

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

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

January 14, 2009

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

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

HDRB Members Not Present:

Eric Meyerhoff

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

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

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

RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

No petitions are continued.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA
RE: Petition of Charles Oxford
H-06-3669-2
601 – 605 Tattnall Street
PIN No. 2-0045-27-014
One-Year Extension

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**. There have been no changes.

RE: Petition of BWBF, Incorporated
Richard Guerard
H-07-3869-2
342 Drayton Street
PIN No. 2-0032-07-001
One-Year Extension

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**. There have been no changes.

RE: Petition of Charles Chapin
H-08-4094-2
35 Montgomery Street
PIN No. 2-0016-16-001D
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

RE: Petition of Pioneer Construction
Graham Cooper
H-08-4097-2
18 West Bryan Street
PIN No. 2-0004-14-003
ATM

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler 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 Greenline Architecture
Keith Howington
H-07-3839-2
201 Papy Street
PIN No. 2-0016-33-001
Revisions to the Façade/One-Year Extension**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to extend and amend a previous submittal for New Construction of the Embassy Suites at 201 Papy Street. Several changes are being proposed to correspond to the interior and for final details during the preparation of construction documents as follows:

- 1) One-year extension of the approval;
- 2) Add canvas awnings;
- 3) Install 28'-4" wide by approximate 10' tall pergola within pool area;
- 4) Increase window widths on upper floors from 3' to 3'-8";
- 5) Lower parapets from 8'-6" to 7'-10";
- 6) Install metal lanterns by Carolina Lanterns (Tradd Street 2);
- 7) Reduce the width of the front projecting entry on the east elevation (Papy Street) from 44'-8" to 37'-8";
- 8) Alterations to the window pattern on the main entry on Papy Street and on Oglethorpe Avenue;
- 9) Alteration to plan of corner entry at Oglethorpe and Papy;
- 10) Add railing from main entry to sidewalk and delete railings and stairs from at secondary doors due to grade change on Oglethorpe Avenue;
- 11) Add railing to sidewalk on Turner Street;
- 12) Change metal shed roof to parapet roof on west elevation and revise window bay spacing and delete doors;
- 13) Change window mullion pattern on ground floor on west elevation; and
- 14) Increase size of louvers at south end of west elevation.

FINDINGS:

The project received final approval on November 14, 2007, is currently in the city permitting process, and construction is scheduled to begin in spring 2009. The proposed changes are in keeping with the design of the original approval and are in compliance with the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030). The increase in width of the windows helps to further break up the massive masonry walls.

The fabric awnings should be resubmitted to Staff for final approval upon selection of colors, fabric, and design. A completed sign package will need to be submitted to the Board for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the amendments as submitted, excluding any signage, with the condition that the awning color and material sample be submitted to Staff for final approval and for the one-year extension from the original approval to November 14, 2009.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Keith Howington (Greenline Architecture) submitted a fabric sample and stated that the color of the fabric would match the windows that were previously submitted.

Dr. Watkins asked if the sample satisfied Staff.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the amendments, excluding any signage, and request for a one-year extension to November 14, 2009. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

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

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Alvin Scott.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval of a partial demolition of a non-rated one-story duplex structure within the National Historic Landmark District and its reconstruction in a two-story form.

FINDINGS:

1. The building was constructed between 1898 and 1916. As a side-gabled one-story cottage duplex. It had not been rated, although by age and design it would have been eligible for listing on the Historic Buildings map. The roof, flooring, and all interior and exterior historic fabric

have been removed with the exception of the framing of the first floor. It is proposed to add a second story and change the form of the building to a front-facing gable two-story duplex. It will essentially be a new building on the footprint of the old structure.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone:	The existing side yard setbacks will be retained.	This standard is met.
Dwelling Unit Type:	A semi-attached duplex is proposed.	The previous structure was a semi-attached duplex.
Street Elevation Type:	A low stoop full porch entrance is proposed.	The previous structure had low stoop porch entrance.
Entrances:	The entrances face the lane.	The previous entrances faced the lane.
Building Height:	The height is 28'-11" to the peak of the roof. The crawl space is 1'-6"; the first floor is 9'-6" and the second floor is 9'-0"	The height to the eave of the main house is 31'-8" and the height to the eave of the house adjacent to the West is 30'-5". The proposed lane house height is subordinate to the street facing structures.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development:	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:	The floor-to-floor heights are slightly less than the minimums. Each half of the structure is taller than it is wide.	Since this is a lane structure the floor-to-floor heights are appropriate. The overall width is the same as the previous structure.
Proportion of Openings:	Rectangular openings with a ratio of 3:6 are proposed.	This standard is met.
Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:	The original building had a four bay rhythm in a window-door-door-window arrangement. A four-bay rhythm is found on adjacent historic structures.	On the front (lane) elevation the bay spacing is a four-bay rhythm on the ground floor and second floor.
Rhythm of Structure on Street:	The new structure is to be built on the same siting as the previous structure.	There is no change in siting.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:	The original house had a full porch with side steps. A full porch is proposed. The porch is not shown as encroaching.	This standard is met.

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards:	NA	
Windows and Doors:	6/6 windows are proposed. The trim has been revised to be compatible.	A specific window model needs to be selected.
Roof Shape:	The original building had a side gable roof. The proposed building had a front facing gable with a 12” overhang.	Front facing gables are used in the area.
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:	A simple, full shed roofed porch with side steps is proposed.	The roof has been adjusted to a 2:12 pitch.
Fences:	NA	
Overlay District Standards:	NA	
Materials:	Smooth face HardiePlank siding and asphalt roof shingles are proposed.	This standard is met.
Textures:	NA	
Color:	No information on colors has been provided.	Please provide colors.
HVAC:	The HVAC units will be placed in the rear next to the steps.	The mechanicals will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval with window specifications and colors to be approved by Staff.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Alvin Scott stated that he was representing his father and that the colors would be dark and light blue.

Ms. Reiter stated that they needed the color samples.

Dr. Watkins asked if the issue with the windows had been addressed.

Mr. Scott stated that he did not have the name of the windows but Mr. Floyd had the information.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Seiler asked if she could get more information on the After-the-Fact approval. She asked if it was a partial demolition and how many times had the Board seen this petition.

Ms. Reiter answered that it had been seen three or four times.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that the colors and window specifications be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the building at 423 East River Street, comprising of four storefront/commercial spaces on River Street and five storefront/commercial spaces on upper floors fronting Factor's Walk. Changes have been made to the proposed storefront to reflect the Board's comments at the December 2008 meeting. Alterations to the building are as follows:

1. Replace existing non-historic metal windows and sliding glass doors. Doors will be replaced with wood clad windows and doors by Weathershield. Replacement windows are to be one-over-one, single-glazed, double-hung sash, wood frame windows.
2. Installation of an aluminum storefront within the existing ground floor opening on the western end of the River Street façade. A large picture-type window with butt glazing is proposed above to be approximately the same dimensions as the storefront opening below to align vertically. Two existing openings will be removed on the second floor. They do not appear to be historic. Both openings will be flanked by metal clad shutters to fit the size of the openings when closed.
3. Installation of a new ground floor entrance to the east of the proposed storefront where a window opening currently exists. Metal clad warehouse shutters are proposed on either side of the entry with an awning above to align with the existing wider opening above.
4. The non-historic rolled asphalt roofing is to be replaced with a standing seam metal roof with a metal gutter on the slope edge. A metal cap and flashing will be installed on the existing parapet at the sides.
5. Eleven condenser units are proposed to be installed on the north slope of the roof.

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 423 East River Street is referred to as 402-410 East Bay Street on the Savannah Survey Book map; however, that building was constructed in 1835 and is the range to the west. 402-410 East Bay Street is illustrated in the 1871 Bird’s Eye View which indicates a different group of buildings on the site at 423 East River Street. The subject range is located at the base of Price Street, which is immediately west of a stairway access and the current range containing the Olde Harbour Inn. This range, containing 423, 427, and 429 East River Street was constructed ca. 1880 according to the Georgia State Historic Resources Form (1995).

The 1884 and 1888 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps depict two buildings on the site at the base of Price Street. At this time, the site contained the two-story brick Nicholl/Nicoll & Mercer Cotton Warehouse, and the one-story wood frame Cooper Shop and Glue House with a brick veneer façade on the south elevation. The 1891 Bird’s Eye View illustrates a two-story range in this vicinity but the artist has distorted the over 300-foot wide building to look like four bays so that the original fenestration pattern cannot be determined; the one-story frame building is depicted immediately west of the range.

The 1898 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps indicate that the one-story wood frame building was demolished, and the former Nicholl & Mercer building was occupied by the Dixie Oil Company who acquired the site of the frame building and built a two-story brick addition to match the rest of the existing range. This footprint is similar to what is present today as illustrated in the 1955, Revised 1973, Sanborn Map; however, the addressing and most likely the fenestration pattern which generally follows has greatly changed over time.

FINDINGS:

The building has undergone non-historic alterations overtime including roof, window, and door replacements; and, most likely, openings have also been relocated. No accurate historical photo documentation has been uncovered prior to c.1980. The proposed storefront has been redesigned and reduced in size to fit within the existing ground floor opening. The following standards apply:

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

The standard is met. The original design and placement of the windows is not known as the building has been greatly altered over time. The existing fenestration pattern has no discernable rhythm along the street as openings vary in size and location. The original windows would have been single-glazed wood frame windows. Staff recommends approval of the one-over-one design which existed historically from the mid-1800's to the present.

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

- 1. Provide dimensions for condenser units;**
- 2. Provide specifications for the metal clad shutters surrounding the new storefronts; and,**
- 3. Provide swatches for awning material and color.**

Dr. Henry asked about the fenestration.

Ms. Ward answered that she could not make a determination. She said that there were no vertical images or photographs of the building prior to 1980.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay) stated that they concurred with the Staff report. He said that the openings on the west side of the building were not original. They tried to reduce the storefront area and create an opening that was more compatible with a brick masonry arch to make it look like a punched window in a masonry wall, rather than a steel-framed structure.

Ms. Ramsay asked what the purpose of the metal clad shutters was.

Mr. Shay stated that they were for protection of the glass during violent weather so they could close the shutters and barricade the opening. He said that it was consistent with other shutters on River Street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation-HSF/Architectural Review Committee-ARC) stated that the plans were a great improvement but that the ARC objected to the four-foot eight-inch

signage board that would be attached to the rooftop. She said that the addition of the section of wood framing seemed unnecessary for the elevator's function and should be eliminated.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Henry asked if the structure was needed for the elevator.

Mr. Shay stated that he did not believe it was needed for the elevator. He said the height allowed for screening the mechanical units later. They did not know who the tenants would be or how the interior would be configured and they wanted something close to the edge for screening mechanical units.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Board would see the whole band extend westward to screen the units in the future.

Mr. Shay stated that depending upon the number of tenants they would be able to consolidate them into three or four locations and screen them. It was not their intention for it to become a new façade.

Mr. Judson stated that the revised design was a vast improvement.

Ms. Seiler stated that she was waiting to see if Mr. Shay would compromise with the structure on the roof.

Mr. Shay stated that it would remain because it would be necessary when the mechanical units were placed there to have screening.

Ms. Seiler asked if it was for the future.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the Board would be more amenable if it was not there now, and to bring it to the Board when the number of mechanical units was known.

Mr. Shay agreed.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the elevator shaft run-off on the roof be reduced in size and details above be submitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Dr. Watkins introduced Mr. Daniel Carey, the new President and CEO of Historic Savannah Foundation.

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

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

Present for the petition was Ms. Alexis Aubuchon.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a one-story addition and ADA compliant ramp on the northern elevation of the train sheds behind the Visitor’s Center located at 301 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard. The addition is 25’ wide, 9’-2.5” deep, and 11’-6” tall with a three-foot covered area over the sales counter. The addition will house individual ticket booths for the six tour companies that operate out of the facility.

FINDINGS:

The historic building at 301 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard is a rated building within the Central of Georgia National Historic Landmark District. The building was completed in the early 1870’s as the Passenger Depot for the Central of Georgia Railroad. It now serves as the Visitor’s Center and Savannah History Museum. The main building and attached shed were constructed of Savannah Grey bricks and originally featured a slate shingle roof.

The property is zoned B-C (Community Business) and the following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Additions: Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building; distinguishable from the existing main structure; constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character defining features; designed to be reversible and; subordinate in height and mass.	The addition is on the north side behind the front portion of the building fronting MKL. It will partially obscure historic archway openings.	Staff recommends approval as the addition will not damage the historic fabric behind it on the historic wall and should be reversible.
Roof Shape: Pitched roofs	A low slope shed roof	Staff recommends approval.

<p>parallel to the street with less than 4:12 shall have an overhang and have brackets or otherwise projecting eave detail.</p>	<p>surfaced in standing seam metal is proposed. The roof includes an overhang.</p>	<p>Brackets are not required since this is a simple shed. A metal drip edge should be used on exposed edges.</p>
<p>Materials: Commercial exterior walls shall be finished in brick, concrete formed or assembled as stone, precast concrete panels with finish to simulate stucco texture, polished stone...Fiber cement panels shall not be used in any case in the district.</p>	<p>The addition is clad IPE Rainscreen cladding by Woodhaven, Inc. on the bottom and Kynar coated aluminum panels on the upper portion. The ticket counter material is cast concrete by concrete interior forms.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. Historically, add-ons to the railroad buildings were done in wood with shed roofs. The proposed materials are a modern interpretation of a historic appendage.</p>
<p>Windows: Double-glazed clad wood windows are permitted on new construction.</p>	<p>Window openings are 2 feet wide by 4 feet tall. Windows are Pella aluminum enduraclad exterior cottage sash windows.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with color selection to be submitted to Staff for final approval.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Ms. Alexis Aubuchon (Coastal Heritage Society) stated that this project was being coordinated with Parking Services.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the booth looked like a Wendy’s drive-thru window and did not reflect the Visitor’s Center or Savannah.

Ms. Aubuchon stated that they took the approach on purpose to follow the Department of the Interior standards for an addition to make sure that it was recognizable as an addition, and that it was a reversible treatment that would not have any affect on the Savannah Gray masonry.

Mr. Steffen asked about the interest of Parking Services.

Ms. Aubuchon stated that it was because of the ticket sales of the Trolley Tour companies which currently operate from podiums in the middle of the parking lot. She said that Parking Services would be managing the structure for the companies and assigning different bays for each company. It was to make it safer and more approachable for the customers.

Mr. Sean Brandon (Director of Parking Services Mobility) stated that when you walk into the parking lot it was a free-for-all, each company had their podium set up, they were on the sidewalk, and

this was an effort to make the visitors experience cleaner so that tour companies would be restricted to the booth. That's where they made their transactions and not out in the parking area.

Mr. Steffen asked if they investigated the possibility of a free-standing structure not attached to the historic facade.

Ms. Aubuchon stated that they considered several options. One option was to locate the structure in the center of the parking lot where the flag pole was currently located. However, it took up needed parking spaces and was near the ADA accessible parking spaces. In terms of infrastructure and costs, setting it away from the building on its own island was cost prohibitive and an access nightmare.

Ms. Seiler stated that it did not look like something that would normally be done and applauded them for trying to fix the situation. It did not look like it fit with the existing building and was the first thing a visitor would see when they entered the lot.

Ms. Aubuchon asked if it was the material.

Ms. Seiler stated that it stuck out in the layout.

Ms. Aubuchon stated that it was very small and covered two of the 25 plus bays. She said that she made a model that showed that the proposed structure was small in comparison to the whole building.

Mr. Steffen stated that he agreed with the look of it but he did not like the attachment to the historic structure. He said that there might be enough space to do a square or circular kiosk to serve the tour companies without attaching it to the building. Once it became detached from the building it would look more like a separate structure and he would have less of a problem with it relating to the main structure because it would look more like a kiosk. Once you attach it to the building it would have to relate to the building which would be an impossible task.

Ms. Aubuchon stated that it was attached for space reasons and that they were trying to maintain the sidewalk edge and not interfere with parking. She said that one of the options was not to use the aluminum on the top portion and have it clad in wood to mimic historic wood siding. This option was not chosen at first because each of the companies wanted to be individually distinguished. She was willing to make adjustments.

Mr. Steffen stated that he was trying to envision historic train pictures with a one-stall structure that stood next to the train tracks. He said that if they could find a way to mimic them in a detached structure, even if they were lined up row to row or with pods, that there could be enough space to serve six tour companies and still use the space without attaching it to the building.

Ms. Aubuchon stated that there were concerns with ADA access for individual booths.

Dr. Henry asked if it was cost-prohibitive to have a stand-alone structure.

Ms. Aubuchon answered yes. She said it would cost more in terms of the electrical work, the site work related to the curb, the sidewalk, and the ramps.

Dr. Henry asked how it was being funded.

Ms. Aubuchon stated that it was through Parking Services.

Dr. Henry asked if the companies were contributing.

Mr. Brandon stated that they were contributing. He said that the bulk of it was being paid by the fees that were assessed. They were trying to create a balance because they all wanted their own area defined with separation between them.

Dr. Henry stated that the wall parallel to MLK, Jr. Blvd. could be a possible site.

Mr. Brandon stated that he could take it back to the companies. Visibility of their vehicles was a concern of the tour companies.

Dr. Henry stated that he could not imagine it would take away from the visibility of their vehicles. He said it would not go any higher than the wall, there was no ramp there, it was a stand alone area, and it would not interfere with any historic structures except for the wall itself.

Mr. Brandon stated that he would be glad to present it. He said the only issue would be how to hook into the utilities. Having no idea what the site work was he thought it was a possibility but that they needed to look at it.

Mr. Hutchinson congratulated Ms. Aubuchon for her contribution to the fabric of the Historic District. He suggested that the attachment could be a soft one and not a hard one in keeping with the constraints of not mimicking what was existing.

Dr. Watkins stated that there were quite a few questions regarding the overall design. He said now that they had feedback they could request a continuance, work with Staff, and work at revising the plans.

Ms. Aubuchon asked for a continuance

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to February 11, 2009, to address the Board's comments. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Peter Thompson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to repair a side porch and enclose the upper floor in glass. The repairs include:

1. Replace all columns with Perma Cast columns to match original.
2. Replace rotten decking material as necessary with pressure treated tongue and groove.
3. Repair turned railing as necessary.
4. Install wood frame and glass above top porch railing and between columns.

FINDINGS:

The upper porch columns are deteriorated and missing pieces.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation-HSF/Architectural Review Committee-ARC) stated that the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation state that the removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided. She said that the two-story side porch was a character-defining feature of the Victorian architecture in the south. In the Historic District Ordinance Revisions it was proposed that side and rear porches not be enclosed with glass but with a fine mesh, lattice, or shutters. The ARC was opposed to the use of the Perma Cast columns because the Secretary of the Interior states that the historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. Removal of historic materials or alterations of features and spaces characterizing the property shall always be avoided. Wood columns were the only appropriate material.

Mr. Steffen stated that he agreed with HSF and would vote against it.

Mr. Johnson asked if there were any other porches with glass.

Mr. Peter Thompson (representing Debbie Smith) stated that there were several houses with glass enclosures. He said that the Perma Cast columns were previously purchased and they could not return them. Ms. Smith wanted something that would last long because there was a problem with the wooden columns, that they did not know the rules and would have followed them if they had known, and that they could not dispose of the columns.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she agreed with HSF and Mr. Steffen regarding the glass enclosed porch.

Mr. Johnson asked how the other sites had glass in the Historic District.

Ms. Ramsay stated they were probably passed before the guidelines were revised.

Ms. Reiter stated that the current standards did not prohibit glass.

Ms. Ward stated that it did not address porch enclosures at all.

Dr. Henry asked if the Board had the authority to make their own judgment in the absence of written standards.

Mr. Judson stated that they would need to be replaced in-kind and not with Perma Cast. He said that the historic integrity of the wood material needed to be retained.

Ms. Debbie Smith (Owner) stated that the existing columns were not original to the house. She said that the third floor porch was added but did not know when. They had replaced the columns once and they rotted within three to five years. The columns they purchased were identical to the existing columns.

Dr. Henry stated that he was aware of wooden columns being replaced with alternate materials and asked if it was against the rules. He said they looked exactly like the wood.

Ms. Ward stated that generally the standards say that materials should be replaced in-kind to match the existing. She said that if there was a change in the material it would have to come before the Board because it could not be approved at Staff level.

Mr. Steffen asked that if Staff was viewing the project from the street would they be able to tell the difference between the Perma Cast materials on the third floor and the original wood.

Ms. Reiter stated that you could tell a Perma Cast column from a wood column because it was pristine and the texture was smooth.

Mr. Steffen asked if there was anything in between.

Dr. Henry stated that a happy compromise would be to approve the Perma Cast and not the glass.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the deck replacement, railing repairs and deny the glass porch enclosure. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Dr. Henry stated that he was for the Perma Cast because he would not tell the difference at a distance from the wood. He said that if the Board took the position of not having modern materials to keep up the Historic District that it would make it difficult to keep up the Historic District.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she was not for the Perma Cast but because it was on the third floor, she was not as opposed to it.

Mr. Gay asked if consideration had been given to doing away with the railing.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board had already passed that issue.

Mr. Hutchinson agreed with the use of Perma Cast.

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Henry made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Perma Cast columns as submitted. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. The motion passed 7 to 2. Mr. Steffen and Ms. Seiler were opposed.

Mr. Thompson stated that they could use Bermuda shutters to cover the length of the porch on the third floor to hide the glass.

Dr. Watkins stated that the motion had been passed and they would have to come back through Staff with another petition.

**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. Paul Hansen.

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 eight-twelve 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:

1. 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.
2. 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 design details listed above.

Approval of the materials and design details as submitted.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Paul Hansen (Hansen Architects) stated that the original building had burned in the late 50's and the existing building was constructed in 1959 and remained until 1992 when the U. S. Attorney's office looked at the location because of proximity to the Federal Courthouse. He said at that time improvements were made by adding windows to make it look more like an office building. Synthetic stucco was new, easy, and inexpensive, and was placed on the exterior. Later, a few changes were made with Starbucks and other businesses. The owner was approached by the U. S. Attorneys who needed approximately 15,000 square feet to get a total of 50,000 square feet for their offices. They looked at the possibility of adding two floors, dropping back 20 feet from the cornice line along Broughton Street on the façade, and roughly 10 feet along Bull Street back to the façade of the building. This lessened the visual impact of the two-story addition. He pointed out the existing stairwells and said they could add some glass to give a more transparent look so as not to read as massive. Before the SunTrust was built, there was a nine-story building on the lot across the intersection. If there was a possibility of adding floors, the corners were where they should go and not on the infill buildings along the streetscape of Broughton Street. They felt from an economic standpoint that keeping the tenant on Broughton Street was important and the addition would not visually impact the street at the pedestrian level.

Dr. Watkins stated that the main issue the Board was to specifically consider was the design. He said they start getting into gray areas when dealing with economic considerations even though they were significantly important.

Mr. John Neely (Neely/Dales Real Estate) stated that the reason for the addition was that the U. S. Attorney's office were trying to stay where they have been for 15 years, and it was difficult to find 45 to 50,000 square feet in the core downtown area. He said they were asked to accommodate them by adding a couple of floors with 7,500 square feet per floor, that met the 15,000 square foot requirements. They tried to come up with a design that was sensitive to the guidelines by stepping it back from the main façade and removing the EIFS on the ground floor. If they cannot be accommodated then they could lose the tenant. They tried to respond to architectural concerns and present a program that met the guidelines.

Mr. Judson stated that he needed clarification on the stairwells because visually that was his main concern with the design. He said that he appreciated that they tried to step it back, make other changes on the ground floor, and remove the faux keystone details. He asked if it was the only alternative for the stairwells.

Mr. Hansen stated they were using the existing stairwell locations in the building. He said there were some things they could do architecturally like looking at the plan for the stairwell, reducing the height of the cornice line, and adding some additional glass.

Dr. Henry asked if there would be a fire safety issue if they had a disconnective staircase.

Mr. Hansen answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that HSF was opposed to a two-story height variance for the Altmayer building. She said that the ordinance revisions propose that height variances would be permitted when concessions were made for certain public uses. They feel that the ground floor was an already vibrant corridor and did not qualify for this type of variance under the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated that this was a four-story height zone because all of the other buildings on Broughton Street were four stories. They did not think there was justification for increasing the height and the ground floor retail already exists. He said that although it might be setback from Broughton Street, the Broughton Lane side of the building appeared to be two stories higher making it six stories. The mass looking north from the south would be higher and they did not think that it was appropriate.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Steffen asked if they had the south elevation.

Mr. Hansen answered that they did not have it in perspective.

Ms. Seiler stated that she thought the design was excellent, however, she served on the ordinance revisions committee and it came out over and over to follow the height guidelines and obey them. She said they spent an inordinate amount of time and she understood the economic viability, but that was what it came down to. Not outstanding design but scale.

Dr. Henry asked if they could accommodate the attorneys by getting rid of the first floor tenants or by digging a basement.

Mr. Neely stated that there was another 15 years on the leases and that they could not be broken. He said that the Urban Renewal plan for Broughton Street would not allow office on the ground floor but that it had to be retail.

Dr. Henry asked about the basement.

Mr. Neely stated that the Athletic Club was there also. He said it was a long-term lease and they had to have 15,000 square feet to accommodate the needs.

Mr. Steffen stated that there was discussion about height variances and that there were a number of considerations to be looked at other than the issue of how the ground floor was being used. He said that he was looking at the special conditions, circumstances, and privileges. If there was any place on Broughton Street that would justify a variance to the height that it was at this corner. He was impressed with what Hansen Architects had done to try to make it work. Although economic concerns were not part of the Board criteria the community general welfare was, and in that sense with the bad economy, the criminal justice industry was probably the only industry growing. There were security issues with the U. S. Attorneys all being in one place and the Board needed to give a nod to that situation which was

unique for the location. He would like to see them revisit the stairwells and the south elevation before he committed. He was inclined to think that this location would be suited for the height variance because of the special circumstances involved. He thought they did a tremendous job putting something together that did not offend the adjoining structures.

Ms. Seiler asked Ms. Ward if it counted as large-scale development

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Ms. Seiler stated that Staff gave their approval and that Staff would not give it unless they thought it would pass the new ordinance revisions.

Ms. Reiter stated that technically they used the existing ordinance to review it and deliberate. She said having lived through a year of the revisions she believed it met the proposed standards for granting additional height, but the ordinance had not passed yet. They had little to use in the existing ordinance to judge by which was why they used the revisions. What was proposed benefited the public good.

Ms. Seiler stated that her concern would be the stairwells.

Dr. Henry asked if it met the new standards.

Ms. Reiter stated that in her personal opinion it would, but the Board had to use the existing ordinance to discuss it but there was little to discuss on large-scale construction, which was why there were revisions. What had been discussed in the Committee had not been vetted by the public and was being vetted by the City Attorney, and she thought it was in line with what the City was discussing for allowance.

Mr. Law stated that the Board had a previous situation with the hotel next to First African Baptist Church and went back and forth about the height.

Ms. Reiter stated that the hotel building next to First African Baptist was new construction. It was to be two-stories above the height limit of six stories to eight stories. She said it was a different situation within a different context. Each individual property was considered in its unique context.

Dr. Henry stated that he would like to see a streetscape with this addition.

Dr. Watkins asked if it would be from the south elevation.

Dr. Henry stated that he was not sure but that he did not have a sense of how it related to the other buildings.

Mr. Hansen stated that they were not trying to confuse anyone by showing perspectives but to look at the building in context at how it would be viewed by anyone walking down Bull or Broughton Street. He said when you look at an elevation that the building would not be viewed in this light, and when you look at it that way it looked like a huge mass on top. In reality, it was a low-impact visual addition as far as the streetscape.

Mr. Steffen stated that he agreed with it in relation to the view, but his reason in asking about the south and the east elevation was that if you walked west on Broughton Street, you would have a different view. He said if you walk from Wright Square north on Bull Street there would be a different view.

Ms. Seiler asked about the ten-foot setback on the left side of Bull Street.

Mr. Hansen stated that it was roughly ten to twelve square feet.

Ms. Seiler stated that when walking down the opposite side of Broughton Street by the Trustees Theater you would see the stairwell until you cross Abercorn, and then it was 20 feet off the front and she did not think that she could see that much.

Mr. Hansen stated that the addition along the east side of the building had two existing stairwells, one was abandoned, and an elevator shaft that extended up to the height of the proposed element that ran north and south. He said there was a larger existing façade element that would further mask the addition if you were coming down Broughton Street walking west.

Mr. Gay stated that in the photograph on A2.1 it showed the two structures on that side.

Ms. Seiler stated that she liked the design. It was well done, enhanced what was there now, and that she understood the economics. She said if it was an exception to the height and they could live with it that it was good.

Dr. Henry asked why the Board could not have a reasonable artistic rendition of what it would look like compared to the other buildings. He said that the plans were not easily understood.

Mr. Hansen stated that it could be provided.

Ms. Seiler stated that she did not want to hold up the project and asked Dr. Henry if he wanted to hold up the project for one scope.

Dr. Henry stated that the idea of a variance was how it would affect the people around it. He said that he did not want to hold up the project but how long would it take to do it.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she agreed with other Board members that stated that the stair tower was the most problematic issue and they needed time to figure it out.

Mr. Judson asked if the stair tower was being looked at from Wright Square in front of CVS.

Mr. Hansen stated that CVS was along one side and the other elevation was from Broughton Street with the stair tower that extended up and the elevator shaft extending further.

Mr. Gay asked what it would look like.

Mr. Hansen stated that it would be a series of windows and glass similar to what was on Bull and Broughton Streets.

Mr. Neely stated that the elevators needed to be there for code. He said they were open to ways of minimizing it but that a totally glass enclosed elevator would minimize it somewhat unless the architects could come up with more ideas.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the elevator was not the real problem but the stairwell.

Mr. Neely stated that it could be the stairwell. He said they could have glass for the stairwell.

Mr. Judson asked if they were looking at the south elevation where there was no setback other than starting it ten to twelve feet from the west edge of the building.

Mr. Hansen stated that there would be a setback on the lane but it would not be ten feet.

Mr. Patrick Phelps (Hansen Architects) stated that it would be setback from Bull Street from the corner back ten feet, but the rest of the structure would be flush with the lane façade. He said that the property was currently zoned for a four-story building and that there was potential for increased height and it would block the view from Wright Square.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the stairwell extended into the ten feet or if the stairwell itself was back ten feet.

Mr. Phelps stated that the stairwell would be within the ten feet, but directly after the stairwell, the addition would step back ten feet. He said that they could restudy to decrease the height. They were design details and what they were looking at was the Finding-of-Fact for the height variance. If they could move forward they could come back and meet with Staff to review the design issues.

Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated that the proposed height set a dangerous precedent because the other four buildings on that corner would also want six stories and that it would change the whole feel of the neighborhood. In this case the height map was four stories and in his view the Height Map shall prevail. It had to be evaluated in terms of the current ordinance and they could not look at the future ordinance. The current ordinance was the rule and it should be looked at.

Mr. Judson stated that it seemed procedurally that the Board could allow the petitioner to have some sense of a consensus before they voted to facilitate the possibility of a continuance. He said that he was not compelled to approve a request involving a zoning variance.

Ms. Ramsay stated that they were lacking in all of the elevations, there were questions on the stairwell and how it sets back, and they didn't have enough information to go forward.

Mr. Steffen stated that he agreed with Ms. Ramsay. He said that it was important for the Board to recognize that the Height Map was to be considered first, but that there were specific places on the Height Map for the Board to grant a variance. The new policy would give the Board more authority than in the past to make those decisions but that they needed to be made in conjunction with the law. With the existing ordinance the Board made a recommendation with visual compatibility and it goes to another Board who made the ultimate determination. This Board's decision was strictly on

compatibility and whether they granted one or two floors, would like to see the south and east elevation before making the decision, and if he was looking at the new statute he believed this was one place where it would be justified by visual compatibility. They met their burden of proof that this was the place to do it but he did not have enough information to know whether it was visually compatible until he had the elevations.

Dr. Henry and **Mr. Johnson** agreed that more information was needed.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board needed options on the stairwells.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he would like to see more and have a sight-line study from various points.

Dr. Watkins stated that typically the Board provided the petitioner an opportunity to ask for a continuance but there was a consensus for more information. He wanted to give the petitioner an opportunity to ask for a continuance

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

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to February 11, 2009, to address the Board's comments. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc.

Jennifer Wall
H-08-4090(S)-2
15 West Liberty Street
Awning

STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc.

Jennifer Wall
H-08-4091(S)-2
628 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Awning

STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of The House Doctor

Charlie Angell
H-08-4092(S)-2
514 East Perry Lane
Color Change

STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Neil Dawson
H-08-4093(S)-2
212 West Taylor Street
Color/Roof/Awning/Louvers
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

RE: NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

a. Unfinished Business

Dr. Henry asked about 401 East Hall. He said he heard that they filed bankruptcy and stated that he had a letter saying there was a hearing to have their restaurant reapproved.

Mr. Tiras Petrea stated that the letter was an application for a continuance of a use approval for a café that was previously approved. He said they wanted to have it approved again and had submitted a site plan to MPC for the café. They were waiting on the Assistant City Attorney for the right-of-way permit that had expired and the building permit that was revoked in 2007.

Dr. Henry asked if a scenario would be that they could clean up the mess without an approval of use, and if they were disapproved for the café could they still be forced to rebuild it.

Mr. Petrea stated that it would have to be looked into. He said that as far as the right-of-way permit being extended that they would have to reestablish it and it would be contingent upon getting a building permit to fix the exterior.

Dr. Henry asked if they had heard anything about them declaring something financially.

Mr. Petrea stated that he had not heard that from anyone.

b. New Business

Ms. Seiler stated that this would be her last meeting.

Dr. Watkins asked if Thursday was the upcoming vote for replacements of the new members.

Ms. Reiter answered yes.

- Nominating Committee Report

Ms. Ramsay stated that the Nominating Committee met and they proposed that the current Chair and Vice-Chair be elected for the next term.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Nominating Committee recommendations that Dr. Watkins remain as Chair and Mr. Judson remain as Vice-Chair. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Steffen stated that the report Ms. Ward would give on the ordinance revisions would establish the legal authority of the Board because it established that an appeal from the Board would be made on the abuse of the authority or failure to follow procedure. He said that it was done everywhere else except for what they currently do, which was to allow people to appeal and then it goes to Council, and that they were basically an advisory Board. There was a lot in there but as a legal voice it was a tremendously welcomed change and he appreciated it.

Mr. Steffen left at 3:50 p.m.

- Historic District Ordinance Revisions - Update – Sarah Ward, LEED AP Preservation Planner

Ms. Ward stated that the ordinance would have an impact on the Board's review and that the proposed revisions were brought up several times today during the meeting. She said that it was encouraging that people were knowledgeable; however, the Board had to operate under the existing ordinance until it was adopted. It was good to keep in mind to move forward under the current rules.

She said that the MPC had finalized a draft ordinance that would go out for public comment soon and that the Historic District Revisions Committee last meeting was held in October when they finalized the recommendations. She gave a brief history of the ordinance with background information on why they were revising the ordinance, how the revisions committee reconvened, what they used to develop recommendations, and the key issues of concern with specific recommendations that would be coming. She said that the Board would be able to comment on these items.

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

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Minutes as presented. Mr. Gay 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