

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

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

March 11, 2009

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

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

HDRB Members Not Present:

**Gene Hutchinson
Eric Meyerhoff**

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

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

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

RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

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

Continue to April 8, 2009, at the request of the petitioner.

**RE: Petition of First African Baptist Church
H-09-4114-2
PIN No. 2-0016-03-008
23 Montgomery Street
Fence**

Continue to April 8, 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. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

**RE: Petition Harold Yellin for
Lincoln Garage Associates, Incorporated
H-09-4113-2
PIN No. 2-0004-27-001
20 Lincoln Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Neil Dawson
H-09-4117-2
PIN No. 2-0032-18-007
212 West Taylor Street
Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Ms. Ramsay asked if construction had already begun on this project.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was true. She said that the contractor thought it was alright because of a previous petition that had been granted. It was in error but they apologized.

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

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

**RE: Continued Petition of Martie Gay for
Mr. and Mrs. Tracy Young
H-06-3631-2
PIN No. 2-0032-44-009
19 East Gordon Street
Additions and Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of parapet; denial of elevator shaft.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Harold Yellin.

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 pedestrian door on the ground floor of the carriage house;
2. Eliminate the second story spiral stair case and replace with an elevator to access the top roof deck. The elevator shaft is 52” (4’-4”) deep by 52” wide extending 9’ above the roof and will be stuccoed to match the approved building material. This has been reduced from the previous submittal of 6’ by 6’ and 10’-2” tall. The elevator door will feature a brick arch header and incorporate the door that was approved on the ground floor of the carriage house fronting the lane. This portion fronts the side yard and will most likely not be visible from the public right-of-way as illustrated in the photographs; and
3. 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 carriage house is currently under construction. The applicant erected a temporary mock-up of the elevator and parapet to illustrate the height and mass of the structures. While all of the design standards have been met for the proposed amendments, Staff has concerns about the overall height of the carriage house with the addition of the previously approved chimney and pergola, and the newly proposed elevator shaft. These features are not common on historic carriage houses at the approved and proposed dimensions. Upon further study of the approved height of the building, adding additional structures to the top of the already tall carriage house would result in a building that is visually incompatible with other structures along the lane.

The incorporation of a more transparent iron parapet from the previously approved solid stucco parapet should help to mitigate some of the height and mass of the carriage house.

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

(l) 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.

A letter in opposition from a neighbor was presented for the record. Part of this opposition was that the height of his house in relation to the carriage house had been misrepresented.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the proposed parapet. Denial of the elevator shaft as it is visually incompatible with surrounding structures to which it is visually related.

Dr. Henry asked if Staff agreed with the allegations of the neighbor.

Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner was not trying to increase the approved height. She said that in the approved for Height and Mass they showed a relationship of the proposed height with the neighboring property.

Dr. Henry asked if the neighbor was saying that it was misleading.

Ms. Ward pointed out the outline of the building and said that the earlier drawing showed it would line up with the balcony. She said that it now appeared that the wall was three feet higher than the balcony railing and it appeared that way from the photographs. The proposed height never changed but it now appeared they did not submit a corrected detailed drawing for Part I Height and Mass.

Mr. Engle stated that he had problems with the roof and the standards being met. He said there was no question that the pergola would show from Drayton Street because the view from the lane showed the full first set of windows being visible inside the elevation, and the pergola extended south of the second window. The roof deck and the pergola would show from the side elevation and they didn't meet the standard.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Martie Gay (Representing Mr. and Mrs. Tracy Young) stated that she had a letter dated February 11th from the previous meeting that the same plans were submitted at that time, and it was a six-foot by six-foot by ten-foot four-inch elevator shaft. She said at that time Staff recommended approval and since that time the neighbor objected. You cannot build a structure based on the neighbor being happy, but based on ordinances and codes, and as long as the building meets the ordinances and codes that was all that should be considered.

They have shrunk the plans to make it a custom elevator, but was 52-inches by 52-inches on the exterior and nine feet tall. The homeowner had gone through every expense to do what he needed to for the Board and the building. The elevator allows for access to the roof, the pergola was not an issue because it was approved, and what was at issue was the elevator shaft. She asked if it met the codes. Stairs would be a much bigger footprint and bigger than a 52-inch by 52-inch elevator shaft. They had to go with the guidelines, with the ordinances, and with the Board's rules and what they submitted was well within the rules, the ordinances, and it has been scaled back.

Mr. Steffen stated that he agreed with the petitioner's comments that satisfying a neighbor's interest was not part of the Board's mission, but he disagreed that they didn't have a standing to come before the Board and bring their objection. He said the fact that it came from an adjoining property owner was highly relevant to the discussion. It was not a height issue or the number of stories, but an issue of historic compatibility with neighboring structures.

The issue with elevators goes back to historic compatibility. People had access to roofs in the Historic Landmark District without elevators when the buildings were built. Access could be handled in different ways and the question of access was not part of the Board's considerations, but whether or not the structure was historically compatible. He was not suggesting whether it was or was not, but the statements made by the petitioner had three things submitted to the Board that had absolutely nothing to do with the Board's consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Alan Drummond (15 East Gordon Street) stated that he wrote a letter to the Chairman and said that the main point of the letter was the discrepancy between the drawings that were submitted showing a composite streetscape of the lane with the height of the new structure in relation to his home. He said that his house was misrepresented and shown to be three feet taller than it actually was. A pergola had been passed. There would be a chimney on the roof, and the latest application was for an elevator tower. He felt that it was a creeping development on a proposal that misrepresented the scale of the building from his side and it was bigger than he expected it to be because the initial drawing was inaccurate.

Mr. Harold Yellin (Representing Mr. Tracy Young) stated that Mr. Young was confused because four weeks ago the standards were met and Staff recommended approval. He said since that time that nothing had happened except that the elevator had been made smaller to accommodate concerns that the Board had. If Staff had previously recommended approval and they made the elevator shaft smaller, should there never be elevators on carriage houses or no elevators on this carriage house? He understood Mr. Steffen's remarks about neighbors, but if there was something that needed to be done that could be done they would like to know how to accommodate the request. They were asking for guidance and thought they had received the guidance when they did what they were asked to do. He suspected that elevators in the Historic District always presented a problem and were probably not historic. If it was information that was needed, they wanted to know how to continue the dialogue.

Mr. Daniel Carey (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that the previously approved additions and modifications to the carriage house were already overbearing on the lane and the adjacent carriage houses. He said it would compound the previous mistake by adding another modification and allow the building to dominate Gordon Lane. The ordinance stated that elevator towers did not count as a story; they believed that adding an elevator shaft to the top was not in keeping with the spirit of the ordinance. The rule if applied to a commercial structure may mean that an elevator shaft would not be as noticeable, but on a small carriage house in a residential area the result was different and deserved

greater scrutiny. The proposed shaft added large, unnecessary, additional mass to the top of a building that was designed to fade into the background of the larger main house.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Henry asked about Mr. Engle's point regarding the visibility of the structure.

Mr. Engle stated that Staff made the recommendation last month, but the Board did not accept the recommendations and asked for a continuance. He said that Staff's recommendations were not the end all deal; it had to be Board approval and the Board did not go along. Staff's recommendation was not justification to approve it. He did not think it made the standard because the elevator, chimney, and pergola would be visible from Drayton Street and he thought it was a mistake. He did not think it met the standard and should not be accepted.

Mr. Steffen asked if the previous approval of the pergola was done more than a year ago.

Ms. Ward stated that it was in 2007 when they made the change.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board approved the pergola where it was proposed in the changes and the only difference was that it was being done in a more transparent way.

Ms. Ward stated that the pergola was not up for review. She said they were asking to amend the parapet from a solid stucco wall to an iron railing which would make it more transparent and lighter at the top.

Mr. Steffen asked if the Board was being asked to look at the pergola by the amendment.

Ms. Ward answered no. She said it was approved in December 2007.

Mr. Steffen stated that it would be problematic for the Board to make a change in what was approved over a year ago, especially when those issues were not being asked to be amended. He said if someone came in and asked to make a substantial amendment over something that had been approved, then the Board would have the right to go back and correct the mistake that they would have made. He felt that the proposed parapet would actually soften rather than increase the potential violation. The issue of the elevator shaft was something different, was new, was not approved over a year ago, and within the Board's purview to deny if it was historically incompatible.

Ms. Ramsay stated that at the meeting where the pergola and chimney was approved that there was a lot of opposition to the design of the chimney by her and Mr. Meyerhoff because it was bigger than a chimney needed to be. She said that in deference to the client the Board allowed it to be bigger than a normal chimney would be because they did not want to move things around on the interior. The Board had already compromised by putting additions on top that were out-of-scale. On the lanes there was more discretion, but this lane was highly visible from Gaston Street, Forsyth Park, and from Drayton Street.

Mr. Engle stated that by going from a solid to iron parapet that they were opening the chimney to further observation, it would become more transparent, and would be more visible than it would be with a solid parapet. He said the Board should stick with the solid parapet.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the alterations to the parapet and deny the elevator shaft because it is not visually compatible with surrounding structures to which it is visually related. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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

The Preservation Officer recommends a **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 project was originally presented at the February 11, 2009, meeting of the Historic Review Board and was continued. No changes have been made to the design from the previous submittal and as such, the following description is from the previous staff report:

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.

BOARD DISCUSSION FROM PREVIOUS HEARING:

The project was originally presented at the February 11, 2009, meeting of the Historic Review Board and was continued. There was consensus among the board at the February meeting that the concept of the proposed building was visually compatible. Several Board members, however, were not ready to approve the project as submitted due to the lack of detail and information provided on the design and some materials.

The following is a summary of the Board and public discussion at the February meeting, focusing on specific aspects of the proposed design. The petitioner has responded to these items in an amended application submitted to the Board and those responses are indicated in italics.

Historic Wall: Further articulate the historic building façade, possibly through an eave projection. Members of the public and the Board were concerned about the preservation of the remaining wall and how the cast concrete wall would be attached to the brick wall. The attachment could cause further deterioration depending on how it was done. The Board questioned the impact on the exterior walls if they were exposed to modern heating and cooling by being wrapped in glass boxes. It was suggested to have the boxes be on the interior so the exterior walls would not be exposed to the interior air conditioning. Provide clarity on what is placed within the arched openings beyond the proposed glass. One Board member felt that the new contemporary design overpowered the historic façade, obscuring the remaining few historic details.

***Petitioner Response:** Articulation through an eave would be historically inaccurate as the original building featured a gable roof behind a parapet wall. Drawings were submitted on the connection of the historic wall to the new concrete wall behind revealing a flashing cap at the top of the wall, with helical ties anchored into the masonry and secured to the new wall with a 2" air space between the two walls and weep holes at the base of the wall. The petitioner does not believe that the proposed design imposes a threat to the preservation of the historic wall.*

Glass bays will be constructed from a frameless, point supported structural glass system anchored to the historic wall.

Several arches behind the gallery space will have an interior wall behind them and a reveal between the historic masonry and the new wall will light the arch. An opportunity for a display facing the exterior will be within the arch. Other arches in less sensitive areas will be open to the interior and provide display opportunities.

Entrances: It was suggested to provide more entrances where possible.

***Petitioner Response:** Due to the new use of the building as a Museum of Art, security and access requirements prevent adding more entrances. The entrance along Turner Street, projecting bays, and an internal courtyard were considered to give the project a sense of human scale along Turner Street.*

Tower: Positive comments were made about the proposed tower element, stating that an iconic element is needed at this location. Some were not concerned about the height of the tower but the articulation of it, specifically the materials and the design. If it is illuminated, what will it look like during the daytime? One member stated that it appeared ‘bland’. A member of the public suggested incorporating an open metal frame to give the tower a more industrial look.

***Petitioner Response:** The tower is proposed to be semi-transparent composed of structural glass mounted over a structural steel frame with minimal exterior metal framing. The goal is to maintain a prismatic effect to capture sunlight during the day, and features a diffused light during the evening. The simplistic design provides contrast to the existing historic building and allows it to become a focal point.*

New Cast Concrete Wall: It was suggested by one Board member to have more detail, such as a parapet or cap, at the top of the 800’ long wall.

***Petitioner Response:** The historic building featured an 800’ long unbroken parapet wall along Turner Street. Detailing was kept minimal so the massing and the detail of the historic brick wall would not compete with the new building but it would serve as a backdrop.*

FINDINGS:

The Up Freight Warehouse was constructed in 1853 and is a contributing structure to the Central of Georgia Railroad: Savannah Shops and Terminal Facilities National Historic Landmark District. 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 applicants met with the City Infrastructure Departments for an informal Site Plan Review on February 5, 2009. Comments were focused on the on-street parking which should be coordinated with the City’s Parking Services Department and the required number of parking spaces needed. Parking will be reviewed by the City’s Zoning Administrator. Remote parking within the approved parking garage for the approved Embassy Suites across Turner Street was suggested. This should be coordinated with the owner and a remote parking request submitted to the City’s Zoning

Administrator prior to permitting. No General Development Plan has been submitted to the City’s Site Plan Review Departments at the time this staff report was prepared.

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 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 following visual compatibility factors [Section 8-3030 (6)] for (b) proportion of structure’s front façade, (f) rhythm of entrance and/or porch projections, (i) walls of continuity, (j) scale of a building, and (k) directional expression of front elevation have not been met. Staff recommends restudy of these elements as outlined in the table below which were provided in the previous Staff report.

The following Visual Compatibility Factors apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Building Height: New construction or additions to existing structures shall be within the height limits as shown on the historic district height map. 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.
Proportion of Openings: The relationship of the width of the windows to the height of windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.	Six existing arched openings establish the appropriate proportions of openings within the façade. They are approximately 13’ wide by 16’ tall.	Staff recommends redesign of the glass coverings over the openings to allow the historic façade to remain as is with as little intrusion as possible. Glass should be flush with the opening or recessed to reinforce the shape of the arched openings.
Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids in Front Facades: The relationship of solids-to-voids in the façade visible from the public right-of-way of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.	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.	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>Rhythm of Structures on Streets: The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjacent structure shall be visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing structure to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>The proposed addition re-establishes the historic footprint of the former Up Freight Warehouse.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Roof Shapes: The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>The proposed design incorporates a flat roof. Light monitors and a light tower project upward from the roof and also feature flat roofs.</p>	<p>The standard is met. Historically the building featured a gable roof behind a parapet wall. The design of the flat parapet wall parallel to the street has been reestablished.</p>

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends a continuance to address the four items below:

The visual compatibility factors, which are the only standards that apply to Monumental Buildings, require that the proposed project look to surrounding historic structures to determine appropriate scale, proportion, rhythm of projections and entrances, relationship of materials, and directional expression. 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-foot to 800-foot 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 redesign of the Up Freight Building. The grand glass curtain wall to the west of the tower suggests a strong contemporary element that is harmonious in design with the existing building.

1. **Staff recommends restudy of the tower above the entrance.** The tower element imposes itself upon the historic brick wall by projecting approximately five feet forward of the original building plane. If this were reviewed as a rehabilitation project, Staff would recommend that the tower be subordinate to the main building in Height and Mass. If the Board finds that the tower element is visually compatible as an iconic element required for a monumental building, Staff recommends recessing the tower so as not to project over the historic wall or relocating it to the west end of the property to not be located within the center of the historic wall.

2. **Staff recommends reducing or restudying the height of the tower above the entrance.** The height of the tower competes with the horizontality of building and does not relate to the surrounding historic buildings. The proposed height of the 86-foot tall tower has been presented to add a skyline feature beyond the approved five- and six-story hotel and parking garage to be sited on the north side of Turner Street, between Papy and Fahm Streets. Staff does not recommend designing such significant features to the height of proposed new construction, but to evaluate them in the context of the immediately surrounding historic buildings and the proportions of the existing building itself.

While the hotel and garage were approved by the Board, there is no certainty that these projects will come to fruition. Drawings for the garage portion of the development, which the petitioners have suggested they will use to meet their own parking requirements, have not at this time

entered the construction documents phase. It has also been indicated that the parking garage may be reduced in height by as much as two-stories (20'). The hotel is currently going through the permitting process; however, the garage must be built to provide the parking before the hotel can be erected.

- 3. Staff recommends restudy the glass enclosures over the arches.** Staff recommends preserving the arches as is and introducing as little new material as possible; 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. Recessed glass could be placed within the new wall so as not to further damage the remaining historic fabric. While regular projections of entrances are provided historically on some of the historic district's most notable streets such as Jones Street, this is not a characteristic found in the Central of Georgia Railroad Landmark district. If the Board determines that the projecting glass bays are visually compatible, Staff recommends reducing the projection to the minimum amount necessary, possibly from 30" to one-foot or less.

Ms. Ward received six letters from members of the public in support of the project from Mr. Maury Pearlman and Mr. Wayne Spear, the Ralph Mark Gilbert Civil Rights Museum, Mr. J. W. Jamerson, III, Ms. Lauren Tonehave, the W. W. Law Foundation, Remer Pendergraph, Ms. Frances Wong, and Rustin Levinson. (See Attached.)

STAFF COMMENTS FOR PART II:

Details for signage, lighting, window openings, and a detailed site plan with the parking requirements noted should be provided in the Part II submittal. For the Part II submittal, Staff recommends reevaluating the need for installing solid doors within the openings on the east end of the wall on Turner Street behind the displays. It was mentioned that the exterior light would not work with the program for the museum; however, many successful museums provide natural light which in this case would enhance the pedestrian experience along the sidewalk.

Two informal SPR meetings. No comments that would seem to impact the proposed design of the building.

Mr. Thomson stated that Sarah presented the Board the Staff report. Subsequent to that report Staff met with applicant's architect twice and had a number of discussions in terms of the list of things that were of concern in the report: Staff feels that the issue of the (attachments of the old wall to the new wall) has been responded to and Mr. Sottile will give you the details. With regard to the openings we have come to recognize the use of this building as a museum and the need to address the openings for security and so on in a different way; we discussed with them at great length about the tower, projections into the right of way and the (glass enclosures over the) archways and concluded that we have a different opinion than they do and that what they have proposed is acceptable, but we have asked them to go into greater detail with the Board as to how they made their design decisions on the building. The encroachment issue is a design feature we have asked them to explain. When we heard it we understood better where they were coming from so we ask you to listen to it and at this point we believe we have done all we can as Staff, and the decision will be yours to make at this point. As to the other aspects the Board was interested in at the last meeting, more design study on the tower and arches will come in design detail. What we have in front of us is sufficient for Height and Mass.

Mr. Sottile:

Treatment of Historic Masonry Wall: There were questions about how we would stabilize and support the brick ruin and whether the various design elements proposed would obscure or visually overpower the remaining design details within the wall. As to the means of supporting the wall, the historic wall is attached to the new concrete wall through a network of structural ties that are imbedded in the historic wall and secured into the new concrete wall. An air space is preserved between the two walls to allow for different rates of expansion and contraction and if necessary to allow moisture to escape through weep holes at the base of the wall. The detail has not yet been fully engineered but this is the overall approach favored by masonry experts and structural engineers.

Treatment of the Arches: As to the concern about obscuring the historic masonry, the decision to preserve the historic masonry ruins and to showcase them as the essential aspect of the façade design was born out of profound appreciation for their inherent beauty and their significance. It is out of this appreciation for the masonry ruins that the decision was made to allow only transparent design elements to project forward of the historic wall so that the historic masonry can be fully appreciated and remain completely un-obscured.

Entrance Tower: Staff raised concerns over the strong verticality of the tower and its proportional relationship to the unbroken horizontality of the original 800-foot-long structure. In discussing this element it is very important to think about the dramatic change of use that is occurring. A district that was designed to fulfill a purely utilitarian function is being repurposed into a vibrant pedestrian environment that must be suited to a very high level of civic purpose. Remnants of a warehouse are being transformed into a museum of fine art. We agree with the assessment of Staff that the verticality of the tower is in strong contrast with the horizontality of the existing structure. This contrast is intentional and we believe, entirely appropriate. Civic buildings must stand out. The use of strongly contrasting vertical elements to distinguish buildings of a civic purpose is well established in the City of Savannah. Examples are the tower of Habersham Hall; the tower of the old Barnard Street School; the clock tower of the County Court House; the steeple of Independent Presbyterian Church; the smokestack of the round house complex; and the tower of the old waterworks building on Gwinnett Street. Many landmarks added over many generations.

Staff raised concerns about establishing the height of the tower based upon the height of buildings that have been approved but, which have not yet been constructed. Furthermore concerns have been expressed that the tower may be out of proportion with the historic structure to which it is related. While it has always been a goal of the design team to create a civic landmark to project it above the forthcoming hotel development, the tower could have been shorter or taller and still accomplish this goal. The final height of the tower was established after considerable study and numerous refinements based upon a series of carefully considered proportional relationships between the new element and the existing structure. Architects have historically used regulating lines to establish proportional relationships between building elements in order to discover appropriate height to width relationships that result in visually pleasing proportions.

On the Farm Street (west) elevation diagram you can see the end elevation of the historic wall of the sheds and the tower element beyond. If you set the reference point at the top of the historic wall and take the width of the historic shed that defines the complete height of the tower. This is the beginning point of that tower element and its complete height is defined by the width of the shed so it is a plan/section relationship that starts to define the total height of the element.

If we take the elevation fronting Turner Street beginning with the top of the historic masonry wall, the distance between the wall essentially the height of the wall becomes the reference point for the mullion that divides the tower into its composition, so we have a 3:1 height ratio where that height again defines the complete height of the tower. Now taking some of those overall ordering principles and studying the proportional relationships of these elements you see what proportions recur in the tower. Its height to width ratio is 3:5, beginning with the smallest openings of the portico elements, and then to the overall proportions of the tower itself. In fact, the 3:5 ratio is one that we already have in our ordinance as an ideal vertical proportion that we seen in the Savannah Historic District.

Mr. Thomson stated to note that each model ends up at the same height.

Mr. Sottile stated that it was also suggested that the tower potentially be relocated or be pushed back behind the façade eliminating the encroachment onto the sidewalk. Prominent entrance encroachments are a well established urban convention in Savannah. A nearby example is the ten-foot portico encroachment on Kiah Hall. The projection of the entrance forward of the brick façade in alignment with Papy Street is a critical part of the design. It is this very gesture that allows the Evans Center to transcend its utilitarian history as a warehouse and assert itself appropriately in the public realm.

Clarifications on the tower as to the nature of its surface, its expression during the day as well as in the evening, and its level of transparency. These questions have been addressed in the memorandum and will be more fully addressed in the design detail.

Series of Glass Bays: Staff has expressed concern that the bays break up the visual continuity of the continuous façade by creating numerous recesses and projections and has suggested that they be eliminated or reduced in depth to 12 feet' or less. First to the question of visual continuity it is true that the building did in fact feature an 800-foot-long continuous façade with no projections and that the portions of the wall standing today still exhibit that continuity. The original building was not designed for pedestrian comfort or urban vitality but for unloading freight. Such relentless continuity does not lend itself to a high quality urban street with an important civic use and character. The proposed depth of the bays was derived from a careful on-site study and from analysis of high quality urban streetscapes that nearly always include a rhythm of projections and recesses. Stoops that project between four and six feet and bays usually project between two and three feet depending upon their width. Shallow projections of 12 inches or less are largely foreign to Savannah streetscapes and such projections would likely not result in meaningful façade variation at the pedestrian level. We believe that the design of the façade strikes the right balance by providing projections that are transparent. This preserves the visibility of the continuous historic wall while creating a rhythm of projections and recesses that addresses the pedestrian experience along Turner Street.

Regarding the attachment of the glazing to the brick and whether the bays could cause efflorescence and deterioration of the historic brick. To the question of moisture damage due to climate control the design team is aware of this issue and of damage that has occurred to historic structures, particularly in low lying areas with high levels of subsurface ground moisture and poor soil drainage. The problem can be exacerbated by a regular freeze thaw cycle which can lead to surfaces spalling in certain types of historic brick; however, we do not believe that these examples are analogous to our site, climate, or subsurface moisture conditions. Indeed historic brick masonry within conditioned glass enclosures can be found throughout the city.

As to the method of attachment between the frameless glass system and the historic masonry wall we have provided a preliminary detail describing that attachment. A further detail will be provided with the submittal for the Part II design detail (review).

Dr. Henry asked what the difference was between semi-transparent and translucent.

Mr. Sottile stated that translucent emitted light and semi-transparency allowed visibility through the surface. He said that a frosted window was translucent, but not transparent.

Dr. Henry asked if they made a change from the original proposal.

Mr. Sottile stated that in the original proposal the tower was described as having translucency, but they have also submitted a semi-transparent as well that included the idea that it was translucent. He said it was not a change to the original intent, but they were saying that it was a light emitting element that had some level of transparency.

Dr. Henry asked if he was looking at it from the outside that he could see the bricks.

Mr. Sottile stated that the elements of the tower that were semi-transparent all began above the historic brick wall, and all of the tower elements below the tower were entirely transparent.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Dr. Peggy Blood stated that she was an art educator, citizen of Savannah, and an art professional for 40 years and thought she had an appreciation and understanding about aesthetics and the value of progressive communities evolving toward the future, while maintaining a sense of classical tradition. She said that an appearance of continuing evolution was what made a great city. A layering of time and accumulation of overlapping traces from successive periods to produce something like a collage of time. SCAD had respect for the past, was mindful of the present, and prepared for the future. The design was awesome to her and the architect had solved many challenges. It should stand out. It was not a warehouse or a home, but was an art museum and like art, should be displayed to look at with a distinctive visual entrance. She noticed that the property was in the shadow of a hotel across the street, it was long, and it needed a recognizable, distinctive opening.

The architect realized by preserving the character of the structure that he was integrating the old and new of Savannah. The façade arches become works of art. They were looking at aesthetics, security for the art work, and security from deterioration. If there were too many openings rodents and bugs could get in, and if there was too much light it would cause deterioration. Uncontrolled temperature, humidity, pollution, and biological agents damage and deteriorate works of art. With every ten degrees Celsius (18 degrees Fahrenheit), increase in temperature reduces the useful life of paper by one-half. Mold, mildew, poor air circulation, are some of the things that come along with trying to preserve art. Things can fade over five to ten years due to improper controls based on a design that had too many openings, too much light, and other things that people were proposing. She urged the Board to consider the design because it was an art museum.

Mr. Daniel Carey (Historic Savannah Foundation/HSF) stated that HSF continued to support the petitioner's request for Height and Mass approval and the overall concept design for the SCAD art museum. He said that greater latitude and flexibility on new design should be afforded this part of town and the project should not be hamstrung by conventional thinking, and picking away key features to the point of inoculating the building into the background. The Board had the opportunity to allow creative, modern architecture for civic structures in this area and implored the Board to use good judgment to look past standard interpretation of the ordinance to a more imaginative solution. The existing historic

train sheds were ruins, but could be revived with a new design. To take away the character-defining features of the proposed design would diminish the possibility of producing a monumental structure that can become a representation of this generation's good work.

Ms. Lise Sundrla (Savannah Development and Renewal Authority) stated that the vision for the Downtown Master Plan recognized the importance of respecting the past and embracing the future. She said over the last 30 years that SCAD had made a positive impact on the downtown area by reusing more than 70 different historic structures. They have taken what were considered white elephant properties and put them back into a viable use that was not the original intent for the property, but created a working, livable and vibrant city and community where people can enjoy, learn about the history, and participate in the activities of the community. The Downtown Master Plan recognized that institutional structures needed to stand out and play a role in the community as a public space, and as a public space. This project and the efforts were in keeping with goals and direction of the Downtown Master Plan.

Mr. Billy Jamerson (Ralph Mark Gilbert Civil Rights Museum) stated that they approved of the beautiful edifice. He said that the building was built by slaves using bricks created by slaves, and understood that one of the native sons was returning to Savannah with a wonderful collection of world-renown art. In 1991 Dr. Evans first exhibited the art work at the Beach Institute. When there was an opportunity for a native son to return to Savannah with one of the richest collections of art in the world, it did not need to stand in a warehouse, but needed to have attention to it. The features would be visible from the Talmadge Bridge and would draw attention to the fact that at one time it was a warehouse that was built with slave labor. To consider flattening out the building and making it blend in with the community would be a big mistake.

Ms. Maureen Burke (Executive Director of the SCAD Museum of Art) stated that she was pleased that the problem with the entrances had been addressed given the national significance of the art work that the building would house in the future. She said they had to meet the National Museum Accreditation standards, and in terms of space requirements you have limited access and environmental stability issues.

The tower was a distinctive design feature that would serve as a guidepost and drawing card for visitors to Savannah's Historic District. Museum architecture was significant in its own right, but this design also incorporated preserving the important 1853 railroad structure and its historic Savannah grey brick as a model for adaptive reuse for the new use of the building. Since the Evans Center and the museum annex were near the Savannah Visitors Center, and there were plans for a hotel and parking lot nearby, the tower would serve as a locator for pedestrians and vehicles, and a highly visible destination for tourists and local people. It celebrated both Savannah's 19th century architecture and African-American heritage, and also established Savannah's new role in art and design as a model.

Dr. Walter Evans stated that his mother was born a couple of block away in Frog Town and it was the first home of his grandparents. He said it was originally a Jewish community and then it became an African-American community, and a shanty town that became blighted. President Wallace asked him where he would like the Evans Center to be. He said this building because he did not want to see more hotels blighting an area that was already blighted. He gave three conditions for the gift. One was that they have a designated building, that it becomes a center for African-American studies, and that the center be open and free to the public.

He said that museums only have one entry door. A great mistake that was made on the Jepson Center is the door that goes outside to the terrace on the third floor and it has been sealed off because you cannot have art with the light and elements coming in. There was also no place to hang art because of the ultraviolet light coming in, and because of that the door has been sealed.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Steffen stated that in 1885 Gustave Eiffel went to the organizers of the 1888 European Exposition in Spain with a proposal to build a large dark-bronze iron tower to honor the event. He said that the city founders found it a strange structure that did not fit into the city design and turned Mr. Eiffel down. Mr. Eiffel took his tower to Paris in 1889 and it became the single most iconic structure in the world. Paris' gain was Barcelona's lost because Barcelona failed to recognize an iconic monumental structure that our own Historic District Ordinance contemplates under Section 8-3030. It specifically contemplates the building of this type of iconic structure to enhance the historic fabric of the community. He thought it would be tragic for the Board to fail to recognize it, especially in light of the fact that HSF fully supported the project.

Mr. Law thought that it would enhance the community and that it was a good project.

Mr. Engle stated that no one was against the art museum. He said the issue was that it would be in a National Historic Landmark District structure and the Board was saying that they were going to improve it for this day and time. The Secretary of Interior Standards state that buildings should be preserved as products of their time, not our time. By the arguments being presented that they want to humanize and articulate the façade, even though that was not how it was originally constructed, it would allow them to put glass roofs on Factor's Walk because that would humanize and articulate it. He asked where does the Board draw the line on national landmarks as to what would make them better for today. Projects like this have been done across the country where the significant character could be maintained without improving the character, and this could be done. He did not think the jewel boxes in front of the arches do that, but rather detracted from the historic character. The pedestrian character had always been a big, long, bland building with openings and now the openings were being obscured. They were covering them up, they would reflect in the day time, they would not be sensed as voids in the planes, and these weren't bays on Jones Street. He thought this was atypical of good preservation practice and he cannot support it. He still did not know about the tower and said that it would be better to move it down to the modern infill glass section. They would still have the feature in the sky with the tower coming over the bridge, but it would not be superimposed on a landmark structure, but part of a new building. He reads the code to say that monumental architecture was new construction and not the rehabilitation of a landmark structure.

Ms. Ramsay stated that her concern was that the new construction overpowers the existing construction, and instead of recessing the glass into the arches, a whole new squared bay element that bore no relation to the existing structures protrudes 30-inches into a very busy street. She said it would be better to recess the glass into the arched openings so that it would read as it did now. The building would serve not only as a museum, but as classroom space. She would be nervous about walking along the entire length of the building at night with no openings, and would like to see more than one opening along the whole blank façade. The tower structure matches the Tate Modern in form, but it achieved a totally different result. The Tate Modern tower was original to the building and in the same material of the existing building while the glass towers served to minimize the original structure. She agreed with Staff that if it was to be used it should be recessed from the front façade to not additionally obscure more of the existing building.

Dr. Henry stated that he felt better about the tower in terms of the material. He said he had a vision of a huge Chinese take out box in front of the building if it was translucent. If he understood what semi-transparent meant it sounded better and had his vote.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass under subsection (I)(16) Monumental Structures of the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030), and with the condition that there be further articulation along Turner Street in the Design Detail development phase. Mr. Judson seconded the motion. The motion passed 6 to 2. Ms. Ramsay and Mr. Engle were opposed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Roberto Leoci
H-09-4108-2
PIN No. 2-0044-01-007
604 - 606 Abercorn Street
Alteration/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

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.

- 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. The deck will be screened with vegetation of shrubs and trees including 'Columnar Juniper' and 'Crepe Myrtles' along all sides of the deck.
- 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.

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 is partially located on the adjacent property at 207 East Huntingdon Street which is owned by the same entity. Since the deck is not considered to be a 'structure', the City Development Services Department has determined that it can straddle the property line. 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 City Zoning Administrator classifies this expansion as an 'accessory use' and as long as the same entity owns both properties, it can be permitted.

The alterations 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.

The standard is met. Vegetation will screen the deck and provide a softer transition to the neighboring properties. The deck is to be stained to match the main structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the petitioner had to guarantee or needed to submit the size of the plantings.

Ms. Ward stated that Staff did not review plantings, but just required that they would be able to be screened.

Ms. Ramsay asked if there was someone in permitting who determined the size.

Ms. Ward stated not to her knowledge.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Roberto Leoci stated that his family had restaurants in Savannah, that he studied in Florence, Italy, and the reason for the deck was because he enjoyed the weather and that it was a good way to have outdoor dining and a neighborhood restaurant. He wanted to stay in Savannah and would like to do outdoor dining like The Mansion on Forsyth Park.

Ms. Ramsay asked if it was their intent to have the plantings as large as was shown on the elevations.

Mr. Leoci answered yes. He said they would be six feet or larger plants. He wanted to make it look like it was part of the neighborhood.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation/HSF) stated that last month they asked the petitioner to screen the deck from all sides of the public right-of-way. She said that HSF was not opposed to the green screen created by the trees, but they were concerned that it might not create the degree of privacy that an eight-foot fence along side all of the property would. It looked as if no screening was proposed for the Huntingdon Street Lane and requested that the Board require the petitioner to screen this area from view.

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

**RE: Petition of Sean O. Roach for
Dr. Lance Hemberger
H-09-4116-2
PIN No. 2-0033-01-021B
548 East Taylor Street
Porch Addition/Alteration**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Steve Sutlive.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval to enclose an existing deck on the rear of the property at 548 East Taylor Street as follows:

Location: The deck is located on the rear of the property and is 18'-2" deep by 13'-2.5" wide. The new screened porch will be located on the existing deck extending 14'-2.5" tall at its greatest height. An existing stucco wall on the east end of the property has been incorporated into the addition.

Materials and color: The porch is constructed of 2 by 4 and 4 by 4 wood posts with wood rafters painted tabby white.

Windows and doors: Anderson white double-hung screen windows, Anderson vinyl screen door 700 series, and aluminum fixed Velux skylights.

Roof: Shed roof extending from the main house surfaced in 25-year asphalt shingle, weathered gray.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 548 East Taylor Street is a part of a brick row constructed in 1893. The building is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density) with a maximum lot coverage of 75 percent permitted. The parcel is 18' wide by 100' deep for a total square footage of 1,800 square feet. The existing and proposed building footprint equals 1,304 square feet for a total building lot coverage of 72.4 percent. The new screened porch is minimally visible from East Broad Street. The new porch extends 8' above the adjacent stucco wall making only the top portion visible from the public right-of-way. It is unclear whether or not the stucco wall is on the property at 548 East Taylor or on the neighboring property at 550 East Taylor Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the following conditions:

- 1) The exterior white color be restudied and a color that blends in with the existing building be used and resubmitted to Staff for final approval.**

- 2) **The porch enclosure be located entirely on the subject parcel at 548 East Taylor Street. If the stucco wall to the east is owned or partially owned by the neighbor, the proposed porch addition should not be built upon it. The addition should be relocated to the subject parcel.**

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Steve Sutlive (Representing Dr. Lance Hemberger and Mr. Sean Roach) stated that the project started off on a bad foot. He said the plans were drawn up trying to adhere to the codes and the problem was the erroneous information that was received. They started the project without proper approval from the Board and the permitting process. Once the project was started a stop work permit was placed on the structure and that was why they were present today. The main concern that he was hearing from Staff was that the structure encroached on the common wall on the east side of the property. That could be circumvented by taking the four by four support beam and moving it west creating the bearing on the deck on the property to support the load of the roof. The CMU wall would not have any structure attached to it.

The paint color could be supplied to the Board if it was an issue. The surrounding community was concerned because they started without the proper authority and Dr. Hemberger apologized for that. There was also concern about not seeing any kind of access to the townhomes. The CMU wall was an eight-foot wall that provided privacy for the homeowners who live on the street and it was not like when you walk out the back that you would see an eight-foot wall if you're on the ground floor. If you're on the second or third floor the property might obstruct the view westward, but it was a contention that the Board would have to decide. There would be subsequent plans provided showing the roofline that would be moved west.

Mr. Judson stated that he appreciated their willingness to move it and eliminate the encroachment, but he was still not clear if the stucco wall was on the property line.

Mr. Sutlive stated that the center of the CMU wall was the common separation line between the two structures.

Mr. Engle asked if the concern of the neighbors was the view toward East Broad Street and the concern of the Board was the visibility from East Broad Street. He said that the ridge was over 17 feet above grade and asked if it could be lowered. It was 10 feet 3-inches to the eave and 14 feet 3-inches from the deck to the ridge and asked if they could bring it down a foot or two.

Mr. Sutlive stated that a shingled roof required a 3:12 pitch to make it functional and that was where the pitch was now.

Mr. Engle stated that it could be metal. He said he did not know if it would satisfy the neighbors if it was brought down a little, but it would cut down the visibility from East Broad Street.

Mr. Sutlive stated that the concern was the view that the neighbor had on the east side of the property and they can't look from the second floor down to the west side of the building. He said that the structure was projecting above the eight-foot CMU wall six feet. The visual problem was anyone living east of the property trying to look west down the lane.

Ms. Sue Bordenkircher (546 East Taylor Street) stated that the sunroom addition would damage and obscure the character-defining features of the townhouses on both the east and west sides. She said there were five continuous row houses and should be noted as a contiguous property. It would not be visually compatible with the contributing structure, as well as the structure of the townhouses and would not blend in. It would devalue her property as well as the other properties, and it would limit the sun light and air to her and the other properties.

Ms. Barbara Schulz (540 East Taylor Street – Resident and Vice President of the Historic Beach Institute Neighborhood Association) stated that Dr. Hemberger has been a good neighbor and helped in beautifying the block, but she disagreed with what he was trying to do and that it blocked the view. She said that the neighbors agreed that Dr. Hemberger would be opening Pandora's Box and they asked what would be next because everybody would have something they would want to do.

Mr. Daniel Carey (Historic Savannah Foundation/HSF) stated that the frequency of approving after-the-fact requests was a disturbing trend and they understood that some people were not familiar with the rules and ordinances of the city and move ahead without permission, but that ignorance of the law was no excuse. He said that to allow it to happen with no penalty or repercussions sent a message that the law could be ignored. There should be middle ground between tear it down and start over and simply allowing it to stand without penalty because it had been built. Savannah's codes and procedures were designed to allow the public to safely enjoy the historic city, and they support the ordinance and were not in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Sutlive stated that the main points he heard was the lack of being able to see down the lane from the second floor view, and it was a legitimate concern even though you would be over the roof. He said if you were on the ground floor the view was limited because of the walls that go out the back of the property.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board had gotten off-track on an issue that was not the Board's (whether you could see down the lane or into the neighbor's back yard). He said the concern was whether the addition was visually compatible with the rest of the structure. It may be a related issue but it was a separate issue, and the issue the Board needed to address was whether the structure was visually compatible with a very unique block.

Ms. Ramsay stated the Board did not have a legal stand on the view and they could not address that, but they could address visual compatibility.

Dr. Henry asked if there was anyone the neighbors could go to and address the issues.

Dr. Watkins stated maybe, but for the Board's purposes they were dealing specifically with the compatibility.

Mr. Steffen stated that he and Mr. Gay were the longest serving Board members and they had been talking with the City about that issue and the issue that HSF raised about having the ability to fine someone who began to build without permission. He said that the Board did not have that ability but they had the ability to decide whether it was visually compatible.

Mr. Judson stated that the Board could find it being visually incompatible.

Ms. Ramsay stated that this was the third petition today that was an after-the-fact petition.

Mr. Steffen stated that the only penalty was the stop work order and a delay in the project. He said it was not insignificant but it was not a fine.

Dr. Watkins stated the Board did not have a means to deal with after-the-fact scenarios and it was more of a City issue.

Mr. Engle stated that if you took the two drawings and superimposed them, it appeared that the roofline of the addition would cut the second floor window in half. He said it was a strange use of a porch roof in Savannah because normally it would come below the second floor sill and not through the center. He did not think it was compatible and did not meet any standard of design in Savannah. He also felt the reason they were putting in skylights because they had eliminated half of the window by the roof. If the Board had been asked to review it before-the-fact, he would have had a severe problem with it and said to lower the whole thing. They were building a deck that was three feet above grade and, therefore, they have to build a roof that was 17 feet above grade instead of lowering the whole thing. It was not compatible with how it was normally done.

Mr. Judson stated that he didn't have the line of sight and the pictures were probably taken from the rear steps being above grade and looking down. He said that what he could see of the roof was not from East Broad Street, but he could see it from the lane. It was a sore thumb and not compatible with the continuity of the five historic structures or viewed as one historic structure. It wasn't a matter of material, but a matter of scale. It looked like a shed roof that had been stuck on the back of the building. He found it visually incompatible and asked if the Board should move to deny the application and disallow the construction, and if they were clear with the City in terms of retrofitting the building to the original.

Mr. Tiras Petrea (City Zoning Inspector) stated that his understanding was when the Board or the Zoning Board of Appeals deny an after-the-fact approval or variance, then the petitioner would have to remove it unless they do something else.

Mr. Judson asked if it was enforced by building codes.

Mr. Petrea stated that it would be enforced by zoning.

Ms. Reiter stated that the Board needed to state the specific standards that it was not meeting; otherwise it would be open to appeal.

Mr. Gay stated that it was not visually compatible.

Ms. Reiter asked why.

Mr. Gay stated that it didn't look right.

Dr. Henry stated that it cut across a window and it was too high.

Ms. Ramsay stated that on page nine in the ordinance it states under rhythm of entrances and/or porch projection that the relationship of entrances, porch projection, and walkways to structures shall be

visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they were visually related, which she though would apply in this case.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it was Section “c” on pages eight and nine, item “f”.

Mr. Steffen stated that Dr. Henry would need to say (k)6.(c) and (k)6.(f).

HDRB ACTION: Dr. Henry made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review deny the petition as submitted because it is visually incompatible as provided in subsections (k)6.(c) Proportion of Openings, and (k)6.(f) Rhythm of Entrance and/or porch projection of the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030). Mr. Engle seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of BWBF, Incorporated
Richard Guerard
H-09-4118-2
PIN No. 2-0032-07-001
342 Drayton Street
New Construction/Height and Mass Part I and Design
Details Part II**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. Richard Guerard.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Detail approval for **Phase 1 (five units) of a three phase project. Although Phase I is what is being considered at this meeting, there is some discussion of future phases to understand the form at build-out.**

Submittal to Site Plan Review for comments is required prior to Part I. Any comments received are required to be addressed prior to permit approval. The petitioner has informally met with SPR and submitted plans for formal comments.

FINDINGS:

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Development Standards: Setbacks: No setbacks are required in a RIPA zone.</p> <p>75 percent maximum lot coverage.</p>	<p>The structure is sited to be on the zero-lot line on the Drayton and Charlton Street sides. It is 49.95 feet from the adjacent residence property line. Parking is proposed within this area as well as along the lane.</p>	<p>The wall of continuity is maintained at the corner of Charlton and Drayton Streets.</p>

<p>Dwelling Unit Type:</p>	<p>Apartment-Condo</p>	<p>Apartment buildings as a type are rare in the Historic District. A photo study of 14 apartment buildings indicates that the average width is 30-40 feet in the RIPA district. Where it is larger the building is subdivided into multiple entrances or other scale-altering devices (See photos below.) The applicant will provide multiple entrances in the build-out.</p>
<p>Street Elevation Type:</p>	<p>Ground level entry.</p>	<p>Ground level entry apartment buildings are found in the Historic District.</p>
<p>Entrances and Building Orientation:</p>	<p>The main entry is oriented to the east-west street. The proposed entry has double doors and a top light.</p>	<p>The entry meets the orientation standard, however, for such a large structure, the entry lacks monumentality.</p>
<p>Building Height: The site is located in a four-story height zone.</p>	<p>The building is proposed to be four stories. The overall height is 43'-10".</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development:</p>	<p>The projected building footprint at build-out is approximately 5,294 Square feet and the proposed building is four stories high, therefore, the Tall and Large-Scale Development standards do not apply.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:</p>	<p>The width of the zero-lot line Phase I portion fronting Charlton Street is 39'-6".</p>	<p>At build-out this is to represent two attached structures.</p>
<p>Proportion of Openings:</p>	<p>The window openings are rectangular, 3'-0" by 6'-0", vertically aligned. The windows over the main door are wider to emphasize this portion of the façade.</p>	<p>The alignment and proportion of the windows meet the standards.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</p>	<p>The building at build-out is designed to appear as two attached townhomes on Charlton Street.</p>	<p>Staff recommends further revisions to the main entrance and canopy. A second entrance is projected for Phase II. Phase II is scheduled to begin about four months following the initiation of Phase I. If this is to be a longer period, Staff recommends softening the blank walls with vines or plantings.</p>

Rhythm of Structure on Street:	The phases once completed are to represent attached town homes.	
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, and Balconies:	Balconies projecting 3’-5” are proposed on the Drayton Street side. At build out there will be two sets of such balconies on the Drayton Street side.	The balconies will be reduced to 3’ to meet the standards.
Walls of Continuity:	The Drayton Street corner is maintained by the positioning of the structure at the corner.	Parking should be accessed from the lane only and screened when visible from the street. Screening can be a minimum 3’ hedge or solid masonry buffer or both. Staff recommends both in this location. A detail needs to be submitted.
Roof Shape:	A parapet surrounds a flat roof. There is an elevator penthouse located on the roof.	The roof standards have been met.
Scale:		

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors:	Six-over-six and eight-over-eight clad wood double-hung windows by Anderson, narrow-line series are proposed. Anderson Doors. Paneled PVC Shutters by Atlantic.	The window standards are met.
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, and Porches:	The stoop consists of a step up. A metal canopy on brackets is proposed. The balcony railing is by Lawler LC-410c with ogee cap rail.	The balcony projection should not exceed the three foot maximum. The canopy design needs to be revisited to be more compatible with the architecture.
Fences:	A hedgerow is proposed to screen the surface parking lot.	Staff recommends both a vegetative and solid masonry screen along Charlton Street.
Materials:	The walls are proposed to be brick. Cherokee Queen Size “Mosstown” No. 52-17-888 for the main walls and Jenkins Brick “Brompton” for the banding. The mortar color will be “Savannah Ivory.” Standing seam metal canopy over front door; metal balconies.	Brick is a desirable material. A sample panel will be erected on site for review prior to final selection.
Textures:		See above

Color:		See above
HVAC	It is proposed to place the HVAC units on the roof.	It is not clear whether the parapet will screen the HVAC units.
Trash	A trash enclosure is temporarily placed on the east elevation. A dumpster is proposed at build-out.	There will be no provision for recycling.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the following conditions:

1. Any SPR comments are required to be addressed prior to permit approval.
2. The main entry double doors and metal canopy need further study. Staff will provide further input regarding this.
3. If the phasing of the project will extend longer than eight months, then the blank walls should be screened with vegetative planting.
4. Location and screening of electric meters and screening of HVAC units.

Ms. Ramsay asked if there had been a submittal for the exact same building for two different sites at the same meeting.

Ms. Reiter stated that there would be a second one coming up with the same building at a totally different site, which was unusual. In Savannah there are historic row buildings in different places.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the Board would see the same building again and it wasn't the most attractive building. She wondered if it was something that was rare or ever happened before.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Reiter if she knew of any apartment buildings that used shutters. He said that Staff mentioned that it was looked at as an apartment building and he could not think of an apartment building that tried to differentiate one section with shutters and one section without them. Shutters say townhouse and not apartment building.

Ms. Reiter stated that she would have to look at the pictures.

Mr. Engle stated that it was a mixed metaphor that was not clear if it was to be looked at as an apartment building or as a huge townhouse block. He said if that was the case then the detailing was mixing a little of everything.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was her feeling that it looked like an apartment building because the mass was reflective of the EMC building across the street that was large. She said you could try to make it look like row houses, but it would not come off as looking like a row house, particularly with the ground floor entrance. There weren't any four-story row houses with ground floor entrances. It needed to have an entrance that said apartment-house because that was what it was.

Mr. Engle stated that he agreed and the detail should go with apartment-house type detailing and not townhouse detailing.

Dr. Henry asked that if the phased project was not completed, did the new regulations address that.

Ms. Reiter answered no.

Dr. Henry stated that based on the Hall Street situation, he thought that the Board should put something in new regulations that would not permit that kind of hiatus to happen again.

Ms. Reiter stated that these were two different issues. She said that Hall Street was a building that was dismantled.

Ms. Reiter stated that the same situation had happened in the row diagonally across Drayton Street. She said there was a large blank wall waiting for the next buildings to be built. It wasn't attractive, but it happened from time-to-time. In this case because of the way it was being put together that there would be blank walls on two different sides which was unusual. She was more concerned that these blank walls would not be on the property line.

Dr. Henry asked if they were concerned about the project not being completed on time.

Ms. Reiter stated that the owner said Phase II would start four months later and then Phase II would start four months later after that. She said her question was that the bottom could drop out in four months and what would they be left with?

Dr. Henry asked if the only solution they had if that happened was the vegetation.

Ms. Reiter stated that she was just bringing it up as a point.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Richard Guerard stated that the phasing was a part of any development whenever there was more than one facet of a building, particularly a condominium. You get building permits on the common space, the overall structure, and on each individual unit within the building. He said that you could theoretically get a certificate of occupancy for a building without obtaining one for all of the units. You could occupy a unit within a building whether it was a 5-unit or 75-unit building if the common space in a structure and the units were given a certificate of occupancy. When a building was multifaceted, there was no guarantee from any builder that he had the wherewithal to finish the project. When you pull a building permit there was no financial requirements to show that you have the cash to finish the building. The reason he showed it in phases instead of drawing the whole building and trying to permit it was because he wanted to get started on Phase I. This intention was to complete the whole building. To come back and permit it as a complete building did not guarantee that they would finish the building. There were other examples of buildings built from the zero lot line where the end wall was a solid masonry wall to construct onto. In this case they could subdivide the property, but it was pointless. The only reason they would phase it was when they would build one section and it was being dried in, they would start coming out of the ground with the next phase and start closing units in one building while the other was going up. It was more a financial than a construction reason.

A similar structure on this lot had been approved by the Board; it was a larger structure that covered more surface area, and it was closer to the Hartridge home on the west. The new design was a smaller footprint and moved it further away from the Hartridge property, which was a big concern, in an attempt to improve the site and help provide privacy. They had discussed the fence screening the parking from Charlton Street with the neighbors and they would match the fence across the street and did not have an issue doing an eight-foot stucco fence to match and be compatible with the neighboring areas.

He would prefer for the building to look like two row homes. If it took putting in a high stoop entrance, then they would revisit that area concerning the entrance. They worked with Staff to improve the entrance and fell short with the time period they had.

Mr. Judson asked if the access to parking was off the lane and not off Charlton Street, and if the screening wall would abut the final Phase II of the building.

Mr. Guerard answered yes to both. He said there was an existing brick wall between the remnants of the demolished building and the Hartridge house, and the idea would be to tie the stucco wall into the existing wall.

Ms. Ramsay asked if they intended for shutters to be on the windows as shown on 1.1 and not on A2.1, and there was a detail on A1.5.

Mr. Guerard stated that they were attempting to make it look like two row homes and the plan was for one side to be shuttered and the other side not to be shuttered. He said that in Phase II they were planning for shutters. If the Board felt that the shutters were not appropriate they would remove them.

Mr. Johnson asked if they would be apartment buildings or townhouses.

Mr. Guerard stated that they would be residential condominiums.

Dr. Watkins asked if they were willing to split it between Phase I and Phase II.

Mr. Guerard stated that in downtown Savannah there were a large number of buildings that were very similar and with the best architect in the world there was only so much you could do with a rectangle with a 30-foot front. He said that the project was an important project to them and they wanted to move forward. Their main goal was to move forward on the Hull and Habersham Streets property.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation/HSF) stated that the HSF was adamantly opposed to this request because it did not meet the requirements for a Part I decision. She said that the submission failed to properly demonstrate the overall Height and Mass of the finished project as it related to the lot or to the adjacent area. Because the project was being approached in phases, it was impossible to judge the entirety of the project when one portion was proposed at a time. The precedent for phase construction was set forth on July 12, 2006. The petition for 508 – 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue was submitted and approved for Height and Mass based on the drawings which represented all phases of the two-phase project, and understood that it would be constructed in two phases. It was necessary to show both phases as a whole to understand the concept for massing for a Certificate of Appropriateness. This case should not be treated differently.

Ms. Louise Howard (President of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of Georgia) stated that they were concerned about their surroundings, particularly the buildings to the north on Macon Street and south on Charlton Street. She said that the existing Lafayette on Macon Street dwarfed the Andrew Low house. However, the variations in materials, fenestration, and architectural detail broke up the mass of the structure helped it blend with the surrounding structures. To the south on Charlton Street were the Battersby-Hartridge house and the vacant lot under discussion. They wanted to ensure that the project would not have a detrimental effect to a streetscape already bound by inappropriate structures. They requested a continuance of the petition so that the developer had time to review and incorporate the suggestions of Staff regarding Height and Mass and Design. Changes during the drawing phase could ensure that the completed buildings compliment the quality of the existing historic structures, while retaining the current contemporary design aesthetically.

Mr. Stephen Boland-Davis (Director of the Andrew Low House) stated that one of the most critical issues regarding infill construction in historic neighborhoods was Height and Mass. He said that historically Savannah had made many mistakes in scale. Infill architecture made the original structures the intrusions rather than the original streetscape with three and four-story buildings. The height of the proposed building was ten feet taller than the Andrew Low house, and was considerably taller than the first Girl Scout headquarters. The fenestration, doors, and surrounds were smaller than those in the surrounding 19th century structures. If these parts of the building were brought into proper scale, the buildings could co-exist with minimal impact on the surroundings. They asked the Board to continue the petition to allow the developer considerable time to consider the comments and suggestions of Staff in regard to Height and Mass and Design. They hope that suitable changes to Height and Mass elements of the proposed structures could be achieved at minimal cost so that the quality of the facades reflects the surrounding area and not remain a monolithic box. With careful consideration the proposed structures should be buildings that both the developer and City were proud of.

Ms. Anna Smith (Girl Scout) stated that she was eight years old and has been a Girl Scout for four years in the historic first headquarters building at 330 Drayton Street, along with other Girl Scouts of historic Georgia. She stated that she wanted the Board to protect her building.

Ms. Janie Brantley (Girl Scouts of Historic Georgia, Incorporated) stated that they were concerned with the aesthetics of the building blending in with the neighborhood. She said that the lot was in the center of the Girl Scout mecca. It was originally owned by the Girl Scouts and was adjacent to the first headquarters and the Andrew Low House. It was a very important structure for the girls and something they take seriously. They were also concerned with safety of the girls and the building.

During a recent assessment before they restored their headquarters building it was recommended that they track the stress on the building in direct correlation to the demolition of the building that was previously on the lot. When that building was demolished and during clean up on the property their building shook and it concerned them as to the safety and future of their building. They were concerned that the proposed building would turn into a long construction nightmare and by the time they have their centennial anniversary in 2012 they may be looking at blank walls on the building. They were concerned with the phasing of the construction and what it may do to their business. During demolition of 342 Drayton Street some bricks fell and they were concerned about the safety of the pedestrian pathway for Girl Scouts because they were encouraged in tours to walk by these buildings. They asked for a continuance for the project so that these items could be addressed.

Mr. Walter Hartridge (119 East Charlton Street) stated that their home was a rated structure in the Historic District, but not on the National Register of Historic Places like the Andrew Low House and the Girl Scout facility. He said these structures were important and with respect to visual compatibility factors that the relationship of materials, texture, and color of a façade of a structure shall be visually compatible with predominate materials, textures, and colors used on contributing structures to which the structure was visually related. He said that the ordinance stated that the exterior expression of the height of the first story shall not be less than 11 feet and that walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building provided, however, that iron fencing may be used. There was stucco on the first floor of the half basement and above that was a darker brown Philadelphia or Baltimore brick with Savannah Grey brick behind it. If they put stucco on the first floor of the proposed structure and the 8-foot wall going down Charlton Street to screen the parking was stucco and consistent with the wall across the street of the Colonial Dames garden, he felt that these considerations were reasonable. Whether the Board considered it a project in stages was the Board's decision, but asked that they would defer the design phase to a later date and limit today's decision to Height and Mass because many things needed to be done to the design that had been agreed upon by everyone so far.

Ms. Jan McKinney (Director of Council Initiatives of the Girl Scout Council of Historic Georgia) stated that they were concerned about their building and its age. She said when they first started discussion about their structure and had the trackers placed on the walls, they wanted to make sure that something was put in place to make sure that surrounding buildings were not being damaged during construction. Their building is across the street from an ugly green fence because construction of the row was not finished and they don't want that on two sides of their building and they want to ensure that the building was completed so they won't have to look at something like that for the next four or five years.

Mr. Guerard stated that there would not be any bulldozers on the site because the site was too small. He said the biggest piece of equipment would be a backhoe. This tract of land had been approved by the Board on Part I and Part II for a larger building with more mass at a height equal to the proposed. The building being proposed is the same height, but a smaller mass than what was approved. The stucco on the first floor would solve a lot of issues and give the building a different look.

Mr. Judson stated that it was not the Board's position to move for a continuance. He suggested the petitioner ask for a continuance on Part II Design to separate the issues.

Mr. Guerard stated that he already agreed to it. He just wanted to clarify that the mass was smaller than what was previously approved and it was approved at a previous meeting to carry it for another year.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Engle stated that HSF had a valid comment and that he had an impossible time judging scale and mass on one-third of a building. He said when a developer breaks it into separate phases you cannot judge scale and mass of the finished project and it was a bad precedent. The Board had to look at the entire building as built out in its entirety to know the true scale and mass.

Mr. Steffen asked if Staff briefed the Board on what the finished product would look like with all portions.

Ms. Reiter stated that they had a sheet that showed four sides. She said it didn't have the Hartridge house in it.

Mr. Engle asked if the Board was approving everything or Phase I.

Ms. Reiter answered Phase I

Dr. Watkins stated that it was Phase I of Height and Mass.

Mr. Engle stated that he thought the Board should be reviewing and approving an entire building and not part of it. He said the next design could be totally different for Phase II. Does the Board say they can't build Phase I and it's already built? They should be looking at an entire project.

Dr. Henry stated that he and Mr. Engle have the same problem from different directions. He said that he had a problem with the phases.

Mr. Johnson asked if the petitioner received a permit for the whole project or to do phasing.

Mr. Steffen stated that they could get a permit and approval for the whole project and still build it in phases. He said the Board had to realize they weren't preventing it from being built in phases if the whole thing was approved.

He complimented Ms. Anna Smith. He said that she was awesome; she inspired him and thanked her. This project initially came to the Board as an adaptive reuse of a very historic service station on the site that would have been a much smaller project, not involved the dangers of demolition, and the same people present today were very opposed to it. It was not a lesson to them but a lesson to everyone that they have to be careful when dealing with properties that were going to be developed that they could end up with something more intrusive. He was concerned about the safety issues from the past and whether the Board decided to continue it and that they not let it take too long to do something on the site. The vacancy of the site was also a safety concern. He drives by every morning and he couldn't think of anything more unattractive for the work that the Girl Scouts were doing than seeing the blank walls and people trying to park, and if he was walking with his child he would be worried. The Board needed to be careful because the site was going to be developed at some point and not get too much in the way of things in the long run. He complimented Mr. Hartridge and Mr. Guerard on working together to get the stucco and design right, which was a big asset to the Board with trying to do something with the project.

Mr. Judson left at 5:25 p.m.

Mr. Steffen asked Staff if they could make a conditional approval of Height and Mass subject to the provision of further drawings to show the articulation of the entire project. He said the Board would hear it again on Design Details even if they approved Height and Mass today.

Ms. Reiter stated that the petitioner had provided build out drawings.

Mr. Engle stated that they had the entire building but it was how it was written. He said that Staff stated that the Board was only approving Phase I Height and Mass and suggested they change it to approve Height and Mass for the entire structure. How the petitioner phased it was his concern. They didn't have to do it all at once but it was a bad precedent not to insist on full drawings for Height and Mass in the beginning.

Mr. Steffen stated that Ms. Ramsay made an important comment about two projects that were the same. He said that one of the ways to solve two problems was if Mr. Guerard would work with Staff on rearticulating the entryway in a way that said it was more than just a block. When the other project comes up the entryway could be distinctive and different. It didn't bother him that the two footprints were similar but what would bother him was if they built two things that looked exactly the same in two different parts of the district because it didn't seem right.

Mr. Engle stated that the stucco first floor and wall could break up the clone syndrome.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review hereby approve Part I Height and Mass for the petition in its entirety (Phase I, II, and III) with the following conditions:

1. Restudy the main entry double doors and metal canopy.
2. If the phasing of the project will extend longer than eight months, then the blank walls should be screened with vegetative planting.
3. Location and screening of electric meters and screening of HVAC units needs to be indicated on the drawings.

Mr. Engle seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to April 8, 2009, for Part II Design Detail review. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of BWBF, Incorporated
Richard Guerard
H-09-4119-2
PIN No. 2-0015-17-002
404 East Hull Street
New Construction/Height and Mass Part I and Design
Details Part II**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Richard Guerard.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST: The applicant is requesting Height and Mass and Design approval of **Phase I (five units) of a three phase project for a condominium building** at 404 East Hull Street on a tract of lane bounded by Hull Street, Oglethorpe Avenue, Habersham and Price Streets. The lane is in private ownership. This property has no current recorded subdivisions. (While only Phase I is the subject of this review, some indication of the direction of Phase II is discussed).

FINDINGS:

Submittal to Site Plan Review (SPR) for comments is required prior to Part I. Any comments received are required to be addressed prior to Part II approval. The petitioner informally submitted plans to SPR and has submitted for formal comments. Informal comments received include that the five parking spaces need to be shown on the site plan and all five paved. (Attached.) Also, the petitioner is responsible for sidewalk improvements adjacent to the structure.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Development Standards: Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone. 75 percent maximum building coverage.	The project is built to the zero-lot line along Hull Street. Along Habersham Street the northern portion of the building is set back six feet. Since the overall tract is not subdivided, the rear and northern setbacks are unknown.	The proposed setback of Phase II creates an awkward relationship. The applicant has agreed to bring the west façade flush with the lot line and will provide a revised site plan.
Dwelling Unit Type:	Apartment-condo	The applicant is designing the build-out to resemble attached town homes.
Street Elevation Type:	Low stoop	Ground level entry apartment buildings are found in the Historic District.
Entrances and Building Orientation:	The entry is oriented to the north-south street. At full build-out there will be two entries facing Habersham Street.	Historically, former buildings on this corner were oriented to the north-south street. For such a large building, the entry lacks scale and prominence. It is more residential in scale. Utilizing two entries would be more compatible, particularly with the historic plan. There is an exit on the east (rear) wall that will exit into a future alley between structures. The applicant has agreed to multiple entries at build-out and to more emphasis on the main entry. A revised elevation will be submitted.
Building Height: This portion of the site is located in a four-story zone	The structure is proposed at four stories. It is 43'-10" in height.	This standard is met.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development:	The projected building footprint at build-out is approximately 5,294 square feet and the proposed building is four stories high, therefore, Tall Building and Large-Scale Development standards do not	NA

	apply.	
Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:	The width of the Phase I proposal is 39 feet 6 inches.	It is proposed to leave blank stucco walls at the juncture of the future phases. The second phase should begin approximately four months after the beginning of the first phase and so on.
Proportion of Openings:	The window openings are rectangular, 3’-0” by 6’-0”, vertically aligned.	The proportion standards are met. The applicant has agreed to look at increasing the size of the windows over the main door and will submit a revised elevation.
Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:	It is the intent of the petitioner to mimic the concept of a row of buildings.	The petitioner has agreed to an additional entry in the final build-out and to “beef-up” the main entry. A revised elevation will be provided.
Rhythm of Structure on Street:	Historically Oglethorpe Lane ran through the site (See Sanborn Map below). The site plan indicates an open space between Phase II and the lane, which will be parking accessed from the former lane.	The applicant has agreed to bring both phases of the structure to the zero-lot line of Habersham Street as a structure with multiple entrances.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, and Balconies:	The intent is that at build out the structure will look like attached townhomes with multiple entrances.	The applicant has agreed to increase the scale of the main entrance
Walls of Continuity:	No fences are shown.	
Scale:	The scale at build-out is proposed to be reduced by devices to make it look like attached row houses.	The mass will be broken down with an additional entrance facing Habersham Street at build-out.
Roof Shape:	Flat with parapet	Parapet is flat and small in scale given the height and mass of the building. The applicant will restudy the top cornice and show on a revised elevation.

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors:	Six-over-six clad wood double-hung windows by Anderson, Narrow-line series are proposed. Anderson Doors. No shutters are shown, but a shutter catalog was provided.	The window standards are met.

Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, and Porches:	The stoop consists of a step up. The balcony railing is by Lawler LC-410c with ogee cap rail.	The multiple entries at build-out will be more compatible and will help break up the boxiness of the mass. The balconies exceed the three-foot maximum projection and will be reduced six inches.
Fences:	None indicated	
Materials:	Brick walls. Cherokee Queen size brick “Mosstown” 52-17-888 for the facades and Jenkins “Brompton” for contrasting bands with “Savannah Ivory” mortar. Standing seam metal canopy on brackets over door; metal balconies.	Brick is a compatible material, Samples have been provided.
Textures:		See above
Color:		See above
HVAC	It is proposed to place the HVAC units on the roof.	
Trash	A trash enclosure is temporarily placed on the site of the Phase II construction screened by a wood enclosure 8’ high. No accommodation has been made for recycling and trash cans.	There will be no provision for recycling.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with conditions:

1. Any formal SPR comments are required to be addressed prior to issuance of building permit.
2. Revised west elevation and site plan reflecting the flush west elevation, revised entries, revised top cornice, and revised windows over main entry.
3. Show location and screening of electric meters.
4. Phase II and III elevation details to be brought back to Board for review prior to initiation of Phase II and III construction.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was one legally one tract, that there was an existing Oglethorpe Lane that went through the property at one time, and when it was sold the lane was deeded over to the parcel and was no longer in public but in private ownership. Mr. Guerard owned the lane and Staff had pleaded that the lane not be built on but used for access to parking, keep the Oglethorpe plan in tact, and the site plan showed that it was.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Guerard stated they have been working on the design for 16 months, have had numerous designs that encumbered the lane, and it would never be turned over to the City of Savannah. He said the recent design would allow the lane to be a thoroughfare with access to parking. The property was not zoned RIP-A or RIP-C because they rezoned it over a year ago making it a commercial tract of land. (Staff Note: The parcel was zoned RIP-C in 2007.)

The entrance was similar to several entrances in the area, they were not sure of their future plans for the whole development, and that they would probably subdivide the land and have it become individual lots as far as the rest of the tract and the development.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation/HSF) stated that the comments for the last submittal still rang true for this project. She said they would like to reiterate that this proposal was the same structure as was presented for 342 Drayton Street. HSF was dismayed by this type of cookie cutter design and construction technique. The underlying reason that Savannah had strict standards for the Historic Landmark District was to ensure that the best building would be built for the site. If template buildings that meet the ordinance could be developed and placed indiscriminately, then what would be the need to consider the site. They requested that the Board ask the petitioner to restudy the site and return with a more customized and completed approach for new construction within the Historic Landmark District.

Dr. Watkins asked Mr. Guerard if he was open to having a separated Part I and Part II with the similarities of the previous project.

Mr. Guerard stated that the only similarities the two buildings would have in common were that they were both rectangles. He said that it was a brick building, that stucco was not appropriate in that area, he didn't think anyone would know that the same person built both buildings by the time they finished with the Drayton and Charlton Streets design. There were numerous structures that were similar in the area that have the same look and structure that were side-by-side and identical. There were ones in different areas that were identical and the only difference was the paint color and the window sill. This building would not resemble the other building when finished.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Henry asked if there was a method to assure that they could avoid the cookie cutter problems and if Staff would have a heavy hand in the final look of the two buildings.

Ms. Reiter stated that Part II for Charlton Street was continued. She said that she was recommending that the door way be revisited and agreed that stucco was not appropriate for this site. The Board should look at each site individually, but it was a neighborhood where many houses were identical and this was not new in Savannah. The Board needed to look and make sure that it fit the site.

Mr. Steffen stated that if it came back for review with the first part of the motion like the last project with the revisiting of the entry and canopy, to show the location of screening the meters, and the elevations brought back, did they need to go back and do Design Detail again.

Ms. Reiter stated that if the Board was happy with the brick and would approve it as the whole thing, and then the details could be brought back to Staff.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition in its entirety (Phases I, II, and III) with the following conditions:

Any formal SPR comments are required to be addressed prior to issuance of building permit; Part II design detail revisions such as the front door be brought to Staff for approval; show location and screening of electric meters.

Dr. Henry seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Guerard asked if Parts I and II were approved but he had to bring it back to Staff for the approval on the doorway and they were finished with the Board.

Mr. Steffen stated that they had to bring Design Details back to Staff.

Mr. Guerard asked if he was to bring the Charlton Street Design Details back to the Board.

Mr. Steffen answered correct.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-09-4121-2
PIN No. 2-0016-01-001
0 Barnard Street
New Construction/Part I Height and Mass**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass of a six-story hotel annex to the Inn at Ellis Square on the northwest corner of Barnard and Bryan Streets fronting Ellis Square.

A previous design for a mixed-use retail/office building was submitted in 2008 and received approval for both Part I and Part II. The new proposal occupies the same site but has been redesigned to be an annex for the existing hotel to the north with retail on the ground floor.

FINDINGS:

The property is zoned B-C-1 (Central-Business) and is currently vacant. A portion of the neighboring parking garage will be demolished and the property used for the proposed development. Partial demolition of the parking structure and the alterations to the remains of that structure were approved by the Historic Review Board on October 8, 2009, (File No. H-08-4057-2). A recombination subdivision plat will need to be submitted and approved prior to issuance of a building permit.

Comments from Site Plan Review (SPR) were submitted by the City’s infrastructure departments in February 2009. All departments have reviewed the General Development Plan with the revisions needed below. These revisions and variances will need to be addressed prior to the Part II, Design Details submittal.

- 1) MPC, Geoff Goins: Pursuant to Section 8-3025(b) Hotels are permitted in B-C-1, provided they front onto arterials. Bryan and Barnard Streets are not classified as arterials on the Street Classification Map. A variance from this standard will need to be obtained, prior to approval by the MPC.

- 2) Traffic Engineering, Cindy Coddington: Handicap ramps for Bay Lane, Barnard Street, and Bryan Street will need to be shown on the Specific Development Plan.

- 3) Streets Maintenance, Carey Purvis: 1) Show ADA ramp locations; 2) Improvements on north side of Bay Lane are on a separate parcel. Is this going to be on a separate plan?

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Development Standards: No setbacks, maximum lot coverage, or parking are required in B-C-1 zone.</p>	<p>The building extends to the property line on both Barnard and Bryan Street with recesses (4’ by 2’ and 12’-4” by 5’) and a curved recessed corner entrance fronting the square.</p>	<p>The standards are met.</p>
<p>Street Elevation Type: A proposed building on an east-west connecting street shall utilize an existing historic building street elevation type located within the existing block front or on an immediately adjacent tithing or trust block.</p>	<p>Six-story hotel with commercial space on the ground floor.</p>	<p>There are no historic buildings within the block front. Immediately adjacent trust and tithing blocks feature historic buildings that are built to the property line for the full height of the building, typically divided by storefronts and fenestration into 60’ and 30’ increments. The historic portion of the Inn at Ellis Square (Guckenheimer Building) across Bay Lane is a tall four-story building that occupies the entire lot for the full height of the building, with slight (inches) recesses in the center portions of the building which are continuous for 60+ feet to accentuate the corners of the building.</p>

<p>Entrances: A building on an east-west connecting street fronting a square shall have entrances at intervals not to exceed 50’.</p>	<p>A corner entrance and side entrances on Bryan and Barnard Streets are proposed at approximately 15’-20’ intervals.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Building Height: Six-story height zone. Minimum commercial floor-to-floor heights: 14’-6” on the ground floor; 12’ on the second floor; 10 feet on the floors above.</p>	<p>Six-stories with an overall height of 82’-8” including the parapet. Floor-to-floor heights are 20’ for the ground floor, 12’ for the second floor, 10’ for the upper four floors, with a 4’ parapet and bracketed cornices and gabled pediments above.</p>	<p>The standards are met. The previous approval for a building on this site was for a six story building with 12’ floor-to-floor heights.</p>
<p>Tall Building Principles: The frontage of tall buildings shall be divided into architecturally distinct sections no more than 60’ in width with each section taller than it is wide. Buildings greater than four stories in height shall use window groupings, columns, or pilasters to create bays not less than 15’ nor more than 20’ in width. Buildings greater than 60’ in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances.</p> <p>Large-Scale Development: Large-scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plan exceeds 60 feet in width.</p>	<p>The building features a base, middle, and top defined by materials, band coursing and a cornice below the top floor.</p> <p>The building has numerous recesses and setbacks along the sidewalk edge with no wall plane exceeding 20 feet in width.</p> <p>Entrances are located on both the east-west street and the north-south street.</p>	<p>The standards are met.</p>
<p>Commercial Design Standards: The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront. The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature...The height of the first story shall be not less than the exterior</p>	<p>The ground floor will be occupied by an “urban market” or commercial use. The first story is separated from upper floors by a change in material and a stone band course. The height of the ground floor is 20’ with all other floors at 10’-12’ in</p>	<p>Staff recommends further distinguishing of the top story from the lower stories within the fenestration. Simplification and consistency within the parapet could further unify the top story of the building.</p>

<p>visual expression of the height of any single-story above the first. The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story. Retail storefront glazing shall be not less than 55 percent... storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18"-24" base of contrasting material, to the lintel.</p>	<p>height. The top story is distinct from the lower floors by the incorporation of a metal cornice within the metal frame sections of the building. Double-door storefront entrances with sidelights are proposed on the Barnard and Bryan Streets facades. A full glass storefront is at the northeast corner entrance and on the recessed entry arcade to the west. The storefront on the western portion consists of a projecting two-story arcade that is 18'-4" wide and 16' deep.</p>	
<p>Proportion of Structure's Front Façade: The relationship of the width of a structure to the height of its front façade shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>The building is 76' tall divided into 60' wide sections with 30' wide sections at the corner and the western end of the Bryan Street elevation.</p>	<p>The standard is met. The floor height of the ground floor is at 20' to be consistent with other historic buildings within the hotel campus. Surrounding buildings within the City Market area are much lower in height.</p>
<p>Proportion of Openings: The relationship of the width of the windows to height of windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement, and top story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3; provided, however, nothing in this section precludes an arched window being used.</p>	<p>Independent window openings are 6' tall by 3'-8" wide. Grouped window openings are used on the projecting bay to the west and on the corner portion. Paired window openings are used within the central portions over the recessed entries</p>	<p>Verify that all windows within the paired and grouped window bays, exclusive of storefronts and top story windows, have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids: The relationship of solids-to-voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure shall be</p>	<p>There are a high number of voids-to-solids within the street fronting facades broken into bays within 60' wide and 30' wide segments.</p>	<p>Verify that the minimum proportions required are met; see above.</p>

<p>visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>		
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street: The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjacent structures shall be visually compatible with the open spaces between contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>There is no open space between the proposed building and the neighboring parking garage.</p>	<p>The standard is met. Historic structures within the ward are built adjacent to one another with no open space.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, and Balconies: The relationship of entrances, porch projections, and walkways to structures shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which they are visually related.</p>	<p>The arcade projects forward of the building plane on the western end of the Bryan Street façade. The building is set back 16’ from the sidewalk with a 5’ projecting window bay on the second through sixth stories.</p>	<p>The standard is met. While this setback is not typical of historic buildings within the ward, the wall of continuity is maintained at the sidewalk.</p>
<p>Roof Shape: The roof shape of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related.</p>	<p>The roof is flat behind a parapet wall. Paired gabled pediments are located over the sixth story on the 60’ wide sections of the Barnard and Bryan Streets facades.</p> <p>Projecting metal cornices are located over the 30’ wide sections at the corner and arcade.</p>	<p>Staff recommends simplification and consistency within the roof line; see comment on Commercial Design Standards.</p>
<p>Scale: The mass of a structure and size of windows, door openings, porches column spacing, stairs, balconies, and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related.</p>	<p>The scale of the building is six stories on a 90’ by 123’ lot. A large amount of void within the masonry façade broken into 30’ and 60’ increments mitigates the scale of the building.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of **Part I, Height and Mass** with the following conditions:

1. All window sashes (independent, paired, and grouped) meet the minimum 5:3 ratio; and
2. The top story be further distinguished from the lower floors.

Staff recommends that other comments be taken into consideration for **Part II, Design Details:**

1. Restudy the brick column/pier on the second and third floor balcony railings. The heavy material seems awkward ending in the middle of the second floor with no roof.

Provide information on potential ramping indicated at entrances on exterior elevations. Any ramping into the entries should be done on the interior and not on the sidewalk.

Mr. Steffen asked how the petitioner would distinguish it further by making it simpler.

Ms. Ward stated that if they could take the cornice off the section, getting rid of the piers, and bringing it down. She said it was just a suggestion to distinguish the top story. The parapet was distinguished but the story itself was similar to something they did earlier.

Ms. Ward stated that the Height and Mass were similar to what was previously approved by the Board with the exception of the two-story addition. She said they looked at the Guckenheimer building to influence the design approach and materials, but it wasn't being looked at today. It was the influence for the first floor height.

Dr. Henry asked if the Board had approved the façade.

Ms. Ward stated that the Board approved something similar to it in 2008. She said this was a separate project because there was a new use for the site.

Mr. Engle stated that it needed horizontality because it was all vertical. He said they could bring some horizontality with the cornice continuing across the whole build on one floor lower.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects) stated that they had always intended something for the corner that was different than the rest of the hotel because the function was different and would be more distinctive than what was presented today. He said that rather than do office space on the upper floors that they wanted to add 80 to 85 keys to the existing hotel. They were to design the building to unify the campus and both tithing blocks would be one hotel campus with the entrance off the lane. The Historic District standards state that they were to relate to buildings in the same block face and since there were none that were historic on either Bryan or Barnard Streets, the building they used was the Guckenheimer building. There were distinctive features to the building such as a very articulated silhouette in the way that it met the sky, not with a flat parapet, but with a number of pedimented shapes. The highly rusticated stone base of the building was 20 feet high rather than 16 feet which was the minimum within the standards. (Staff Note: 14' – 6" is the minimum.) The arch motif occurred repeatedly although the volume of the building was a box.

The proposed design for the opposite corner, so that they were diagonal and related to each other, was taken from the Guckenheimer building, with the two features mentioned above with the ground level having a stone material with a 20-foot ground floor height. The material of the Guckenheimer building was a redder smooth brick with fine mortar joints, and the building in the background was the building built in 1970 with a browner brick and more texture. The previously approved grilles for the building have been installed to cover the PTAC units. Making a new building that related to the Guckenheimer building also related to the 1970's building was a bit of a design challenge. The ground floor level was more open than before, there was a higher proportion of glazing, and the walls with the openings could swing open as doors or fold back and become wide open during perfect weather. They have proposed a Mass and Height similar to the Guckenheimer building and to the 1970's wing to the Inn at Ellis Square, and the Avia Hotel across Barnard Street.

The roof shapes were important and there were roof articulations on the Guckenheimer building, although there was not a place to stand and see both corners at the same time. In order to make this a campus of buildings for the same hotel they felt that they should relate to each other and the rooflines were similar on the two buildings. The thrust of the urban design was that the entrance on the left hand side of the tall building mass, goes through the building, and connects back to the entrance of the Inn at Ellis Square. The building was renovated approximately five or six years ago formed the Bargain Corner was converted into the guest services wing. The entrance to the hotel complex now will be where it belongs on Bryan Street instead of back in the lane. Guest services would be performed on the lane, but the hotel for the first time would have a front entrance facing onto a main street.

The building would meet the sky and ground in an interesting way and they created glass canopies over the big entrances on the Bryan Street side and would have fretted glass that would reflect a fair amount of light, with the entrance on the left hand side going through. On the right hand side Staff pointed out the brick pier on the corner. He said it was very transparent and needed to have a little bit of mass because it was transparent. You could see through the building to the lane side and the existing parking garage would be rebuilt with the stair towers and the elevator being demolished to make room for the building on the left. The detailing in the brick on the upper levels was learned from the Guckenheimer building. The 20-foot height was a monumental entrance on the corner that would go into the urban market and not part of the hotel. The area above the doors was a place holder and they were asked to look at a bas-relief that would have scenes from nature or natural foods. The corners above the brick piers were transparent that needed to have mass. Down the lane would be the current entrance to the hotel; the area would be improved, but would be brought back as a separate petition. The area opposite in the middle of the hotel with the existing wing was setback from the rest of the building mass with architecture that was learned from the modern wing, but recessed so that it was not prominent.

The window sashes where they were ganged or independent were the right proportions and they would confirm it with Design Detail drawings. He agreed with Staff's comment that the top floor was articulated with some horizontal definition, but was not horizontal to the corners. The corners still protrude through the mass and go vertical and it could be learned from the existing building and add more horizontality between the fifth and sixth floor. He did not want to say that it would be extruded and wrapped around the whole building cornice. He thought it had to start and stop more like the Guckenheimer building did. They would restudy the corner pier, but thought when seen in three dimensions that it was understood. It was transparent already and if it didn't have strength or mass to it then it would get puny.

There was a slope from the front threshold of the entrance down to the curb line of 20 feet on Barnard Street and 15 feet on Bryan Street. The last page of the drawings showed a slope that was there for drainage, but there would not be a handicap ramp.

Dr. Henry asked if Mr. Shay agreed with the recommendations made by Staff.

Mr. Shay stated that he did.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation/HSF) stated that in the previously approved design the massing of the building was alleviated by the two-story step down to the three-story parking deck on Bryan Street. She said that in the new proposal the step down didn't exist and requested that in Height and Mass approval that they restudy the step down. They felt that the overall design was more successful than the previously approved petition.

Dr. Watkins stated that Mr. Shay said that he was amenable to Staff's recommendations.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass, with the following conditions:

1. All window sashes (independent, paired, and grouped) meet the minimum 5:3 ratio; and
2. The top story be further distinguished from the lower floors.

Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Lott + Barber Architects
Forrest R. Lott
H-08-4001(S)-2
525 East Broughton Street
Roof Material Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of J. T. Turner Construction Co., Inc.
Bryan J. Robinson
H-08-4008-2
321 East Congress Street
Relocate Existing Fence
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc.
Jennifer Wall
H-09-4111(S)-2
115 West Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Marjon P. Howard, III
H-09-4112(S)-2
15 East Jones Street
Entry Gate
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Kathleen Donahue and Mark Sanders
H-09-4115(S)-2
12 Price Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Joan Sumner
H-09-4120(S)-2
329 East Broad Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Mr. Gay asked about the property on Habersham and Hall Streets. He said the roof looked like it was caving in.

RE: NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

a. Unfinished Business

b. New Business

1. E-Agenda Training

2. Historic District Review Board Retreat – Thursday, August 27, 2009

Ms. Reiter stated that MPC would be going to paperless packets in September. There would be two training sessions in August. She asked the Board to read the memo and look at the dates to let Staff know if there was a conflict. There would be a retreat on Thursday, August 27th in combination with the computer training and the overhead would be phased out. Packets would be sent via email and Staff needed email addresses to tailor the e-agenda to how the Board was run. If Board members did not have a computer or didn't want it, then Staff would need to know to deliver a paper package.

Mr. Thomson stated that Board members would not be sent a package, but a link notifying Board members that the information was available on the e-agenda site.

**RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS
MEETING – February 11, 2009**

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

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp