foot interval standard.
- Restudy the large amount of solid above the top row of window openings.

All of these conditions have been met with the exception of the entrance on Fahm Street. Another entrance has been added; however, there is an 86-foot interval between it and the adjacent entrance. In addition, the following items have been changed from the Part I submittal:

1. The brick corner tower element on the east façade previously was under one gable roof. It has now been extended to feature three window openings in width with a four-inch recess in the center with a parapet and a gable roof.
2. False window openings replaced open areas next to the western tower on the north elevation (Oglethorpe Lane). In addition, this portion of the tower was elevated to respond to interior conditions of the garage.
3. Grid patterns in ventilation areas and storefront glazing have been condensed to respond to the sloping conditions of the sidewalk and to provide a base under the storefronts.

**Site Plan Review:**

The General Development Plan has been submitted to SPR and the comments have been submitted by the City’s infrastructure departments. Revisions have been requested by all infrastructure departments, but mostly for clarification and/or notations to be provided on plans. No requests to change the sidewalks or plans were submitted.

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

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

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p><b>Commercial Design Standards:</b> The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront. The first story shall be separated</p>	<p>The first floor will contain portions of retail space and parking for the garage. The ground floor features storefront and a high level of</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>

<p>from upper stories by an architectural feature. The height of the first story shall not be less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single-story above the first story. The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below. Retail storefront area 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. Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel, or copper as part of a glazed storefront system.</p>	<p>transparency. Most of the ground floor is open for ventilation into the garage with glazed storefronts along Turner Street (south), at the southern end of the Fahm Street (west) elevation, and at the southern end of the west elevation where a pedestrian entrance provides access to the elevator shaft. Band coursing has been incorporated on the brick corner portions of the building. The storefront, concrete lintels, and awnings are used to distinguish the ground floor from upper floors in the middle portions of the building. Awnings vary in vertical clearance around the building, from 7’ to 10’ above the pedestrian way. The top floor of the concrete portions is distinguished by horizontal concrete banding. The brick portions feature string courses, brick header rows, and gables. The base of the storefronts on Turner Street has been designed to correspond to the slope of the sidewalk and does not meet the minimum 18” standard in some locations to make the storefronts consistent within the façade.</p>	
<p><b>Windows and Doors:</b> The centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically. Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3” from the façade of a masonry building.</p>	<p>Openings in upper stories of the garage and along the lane are open for ventilation. They feature 42” tall aluminum railings with ¾” pickets and 2” square posts and a two-light metal grid above. Grids for the ground floor openings are aluminum tube frames with 2” square tubes. Ventilated openings on the lane elevation feature aluminum louvers. False windows are located on the</p>	<p>Staff recommends reconfiguration of the grid patterns on the storefronts on Turner Street to correspond to the vertical grid elements in the openings on the upper floors. See Part I drawings.</p>

	<p>elevator shaft towers.</p> <p>A YKK aluminum storefront system with multiple divisions in the light patterns is proposed.</p>	
<p><b>Roofs:</b> Gable roof pitches shall be between 4:12 and 8:12. Parapets shall have a string course of not less than 6” in depth and extending at least 4” from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between 1 and 1½ feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum 2” overhang. Roofs visible from a street shall be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile, or asphalt shingles.</p>	<p>A sloping roof for the garage behind a parapet is proposed for most of the building. Some corner towers feature front and side gables with an 8:12 pitch surfaced in standing seam metal.</p> <p>A precast concrete coping is used at the top of the parapet.</p>	<p>The brick tower element on the east elevation has been altered from Part I to be two separate parts that overlap, one under a gable and one projecting 4” in front of the gable portion under a flat parapet roof. This juxtaposition is awkward and staff recommends simplifying the design so it reads as one piece or two separate pieces.</p>
<p><b>Fences:</b></p>	<p>No fences are proposed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Materials:</b></p>	<p>Brick veneer on the southwest and southeast corner towers and pre-cast structural concrete panels on the spans between towers and the towers on the north side of the building. Metal railings, louvers, and trellises are proposed on the spans between the corner towers. Louvered screens are located on Fahm Street and Oglethorpe Lane within individual bays beginning above the second floor and extending to the top of the building. Steel frame Greenscreens with steel wire are located at intervals within bays on the ground floors on Fahm Street and on the west elevation (interior to the block). They are 3” deep and project a maximum of 9” from the face of the building mounted to the concrete with expansion anchors.</p>	<p>Staff recommends that a sample panel of all materials and significant design details (window, parapet, string course, and trellis) be constructed on site for final approval by staff. Such panel should remain on site for the duration of construction to serve as a quality and compliance control element.</p>

<p><b>Color:</b></p>	<p><b>Brick-</b> Hanson Brick, Annapolis, modular  <b>Mortar-</b> Lafarge, Ivory Buff  <b>PreCast Stone</b> – Metromont, to match color “Arriscraft” Smooth Tan  <b>Railings, Tubular Frames, Storefronts, Greenscreens, and Awnings (metal and canvas)-</b> Sentriclad, Millhouse Green  <b>Standing Seam Metal Roof-</b> Sentriclad, Colonial Red</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p><b>Utilities and Refuse:</b> Refuse storage areas shall be located within a building or shall be screened from public streets and lanes.</p>	<p>Refuse for the garage will be located within the building on behind the east façade.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval for Part II with the following conditions to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval:

1. Simplify the brick tower element on the east elevation to read as one or two individual pieces not overlapping;
2. Simplify grid pattern in first floor storefront areas; and
3. Construct sample panel with all significant materials and architectural details on site for final approval by Staff.

**PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Keith Howington (Greenline Architecture)** stated that he had no problems with any of the conditions that Staff was recommending. He would restudy the tower and they would construct a sample panel.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that it was not the first garage with retail space at the bottom. She asked if the owners had preconceived ideas about occupants for the retail space.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the owner would like a large drug store. He stated that it was a flexible leasable space. He said it could expand to over 20,000 square feet. They had to reduce the plans because they could not find a tenant. Currently, the retail is along Turner Street and is flexible because the ramp is located in the area so that the retail can turn and go down Fahm Street.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she was willing to make a motion to approve it if the applicant was willing to make the changes. She asked Staff that if she made the motion would it be necessary for them to submit new drawings, or was Staff comfortable with the way he was going to do it.



Ms. Ward stated that the Board could approve it with Staff conditions which would require them to resubmit drawings to Staff, but not to the Board.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the following conditions to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval:

1. Simplify the brick tower element on the east elevation to read as one or two individual pieces not overlapping;
2. Simplify the grid pattern in first floor storefront areas; and
3. Construct a sample panel with all significant materials and architectural details, on site, for final approval by Staff.

Mr. Law seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Michael Porterfield  
H-08-4037-2  
401 East Hall Street  
PIN No. 2-0044-08-010  
Roof Repair/Existing Windows,  
Doors/Rehabilitation/Alteration**

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

Present for the petition was

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The petitioner is requesting approval to reconstruct the exterior of 401 East Hall Street with the following revisions:

- 1) Make the windows on the Habersham Street façade align top and bottom.
- 2) Change the rear door from double to single.
- 3) Eliminate the rear exterior chimney stack.

**FINDINGS:**

- 1) All the exterior detail was removed and stored (see photos) in order to correct structural failures.
- 2) It is intended to reinstall all the original exterior detailing per drawings and before photographs.
- 3) The applicant states that both the Habersham Street windows will be relocated to create space for a bathroom. It is stated that the rear window will be made smaller. Neither of these is reflected on the drawings.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with the condition that the window location and size be coordinated with Staff prior to their installation and that Staff be updated on the status of the project by e-mail every month until completion.**

**Dr. Henry** asked about the restoration of the sidewalk.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the sidewalk was not a Review Board issue.

**Mr. Gay** stated that there was a barrier around the whole building and the sidewalk cannot be used because of it.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that it was supposed to be off the public right-of-way. She said they could let inspections know because it was their issue.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that there were no floor plans and asked about the intended use.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that since they were looking at to go back as it was there weren't any interior floor plans.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she was concerned because of the photos of the rear view. She asked if the gazebo or trellis would be visible from the street.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the top of it was visible.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that she did not recall having it come to the Board and asked if they had permission to build it.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that she did not know how long it had been there.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that it should not be there.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ron Heilig** stated that the gazebo was there when they purchased the house. He said if the Board did not like it that they would take it down.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that they needed to familiarize themselves with the guidelines. She said that it was a wonderful neighborhood and she did not know how they could make an investment in a 101-year-old building and not know that there was responsibility to the Historic District Review Board. They needed to have the guidance of Staff as a resource, but that the gazebo cannot be sticking out. They don't have to tear it down but they needed to make it look right and Staff could tell them how to make it right.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that he had met with Staff and was informed of what was done wrong. He said that it wasn't an issue at the time, but if Staff had an opinion, they were willing to work with total compliance. They never had any intention to change the building, but when they opened it up it was horrendous. The wood floor was on the ground, there was no foundation, and there was at least a 10 to 15-inch drop. They had to place pylons to support the house. They had something for structural repair but when they

saw what was needed it became a vast structural repair, that involved jacking it up. It was explained at that point that more work was needed and they should have consulted with the Historic Review Board. They were never planning to change the building on the outside. Their intention was to make minor changes to the details that were mentioned. They would like to place a bathroom in the back because when the building was built they did not have the codes for the size of the bathroom. It needed another foot to be handicapped accessible.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if there was a structural engineer or architect involved with the project.

**Mr. Heilig** answered yes. He said the drawings were done by the architectural firm, Dalu Design.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if there was a structural engineer since there were structural problems.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that the architect looked at it for them and that they were not changing what was existing.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she was concerned that it was in the condition that it was from someone making repairs who might not have known what they were doing.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that he thought it was because the building was old and the foundation was rotten. He said they would have to go through inspections and permitting to proceed.

**Mr. Johnson** asked if they had a building permit with floor plans.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that they had a building permit for structural repairs.

**Mr. Johnson** asked if the building inspectors asked for the plans for what was being done.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that he was not present at that point.

**Mr. Johnson** stated that it was in the Historic District and that they would have to submit plans for what was to be done. He said that inspections would have told them what to do.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that Staff informed them that after the Review Board hearing that they would have to go back through permitting. He said the original permit for structural repairs did not cover the full scope of the things they had gotten themselves into. The building permit said that it was for structural repair and it was all they planned on doing, but it was structural replacement because of the termite damage and rotting boards.

**Dr. Henry** asked if they had any permits and if they had the permission of the Review Board to proceed.

**Mr. Heilig** answered no. He said they did not have permission from the Review Board, but that they had a City building permit and they thought it was all they needed in the beginning.

**Dr. Henry** asked if they had a zoning permit.

**Mr. Heilig** answered that they did.

**Dr. Henry** asked if there were any other kinds of permits that was needed for construction.

**Dr. Watkins** stated that the Board had communicated to the petitioner that there were certain requirements to be fulfilled when moving forward. He said what they had to consider now was what was being brought forth.

**Mr. Steffen** asked who the actual owner of the property was.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that it was Mr. Michael Porterfield and that they attended church together. He said that the building was going to be a sidewalk café or tea shop. Mr. Porterfield was in North Carolina.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if it was in one person's name.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that it was in Mr. Porterfield's name, but that they had worked together on a lot of projects. He said that since he lived there that he did a lot of the leg work with the pylons and the lath in the walls.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that they had a permit to do exploratory work and sill work, but they had exceeded the permit. She said a stop work order was placed and the owner was taken before the judge. They were present today to get Review Board approval in order to go back to permitting and get the proper permits to continue. They will be back in court on Monday.

**Mr. Steffen** asked what court they would be in.

**Mr. Tiras Petrea** answered the Chatham County Records Court.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that the question about the sidewalk was one of the issues too. He said that they had a permit for extending the wall through the Department of Traffic Engineering because it was a safety wall.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if he was a licensed contractor.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that he was not, but others in the church were. He said that he was working with other people who were licensed contractors.

**Mr. Ramsay** stated that Mr. Heilig was doing the work.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that initially he was, but that he did not place the studs. He said he removed the old drywall and discovered the situation, was told what they would have to do, and arranged weekend work. They assumed he was knowledgeable about all of the steps that you must go through, and when they received a stop work order they knew about it and explained it to him.

**Mr. Johnson** asked what date the stop work order was given.

**Mr. Reiter** stated that it was approximately a month ago.

**Mr. Heilig** stated that it was approximately two or three months ago.

**Mr. Johnson** stated that if they received a stop work order that they had to start over. He said that they would have to go through the process of building, engineering, and at least five or six departments before the permit was approved.

Mr. Heilig stated that they had met with the officials from three different agencies about the wall. He said that things took some unexpected turns with the magnitude of what needed to be done. At that point they probably needed to get others involved, but that it was more his ignorance than anyone else's. The stop work order said that they had gone too far and it was explained by Staff what they should have done.

Mr. Johnson stated that the contractor that should be licensed.

Mr. Heilig stated that there was no contractor but that it was Mr. Porterfield, on his own property, with his own friends. He said it was not like he hired someone to do it.

Mr. Johnson stated that he had to have a license.

Dr. Henry asked if anyone in the City staff told them that they had to go back for a work permit.

Mr. Heilig answered no. He said that the stop work order only had two things and that the permit for the wall had expired. It was a matter of him going to Mike Weiner at Traffic Engineering, and within a few days they had an extension based on the timetable they submitted to Staff for how long the wall could be up. Traffic Engineering wanted the wall down and they did too.

Dr. Watkins stated that he appreciated them being open about what had taken place and recommended that they work closely with Staff so that they didn't have to go back to this point again.

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the window location and size be coordinated with Staff prior to its installation, and that Staff be updated on the status of the project by e-mail every month until completion. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. Mr. Johnson, Ms. Seiler, and Ms. Ramsay were opposed. The motion passed 5 to 3.**

**RE: Petition of Richard Rothbard  
H-08-4045-2  
223 West Broughton Street  
PIN No. 2-0016-25-018  
Color/Stucco Repair, Repointing/Windows, Doors**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Richard Rothbard.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to rehabilitate and alter the building at 223 West Broughton Street. The applicant intends to open up the second floor for residential space and is requesting approval to install windows in this portion of the building and for additional alterations as follows:

1. Remove the existing T-111 and install new aluminum frame storefront with single-glazed glass transoms. The aluminum frame will have a copper color to match the copper storefront below.

2. Above the transom, the T-111 will be replaced with plaster to infill portions of the missing columns on the far sides and ten vertically aligned wood awning windows with single-glazed clear glass. The existing horizontal plaster bands at the top and bottom of the column capitals will be preserved.
3. The existing copper storefront, glass, tile base, and stucco shell will be preserved. A new metal coping will be installed at the top of the building.
4. A clerestory and roof access area with a wood deck and railing are proposed on the roof. The access area will be surfaced in stucco with fixed wood windows and a standing seam roof. The railing is approximately 12' behind the parapet wall and the access area is located approximately 30' behind that. The access will be minimally visible from the rear of the property.
5. On the lane elevation, new wood one-over-one double-hung windows with single-glazed low-e glass will be installed in the three existing upper story window openings. The CMU which currently infills the lower opening will be replaced with matching brick. Matching brick is proposed to replace the existing CMU which surrounds the existing metal door.
6. A new metal canopy is proposed to suspend over the rear entry door. It projects two feet from the face of the building.

#### **FINDINGS:**

The commercial structure at 223 West Broughton Street was constructed/altered ca. 1917 and is a rated structure in Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The storefront has been altered with the introduction of T-111 replacing the original grouping of contiguous one-over-one double-hung sash windows. The findings are as follows:

1. The proposed windows for the front and rear facades are single-glazed wood frame windows and as such meet the standards for replacement windows on historic structures.
2. The proposed roof access and deck will not be visible from the front elevation and will only be minimally visible from the rear. It is subordinate to the main building, inconspicuous in location, and does not obscure any character defining features.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with the following conditions:**

1. **The brick infill should be able to be differentiated from the original brick so the openings are easily detected and,**
2. **Colors must be submitted to Staff for final approval for windows, stucco, and metal canopy.**

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

1. The brick infill should be able to be differentiated from the original brick so the openings are easily detected and;
2. Colors must be submitted to Staff for final approval for windows, stucco, and metal canopy.

Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Ramsay Sherrill Architects  
Linda Ramsay  
H-08-4046-2  
12 East Taylor Street  
PIN No. 2-0032-15-019  
Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. E. T. Smith.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

Ms. Ramsay recused herself.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to add an elevator at the end of the alley way to the west of the main house.

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed elevator shaft is to be stucco over concrete block to match the main house. The footprint is 3'-11 1/2" by 6'-5" and will be partially hidden by a street wall. The original windows in the "ell" will be retained and new 1/1 windows similar in size to the main house will be placed on the street side of the shaft. The window selection will be coordinated with Staff. The existing condensing units will be moved forward or placed on the roof.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval**

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed 7 to 1. Ms. Ramsay recused herself.**

**RE: Petition of Motorini  
Aron Glinsky  
H-08-4047-2  
236 Drayton Street  
PIN No. 2-0015-30-001  
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Aron Glinsky.

Ms. gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to enclose the existing porte-cochere and replace the garage doors on the building at 236 Drayton Street. An anodized aluminum storefront and garage door will be used to enclose the space and the existing art-deco columns and wall behind will be preserved. The existing garage doors on the west elevation will be replaced with anodized aluminum and impact resistant glass garage doors. Both have an aluminum/silver finish with clear glass.

**FINDINGS:**

The one-story building at 236 Drayton Street was originally constructed sometime between 1936 and 1937. It was built for the Texas Co. as a Texaco Service Station with Art Deco style elements including vertical columns embellished with glass tile inlay. Until early 2008 when Smith's Sunoco relocated its business, this building served as an auto related facility. The proposed redevelopment of the property is for the Motorini Company whose focus is on the Vespa. This use will continue the transportation related industry that has historically been associated with the site.

The garage doors and glass storefront are setback from the historic columns and provide transparency allowing the original porte-cochere to be distinguished from the enclosure, which is also reversible. The existing garage doors are not original to the building and the replacement doors are more appropriate, providing a greater sense of transparency and blending with the existing glass storefront on the building. Historically, there were no garage doors and the openings were open to the environment.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval**

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he was gratified to see that one of the service stations on Drayton was being preserved to appear as a service station. He said that one day he would love to show his daughter what they used to use as a gas station. The Vespa business was a great transition in getting away from oil dependency and that was even more gratifying.

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



**RE: Petition of Sign Mart, Incorporated  
H-08-4050-2  
102 West Bryan Street  
PIN No.  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of fascia sign** and **approval of blade sign with conditions**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Bill Norton and Mr. Jeff Jones.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of an internally projecting blade principal use sign. The size is 5' wide by 15'-5" high or a total of 81.25 Square feet. The sign is to be mounted between the third and fourth story levels on the southwest corner of the building. The applicant is also asking for approval of a 4' tall by 8'-7 1/2" (34.5 square feet) internally illuminated fascia sign to be placed over the north (lane) entrance to the hotel.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The signage as proposed is within the allotted square footage for these entrances. However, while technically allowed, a two-story illuminated sign is incompatible in scale within the National Historic Landmark District. At least three other businesses in the area have scaled back their signage to be more compatible with the scale of the Landmark District. The petitioner may wish to consider an alternative that would use individual letters mounted onto the top of the marquee on the Barnard and Bryan Street sides.
2. The signs consist of an aluminum charcoal grey body and aluminum white pearlescent body with engraved design. The lighting is a halo effect.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval of the lane fascia sign as submitted; approval of a blade projecting sign provided the height not exceed one-story with revised drawing to come to Staff for final approval.**

Ms. Ramsay asked about their feeling for reducing the size of the blade sign.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Jeff Jones (Project Manager for Lodgeworks)** stated that Savannah was the first of four brand hotels with others in Long Beach, Napa, and Houston. He said that Savannah's would open four months prior to Long Beach. They tried new brands to see what would look good for the community. What was not clear was that to reduce the sign to one-story was that the lettering was only two inches wide, had a real thin sheet of metal, and within the letter was a 3/16-inch routed out strip. They had viewed it at night to see what looked good from far away and it was the standard they came up with for the AVIA hotels across the country. To shorten it to a one-story sign would reduce the fonts and it would look

completely different, or the 3/16-inch routed line would be down to just over 1/8-inch which would ruin the look at night. They explored putting the letters up with different sized letters, from different viewpoints, and had architects draw things up but it didn't look as classy as what they ended up with. The size was an issue that was the Board's concern; it was proportionate to the building. The building next door had an eight-foot sign on a four-story building that was put up yesterday. In his opinion, he would request the Board's reconsideration on it because it was a very classy-looking sign.

**Dr. Henry** asked about the building with the other sign.

**Mr. Jeff Jones** displayed a photograph of the sign next door that was installed. He said he looked at their sign in proportion to the type of work they were doing. They were trying to do everything they could to bring a really good look to the building and to the area.

**Ms. Ward** stated that a blade and fascia sign was approved for Five Guys Burgers and Fries that was supposed to be a gray background with red lettering in a rectangular shape and not rounded at the edges.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked about the size of the sign.

**Mr. Jones** stated that the letters weren't as wide and it was a real thin blade that made the difference in the overall look.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the height of the building was much taller than the other building.

**Mr. Jones** said yes; proportionately.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he appreciated the desire to protect the brand, especially when the company was young, and that there was nothing unattractive about what was put together. He said that every national chain that came into the Historic District had to deal with this issue whether it was McDonald's, Five Guys, Outback, or any of them. It may be the only place in your brand where the sign had to be a different size, but if that was the case, then so be it.

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. The motion failed.**

**Mr. Steffen** stated that his thought was to allow them to take another shot at this and come back with something that didn't disrupt the flow of signage and wasn't too big. He said he didn't want to put Staff's recommendation in the motion to constraint it to not exceed one-story because that might be the result. He wanted them to put their creative minds to work and see if they could put something together that Staff was comfortable with it.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she was not in love with the blade sign idea. She said they could look at other options and some signage around the canopy or individual letters.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he would like to see them do it again, that they had approval of the fascia sign and could move forward with that, and that he understood their desire to protect the brand especially when new. He said there were other ways of doing it and it would give them opportunity to do it.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the sign as it appeared was not two stories.

**Mr. Hutchinson** stated that a picture was worth a thousand words and that they said a lot of things that made sense, but that there were no images to show it. He said that with one image they received a lot of attention. When something like this was done they needed to have everything in picture form.

**Mr. Jones** stated that he would be glad to do that but found about the meeting two hours ago. He said that he was the project manager from the construction side of things and was present from Wichita to represent it. It was what they had, and in actuality the letters look bigger than what they do in person. Two inches was not that wide for the eye and that the width of a window frame was two inches.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that it looked like they were trying to attract the attention of someone driving down the highway like a motel sign. She said it was a nice-looking sign, but that people drive around the squares slowly and would not be going 60 miles per hour.

**Mr. Jones** stated that another point was that people who walk on the sidewalk would not be able to see the sign because the canopies cover the sidewalk. He said that the people in the park may or may not see it and part of the image that they were getting was a bright neon lit sign, which was why he went to the 3/16-inch with backlighting. It was very subdued and soft and could not be seen at nighttime. You would just see the backlighting in a thin pencil light that was unique and not like signs that were seen around here. That was why they had the sign company in California design it, they brought it to Kansas, they met at night when it was dark to look at, and spent a lot of time making sure that it wasn't too obtrusive. They did not want to convey cheap because they were an upscale boutique hotel.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that the Board had petitions come to them where some of the views were shown and it helped the Board understand the need for something that might be different. He said that he could reword the motion, but that he wanted to make sure that the second projected sign would come back to Staff for further review, and to allow them an opportunity to present some alternatives. Maybe they could get some drawings that would show what was described because what they saw now was bigger than everything else in the neighborhood and it was a problem.

**Mr. Jones** stated that he had a real sized letter "I" that was made for approval and he would be glad to bring it to Staff.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that it would help the Board more for them to see what it would look like.

**Mr. Gay** stated that it should be the whole sign. He said that since there weren't any other hotels that they couldn't have a photograph but a realistic rendition.

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition for the fascia sign as submitted, and a projecting sign at Barnard and Bryan Streets with the design to be brought back to Staff for further review. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**RE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS**

**RE: STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of Lauren Boxx  
H-08-4032(S)-2  
506 Tattnell Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Monterey Square Properties, LLC  
E. T. Smith  
H-08-4034(S)-2  
23 East Gordon Street  
Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Sean Dixon  
H-08-4035(S)-2  
709 – 711 Price Street  
Roof Repair/Windows, Doors  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of Barnes BBQ Express  
H-08-4036(S)-2  
109 – 115 Whitaker Street  
Sign Color/Logo Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
5. Petition of Turner Interior Solutions  
Jason Turner  
H-08-4038(S)-2  
337 Tattnell Street  
Color Change/Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
6. Petition of Elizabeth Quigley  
David Ferencsik  
H-08-4039(S)-2  
520 East Hall Lane  
519 East Hall Street  
Color Change/Shutters  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
7. Petition of Motorini  
Aron Glinsky  
H-08-4040(S)-2  
236 Drayton Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

8. Petition of Brian Huskey  
H-08-4041(S)-2  
325 East Bay Street  
Door  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
9. Petition of William H. Bradley  
H-08-4042(S)-2  
313 East Gordon Street  
Fence  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
10. Petition of C. E. Hall Construction Company, Inc.  
Allen Neal  
H-08-4043(S)-2  
200 East St. Julian Street  
Alterations to a Ramp  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

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

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

**RE: OTHER BUSINESS**

**a. Unfinished Business**

**b. New Business**

- Board Members

**Ms. Reiter** stated that they were waiting for the City to readvertise the openings on the Board. She said if the Board members know of individuals wanting to submit their applications that Staff could fax the applications, have them fill it out, bring it back to Staff, and they would hand carry them to City Hall. They would only accept them when they were advertised again.

**Dr. Watkins** asked if no one had applied.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that the City told them that no one had applied.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that there were two previous occasions where others had applied that weren't approved. He said that he could think of three individuals who might make good Board members who haven't received approval. It might be worthwhile to resubmit some of those or ask them to resubmit.

- GAPC Fall Meeting

**Ms. Ward** stated that Mr. Judson signed up for the training and he will be sponsored to go to Milledgeville to learn about preservation on October 10th and 11<sup>th</sup>. She said that she wanted to give all Board members a registration form and encourage those who have not attended before to attend, and it might be the last training offered by the stated due to budget cuts. It was a really good opportunity to learn how to be a good Board member, learn about basic preservation practices, and see what other boards were doing.

**Dr. Watkins** asked if there was a particular theme in contrast to the previous one.

**Ms. Ward** stated that they were pretty much the same. She said that if you have been to one before it might be okay not to go, but you learn more about the town that you visit.

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

**HDRB ACTION: Mr. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Hutchinson 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 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

**BR/jnp**