

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

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

February 11, 2009

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

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

HDRB Members Not Present:

**Brian Judson, Vice-Chairman
Gene Hutchinson
Sidney J. Johnson**

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

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

RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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

Dr. Watkins welcomed Mr. Bob Allen's Graduate Preservation Economics class and the new Board member Mr. Reed Engle.

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Continue to March 11, 2009, at the request of the petitioner.

**RE: Petition of Richard Guerard
H-09-4105-2
402 East Hull Street
PIN No. 2-0015-17-002
New Construction**

Continue to March 11, 2009, at the request of the petitioner.

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

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

**RE: Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff & Shay
H-07-3862-2
23 Montgomery Street
PIN No. 2-0016-03-005-008
New Construction
One-year extension of previous approval to March 12,
2010**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Petition of Day & Day, LLC
J. Steve Day
H-09-4099-2
418 East Bryan Street
PIN No. 2-0004-19-003
New Construction/Rear Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Petition of Daniel Brown
H-09-4100-2
228 Factors Walk
PIN No. 2-0004-11-009
Balcony and Railing**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Petition of Red Rock Electric dba
Savannah Cruisers
Charlie Brewer
H-09-4102-2
409 East Bay Street
PIN No. 2-0004-19-006
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Petition of Patrick Phelps, AIA
Hansen Architects, P.C.
H-09-4103-2
412 West Bay Street
PIN No. 2-0003-14-001
Fence and Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Petition of Pamela Stanmire
H-09-4104-2
41 Drayton Street
PIN No. 2-0004-39-009
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

**RE: Petition of Richard Rothbard
H-09-4106-2
223 West Broughton Street
PIN No. 2-0016-25-012
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 submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

**RE: Amended Petition of Kessler River Street, LLC
 Drew Locher
 H-06-3607-2
 102 West Bay Street
 PIN No. 2-0004 -07-001
 Signs**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Drew Locher.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of a signage package including a principal use blade sign; a projecting principal use sign on River Street; two building identification signs; and two principal use signs for the upper story restaurant uses.

FINDINGS:

The River Street-Factors Walk Sign Ordinance applies:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
<p>Principal Use Signs: Where a business establishment fronts on more than one street providing public access to the establishment, one principal use sign for each frontage providing public access shall be permitted.</p>	<p>One fascia principal use sign is proposed for Bay Street and one projecting principal use sign is proposed for River Street for the hotel use.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
<p>Projecting signs shall be permitted one-square-foot of display area per linear foot-of-frontage occupied by each ground level principal use. Maximum sign area of 16 square feet for each use.</p> <p>Fascia signs shall be permitted one-square-foot of sign area per linear foot-of-frontage up to a maximum sign area of 30 square feet.</p>	<p>The Bay Street sign is 15’ tall by 2’ wide for a total of 30 square feet. The opaque white letters are halo (back lit) against a burgundy background.</p> <p>A 16-square-foot principal use sign with ¼-inch thick metal letters is proposed to project from the corner of the building on River Street. It will be indirectly lighted by arm</p>	<p>The principal use sign standards are met.</p>

<p>The outer edge shall not extend more than six feet from the building.</p> <p>A fascia sign not exceeding eight square feet in area may be erected on the River Street façade for an upper story establishment with public access through another principal use.</p> <p>Internally lighted or neon signs are prohibited.</p>	<p>mounted spotlights. A drawing of the decorative metal support bracket has been provided.</p> <p>Two 6.72-square-foot metal principal use signs will flank the River Street entrance for the two upper story restaurants. The letters and border are ½-inch brushed stainless steel. The signs are indirectly lighted by spots above the signs. The background simulates polished black river rocks.</p>	
<p>Building Identification Signs: The maximum aggregate size shall not exceed an area of one-half square-foot per linear foot-of-building frontage and shall not exceed an area of 30 square feet.</p>	<p>Building Identification signs are proposed for the north, south, and west elevations. The signs are Reverse Channel halo illuminated letters totaling 30 square feet each.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval as submitted.

Mr. Steffen questioned the building identification sign.

Ms. Reiter stated that Mr. Randolph Scott, the Zoning Administrator, ruled that it met the requirements for a building identification sign.

Mr. Steffen asked what the name of the building was.

Ms. Reiter stated that it would be called The Kessler.

Mr. Steffen stated that he would vote for the motion because a determination had been made. He said that he had questions on whether it was a building identification sign and if the Board went forward with it they would have to deal with the issue again because, in this case, it was a brand. The brand could also be a building identification sign and he wanted whoever made that determination to be careful about it or the Board would see every building in Savannah branded and called a building identification sign.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay 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: Amended Petition of Martie Gay for
Mr. and Mrs. Tracy Young
H-06-3631-2
19 East Gordon Street
PIN No. 2-0032 -44-009
Alterations for a New Carriage House**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval.**

Present for the petition was Ms. Martie Gay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

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

1. Eliminate the second story spiral stair case and replace with an elevator to access the top roof deck. The elevator shaft is 6’ deep by 6’ wide extending 10’-4” above the roof and will be stuccoed to match the approved building material. The elevator door will feature a brick arch header and incorporate an existing door from the main house. This portion fronts the side yard and will most likely not be visible from the public right-of-way; and
2. Alter the proposed parapet from a solid wall to a more transparent design featuring stuccoed piers with wrought iron balusters between the piers to match the approved balcony design. The height of the wall will not be changed.

FINDINGS:

The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030):

(1) Design Standards

(1) Height (b.) Secondary structures which front a lane shall be no taller than two stories; (f.) Rooftop structures such as church spires; cupolas; chimneys; tanks and supports; parapet walls not over 4’ high; penthouses used solely to enclose stairways or elevator machinery, and ventilation or air conditioning apparatus shall not be considered a story.

The standards are met.

(10) Roofs (e.)Roof decks and pergolas shall only be visible from the rear elevation.

The standard is met.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Ramsay stated that the height of the rail would be the same and asked about the dimensions of the wrought iron.

Ms. Martie Gay (Representing Mr. and Mrs. Tracy Young) stated that the wrought iron would be consistent with what had already been approved for the existing main deck. She said it would be the same wrought iron pattern.

Ms. Ramsay asked about the corbelling at the top of the shaft. She said she would expect to find something similar to what would be on the chimney or to the right of it.

Ms. Gay stated that if you looked at the chimney design, that the shaft design is very similar and used the same detailing that was on the carriage house and chimney.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it did not reflect the same detail on the carriage house, but substantially more. She said that on the chimney it came back in rather than just extending outward.

Ms. Gay stated that the petitioner had no problem noting on the plans that it would be exactly like the carriage house to match

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the roof was flat at the top of the elevator shaft.

Ms. Gay stated that it was flat.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it would drain off.

Ms. Gay stated that it would drain off into the garden.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it was brick or stucco.

Ms. Gay stated that the material would be stucco. She said whether it was brick underneath or traditional framing covered with stucco, the homeowner had no problem doing whatever the Board would like. They planned on building a traditional frame.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation-HSF/Architectural Review Committee-ARC) said that although the ordinance stated that elevator towers did not count as a story that it was the petitioner's position to add a ten-foot four-inch by six-foot deep elevator shaft to the top of the building, and it was adding a partial story to the building. She said it was proposed for a dependency; one that should be subservient to the main house and was not in keeping with spirit of the ordinance. The

proposed tower added a large, visible, and unnecessary additional mass to the top of the secondary building. It was visually incompatible with the adjacent historic carriage houses and they opposed the petition.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Henry asked if they could add clay pots and narrow it to put in a more similar topping.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the size would be (inaudible) by the elevator shaft. She said that it looked fake but thought there were ways to address it.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it was unusual to have a carriage house with two towers on top. He said that one was for the fireplace and a bar-b-que on the roof, and then the elevator towers were quite incongruent. If they could combine them then it would be better.

Ms. Gay stated that HSF commented on the height. She said in another section there was a previously approved eight-inch pergola. They were adding two feet four inches on one corner and there was already massing that was approved as part of the plan on the roof. It wasn't a chimney that was just sticking up, but rather a pergola showing massing on the roof deck. There was an issue with having the large wrought iron staircase going up the side of the building that was not liked visually. By adding the elevator, it allowed them to remove the staircase and the wrought iron balcony making it more visually appealing from the lane.

Mr. Engle asked about the loading capacity; if it was a lift or a two-person elevator.

Ms. Gay stated that it was a small elevator. She said that the sizing could come down, that they had just received the specifications for what they would be using, and the interior free space could be decreased to 48 ½ inches by 48 ½ inches. If you added the six-inch wall on either side it would bring it down from six feet.

Mr. Engle asked if there could be another possible location.

Ms. Gay stated that they were limited because of the two carriage doors into the garage. She said that it was the only area available for them to be able to go up and down with the staircase and the elevator. To access the roof deck before, you had to go outside and up the winding staircase to the family's grill and patio area.

Mr. Engle asked if they could eliminate the winding staircase entirely and put the elevator shaft where the staircase was originally.

Ms. Gay stated that it could go there but it might be a bigger issue with the Board and HSF. She said it was something that was talked about and they tried to have the of impact on the building and the surrounding area so that it would be more enclosed within the structure and penetrate through the roof for exiting. It was in keeping with a multidimensional house. They had no problem doing it out of brick if the Board asked, but they were trying to minimize the look and draw less attention to the structure.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the drawings were confusing because they said they removed the spiral staircase. She said the Board had seen the project go back and forth and the drawings should reflect what their intent would be.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the elevator projection and the chimney stood alone and that the pergola was approved. He wondered if the chimney had a bar-b-que and not a fireplace on the roof of the carriage house, and if it couldn't be moved by the elevator to create one mass with the flue of the fireplace below it. It seemed like two separate vertical masses on top of a carriage house that was heavy.

Mr. Engle stated that he agreed with Ms. Ramsay and was confused by the drawings. He really couldn't tell and they needed to be clearer.

Dr. Watkins stated that it seemed there was some consensus for needing clearer information. He said the Board could not necessarily rule on a continuance, but it probably wasn't heading in a favorable direction. They had the option of asking for a continuance and the Board could vote on it.

Ms. Gay requested a continuance. She said that the fireplace was one that sat on top of another fireplace in the main living area below and there would be a chimney there regardless.

Mr. Steffen stated that his question was one that HSF raised on whether it was subservient to the main structure. He said that one part that was missing was a good comparison between what was submitted and what the main structure looked like now. It would be helpful to him to be able to see that. He was not as concerned with some things other Board members raised, but was concerned with that issue and the Board was correct in saying that they couldn't get a good grip on it.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that if they had a west elevation showing the existing building and the two towers as they related to the building that it would help.

Mr. Gay stated an elevation of the front of the building from Gordon Street.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the March 11, 2009, meeting at the petitioner's request. Mr. Engle seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Christian Sottile et al
H-08-4068-2
233 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard at Turner Street
PIN No. 2-0031-47-004
Rehabilitation and New Construction/Part I Height and Mass**

The Preservation Officer recommends continuance.

Present for the petition was Mr. Christian Sottile.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicants are requesting approval of Part I, Height and Mass for a rehabilitation/new construction project for the north shed of the Central of Georgia Railroad Building at 233 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard.

The proposed project for rehabilitation/new construction incorporates the ruins of the 1853 Up Freight Warehouse into a new design for the Savannah College of Art and Design Museum of Art. The existing walls will be conserved in their present state along Turner Street with a contemporary building behind it. The proposed cast concrete wall beyond will provide permanent support for the remaining historic wall.

A nine-foot wide glass wall will replace the non-historic concrete wall that connects the former Central of Georgia Headquarters building (now Kiah Hall) to the former warehouse. A solid concrete wall is proposed to fill in the remaining area until the historic wall is reached, spanning 39'-11". This wall will incorporate a light reveal at sidewalk level and will provide a location for engraved building signage. Further west down the block, a 75' wide glass curtain wall, framed on either side by concrete walls spanning a total of 134.75 feet, will provide a wall of continuity along the street where a large portion of the existing historic wall has collapsed.

The applicant proposes to utilize the intersection of Turner and Papy Streets to highlight the entrance fronting Turner Street, incorporating a 20' wide by 30' deep by 86' tall translucent tower to serve as a beacon and to add variation to the skyline. The tower projects 30" from the face of the building with additional pilasters supporting the tower portion above, projecting a total of five and one-half feet into the public right-of-way.

Glass boxes (13' wide by 17'-6" tall) encase the existing archways along Turner Street, formerly used as openings into the warehouse. They encroach 30" into the public right-of-way. A glass canopy is proposed over the historic portions of the façade projecting six feet over the top of the existing historic wall providing coverage from the elements.

Originally designed as a one-story warehouse, the proposed design incorporates two levels within the building, elevating the height beyond the historic walls from 23' to 32'-2". The existing brick walls will remain at their existing height of 23', while the cast concrete walls beyond will extend up 32'-2". Light monitors are located on the roof at regular intervals. Monitors extend 4' above the proposed roof line and are 26' deep.

Gateways to the interior courtyard are proposed on Fahm Street and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK). The gate on MLK will be enlarged with a new frame flanked with new solid garden walls and the existing historic iron fencing to provide access to the courtyard through a new centrally located staircase. The new frames are proposed to be 13' wide by 17' tall of polished concrete. The Fahm Street gate will be flanked by vegetated cast concrete garden walls nine feet in height.

BACKGROUND:

The property is a contributing structure to the Central of Georgia Railroad: Savannah Shops and Terminal Facilities National Historic Landmark District.

The shed was constructed in 1853 as the Up Freight Warehouse for the Central of Georgia Railroad; predating the Central of Georgia Headquarters building fronting MLK, to which it is attached, by two years. The footprints of both structures are illustrated as early as 1856 in John M. Coopers Map (illustrated in the packet provided). The Up Freight was the first building completed in the passenger, freight, and office area north of the repair shops. The building is described as a simple, one-story brick structure, approximately 60 feet wide by 800 feet long, compartmentalized by fire walls, with wooden trusses supporting the roof and large, wooden double doors (1975, NHL Nomination). These buildings are illustrated in the 1871 and later 1891 (Figure 1) Bird’s Eye Views.

FINDINGS:

Stabilization of the remaining warehouse walls, now in a state of ruin, was approved by the Historic Board of Review on November 12, 2008.

The former warehouse building is currently sited on two parcels, both zoned B-C (Community Business). The proposed structure is a Monumental Structure, defined as an “institutional building such as a church sanctuary, governmental building, school or institution of higher learning, theater or museum, historically having special or unique form because of the nature of its use [Historic District ordinance (Section 8-3030)]” and is exempt from strict interpretation of the design standards; the visual compatibility factors apply.

The interior courtyard will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way but for the most part is obscured from view and not subject to review. Improvements to the sidewalks for widening (to approximately 10’ in width) and an additional 8’ for planting of street trees and on-street parking are also planned for the development in coordination with the City of Savannah and will be reviewed by City infrastructure departments. The project was submitted to the City for Site Plan Review and is on their agenda for February 5, 2009.

The following height and mass standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Development Standards: No setbacks are required and 100 percent lot coverage is permitted in the B-C zone.	The proposed footprint is located on the historic footprint of the former warehouse. Six 30” Glass projections and a glass tower are proposed on the Turner Street elevation.	Provide site plan showing all encroachments and property lines in relationship to the building for Part II, Design Details.
Street Elevation Type:	Historic Railroad Warehouse building.	
Entrances:	One entrance is provided on Turner Street and courtyard entrances are located on MLK and Fahm Streets.	Incorporate more entrances on the 800’ long Turner Street façade to provide breaks along the masonry building and to enhance the pedestrian experience.
Building Height: Five-story height zone.	The existing historic wall is 23’-2” and the proposed concrete wall beyond is 32’ tall. A central translucent tower is 86’ tall.	Reduce or redesign the height of the tower to reinforce the strong horizontal elements which characterize the historic warehouses present in the Central of Georgia NHL district.

<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:</p>	<p>The design incorporates the remains of an existing historic façade whose proportions establish the appropriate height and width proportions. A vertical 86' tall tower is located within an otherwise continuous 800' long one-story warehouse building. The remaining wall is 23' tall without its original gable roof.</p>	<p>The tower element is out of proportion with the contributing structure to which it is related. Staff recommends reducing the height or redesigning this feature.</p>
<p>Proportion of Openings:</p>	<p>Six existing arched openings establish the appropriate proportions of openings within the façade. They are approximately 13' wide by 16' tall.</p>	<p>Staff recommends redesign of the glass coverings over the openings to allow the historic façade to remain as it is with as little intrusion as possible. Glass should be flush with the opening or recessed to reinforce the shape of the arched openings. Provide information on infill of rectangular openings for Part II, Design Details.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</p>	<p>The rhythm of solids-to-voids is established within the existing façade. Large gaps within the wall will be infilled with cast concrete and glass.</p>	<p>The juxtaposition of the concrete and glass walls behind the current wall maintains the existing rhythm of solids-to-voids while distinguishing the old from the new.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:</p>	<p>The rhythm of porch projections and walkways is established by the current building. The proposed design features 6 projecting glass boxes (13' wide by 30" deep) and a tower element that projects approximately 5'-5".</p>	<p>Staff recommends restudy of these elements; see above comments on Proportion of Openings. Historically, projections may have occurred on these buildings in the form of loading docks or platforms. The proposed entry portico recalls the Greek Revival style Kiah Hall more than an industrial expression. The glass bays and tower are out of context with the continuous 800' façade and create numerous recesses and projections breaking up the visual continuity of the historic building wall.</p>
<p>Walls of Continuity:</p>	<p>Spans of cast concrete and glass are proposed where historic portions of the wall have collapsed creating a wall of continuity along the street.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval for infill; see above for comments on projections.</p>
<p>Scale:</p>	<p>The existing one-story warehouse building and surrounding historic structures provide the context for scale.</p>	<p>The proposed tower element is out of proportion and scale with the contributing structures to which it is related. The Central of Georgia Railroad building to which the warehouse structure is attached should</p>

		remain the dominant structure in that collection of buildings.
Directional Expression of Front Elevation:	The directional expression is characterized by the strong horizontality of the existing historic structure.	The contemporary infill elements along the east and west end compliment and build upon the existing horizontal character. The proposed strong vertical tower element is in contrast to the directional character of the historic building to which it is visually related.

RECOMMENDATION:

The exposed cast concrete and glass curtain walls provide a subtle yet harmonious contemporary juxtaposition to this significant landmark structure. The warehouses and sheds that comprise the passenger and terminal area of the Central of Georgia Railroad National Landmark Historic District are defined by their 600’ to 800’ long spans of low horizontal lines, allowing the frontage buildings along MLK to serve as dominant element of the building composition. This design pattern still exists in the remaining railroad structures and should be retained through the re-design of the Up Freight Building. The grand glass curtain wall to the west of the tower suggests a strong contemporary element that again is harmonious in design with the existing building.

1. **Staff recommends reducing the height or redesigning the tower above the entrance.** The height of the tower competes with the horizontality of building. Staff recommends utilizing the glass curtain wall area, which is all new, for a grand entrance if one is needed. An additional entry at the convergence of Papy Street could and should still be provided.
2. **Staff recommends that the design provide more entrances along the Turner Street façade.** This façade spans 800’ and only one entrance is provided on what is suggested to be a major pedestrian thoroughfare connecting the SCAD residential area to the campus and the rest of the historic district. Within the existing historic wall, arched openings, now enclosed, provide much needed breaks within the long masonry wall. Staff recommends opening these up for entrances where possible as was done on the Down Freight Warehouse behind Eichberg Hall. Where openings were not usable or feasible, shuttered doors were installed to reinforce the indication that an opening had been there and the shape of the historic arch. The same could be done here with glass.
3. **Staff recommends restudy the glass enclosures over the arches.** Staff recommends preserving the arches as they are; butt glazing could be incorporated within or flush with the opening if needed to reinforce the shape of the arch and maintain the consistent wall of continuity along Turner Street.
4. **Details for signage, lighting, and window openings should be provided in the Part II submittal.**

Staff recommends a continuance to address the items above.

Dr. Watkins stated that since the recommendation was a continuance that the petitioner would appreciate feedback.

Ms. Ward stated that there would be a presentation to show how they came up with the design decisions.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Christian Sottile (Sottile & Sottile) stated that he was excited to present a project this afternoon that is of great significance to Savannah as a whole and to the international community beyond. He said that Staff mentioned he was there to present, but he represented an entire team of architects who have been working on the project diligently. Mr. Neil Dawson, Ms. Meg Needle from Lord, Aeck & Sargent, as well as their client Mr. Martin Smith from the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD). They were talking about the SCAD museum and the Evans Center in the site of the former north sheds of the Central of Georgia Railway.

Four categories were developed as they critiqued the design to bring it into its current form. It included urbanism, ideals about materiality, and then finally the form of the building. For context they looked at the district in the West Boundary area where Ms. Ward had shared its more recent history as the Central of Georgia Railway. Going back to the 1820's, it had an entirely different development pattern. It began in an area that was similar to many other neighborhoods in Savannah as a walkable fine-grain pattern of urban development as seen in the 1820's map. Of course, the railway would change it by creating a much more industrial character, erasing the patterns of human habitation that had begun emerging in those earlier years. Interestingly, Turner Street was referred to as New Street at that time and, in fact, was the premiere street in this district before Oglethorpe Avenue became a dominant street later on.

The challenge was that the solution here must be a civic building. With that came an entirely different set of challenges and opportunities, but every decision made had tested that. They started at the broadest level of the skyline of Savannah looking at the magic moment you see when coming over the Talmadge Bridge. At the peak of the bridge the entire skyline of the city was remarkably intact and legible. In fact, the city had an intact skyline punctuated by its most remarkable buildings that had been collected over centuries; the dome of City Hall, the spires of the Cathedral, the towers of the public buildings. The Historic Review Board had approved two major buildings to be built on Turner Street; a five-story hotel and a six-story parking garage to be built on the block between Turner Street, Papy Street, Oglethorpe Avenue, and Fahm Street. They took the skyline and starting studying it: what was going to happen when they would extend the wall of private development? The future skyline would look something like the height of the existing Hampton Inn at the corner of MLK and Turner, and would essentially continue as a wall of private buildings down Turner Street. Their quest was if it was appropriate to mark the skyline in a small way, then they must understand the future context. A skyline element within this building could contribute to the district to help provide an identifiable moment with the public landmarks and West Boundary. Height assessments for the skyline element were in relationship to the approved five- and six-story buildings.

Papy Street seemed to be a very logical place to create the main entrance for the museum and, in fact, it marked the rhythm of blocks that was familiar in the district. The Papy Street sidewalk lined up directly with one of the historic arches in the remnant of the wall. When you come up to the corner of Turner Street and MLK looking at the incredible example of Greek Revival architecture, Kiah Hall, and down the long expanse of the 800-foot long block of Turner Street, they started to study what would a vertical element in that area do to help mark an entrance there and vary the skyline along the streetscape. This was a broad scale, the idea of what did it take to be civic, what did it take to be the scale of something civic, but not to be forgotten and equally important was when you get close to it. It had to be really good.

The test was that the solution must be humane at street level. The scale was individual and every choice must lead to a more humane version of the area. They started with Turner Street and asked how can they make it a great street because it was a street that was not made for people. It was a great urban design 101 photograph, and he asked what was wrong with the picture. He said that you see students constantly making the trek in the center of the road with parked cars on the other side next to the sidewalk. They started to look closely at what was possible in the right-of-way. The solution recommended a ten-foot sidewalk and a defined parking zone that introduced the street trees into that setting to create a narrower sense of travel way for moving cars, and created a much broader sidewalk for pedestrians. They also looked at ways to make the sidewalk a safer more comfortable place. As part of the proposal they designed a glass awning that would do a couple of things. It was there to preserve the wall, but also to provide shelter for pedestrians down Turner Street.

When they looked at the urban fabric they realized that the rhythm of Papy Street actually divided the block into an increment that was much more like the rest of Savannah. It was about 400 feet and typical blocks were 300 feet. They were really excited about an opportunity to create a movement through the block. He pointed out the Visitor's Center and said that the opportunity for visitors at the Visitor's Center, the Roundhouse Complex, or the future Childrens' Museum to be able to move through the block at the midpoint. It was another important moment for the design team to really look at making the passage there clearly identified. Also, a north-south movement was needed through what was now designed as a public garden; a courtyard garden for the museum that would exist between the new building and the existing shed behind Eichberg Hall.

As they got to the question of materiality they realized that it was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to deal with a project that was not a typical preservation project. They were dealing with a building that was not there any more. What they did have, as they thought about putting a new building on the site, were the remnants of something that was absolutely spectacular and irreplaceable, in the fragments of the walls that still remain on the site. That became the largest inspiration for the project. They realized that they needed to do something here that would be world class, that would be unrepeatabe, that would take advantage of the great inheritance they have with the wall.

He displayed a slide of words and stated that the words were just a sampling of ways they thought about the project. What was old was contrasted by what was new; what was rough could be contrasted with what was smooth; what was coarse was contrasted by something that was fine; what's opaque and solid was contrasted by things that were more transparent; what's horizontal was contrasted by design positions that were more vertical; what's heavy was contrasted by things that were light. Every decision could be looked at under this plan as a way of creating a real dialogue; a way of living with our history

and at the same time making history on this site. These kinds of images were inspirational. They found that the skyline element, another inspiration for marking the sky, should take a modern approach and blend in with an industrial building being retrofitted as a museum, but it had a sense of civic identity symbolizing the skyline in the wonderful image of the night sky. They took those ideas and started to bring it down to the level of form in the solutions that the Board saw in their package. The biggest idea there for them was that the solution must be memorable; the Board could say it was hard to achieve, but great civic buildings were memorable and not repeatable. Once you have seen them you realize they can't be done anywhere else, and when you see them somewhere else, somebody has copied it.

The first mission was to save the remnants of the wall and the solution was the insertion of a new building. A very smooth, clean, concrete sleeve that would sit just inside the body of the old remaining walls of the north shed, to provide support for them and provide contrast to them. You saw that in the long elevation with the new building sitting just within. Staff pointed out that there were two major exceptions along the integrity of the remaining wall. There was a large gap just west of Papy Street and then there was another gap between Kiah Hall. They looked at those as opportunities for the new building to express itself more freely than it did, when it was doing the task of rescuing the old walls. They also decided to explore the entrance at the Papy Street intersection.

They looked at the back of Kiah Hall where the historic wall ended and proposed a connection between old and new that was transparent to create a gentler fit. Think of it as a gasket between old and new that would have a nine-foot segment of glazing. At the other break they realized they had an opportunity to open up glass again and they have a section of more transparent wall, but were interested in the dialogue of conserving the historic fabric of this building in its state. Again, stabilizing it and preserving it so that it was actually a testament to the linear horizontal quality that this area has had.

The arches were by far their favorite part of the old fabric; they were exceptional. Brick masons were challenged to create elliptical arches in today's day and age of this quality. The idea they proposed along the Turner Street frontage started first and foremost out of deep respect for the arches. They could not find a way to attach glass to them or inside of them without somehow affecting them and making them less of an expressed geometry. Their proposal was to create a display for the arch by inserting glass outside of the wall. In a sense, they were putting the arch under glass and making that part of the exhibit. Part of the museum was being able to use the arches as a living part of the public side of the building as part of that exhibit. They did think that through lighting they would have a better opportunity to display it in this way rather than leaving them exposed to the elements to degrade further over time, so this idea was proposed. A second agenda behind trying to do this was to make Turner a better street to create a sense of rhythm along that streetscape. They walk down their favorite streets in Savannah and they have projecting bay windows, stoops, porches, and elements that provided interest in the streetscape. Try walking down 800 feet, try walking down the Civic Center. Part of the mission was in how to make the windows opportunities for display, to collect light, and to diffuse the light back out into the public realm of the streetscape. There was no way to put glass into the arch properly without damaging the arch, but by putting it under glass it would actually preserve it in a more effective way, and allowed you to see exactly what it was.

Staff mentioned that some rectangular openings had been bricked in over time and that they would like to restore that rhythm to the streetscape. They were looking for every opportunity to make it a more interesting and active streetscape. Design Detail was not indicated yet because they were at the Height and Mass level, but they wanted to share some of the thoughts that had gone into those pieces.

At the entrance was the special moment where the sidewalk crossed into the archway within the wall and they were looking at that as the main entrance. This, in a sense, would be similar to the other arches that would have glass in front of the arch protecting it, but it would actually provide the entrance as well. There was a view where they were starting to put the ideas together. A building that was a memorable series of contrasts was all designed into the best use to try and communicate what they were. The transparent volume that was reaching up to mark the skyline provided a scale and texture along Turner Street that made it a much more walkable street. They were seeing a dialogue of old and new; rough and smooth contrasting ideas.

The elevations were shown from a technical standpoint contrasting and showing the contextual scale of all of the elements in this long section of the city starting at the Civic Center, which was remarkable when you drew it. He pointed out MLK Boulevard, the head house at Kiah Hall, the beginning of the museum, the marker at Papy Street, and continuing on to the end of the block to the larger gap in the wall, Fahm Street, and the Turner House residences beyond on the edge of West Boundary. Looking back from Fahm Street you could see a good relationship of the shed, you could see where they have shown were the approved buildings; the parking garage and the hotel beyond in relationship to the lantern element, which was derived as being one-story above the five-story hotel and six level parking deck on the north side of Turner Street. It was effectively one-story taller within the five-story height zone – the proposal showed approximately a six-story height for that element, as a threshold.

He was not going to spend much time on the courtyard. As Staff mentioned, it was not a key part of the review, but he wanted to share just a few images and some of the things that would happen there because they saw it as another very important side of the project and a way of creating a new, shared community space within the West Boundary. With that came the importance of providing a proper entrance, and they studied the existing wall between Kiah Hall and Eichberg Hall to look at a way to create a proper entrance to this new public space that had never existed before. They looked at creating essentially a gateway, a portal into that space and a monumental stair to be built within the courtyard so that visitors and students can enter that space in a comfortable way. They had a great tradition of those kinds of entrances in the West Boundary. He showed an image of the Mary Marshall house (now demolished) on Oglethorpe Avenue (the old West Broad Street). There was a wonderful garden entrance there. Even existing today was the entrance to the Scarborough House which was now the Ships of the Sea Museum. The great example of how, as you move into the West Boundary area, that the gardens started to become apparent.

He thanked the Board for hearing him out and hoped to leave the Board with the idea that this was a solution that must be civic or must be held to that standard and cannot be done anywhere else, at any other time, in any other way.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked what the materials of the walls behind the existing walls would be.

Mr. Sottile stated that they expected it to be cast concrete so that it would have a very smooth quality. He said they realized that the historical wall was made of many pieces with the individual bricks and felt that the solution actually needed to be equal and opposite. It needed to be very clean and easily legible.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it would have stone images or would it be totally smooth.

Mr. Sottile stated that it would be smooth. He said that it was what they knew at this point because they were not at Design Details. The intentions were that it would have a polished finish.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that his second question was that the Papy Street entrance into the building, the garden, and so forth was not where the tower was. It separated the west of the tower by several feet.

Mr. Sottile stated that it was aligned with the Papy street right-of-way and did favor the western side of the right-of-way to align with the sidewalk.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if Papy Street ran down when you looked down Papy Street, if it was the entrance that took you through the garden, or was it the entrance under the tower.

Mr. Sottile stated that the tower marked the entrance.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the tower was in the middle of Papy Street as you looked south.

Mr. Sottile answered yes.

(Ms. Meg Needles answered Mr. Meyerhoff from the audience out-of-order without approaching the microphone - inaudible.)

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it ran directly into the garden.

Dr. Watkins informed Mr. Sottile that if anyone wanted to speak they needed to state their name and come to the microphone to record it.

Mr. Sottile stated in answer Mr. Meyerhoff's question, that on the site plan was the Papy Street alignment and the element that would be the primary entrance and that would allow the passage through the mid block. There were additional arches that continued west along that streetscape he thought Mr. Meyerhoff was seeing in that image.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he liked the presentation and some of the background thinking. He said the thing that bothered him a little was that he remembered so many years ago where the Historic Review Board met at the site with Mr. Neil Dawson and SCAD being present, and they were talking about preservation of the one-story long warehouse. The way it appeared now was that, as preservationists, they would show the remnants of a deteriorating wall and he was wondering if there wouldn't be another way of depicting it so that it represented that there was once a building there. In other words, capping off the top with an eave line of the gabled roof that was over it to show there was a building there.

Mr. Sottile stated that he emphasized that one of the parts of the proposal, as it related to the old wall, was that there was a projection that would simulate a sense of a projected eave above and a section of the remaining wall.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if it was a projective eave or a canopy.

Mr. Sottile stated that in fact, the original building had a parapet wall on Turner Street with no projecting eave along the public right-of-way.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it was a gabled roof.

Mr. Sottile stated that it was a gabled roof that came behind the parapet and then drained internally.

Mr. Steffen stated that he wanted to apologize to some who would prefer that he not make some of his comments before he heard from members of the public. He promised that he would listen to them, but that he had to leave the meeting early before the discussion was over, and wanted to make sure that Mr. Sottile and the other architects heard his comments. He wanted to say that after having read the information provided by the Staff, which he greatly respected, he was going to note his disagreement with their conclusions about the tower element. He shared the architects' vision after seeing the project, and he thought that it was important for something that was going to be so important to the fabric; that there be an iconic element to it. He was sure that when they decided to put the pyramid in front of the Louvre that there were people who said that it was a travesty. He thought the glass tower drew the exact perfect attention to this project, thought it was iconic, thought it blended the new and the old which they were obviously trying to do in a museum element, and he was going to enthusiastically support that the Board did not mess with or reduce the element. He knew that there were things in the submission that probably needed more review and he did not want to go into great detail in all those, but this was very much an adaptive reuse, an adaptive use of an age that, unfortunately, had gone by and maybe would some day return with the use of trains. He could not think of a more perfect location for what SCAD wanted to do; he wanted to complement them not only on their vision, but their choice of the architectural team to work with them. He thought that they at least had the team exactly right, and said that an evaluation needed to be made over a lot of the important elements that they yet have to do. As a larger vision he thought this was wonderful. He also wanted to say that a lot of times when the Board talked about going to the maximum height or even beyond it, the greatest danger that they faced on the Board was that someone would do something and then everything around it started getting really big. That was the exact opposite of what he believed was going to happen here. Because of the iconic nature of this particular tower that was being placed there, he thought it was going to visually discourage the growing up of things around it because it was going to be that iconic identifying landmark where people would say we're going to the museum, we're going to visit the old train shed, we're going to visit the Coastal Heritage area, we're going to visit the Battlefield, and that's our landmark. He thought it was a tremendous way of drawing peoples' attention to something that he hoped would become a reality. Again, he wanted to complement what had been done so far. For those who were saying that he's jumping ahead, he knows there was a lot of work yet to be done on this, but he wanted to make sure that they didn't stray too far from the vision.

Dr. Watkins asked if there were any more questions for Mr. Sottile.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she understood what Mr. Steffen was saying about the tower, but the height was not her problem with the tower. She said that her problem was probably the blandness of it. This was an opportunity for a solution for an art museum and it was just out of glass block. That's kind of been done, or a transparent tower. She asked what materials they intended to use.

Mr. Sottile stated that they had not produced a material selection for the element yet. He said that they have really been more concerned about the urbanism of it, its form, and its positioning. He would say that he thought it had translucent quality. He thought it had to be light, he thought it had to be luminous, and he thought it was simplicity which was the balance that they were trying to strike here. They've adopted a language that was meant to be very minimal and very austere. They did a job of creating an identifying landmark in a very modern era. It has been approximately 100 years since a civic building has been attempted to add to the skyline in Savannah. They looked at all of their favorite landmarks of the city and realized that they had all been rendered in ways that were corresponding to their time in history, and they felt that the opportunity was to do something that was exquisitely minimal. That was their goal for design development, design detail, to really explore what that meant in that regard.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she associated the glass block buildings with 1960's development rather than a more modern expression of our time. She said that other than that she thought the 1820's map brought up the question that Staff had about openings on Turner Street where they saw multiple blocks and multiple entries. She asked Mr. Sottile if he would address the Staff's comments about the entries on Turner Street.

Mr. Sottile stated that he was going to ask the design team to help with that answer. He said that the program for a monumental building was somewhat of an exception. In fact, in the ordinance the requirement for multiple entrances was not one put toward civic buildings because of their size and their unique program. Certainly the program of the museum was exceptional in that respect.

Mr. Neil Dawson (Neil Dawson Architects) stated that Mr. Sottile was right. He said that they absolutely struggled with this issue, much like Staff had, in the suggestion that multiple entrances in the arches was one of the ideas that they actually considered strongly and looked at. They felt like recessing those back didn't create that kind of active street environment. They felt that by pulling them forward slightly 30-inches, that it would activate the street and create, as you look completely down the 800 feet, a sense of rhythm for where the entrances would be. Of course, historically, they would have been closed with some kind of shutter door so there would not have been an entrance historically that would fit the use. As Mr. Sottile said, that with the museum you typically don't want to have six or seven entrances to the museum. From a security standpoint they couldn't. They were kind of stuck between a rock and a hard place. They felt that by pulling them forward and creating a sort of "jewel box" of museum display that it might be a way to energize the street and create a visual rhythm as you look down the street.

Dr. Henry stated that he was confused about the glass and the arches. He said that he thought he heard Mr. Sottile say that it was a preservation move; needing the glass in front of the arches to preserve the arches.

Mr. Sottile stated that was right.

Dr. Henry stated that he also thought he heard Mr. Dawson say that it was an aesthetic choice.

Mr. Sottile stated that it was two-fold. He said that one of the results of creating the “jewel box” display was to create a visual rhythm on the street that did not exist currently, and in doing that they also had a way of bringing displays within the existing arches. It’s a conservation strategy in that it was protecting the top of the wall.

Dr. Henry asked if Mr. Sottile was saying that it was possible to follow the Staff’s recommendation and physically possible to add glass to the inside of the arches.

Mr. Sottile stated that anything’s possible. He said that to put glass inside of the arches was more invasive to the arches themselves. There was a more interesting opportunity here to do something that was of an even higher level of conservation, and at the same time produce a level of urbanism to help make Turner Street a people street. So, urbanism and architecture were working hand-in-hand.

Dr. Henry stated that he liked very much what was done on Turner Street because he has an office in that area and drove around SCAD students on Turner Street. He said that regarding the translucent material, one of the concerns he had was about the term and that he could envision a huge six-foot tower box.

Mr. Sottile stated that they would take any comments about the analysis. He said the Board had a chance to look at it as Height and Mass as they studied it, but their attempt was that it be a light element. He thought it would create a contrast to the solidity of the old brick wall and the solidity, frankly, of Kiah Hall, the Greek Revival building that landed on the ground with both feet. It took the entire building to be in relationship with that; with the equal and opposite idea that this element did need to feel very light.

Dr. Henry stated that he could see illuminating the building at night, but in the daytime it was just a box out there.

Mr. Sottile stated that they would take the comment to heart. He said that it had to perform both during the day and in the evening.

Dr. Henry asked Staff how they felt about the glass on Turner Street.

Ms. Ward stated that Staff recommended approval and that they supported it.

Mr. Engle asked if the courtyard and the passages would truly be open to the public all of the time. He said that there were those who said that SCAD had done an awful lot of wonderful things, but most of it was locked up and the public could not experience it. He asked if it was going to be a civic, urban place or if it was going to be a place for students.

Mr. Martin Smith (Savannah College of Art and Design-SCAD) stated that the answer was if they were asking for it to be open 24-hours a day 7-days a week. He did not think that it would be open all night long, but as for daily opening to free passage the answer would be yes. He said anytime that the building would be open there would be a free passage through and he imagined that it would be roughly

six days a week. The intent was that there would be a free passage through the courtyard. They have the opportunity to bring patrons from other museums into their property, into their experience, and that was what they wanted; for it to be a civic building. He said that his timing was off for not stepping up earlier, but wanted to underscore Mr. Dawson's comments about multiple entrances on Turner Street, with the understanding that there would be tens of millions of dollars worth of art in the building. The security was very important and free-flow traffic through multiple entrances created a lot of problems for them operationally. In addition, in a museum environment the mechanical systems were there to maintain a very high level of environmental control, and that one entrance created an environmental filter so that the climate could be controlled in the gallery.

Ms. Ramsay asked stated that if you look through the glass boxes over the brick arches, was it transparent or did you look in the back to see a brick wall.

Mr. Sottile stated that you would be looking through the arch.

Ms. Ramsay asked if it would be glass on the other side so that it wouldn't be a solid wall on Turner Street.

Mr. Sottile stated that the arches themselves would be a display area. He said that inside of the museum there would be an opaque wall.

Ms. Ramsay asked if you would be looking into the museum through the arched openings.

Mr. Sottile stated that you would be looking into the museum, and then again, this was an interior design part and he was not sure that he was the right person to answer it. He said that they would be looking into a portion of the museum that allowed for individual display opportunities.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it was to liven up Turner Street while walking along and sightseeing some of the activity in the museum, which would make the museum also more active on Turner Street by having portions visible through the arches.

Ms. Meg Needle (Lord, Aeck & Sargent Architects) stated that there was an assortment of things that would happen inside of these individual display cases, and that the current program was evolving. She said the galleries had strict light requirements and the contrast of light from outside was not compatible with viewing the art work on the inside, so it would be very carefully controlled without exterior light. On the west end of the building toward Fahm Street they were creating a circulation corridor behind the Turner Street wall. Those windows they envisioned would contain the big glass expanse where the wall was missing, and that was the catalyst for reprogramming that end. Basically, they would have a lot of movement and you would actually see what was going on inside of the museum. You wouldn't actually see into the gardens, but on one end there would be more display cases. One of the windows that was now shown in the museum shops would actually be an entrance into the store that was modeled after a true storefront. Other areas would have circulation behind them and contain a lecture hall and the future galleries or education areas that were down at that end of the building.

Mr. Steffen left at 3:35 p.m.

Mr. Engle stated that on Page 7 in the upper left-hand section that he was a bit confused because they kept talking about the glass canopy to protect the wall, but that the elevation showed it at five feet below the wall. The hand drawing section showed it coming down the brick wall and, in fact, it was connected by the top and bottom of the brick wall. He did not see how it was providing any protection to the wall at all. It was a nice pedestrian scale.

Mr. Sottile stated that the front part of the packet contained design studies where they included a series of interpretative sketches that were used along the way to develop the final design submitted. He said that there was a time when the first iteration of the canopy was shown as actually attached to the brick wall. The formal proposal fell under the third chapter. The current schematic museum design was essentially the Height and Mass proposal, which showed that all of the building canopy sections above the brick wall with the idea being that it was more successful in that location. It could attach directly to the new construction to alleviate the issue of having to attach it properly to the old wall with the intent of it being as gentle as possible, but also to provide protection to the common wall. The proposal that was in front of the Board for Height and Mass was that the canopy was located as shown in all building sections.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that in all of the discussion that they had heard about the tower being the focal point of the entrance and being a passage, he asked why not extend the tower southward, go through the building and show that it was a passage, and then the glass mass would have a more powerful meaning of being the entrance.

Mr. Sottile asked if he meant increasing its footprint.

Mr. Meyerhoff answered yes.

Mr. Sottile stated that they did a number of studies and were concerned because one of the initial actions was exactly that; to walk it through the block so that you could understand what it was trying to tell you to do. He said it actually became less of a skyline and began to look like a private building. It had to be a civic element, had to be clearly not inhabitable, and had to be clearly a vertical element. It evolved into a form that marked the Turner Street entrance, and then if it goes down into the courtyard it actually becomes a terrace. He appreciated the comment because it was one of the early instincts.

Mr. Engle stated that he wanted to go back to the sketch of MLK looking down Turner Street on Page 3. He said that he loved the project and really wanted to see the museum happen, but when he looked at that he did not see any historic building left. There was so much glass, light, transparency, and so many trees in the public right-of-way that you wouldn't know if there had been a real building there at all. He was not sure if the materials should be rethought a little. It's a landmark building albeit, it was a ruin now, but it was not a nitty-gritty railroad building any more, but a glossy, glass art museum and he thought it needed to recognize the horizontality and the history a little bit more. He was not sure that they couldn't do both and have a wonderful building. They had done it on the other shed where the architecture studios were; that was great and it worked for everybody. He thought that this was going a little bit too far and he did not know what he thought about the tower because he did not see enough detail to be able to make a decision. He said that he started out not liking it and was more and more willing to think that maybe it could work, but he needed to see more detail. He was not sure, in terms of

a historic building, that anyone would ever know that it was a historic building on the Register by the time this was done.

Mr. Sottile stated that he appreciated everyone taking the drawings and looking at them carefully because these were design sketches and each answered a particular question. He said that they had studied the relationship of Kiah Hall as the primary façade along MLK and the rhythm of the entrance marked by the tower. They had shown a more mature version of the street trees and believed that they had dealt with the remnants of the wall in a way that was absolutely respectful of what remained there. They didn't think that the project could look any different than it did had those walls not been there but, the overall horizontal expression of the main mass and the sleeve of the new building faithfully ran 800 feet along the length of this project, and it was all because of a building that was there before. The tower was an element saying that the future of this area was different than the past, and they believe that the old building had driven every decision that was made in designing the new building.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Walter Evans stated that he would like to make a couple of brief comments. He said that when he and his wife Linda gifted their African-American art collection to SCAD almost two years ago, that the President, Ms. Paula Wallace, had asked him where he would like it to be housed. He said he did not have to think long about an answer because he had already decided that he wished for it to be housed in what he always called the sheds. His mother was born at 511 Guerard Street in Frog Town 92 years ago, and lives just a couple of blocks from there now. Garrard Street does not exist today but it was right in the vicinity of those sheds. The sheds were also off West Broad Street where his family had a daily presence; this being the commercial center for Savannah's African-American population. One essential reason for him wanting this particular building was that it was built by enslaved African-Americans; even the bricks that were known as Savannah Grays were made by enslaved African-Americans on the Hermitage Plantation. President Wallace's response was simply that they would use the building, but only if they could make it extraordinary. After two years of design changes the architects finally came up with a design that they thought was exciting. For him, the glass tower, and he wished it were taller, symbolized a beacon to attract and welcome visitors to the city. It also symbolized a prism for present and future generations to look into the past. The building would not only house their art collection, but would serve as a center for African-American studies and be available to the public with an emphasis on collaborations with local public schools. In fact, this was a condition of their gift. This design very much reminded him of the Louvre in Paris with its iconic glass pyramid incorporated within 17 century buildings. This design could easily become Savannah's Louvre, and he strongly recommend that the Board approve the design exactly as presented.

Mr. Daniel Carey (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that the petitioner made a formal presentation to their Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and that the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) was pleased to support the petitioner's request for Height and Mass of the proposed SCAD art museum. He said that it was their opinion that the architects and designers had taken a thoughtful approach, considered the context, and developed a design that incorporated the ruins of the historic train sheds while introducing a fresh new building into Savannah's landscape. The glass tower feature would, if carefully executed, add interest to the city skyline and become a focal point that would move visitors eyes away from the mundane five-story parking garages and hotels on the west side of town. HSF appreciated the innovative approach of blending old and new without blurring the lines between the two.

What often happened was that old and new present a fork in the road; travelers simply plow straight ahead. In this case the applicant had created a juxtaposition between the old and new to pay respect to both. They looked forward to continuing dialogue with the applicant so that they could discuss any future issues that may arise.

Ms. Quinn Stewart (Graduate Historic Preservation Student of the Savannah College of Art and Design) stated that she was representing those who weren't present and that she had two very small comments. She stated that the students did not discuss very much about the materials or the massing, and that the tower was not even a concern of theirs because their concern was two-fold; the discussion of a central movement between the tower side, the Turner side, the art museum to the Visitor's Center, and then to the courtyard. Speaking from personal experience, you can't get through Eichberg Hall unless it's for a very good reason. You must go past security with a SCAD card, and then sign in. The trek around Eichberg Hall either to the south or to MLK was quite long from the Visitor's Center with the railroad house museum to get to class. Other than that, right now there was a parking lot located where the section of the courtyard was going to be, and to the south of both sheds there was a small parking lot. Both were available to SCAD students but her fear as a pedestrian on Turner Street was that parking would be forced from what were now parking lots and onto the streets. There would be a private parking lot, but for the foreseen future until construction moved, all of the extra parking that was required for the community and the SCAD students would disappear. This would cause more pedestrian traffic to be hindered and cause more traffic congestion to move from Fahm, Papy, and Turner Streets and MLK.

Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated that he supported the tower and thought that it was a great idea. He said that his concern was that the mass of it was that its aperture was of a steeple or a campanile, and if you looked at the mass in regard to the adjacent building, especially historic buildings, it was way out-of-scale versus what a steeple or campanile would have been in relation to the balconies. He was wondering if use of a metal frame structure like the Eiffel Tower, if you will but not pointed, or a metal frame that you would have around a gas tower. That kind of approach would include an industrial flare to it and be more compatible.

Ms. Katherine Purcell (Undergraduate Historic Preservation Student of the Savannah College of Art and Design) stated that college students had made comments about not being able to go through Eichberg Hall and losing some of the parking that they have, as well as other comments. She said that creating a pedestrian environment was key. You have to consider the urbanism of this project and the impact of the limited parking around Eichberg Hall and the addition of the parking garage that would be adjacent to it. You would be essentially creating a pedestrian thoroughfare through the courtyard while eliminating the existing parking. You would also have to be concerned about how traffic flowed in and out of the garage on Turner Street. More pedestrians in this area, along with more cars going in and out of the garage created a hazard. While Turner Street was a larger street, some of the others like Papy and Fahm Streets were not considered a thoroughfare.

There was some concern of putting the arches under glass, thus undermining their integrity, and she was sure that the Board did not want to do that. It might work better to put the glass in the concrete sleeve behind the existing wall; it would preserve the opening along the street and also maintain the security and environmental controls within the building, while preserving the historic integrity of the brick wall. It was important that the glass awnings be above the historic wall to provide protection, however, you

also have to take into consideration the height of the greenery and the width of the awning to ensure it provided protection for the building and the pedestrian. It needed to be substantially wider to protect the pedestrian from a rain shower. Other than that they have done quite a good job blending old with new, and they have created a viable solution with the remaining building walls that were left.

Ms. Meagan Steady (Graduate Historic Preservation Student of the Savannah College of Art and Design) stated that at first she did not like the idea of the tower, but after having seen the presentation and heard the ideas behind it she could see how it would be an addition to Savannah's skyline. However, she was concerned and stated that it was also a concern of Mr. Engle, that the remaining portions of the railroad shed would be overpowered by the amount of modern materials and more modern design elements.

The tower was similar to the Tate Modern Museum in London that was mentioned earlier. However, the tower in the Tate Museum was part of the original building; it was an industrial building, and an industrial chimney tower. The Louvre was also mentioned, however, a train shed was not really a close comparison, unfortunately, as much as they would truly love to have it in Savannah. The pyramid at the Louvre did work well in that case, but also because the Louvre was such an active building it could balance out the modernity of the pyramid with historic context inside of the Louvre itself.

Due to the loss of historic fabric the train sheds and the building was not alive; it was a ruin. She would consider looking at finding a way to give more of a nod to the historic building fabric or historic construction and the heights of other things in the area in a historic manner, rather than things being built like the parking garage and the hotel which would essentially be higher. It was more of a balance between the two rather than keeping the old things because they were putting a lot of new on top of it.

Mr. Travis Rose (Graduate Historic Preservation Student of the Savannah College of Art and Design) stated that one of his major concerns would be the compatibility of the historic fabric with the new construction. He said that the idea of fitting a sleeve inside of what was already there was very appealing but, what he would like to see was more of a detail of the space in between the historic fabric and the proposed sleeve. Simply because that could actually further deteriorate what was already there, provided that they were talking about the ruins. The drawings were obviously in homage to that ruin. In working with it he would like to see be sure there was no way that moisture, condensation, mold, or anything else could deteriorate what was already there and get in between the sleeve and the existing fabric. He liked the idea of having the glass overhead to prevent any kind of moisture from coming in between any kind of screen that would be there. He asked that with the idea of putting glass in front of the arches to protect it, how would it be attached, would it be attached directly to the wall, and if so how, and with what materials.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Engle stated that when he first looked at the drawings he thought that they were having a simple jewel box with sealed arches and not opening them up. He said that the minute you bring interior HVAC into a jewel box that was over exterior masonry you were inviting exactly what happened at Jamestown, which was a rising damp, efflorescence, mildew, and with all of the questions that were raised that it was a serious issue where no one ever came up with a final answer. The example that was shown earlier showed a piece of glass in front of arches, but it wasn't connected to the masonry, it

protected it, but it was wide open behind it. This was what bothered him about the jewel box and the fact that they were denying the historic fabric and placing lit-up glass. You would not see the arch a lot but a big lit-up glass box with an opening inside. Maybe the glass box should be behind the arch on the back side of the masonry so that it invited people into the structure instead of holding people away from the arch. Those arches were critical and yet they were putting glass three feet away and saying that you cannot touch it, it was an art museum, and you can't get near the paintings. His feeling of all those bays sticking out was that if it didn't bring the people into the arch that it put up a barricade.

Ms. Ramsay stated that Staff's recommendation was to continue the petition. She said that she needed more information on the moisture from glass boxes.

Mr. Dawson stated that all of the issues that were brought up by the public were issues that had been talked about when they had a two-day meeting with the engineers, and that they were very conscious about separating and connecting the building in a way that was structurally sufficient, but allowed for moisture to migrate outside of the buildings. He said that they could control moisture without introducing it into the historic fabric. They were excellent points and issues that were being dealt with in great detail with the engineering team as they moved forward with the project. They didn't have the answers on that but they were issues that they were currently working on to resolve before bringing them back for the Part II submittal.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that one comment he thought needed to be looked at and studied as they got into the final design was the remaining wall in its length being broken up; as you look above there was an 800-foot long parapet. He said that they should study breaking that long 800 feet into increments.

Mr. Sottile stated that the awnings actually extended where the historic wall was present. He said that when a pedestrian was looking up, part of the intent was to have variation in the upper expression.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he was talking about the total length of the parapet top of the new building, which was 800 feet with no break in it and no ornamentation.

Mr. Sottile stated that it had the six-foot awnings that started and stopped continuously at the upper roof line. He said that from the bird's eye view that what Mr. Meyerhoff was saying was true; it was a continuous line but that from a pedestrian perspective their hope was that they would actually highlight sections of the wall by creating a movement.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that a pedestrian on the other side of Turner Street could see 800 feet of continuous parapet.

Mr. Sottile stated that hopefully they would be looking at the beautiful street trees or actually focus their eyes on the fabric of the historic wall. He said that part of the exercise was trying to see all of the things together.

Dr. Watkins asked for additional comments to get a sense of where the consensus was going.

Ms. Ramsay stated the Board did not know enough about the questions that were raised on the glass boxes and the moisture. She said that she would like to see some entrances on Turner Street and that there was a question with the intersection grade.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he would like to see more study in the massing.

Mr. Gay stated that he would like to see the petitioner ask for a continuance.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board could not issue a continuance without the petitioner's consent, but based on the consensus, the petitioner had the option of asking for a continuance or go for the vote.

Mr. Dawson stated that particularly the environmental issue with the glass box was an emphasis that Ms. Ramsay brought up, and that there were quite a few issues that they would further study. He said they would like to hold the issue of the glass box entry elements. They needed some sense from the Board regarding the tower and the general design and requested that the Board make a motion approving Part I Height and Mass with further study on the glass boxes.

Dr. Watkins asked for a motion.

Mr. Engle asked if it was possible for them to study the hierarchy if they could approve the height but not the design, and asked for further designs.

Dr. Watkins stated that the petitioner was looking for Height and Mass now.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she thought that there were so many issues. She said that the Board had been chastised in the past about passing Height and Mass, and then it would come back to bite the Board when the petitioner would say that it was part of Height and Mass and the Board had already approved it. She thought that the difficulty was in articulating everything. One of the SCAD students bought up the awnings, Mr. Meyerhoff brought up the variation in the parapet, and those were Height and Mass issues.

Mr. Gay stated that it was an awful lot to digest at one time and that was why he would like to see a continuance. He said that it was not that he wanted changes, but that there were so many elements involved that the first time around it was hard to say that everything was fine.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he had been around the Board for a long time and always brought up the same point of the juxtaposition of the building being vertical and/or the expression being a part of the mass. He said that he thought the mass needed a little bit more study, particularly the building behind the existing wall.

Dr. Watkins asked for a motion. He stated that there was an option for a continuance but that the petitioner said they would rather have a motion either up or down.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the City Attorneys had discussed whether the Board could make a motion for a continuance.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board offered the petitioner an opportunity to ask for a continuance, but that the petitioner would rather have a motion up or down and that he was asking for a motion.

Mr. Dawson stated that they did not want it to fail but at the same time they made some considerable effort that required some pretty good design ideas. He said they needed to have some sense from the Board of more than just a continuance to go back, and asked what would the Board expect to see next time that would be substantially different. He heard that the tower needed additional study in the details and he agreed, but he thought it would be a Part II item. Certainly the depth of the awning and the glass overhang could be restudied, but again, he believed that it would be a detail item rather than Height and Mass regarding the depth and the awning. They needed some general consensus of whether or not the whole concept of the concrete sleeve and the whole concept of contrasting materials, memorable architecture, and the power element were viable concepts, and they would like to have something to hang their hat on to report. They were certainly more than willing to study details like awnings, entries, and glass boxes because in his mind they were important elements that could certainly be dealt with in Part II.

Dr. Henry asked if it would be possible to take a vote on it with the idea that the arches, glass, canopy, and the towers being problematic in terms of adjustment could come back for just those specific few things, and then take a vote on whether the project was approved.

Dr. Watkins stated that the petitioner had asked for the Board's feedback or a consensus on the sleeve concept, the materials, and the tower. He said that at this point they needed a motion to either approve or deny it.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Height and Mass as submitted. The motion was not seconded and the motion failed.

Dr. Henry asked if the Board could approve the Height and Mass with an addendum of the specific questions.

Dr. Watkins stated that it was not the motion.

Mr. Gay stated that he would amend his motion to say that because there were specific questions about it and that he thought the concept was a viable one and that was why he approved it. He said that if the Board wanted to amend it to preserve judgment on certain aspects of it as Dr. Henry pointed out, then that was fine.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board had to be specific about the aspects.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she wondered whether the concept was a good one. She said that the Board could leave it at that but was not ready to vote approval of the Height and Mass.

Mr. Dawson stated that his sense for hearing the Board was that the Board would not approve Height and Mass Part I. He said that he could certainly understand how it had to be studied, however, they did not want to go away and come back in three months and have the Board tell them that the concrete thing would not fly. They would like to have something to hang their hat on in some way.

Dr. Watkins stated hence the repetition of the petitioner's question when asked specifically about the sleeve concept, the materials, and the tower and if the Board had a motion on it, a consensus, or comments from the Board.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she did not think that the Board could do that. She said the Board had to approve Height and Mass and she didn't think they could approve concept. The Board could give the petitioner input on it.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he personally felt that he heard several of the Board members say that the concept was fine; Height and Mass not exactly fine.

Dr. Watkins asked if there was one yes for Height and Mass. He asked if there were other comments on Height and Mass.

Ms. Ramsay stated that conceptually, it was an elegant solution. She said that for Height and Mass that the petitioner was not there yet.

Mr. Law stated that he would think that the petitioner could work with Staff.

Dr. Watkins asked if Mr. Law was voting up or down.

Mr. Law's answer was inaudible.

Dr. Henry stated that he was for Height and Mass and did not see how the Board could get around it. He said they were talking about a big tower, that it was relatively detail aspects, and that he was concerned because he had seen this kind of thing happened with items being in design that changed later, and that it was Height and Mass when we didn't think the Board was voting on it. In terms of the general idea he was persuaded to vote for it.

Dr. Watkins asked in terms of Height and Mass.

Dr. Henry stated that if he understood Height and Mass which he did not think that he did. He said that he would vote for it.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he still felt that the mass was an issue at this point; the expression of the mass and that it needed further study.

Mr. Gay asked if he was talking about the solid.

Mr. Engle asked if the Board was talking about anything except Turner Street.

Dr. Watkins stated that right now they had a consensus of four against and two for the project. He asked if the Board should move forward with a vote or get a continuance so they could move forward.

Mr. Dawson stated that he did not hear any of the discussion related specifically to the tower and obviously it was a big element for them to consider. If that was something that needed to be shorter,

they needed the Board's input now. He said that he did not know what restudy mass meant. If the tower needed to be changed or if the Board did not like it, then it was something they needed to know.

Dr. Watkins stated that at this point there was talk about restudying and the Board needed to move forward with the motion. He said that at this point they needed to move it forward and they were either going with it or not.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if he could move to ask the petitioner to have a continuance.

Dr. Watkins asked for a move up or down.

Mr. Thomson stated that the Board's motion needed to be specific in the denial. He said that the applicant was looking for specifics like the tower was tall or too massive in relation to other things and the building itself. He said that would be more detailed for example.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the petition based on the incompatibility of the project with the following visual compatibility factors:

1. The entrances
2. The proportion of the structures front façade
3. The glass projections
4. The mass of the tower
5. The rhythms of solids-to-voids

Mr. Engle seconded the motion. The motion passed 4 to 2. **Mr. Gay** and **Mr. Henry** were opposed.

Mr. Dawson stated that in accordance with the Robert's Rules of Order that he would like to request a motion to reconsider and requested a continuance on the petition. He said that he believed that it was consistent with Robert's Rules of Order to ask for a continuance and the Board could reconsider the petition.

Dr. Watkins stated that under the Robert's Rules of Order that the petitioner could come and ask for a continuance, and he asked if they had a motion to reconsider the matter for a continuance.

Mr. Thomson stated that there needed to be a motion to reconsider, the Board would vote and it would eliminate the denial, and then there would be a vote for a continuance and that would be on the record.

Dr. Watkins asked for a motion to reconsider the petition.

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

Dr. Watkins asked if the Board needed a motion to continue it.

Mr. Thomson stated that he did not think the Board did because technically the Board could not make that decision.

Mr. Gay stated that the Board had to approve the motion. He said that the petitioner could not just ask for a continuance and the Board say good.

Ms. Ward stated that in the past the Board always voted on it.

Dr. Watkins asked for a motion for a continuance.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the March 11, 2009, meeting at the petitioner's request. Mr. Law seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Paul Hansen
H-08-4096-2
100 Bull Street
PIN No. 2-0004-45-008
Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Phelps.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval:

1. To add a two-story addition to the existing building to allow for the expansion of the U. S. Attorneys' office. The addition is to be setback 20 feet from the Broughton Street elevation and 8 to 12 feet from the Bull Street elevation. The materials of the addition will be YKK aluminum storefront with metal panels below. A three-foot projecting aluminum sunshade with brackets will be used above the new fifth floor and a similar sunscreen with a four-foot projection will be used at the top of the sixth floor. The floor-to-floor heights of the new floors are 13 feet each for a total height of 82 feet 5 inches.
2. To remove the EIFS cladding from the street level and replace with a more noble material, in this case with Arriscraft Renaissance masonry units.
3. To remove the fake keystone motifs above the fourth floor windows and replace them with rectangular lintels.

4. To make color changes as follows: Recoat the façade above the ground floor in elastomeric using Toney Taupe for the columns and cornices and Accessible Beige for the field color. Replace existing awnings with Dark Grey-Black awnings Color: Caviar; the storefront and metal panels will be YHS50 Atlas color “Sierra Tan”. The existing stair towers will be painted “Accessible Beige”.

FINDINGS:

Amendments since January hearing:

1. **Full street elevations showing view along Broughton Street and Bull Street.**
2. **Elevations of south (lane) façade and east façade.**
3. **Increased setback of the southwest stair tower.**
4. **Photographic perspective views from Wright Square and looking west on Broughton Street.**
5. **The existing building was constructed in 1959, however, due to subsequent alterations to the exterior façade it does not qualify as a contributing building within the National Historic Landmark District.**
6. **The building is located within a four-story height district. The Board of Review will need to make a Finding-of-Fact that the additional stories are visually compatible in order for the petitioner to obtain a two-story height variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.**

DISCUSSION:

Staff finds that the additional stories are justified by the following facts.

- The ground floor has a number of mixed public uses along the entire street frontage creating multiple entrances and an interactive pedestrian experience.
- The ground floor EIFS is being replaced with a more permanent material – masonry units which are human-scaled and which will help break the mass of the building. This is a proposed recommendation of the Downtown Master Plan.
- The faux architectural elements such as the keystones are being removed and the color scheme is being improved.
- The two new floors are setback from the north and west elevations reducing their impact. The original Chadbourne Report had this corner in a six-story zone provided that the following Large-Scale Development standards are followed.
 - The entrances face a frontage street at intervals less than 60 feet.
 - The facades are divided vertically and horizontally into implicit bays.

- The addition will provide Class A office space within the heart of the Historic District, a goal of the proposed Downtown Master Plan. This will enable a large office segment to remain in the Historic District thereby encouraging the economic viability of the District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of a Finding-of-Fact that the additional two stories are visually compatible based on the facts listed above.

Approval of the materials and design details as submitted.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Phelps (Hansen Architects) stated that they were asked to come back with the lane and east elevations, streetscape information, and (inaudible) elevations because there was some confusion about what perspective the elevations were showing. He said that on Page 3.2 that the north Broughton Street elevations show an addition that was two stories above the existing parapet, and that the section from the stair tower back is setback from the parapet approximately 20 feet. He pointed out new additions on Bull Street that were setback 10 feet and 8 feet with the stair tower in the back. They were able to work with the existing plans and removed the stair tower projection from one location to help bring the façade back and not impact the street. The lane elevation had a change in materials from the original building. They were building behind the parapet and there would be a small transition in the horizontal plane as the addition goes up repeating a portion of the windows in that pattern, and the wall would be the Broughton Street east elevation. The existing parapet elevator equipment and the extension in the stair tower would be included in the first story addition would be just a one-story addition onto the façade.

The streetscape included line-of-sight diagrams showing the visibility of the addition to the building from the opposite corner. There were non-historic buildings and along Bull Street and across Broughton Street you could see the stair tower and the corner of the new addition in the line-of-sight. They were in a process of competing to get a tenant to stay in the building, and until they could secure it they would continue to define the program. If they could reduce the scope of the square footage with what was required within the existing square footage in the addition, they would look again at modifying the stair by pulling it back from the street so that it would not protrude. It was a contention with the Board and they agreed that it could be manipulated further. He displayed the perspective with the stair tower gone and how it preserved the cornice along the existing building, set the addition back, and impacted the height of the street. From the corner of SunTrust you could see the resemblance of the translucent sun protection devices that would be there, the protrusion above the entrance of the U. S. Attorneys office, and the stair tower.

They tried to find the most visible spot of the building from the square that showed a tree canopy, and as you get closer to CVS the line-of-sight was cut from the lane. They were trying to follow the Secretary of the Interior Standards even though it was a non-historic building because the precedent with additions in the Historic Districts stands, or follow the context of making additions separate from the original buildings in materials, setting them back so that it didn't seem that they were extending an existing building. There was a change in material of a taller building in the back where an addition was made.

The perspective from the east looking west on Broughton Street showed the elevator shaft and the existing stairs. He displayed a drawing that showed an enclosed area, the new addition above, and the extension of the existing stair with a diagram showing the extension of the height.

As Staff mentioned, the original Chadbourne study recommended that the area be approved for six-story, but off Johnson Square and the four corners of Bull Street and Broughton it was rated to be six stories. It fell back to what Mr. Steffen mentioned earlier about prominent areas in a Historic District that were allowed to have focal points. Bull Street gained the axis of the city from City Hall to Forsyth Park and down further, those key intersections deserved to have more prominence than others. There was discussion about whether or not a precedent would be set within the Historic District for people that would come and request additional stories. He said that each project was reviewed individually whether it would be now or the next door neighbor. This project was significant and should be reviewed on its own merits as setting an example for what could happen in the future. They had to look at things like it was a non-historic structure, it was a prominent street corner, the things they were doing for the existing building was encouraging strong development within the area, or approving the skin of the building by putting in exterior materials and presenting a streetscape with tenants within it.

He displayed a photograph from the 1930's of the original four-story building that was on the site. There was a ten-story office building across the way. The corner had a sense of being a strong civic center and deserved additional height in the area. Looking southeast on Broughton Street (the corner of Bull and Broughton Streets), there were two single-story buildings and theirs was a four-story building with the two-story addition proposed. He displayed a photograph of a four-story building and pointed out the large floor-to-floor heights that added historical prominence to the corner.

Mr. John Neely (Neely/Dales) stated that the U. S. Attorneys needed 45,000 square feet of space and that they cannot accommodate them in the building without expanding. There were very few places in the downtown area that could accommodate that much square footage in an office building. He said that if they could not accommodate them that there was strong chance the 60 or 70 employees would relocate away from the court area downtown. As they approached the project they wanted to be as close as possible to the architectural designs, thought they had proposed an architectural design that was very sensitive, and that it had minimal impact on the visual compatibility of the area. They agreed with Staff's recommendations in terms of approving the petition as presented and would like to have Part I and Part II approval with the Finding-of-Fact that the additional two stories were compatible. He knew the Board would hear comments that it was a bad precedent for future projects, but this was a new building and not a historic building. Also, from being on the Board, every project that was considered was stand-alone and people would make arguments and point to different precedents, but he knew that as individuals that the Board would consider each property in its own context.

Mr. Engle stated that the petitioner said they had the Secretary of the Interior Standards but the Secretary of the Interior Standards would call for it to be contemporarily compatible material and not trying to match the historic, even though it wasn't a historic building. He said if there was any way on the east elevation, why they would infill an identical even though it wasn't historic brick, and why wouldn't they go with contrasting materials to keep the historic. Even if a four-story building was built next door you would still see it and asked why they would infill it with identical brick even though it wasn't historic brick and go with a contrasting material to keep the historic roofline.

Mr. Phelps stated that one reason was the feedback they received from the Board from the previous submittal. He said that they extended the secondary material so that the prominence of the façade would stand out more on Broughton Street for an aesthetic difference. In the future there would be a four-story building adjacent to it, would cover up the material, and the brick would be the best solution. If there was a combination of a four-story building and a combination of materials, then something had to get treated there for the existing building to fit high into it successfully, so that there was one material to tie into the new building versus two or three.

Mr. Engle stated that they could use a different color brick.

Mr. Phelps stated that they could, but it brought up the aesthetic issue of drawing the eye to that corner because there were many materials going on there.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the east elevator was troubling, it would give some variety, and then there was the ghost of the old building in reverse.

Mr. Engle stated that the way it was drawn actually showed a different colored material.

Mr. Phelps stated that they could review the material with Staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Daniel Carey (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that the ARC maintained their firm position that the requested two-story height variance for the Altmayer building should be denied. He said rather than be distracted by the extraneous arguments about the potential economic benefit, because it was not a very thorough review on the applicable, relevant portions under the ordinance. Height, reconstruction, or additions to existing structures shall be within the height limits as shown on the Historic District Height Map.

In the current ordinance the Height Map was four stories on this block. Following the existing rules this was a black and white issue that failed on its face. If, and they did not support this approach, the Board considered the proposed new ordinance in making its decision they contend that the proposal failed to meet those standards as well. In the proposed new, but not yet adopted ordinance, height variances may be allowed when concessions were made for certain public use. The ground floor of this building was an already vibrant commercial corridor and did not qualify for a variance under these provisions. It was their suggestion that the Board should not consider the economic implications of past, present, or future tenants of this space, but determine the visual compatibility of a building to the neighbors. It was HSF's concern that a desire to retain and improve existing mixed-use and office space could set a precedent for height variances. The exception could easily and quickly become the rule with the result being six-story buildings along Broughton Street, and it could undermine the integrity of the National Historic Landmark District. They asked that the Board not consider precedent where each case was considered, but applicants making the argument said that it provided economic benefits. If the Board would consider one then they could consider the other, or neither. In this context the Board needed to consider neither because it did not meet the visual compatibility and the height variances.

They appreciated the petitioners' forthright effort to work with HSF to try and reach an amicable solution. The underlying issue of such a large jump in height from four to six stories cannot be disguised by design, therefore, they were opposed.

Dr. Henry asked that if it was for public use that you could raise the height.

Mr. Carey stated that it was in the proposed ordinance.

Dr. Henry stated that there was a commercial use underneath that officiated the public use.

Mr. Carey stated that they were one in the same. He said that the exception, as he understood, was granted when it would encourage a greater public use. Their position was that there was already a great public use there.

Dr. Watkins stated that it was more along the public good.

Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated that the DNA concurred with and endorsed the comments made by the HSF relative to the addition. He said that the two additional stories were in violation of the provisions of the approved Height Map. Not only was it not visually compatible with its immediate surroundings and the excess height was not visually compatible with portions of the Historic Landmark District. In a recent public skyline survey conducted by the MPC in conjunction with the Trustees Garden Club, respondents said that it was important to preserve their right to see the sky, and this violated that right.

This proposed addition violated the intended Historic District Ordinance as being visually compatible in the Historic Landmark District, and the DNA would argue that it should not be approved. Approval of the addition that violated the height limit set a dangerous precedent. Visually incompatible additions to the height of buildings were denied, while this one was approved for economic reasons.

The design aesthetics to the addition were also not visually compatible to the existing structure, and he understood the Secretary of the Interior Guidelines for historic buildings, but this was not a historic buildings. The proposed materials were totally inconsistent with the existing structure, giving the addition a failing appearance, and it was not visually compatible.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Engle stated that when he first came to Savannah he thought the building was ugly and that this was an improvement. He said what was done to the building in the past was horrendous, that this made it better, and that he was not offended except for the east elevation. He thought a town had to change and change carefully, and this was careful. It was not a historic building and should be allowed to change through a variance. He didn't think that everything on that block should be six stories, but he thought they had done a good job, but needed to work on the east elevation more.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she agreed. She said it looked much better than the last time they saw it, but she still hoped something could be done to the stair tower on Broughton Street.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he was not present and wanted to abstain.

Ms. Ramsay asked if a Board member had not been present before was there a rule where they could abstain.

Mr. Thomson stated that a Board member had to vote unless they declared a conflict of interest.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he would vote but would abstain from making a comment.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Engle made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Finding-of-Fact that the two-story addition is visually compatible and approval of the materials and design details, with the condition that a contrasting brick be used in the east elevation infill. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Coastal Heritage Society
Travis Brown
H-09-4101-2
Louisville Road Between Martin Luther King, Jr.
Boulevard and West Boundary Street
PIN No. 2-0031-47-001
Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Travis Brown.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting to erect four segments of fencing along the brick retaining wall embankment on the north side of Louisville Road, between the rear of the train sheds and the wing wall of the viaduct to the west.

FINDINGS:

1. The western most segment will be a reproduction of the historic three-rail wood fence. This wood post fence segment will be 100 feet long by 3'-11" tall.
2. The next segment will be a 40-foot section of 4-foot tall black metal fence with square posts and pickets to match fences in other areas on the property.
3. The next segment will be a temporary 110-foot long black chain link fence, set back 10 feet from the historic fence segments. This section of fence will be removed when the railroad bridge across Louisville Road is re-erected.

4. The final segment returns to the line of the retaining wall and consists of the black metal picket fence design.
5. Historic photos have been provided.
6. The purpose of the fences is to prevent pedestrians from climbing up the wall and potentially falling in to the road below.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval

Ms. Ramsay asked if the public had access behind the rail.

Mr. Travis Brown (Coastal Heritage Society) answered no and said that it was currently fenced off behind the train sheds.

Ms. Ramsay stated that her concern was that the Building Inspections Department would interpret it as a guardrail and with a guardrail you cannot have any openings.

Mr. Engle asked about the finish of the wood fence.

Mr. Brown stated that there was none.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked about the existing fence on the southwest corner of West Boundary Street.

Mr. Brown stated that it currently did not exist. He said that it was a chain link fence.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the new fence did not extend southward.

Mr. Brown stated that the new fence was on top of the brick retaining wall on the other side of the street. He said it stopped at the parapet wall and the other side was west of the viaduct, dropped off, and was secured with a chain link fence.

Dr. Henry asked if there was a reason they wanted it registered.

Mr. Brown stated that historically the wood fence design extended only from the parapet wall across the historic Louisville Road bridge.

Dr. Henry asked about the different styles of fencing.

Mr. Brown stated that it would cost too much money and they didn't think it existed. He said in cases where there was no historic sign of a historic fence, they would go with the glass picket fence that was more contemporary.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Ramsay stated that the fence would not last long unless if it was treated.

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

**RE: Petition of Roberto Leoci
H-09-4108-2
604-606 Abercorn Street
PIN No. 2-0044-01-007
Deck/Doors/Fence**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Roberto Leoci.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval for a rear deck addition and new rear door on the building at 604-606 Abercorn Street. In addition, the petitioner is requesting approval to construct a fence along the property line fronting Huntingdon Street.

- 1) An existing rear deck was expanded into the adjacent parcel fronting Huntingdon Street. It is 16' deep and 44' wide made of wood to be stained 'Tugboat' DP-535, by Behr.
- 2) A new wood door with glass insets was installed on the rear elevation to provide access to the deck as illustrated in the photographs provided.
- 3) A wood fence is proposed along Huntingdon Street to match the deck with two 4' tall piers made out of Savannah Grey brick. A photograph of a similar fence design has been provided.

FINDINGS:

The building at 604-606 Abercorn Street was constructed in the early 20th century and is a rated building within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The property at 604-606 Abercorn Street is zoned RIP-D (Residential, Medium-Density); the property at 207 East Huntingdon Street is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density).

The deck and fence are to be located on the adjacent property at 207 East Huntingdon Street which is owned by the same entity. The deck has been constructed to provide additional seating for the restaurant located at 604-606 East Huntingdon Street, expanding the use into the neighboring parcel.

The alterations and fence are visible from East Huntingdon Street and Huntingdon Lane and minimally visible from Abercorn Street. The following standards from the Historic District ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

(I) Design Standards (11) Balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos, and side porches: Uncovered decks shall be screened from areas visible from the street. Decks shall be stained or painted to blend with the colors of the main building.

Staff recommends installing a privacy fence of adequate height to screen the deck in order to meet the standard.

(13) Fences and garden walls: Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; provided however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of a wooden fence provided the standard above for decking is met. As proposed along Huntingdon Street, the fence does not relate to a primary building but provides a wall of continuity at Huntingdon Street for a vacant lot, which now contains a wood deck. The proposed design of the fence is to copy an existing fence on the 100 block of East Huntingdon Street as shown on the photograph provided and will not provide adequate screening of the deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that screening for the deck as required by the ordinance and details on the fence (drawings, section, and site plan) be provided to Staff prior to installation and final approval.

Ms. Ramsay asked about the intermediate piers for the fence extension.

Ms. Ward stated that they were wood posts. She said that normally Staff would require a section and site plan and still wanted the details to be provided so that Staff could determine the thickness of the posts and the exact location.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the plantings that were shown were there now.

Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner had information on what would be planted.

Ms. Ramsay asked about the color.

Ms. Ward stated that it was proposed to be stained to match the decking materials.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the colors had been submitted.

Ms. Ward answered yes and passed the color samples around.

Mr. Engle asked if the fence was compatible with the building.

Ms. Ward stated that the standards required that walls and fences facing the public street shall be constructed as a material and cover of the primary building to which it was related. She said that they could use iron if it was a brick or a wood building. The existing building was masonry structure with Perma Cast on the front and brick on the rear. However, Staff did not feel that the fence along Huntingdon Street was directly visually related to the building, and Staff felt that it was appropriate to use an alternate material along the street if they choose.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Roberto Leochi (Owner) stated that he has lived around Huntingdon for many years, was recently laid off as a chef, and the reason he wanted to open the restaurant was because of the sense of the community. He said that there was a lot of dog debris and in the surrounding areas people loitered and left garbage in the area. He and his wife would be there working every day and help to make it a safer community.

They were willing to work with Staff regarding any suggestions for the materials. He said that whatever Staff recommended they would choose a color that was suggested.

Ms. Ward stated that there was a question whether the fence went straight along the property or turned the corner. She said that in her discussion with the applicant that the fence went to the property line and did not turn the corner to go south. She wanted a site plan and a section of the fence submitted to Staff for final details.

Mr. Leochi stated that they hired the River's Landscape Company who would maintain the grounds and the trees. He said that they suggested Wax Myrtles and Cedar, and they would be glad to answer questions and comply with the City Ordinance to put in the right shrubs and trees to make it blend in with the neighborhood.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Audrey Platt stated that she lived directly south of the large deck and was concerned about the trash, security, noise, and parking. She said she understood that there was no provision for a fence on the lane behind the deck or any plans for the back area where cars would be coming in.

Mr. Leochi stated that the parking lot they were using was the Azalea Inn. He said it was owned by his landlord, already existed, and that the back area would not be used as a parking lot because the parking lot was beside it. The car that was there would be removed soon.

Ms. Platt stated that Huntingdon Street had been decimated for years with open lots from Lincoln to Abercorn Streets. She said it separated the northern historic district from the southern end of Hall and Gwinnett Streets. It was very sad and very destructive to the district. To have a very large deck in a commercial entity intruding into a residential area was extremely disruptive and she asked the Board to look at the areas like Huntingdon when making decisions, that it should be residential infill.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that she was not clear on the fencing. She said that the fencing would not turn the corner but stay on Huntingdon Street and not on Huntingdon Lane at all. They felt that the fence needed to be on Huntingdon Lane as well.

Ms. Reiter stated that there needed to be a clear answer from the petitioner. She said if the fence did not turn the corner and go down the side property line, then the deck would still be visible from the street and did not meet the ordinance.

Mr. Leochi stated that he was willing to work with Staff to make the fence go around the corner behind the property line.

Mr. Gay stated that the fence needed to shield the deck from being seen by the public, which meant putting the fence around the lot.

Mr. Leochi stated that they would put a fence around the lot.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that they needed to have a site plan or a floor plan. He said it was confusing as to where the deck was in relation to the adjacent property.

Ms. Virginia Rahn (Property Owner) stated that if they fenced the entire lot it might not be the feel that they wanted because they wanted to keep it more open and residential. She said they could shield it properly by extending the fence to the south along with the existing shrubbery. They were more than willing to meet with Staff regarding the site plan to make sure that it was to scale and fits the overall feel of the neighborhood.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it needed to be submitted because it was confusing about the fence in relation to their property and the adjacent property.

Mr. Engle stated that they could move the fence through the field or pull it back from Huntingdon. He said that all they had to do was screen the deck to fit the ordinance. The fence could be pulled back.

Ms. Rahn stated that they would be willing to do that.

Mr. Leochi stated that they would landscape the front area to make it look nice and not just a vacant lot with debris.

Ms. Ramsay asked about the dimensions because it was stated that it was not-to-scale.

Dr. Watkins stated that there was a consensus for a more complete direction and application. He said that it would go back to the petitioner and they would have the option of getting with Staff, and at this point the petitioner may want to ask for a continuance to come up with a solid plan that Staff would approve.

Ms. Leochi asked if they could get an approval with conditions and go back to Staff to work out all of the details. She said that she spoke with Staff this morning in regard to the height so they could put it on the diagram. It would take them going out there to determine what would be feasible for the area. If she

came in with a tall fence it would be too much, and they could do it to where it would still shield and not be too much like six and one-half feet, with a screen from landscaping, and not create an albatross that stood out in the neighborhood.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board could respect that but he was reflecting the Board's consensus that there was not much clarity because there was some misdirection and multiple things had been stated.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the Board needed a site plan with dimensions.

Dr. Watkins stated that opposed to just waiting for a consensus or a denial, they had the option to get with Staff to come with a more specific plan that addressed the issues.

Dr. Henry stated that he did not see the advantage of having the Board pass it and then go to Staff, rather than going to Staff and then the Board could review it.

Ms. Rahn stated that the advantage for them was that they could continue with the project. She said that at this point that the project was completely stopped. They could continue with the project and work on the details.

Dr. Watkins asked if there was a Board member that would entertain a motion or a consensus that it needed to be re-reviewed.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that construction had been started without coming to the Review Board and now they were trying to approve something that had already been done. He said that the Board was asking for a site plan to see what the petitioner wanted done and they were saying that the Board was holding them up.

Ms. Ward stated that she had a site plan that was submitted but it was not to-scale and did not accurately represent what they were showing, so it wasn't put into the packet. She said that she needed a new site plan.

Mr. Engle stated that he could live with it if the Board passed a resolution that would say they would build a fence that would screen it from Huntingdon Lane with details being worked out by Staff.

Dr. Watkins asked if someone wanted to sponsor it because it appeared that the consensus was that the Board wanted a review.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it was putting undue work upon Staff.

Dr. Watkins stated the option would be to ask for a continuance.

Mr. Leochi stated that they would like to ask for a continuance

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve a continuance to the March 11, 2009, meeting. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Dana Braun
H-08-4095(S)-2
301 West Congress Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc.
Jennifer Wall
H-09-4098(S)-2
205 West River Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Pamela Stanmire
H-09-4104-2
41 Drayton Street
Awning and Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc.
Jennifer Wall
H-09-4107(S)-2
18 West Bryan Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc.
Jennifer Wall
H-09-4109(S)-2
102 West Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc.
Jennifer Wall
H-09-4110(S)-2
303 West River Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Update on 401 East Hall Street

Ms. Ward stated that it went to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a use approval. She said that they were denied the requested use approval, but had submitted plans to permitting under an allowed use on the property, and hopefully it would move forward and they should be getting their permit.

Update on AVIA Hotel-Ellis Square

Ms. Reiter stated that the when this was approved it was to have a sunscreen at the top of the corner tower that gave it character and broke up the corner. She said that the Certificate of Occupancy was approved but the sunscreen was not build. She looked at all of the drawings and amended drawings and the sunscreen showed on everything, and Staff had received complaint phone calls that it was not up. She had placed six telephone calls to Lodgeworks to find out if it would be added later, being manufactured, or why it was not there, and no one had returned the calls. She said that she would get with Mr. Petrea to look at the application.

RE: NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

a. Unfinished Business

b. New Business

RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING – December 10, 2008

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Minutes as presented. Mr. Meyerhoff 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 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp