



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room 1:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

JUNE 16, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW SPECIAL CALLED MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Brian Judson, Chair
Sidney Johnson, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Linda Ramsay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Richard Law, Sr.
W. James Overton
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Ned Gay
Gene Hutchinson
Ebony Simpson

MPC Staff Present: Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

City of Savannah Staff Present: Tiras Petrea, City Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Mr. Judson called the Special Called Meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and thanked the petitioners who were unable to complete their process at last week's meeting (June 9, 2010) for returning today.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Minutes](#)

Mr. Judson explained that there are no minutes for approval due to the May 12, 2010 minutes were approved at the regularly scheduled meeting on June 9, 2010.

III. ITEM(S) REQUESTED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL AGENDA

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

3. [Continued Petition of Cogdell & Mendrala Architects, P.C. - H-100422-4246-2 - 16 Price Street - Rear addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was **Mr. Don Cogdell**.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for a two-story rear addition on the building at 16 Price Street (northeast corner of Price and East Bryan) as provided below. Changes were made from prior meetings on May 12 and June 9, 2010 to address the Board's comments and are indicated in **bold** text.

Location: The majority of the two-story addition is on the northern half of the rear of the property. A second story is also proposed over a portion of the existing one-story rear porch.

Size: Two-story addition, 22'-11" deep by 14'-4" wide. **A rear facing gable has been incorporated into the design to make the addition more compatible with the design of the existing building. The peak of the gable is 26' tall and the primary residence rises to 29'**. A bathroom addition is also proposed over the existing one-story porch.

Materials: The additions are clad in Hardi-plank siding and will be painted to match the primary structure. The bracketed bay window will feature a copper standing seam roof with copper flashing. Aluminum clad windows are placed within punched and paired openings with operable louvered shutters. Louvered foundation vents are located within the solid brick foundation. A brick chimney is exposed through the roof.

Colors: Siding, trim, and shutters to match the main house.

Comments received from the June 9, 2010 meeting include the following:

1. Study the three existing posts on the rear porch;
2. Restudy a boxed bay window or simplification of the design of the bay window;
3. Shorten the height of the ground floor windows on the south façade; and
4. Incorporate a chimney cap to match the main residence.

Revised drawings were submitted on June 14, 2010. All of the conditions of the Board and prior staff comments have been addressed.

The building at 16 Price Street (aka 18 Price Street) is listed as a rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The building, however, is not historic and was constructed in the 1960s by John LeBey possibly as a replica of another structure elsewhere in the district. Mary Morrison's *Historic Savannah* states that it is a replica built in 1968. As such, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties do not apply.

The Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps depict a Victorian-type apartment building on the site in 1916. A photograph of this building is provided on Sheet HRB2.7 in the submittal packet. The existing structure appears in the 1973 update; both are shown as on the maps as 18 Price.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval as amended.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cogdell said they do not have anything to add to the report. He believes that they have met all the requirements and recommendations.

Dr. Henry believes that the Board also discussed the bay windows.

Mr. Cogdell stated that the bay window was discussed and has been simplified in accordance with the Board's recommendation. He believes that they have met all four of the Board's requirements that the Board made at their last meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that this is certainly an improved design from what they saw initially. The points the Historic Savannah Foundation has concerns the bay window, but from the drawing he knew that some details were achieved. However, he did not know whether there are some more details or an isolated sketch of the new window. Mr. Carey believes that the first floor window has been broadened and reduced in height. He is of the opinion that this works better. They submitted a photo and he does not know if it was necessarily intended to be the suggested design for this, but it was more of a boxed window and not so much a bay window with three parts to it. He did not know if this was a consideration of the petitioner. Mr. Carey said they were just trying to reduce the profile and the bay window being the focal point. It is a large addition and they were trying to make certain that it was still secondary or

subservant to the main block. He said maybe the petitioner can address the question of what they looked at and considered before they selected this final design.

Mr. Daniel James said they did address a box rendition of the bay window. However, the box rendition created a more focal point as it became a lot wider than the proposed bay window.

Mr. Judson stated that last week Dr. Williams had some concerns that now the petitioners have addressed. He explained that the three pillars on the porch do have a more defining base that coordinates with the front porch. They are also more substantial. He said as the drawing shows, both the height of the lower windows has been reduced and the width has been expanded. They now meet the 5 over 3 criteria. What they cannot see in this perspective is that the chimney cap now matches the other one on the building. They have some simplification of the bay window, but as Mr. Carey has mentioned it is not an exact replica of the box that they had presented as an alternative. However, the design has been somewhat simplified.

Dr. Williams stated that the window that is immediately left of the triple windows on the first floor is shorter than the other windows. He was curious why the sill is higher. Was this done to clear the railings?

Mr. James answered that it was done to clear the railing. Also, they wanted to define the three group windows together as a more feature to the house. The smaller window is actually a bathroom window and a counter is here.

Dr. Williams said a character defining feature is that windows have their sills match, but the headers vary.

Mr. James explained that an office is behind the three windows. They are trying to bring more light into this room.

Dr. Williams stated that he was not questioning the three windows, but the little window.

Mr. Cogdell explained that the window is recessed well beyond the face of the elevation. No one will ever see it.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Judson explained that when the Board requests that petitioners continue or come back to them with responses to specific suggestions, he cautioned the Board that they are not here to critique and redesign step-by-step every project. The Board needs to be very specific about their concerns and should there be a continuance that the petitioner has a chance to respond to those specific items. He cautioned the Board also about bringing up other design considerations after the fact. This is in fairness to the process.

Mr. Engle said as he remembers, this is not a historic building. The Board is reviewing this only because it is in the Historic District. However, if this was a historic building, he would have a real problem with siding and cornices that match the original building.

Board Action:

Approval of the addition as amended. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

4. [Petition of Harleston Cabaniss - H-100518-4259-2 - 216 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Alteration/Partial Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

The petition is continued from the meeting of June 9, 2010. A quorum was not present and no vote was taken. The petitioner addressed the Board and made their comments a part of the records of that meeting. The petitioner is in agreement with the staff's recommendation for denial.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish a wood frame trunk room addition on the third floor of 216 E. Oglethorpe Avenue. The exterior wall that will be exposed will be in-filled and covered with stucco to match the existing wall of the building. The request is being made to eliminate any potential liability that may exist between this property and the neighbor over a leak in the roof area.

The historic building at 216 E. Oglethorpe Avenue is the western end of a row of townhouses constructed from 1872 to 1874. The building is a rated structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District.

Between 1884 and 1898 a wood frame trunk room was added to the third floor of the end of the row at 216 E. Oglethorpe Avenue. By 1898, a wood frame trunk room was constructed and appears on the map.

The room cantilevers over the open space between the end of this row and the neighboring brick double-house. This is a unique feature that is not typical of the district. This simple space is surfaced in wood siding and features an historic two-over-two double-hung sash

wood frame window typical of the period of construction. No documentation of structural damage has been submitted.

The following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation apply:

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends denial to remove the historic trunk room because the alteration does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and would remove a historic character defining feature of the building.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she was not at the last meeting and for clarification asked the staff if she was correct in her understanding that the petitioner had no objection to the staff's recommendation of denial.

Ms. Ward stated the petitioner would remove the trunk room if the Board allows it; but they did not have an objection to the denial.

Mr. Judson explained that the petitioner is not present today, but does want to be on record that at the last meeting they had no problem with the staff's recommendation for denial.

Mr. Overton stated that the petitioner submitted an application for a request to remove the trunk room and staff has recommended denial and the petitioner has no objection to the staff's recommendation. He wanted the staff to clarify this matter.

Ms. Ward explained that this is a major alteration to the building. Therefore, it has to come to the Board. She said she told the petitioner that she would not support their request and that she would recommend denial. The petitioner just wanted it to be on the record that they tried to move forward with the demolition. If the Board had approved the demolition, they would demolish it.

Mr. Judson explained that the issue is a dispute with the neighbor. The contention is that this addition is contributing to a problem.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Denial to remove the historic trunk room because

the alteration does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and would remove a historic character defining feature of the building. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of Steve Day - H-100519-4261-2 - 12 Price Street - Rear Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

The petition was introduced at the meeting of June 9, 2010 which allowed the petitioner to get feedback, but no action was taken due to a quorum not being present.

Mr. Steve Day was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to add a second-story over the existing rear addition on the building at 12 Price Street.

The historic residence at 12 Price Street was constructed in 1817 and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The existing rear second story addition was approved in 1999 with conditions that it be redesigned to reduce the mass and height to not obscure the simple one-room form that is a significant characteristic of this early 19th century structure.

The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density) and there is no change in footprint to the building.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and

massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be impaired.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval with the following to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Reduce width of addition to be setback a minimum of 12” from the north exterior wall;
2. Architectural shingles to be installed over first floor roof where not covered by the second story addition;
3. Window openings to be enlarged to be the same size as the southernmost window and double-hung sashes to be used. Bi-fold shutters may be used to mitigate reduced size of addition, and;
4. Incorporate appropriate window trim, headers, and sills.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Day thanked the Board for their input at the meeting of June 9, 2010 which helped him dramatically. They took in consideration all the things that the Board pointed out at that time. He met with his clients on the points which helped them to move along in a direction that he feels is better than what they had initially.

Mr. Engle questioned if the casings opened outward.

Mr. Day said he was not sure, but believed they are outward opening.

Mr. Engle said if so, this makes the double shutters a moot point as you cannot use double shutters with an outward opening casement. He explained that double shutters will be used, but the casement is a single window. Therefore, it should be a single shutter or no shutter at all.

Mr. Day stated that Mr. Engle makes a valid point. He had not thought about this.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the petitioner's original drawing, the siding extended over the top of the bottom story porch. She assumed because they are retaining the original, this is no longer the case.

Mr. Day stated yes; this is no longer the case.

Ms. Ramsay asked why they are using short windows and why they don't match the other windows.

Mr. Day asked Ms. Ramsay if she was referring to the windows in the bathroom.

Ms. Ramsay said from the drawings, she could not tell what is in front of the window.

Mr. Day explained that a bench is in front of the window.

Ms. Ramsay wanted to know if blinds could not be in front of the window.

Mr. Day answered that it is a matter of height.

Ms. Ramsay said she did not understand why the window could not go down and the bench be in front of it with a shutter or something so that you could not see inside what was going on.

Mr. Day said they will be willing to look at this.

Ms. Ramsay said the closet window applies to this also.

Mr. Day said with the light coming into a closet there is potential for damage to the clothes.

Ms. Ramsay replied this is why she believes that they would have shutters or blinds for the windows.

Mr. Day stated that he believes that if they do something to the window in the bathroom to make it a larger, they have to do something in the closet to make it balance. He said that they will be willing to do this; return and show this to staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he was concern about the total alteration of the single character of the building by the addition. He read a couple of the Secretary Standards that were not recommended. **Mr. Engle** said he did not see enough differentiation between the old and new and using incorrectly proportioned windows do not make differentiation. When this was redone in 1999, they said it had to be sholved over. This does not cover the entire second story elevation, but this does.

Dr. Williams asked **Mr. Engle** to clarify his statement.

Mr. Engle pointed out the existing addition. He explained that what he was saying if the petitioner had proposed an addition that went to the left and kept it void, they would still would perceive the original scale and character of the building. When you go all the way across the second floor, you don't. For this reason he does not believe that it meets the standards. **Mr. Engle** also read a section from the Historic District Ordinance pertaining to scale of buildings. He said there are other houses in this area and they are not two stories and two rooms deep. Therefore, they are changing the character of the other simple houses in this district. This is not 1880, not 1890, but looking at 1817 and it is one of the earliest structures in this area. **Mr. Engle** read that the roof shape of the structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which it is visually related. Therefore, he does not believe that by bringing the addition up onto the existing historic roof is making

it visually compatible with the other historic structures in the neighborhood.

Mr. Judson said pertaining to the history of the house, he understood that the upper section was approved by the Board. He asked the staff if the first floor was also an addition. He also asked staff if the house was previously only straight perpendicular walls.

Ms. Ward answered that she would have to research this. It appears to be an addition, but it could have been an earlier addition that could have been installed in 1870.

Dr. Williams stated that the house could have been built this way.

Dr. Henry was of the opinion that the lower extension from the back was approved in 1999.

Dr. Williams said only the second floor was approved at that time.

Dr. Henry said he believes that when the Board discussed this the last time, they all agreed that the original idea had already been erected in 1999.

Mr. Engle said if they go out and look at the little bay, it is not intrusive from the street, but this will be.

Dr. Williams said he knows that the petitioner is making a modest setback on the addition so that you can still read the profile of the original house. He asked Mr. Engle that if the current second floor addition is recessed about seven or eight feet, is there a depth he feels that would still allow an addition and legibility and keep the existing house as is and something approximate of what is being proposed. He guessed it would be approximate six inches.

Dr. Williams clarified that he was asking Mr. Engle that with the proposed addition, how much depth would be adequate to allow the legibility of the original house or if he was saying no more addition.

Mr. Engle stated that he was saying no more addition on the right, but they can have the addition on the left.

Mr. Day pointed out that lower level is an add on to the original house.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Day if he knew when this was added on.

Mr. Day said he was not sure; but believed it was added on more than 40 or 50 years ago. He said the part that was added on in 1999 is the upper part. Several later additions have been added to the house. Mr. Day said basically what they are talking about is coming over an addition and over another addition on this side which is the porch. He said to say that they want it to keep the house in its original form is not physically possible because there have been additions to the house all along. As Dr. Williams was suggesting to move the wall back a little, the biggest problem with that is the fact that it has to be useful space if they are going to it because on the left side they will put a bedroom. They are looking at approximate eight to ten feet where they will come across. Therefore, to cut it back to where the existing bump-out is, makes it almost unusable. It comes down to whether they

do it or they don't. Mr. Day said they have taken all of the requests of the Board and have incorporated all of them into their design. There is no way they are going to be able to take the house and reconstruct it and show the original form because a number of years ago they did the bottom addition; a number of years they did the top addition. Therefore, as he has said, this house has been altered. Dr. Day stated that what they are trying to do is take the house and make it more usable for the current homeowners which provides a larger bathroom, an extra bedroom and a simple closet. They are willing to incorporate the things that the Board and staff are asking them to do in this design. He believes that they have shown this.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Day how deep is the wall plain of the proposed addition to the wall plain of the main part of the house. He said it looks about six inches.

Mr. Day said it is six inches.

Dr. Williams wanted to know if there was any room to make the addition narrower.

Mr. Day asked Dr. Williams if he was saying to make it a foot rather than six inches on each side. If so, he believes he can get his clients to do so as this would make it less dominant in relationship to the main house.

Dr. Williams said he did not know if this would be possible, but in light of Mr. Engle's point that it is more visible from the street.

Mr. Day said they were looking at the side from the lane.

Dr. Williams asked what is the elevation.

Mr. Day answered that it is the north elevation.

Dr. Williams stated that one option would be to pull it a foot on each side and the other option is rather than squeeze both sides evenly, take what would have been squeezed on one side and put it on the other side. However, he saw that the closet would really be squeezed.

Mr. Day stated that they will have to see how they could bring it in more than the six inches.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Ward if the 1999 petition requested full width but was approved a smaller width.

Ms. Ward answered that it was never full width. It was one room and may have been wider, but the overall shape had a gable pitch that went all the way to the gable in the main room. Therefore, it was much more massive, but it was never full width.

Mr. Engle wanted to know if the Board would want to see the design again prior to approval. There are quite a few changes.

Mr. Judson explained that the windows and shutters are clear.

Mr. Engle asked about the drip edge and band. The Board has pointed out approximately six different things. They don't know if this will work until they see another plan.

Mr. Judson stated that his inclination as chair is to try to bring the Board to resolution. As long as they are specific as possible, they can refer to staff in terms of items such as window trim and casement design. The Board can make a decision and move forward.

Dr. Williams asked what happens if the Board specifies stipulations and the staff looks at the results submitted and realizes that new problems have surfaced.

Ms. Ward stated that if it changes the design drastically and she was no longer comfortable with it, she would bring it back to the Board. However, she agrees with the Chair. As long as the Board is specific in their conditions, then they are not going to do anything out of those parameters.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Day if the window in the closet is there for external symmetry as opposed to interior light.

Mr. Day answered that this is true.

Dr. Williams said if the window was not there, it might give the petitioner a little more flexibility in terms of shifting things around.

Mr. Day asked if the Board's biggest concern is that the shutter here needs to be operable.

Dr. Williams said his concern is if they are trying to move the wall over, the window would be awfully tight.

Mr. Day stated that he believes the window looks tight only from the standpoint that they have a full shutter here. However, they could use a bifold shutter on this side. It might look a little odd, but the window would be in alignment with the window below. Therefore, a bifold shutter would be on that one side, a regular shutter on the other, and regular shutters on the remaining windows. This would make it fully operational. This would give them the allowance to move the wall in another six inches.

Mr. Judson said his concern is keeping the windows in alignment. If there is a variation in the shutters' style, he believes the Board has seen other situations where double hinged shutters were used as the resolution.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes that it would look better to have smaller shutters on both side of the window.

Mr. Day agreed with Ms. Ramsay.

Board Action:

Approval as amended with the following to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Reduce width of addition to be setback a minimum of 12” from the north exterior wall;
2. Architectural shingles to be installed over first floor roof where not covered by the second story addition;
3. Window openings to be enlarged to be the same size as the southernmost window and double-hung sashes to be used. Bi-fold shutters may be used to mitigate reduced size of addition; and - PASS
4. Incorporate appropriate window trim, headers, and sills.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Alex and Robin Moore - H-100520-4262-2 - 607 Tattnall Street - Alterations and fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Robin Moore was present on behalf of the petition.

This petition was briefly introduced at the meeting of June 9, 2010. No action was taken due to loss of a quorum.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report which has been modified to reflect changes that were discussed at the June 9, 2010 Board meeting.

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the building at 607 Tattnall Street as follows:

1. Remove non-historic side entry portico.
2. Replace non-historic side entry door with two-over-two double-hung wood window

- sash. Replacement sash to be custom two-over-two, single-pane glass, wood frame sash to match the existing windows on the building in shape, size, and material.
3. Install a six foot tall dog-eared wooden privacy fence along the rear and north sides of the property.

The historic building at 607 Tattnell Street was constructed in 1871 and is a rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District.

The existing side porch and entry door were approved by the Historic Review Board in November 1997 and subsequently installed. At that time aluminum siding was removed and aluminum windows were replaced with two-over-two double-hung wood sash windows.

A new deck and French doors were initially proposed and are referenced in the submittal packet; however, these items are not being reviewed at this time. The applicant will resubmit plans for the deck as an amendment at a later date.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval to remove the side portico and replace with a two-over-two single-pane double hung sash with frame window, install the wood fence to be painted or stained with the color to be submitted to staff for final approval.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward that since the petitioners are not applying for the deck approval at this point, does this mean that they are not moving the HVAC equipment at this time?

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioners would not be moving the HVAC at this time.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval to remove the existing side portico, replace the side entry with a two-over-two, single-pane, double-hung sash wood frame window and install a wood fence to be painted or stained. The color must be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Not Present

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Bryce Bounds for the Spriggs Group - H-100520-4264-2 - 349 W. Bryan Street - Elevator Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

This petition was not heard by the Board at their meeting of June 9, 2010.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for a two-story elevator addition on the rear (south) elevation of the Housing Authority Administration Building at Yamacraw. The property address is listed as 349 W. Bryan Street; however, the physical address of the building has been identified as 651 W. Bryan Street.

The addition is located on the rear (south) elevation and will be located at the site of an existing chimney. The chimney will be removed. The elevator equipment will be located under the existing rear stair to be obscured from view.

The addition is 7'-1" wide, projects 7'-10" from the rear of the building, and is 26'-6½" tall. The shaft features a sloped roof behind a parapet with a coping to match the banding on the original building. It will be stuccoed and painted to match the existing building. A metal canopy is located over the exterior entry to the elevator. It is a stuccoed gable to match the elevator and the roof is covered with a metal standing seam roof.

The historic building at 349 W. Bryan (physical address at 651 W. Bryan Street) was constructed in 1941 as the Administration Building for the public housing constructed the same year in Yamacraw neighborhood. The building and 480 units of public housing were designed by supervising architect Cletus Bergen. Levy and Clarke were the consulting architects with John C. LeBey and Walter P. Marshall as Associate Architects. T. Miesse Baumgardner was the landscape architect. The building is listed as a rated structure within the Savannah Historic District. The property at 349 W. Bryan Street is zoned R-M-25 and is comprised of a single parcel that spans two city blocks.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff wrongfully, but hopefully stated in the staff report that the series of metal ramping and stairs at the rear would be removed because of a new elevator being installed. The staff did not see it in the elevation and believed it was being taken out, however, it is not. The petitioner plans to keep the metal ramp. The elevator equipment will be relocated under the existing stairs.

Ms. Ward said the staff recommends approval of the petitioner's request.

Dr. Williams said that page 6 shows that the windows are to be removed and stored off site. He asked Ms. Ward if she knew where the windows would be stored.

Ms. Ward answered no. This would be a question for the petitioner.

Dr. Williams asked if the chimney is the original of Mr. Cletus Bergen design.

Ms. Ward answered that she does not know; but the petitioner is nodding that it is.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward if she reported that all the equipment is going under the steps.

Ms. Ward stated that the elevator equipment is to be located under the stairs.

Mr. Engle asked why does the elevator shaft has to be as high as shown since it does not have equipment above.

Ms. Ward explained that it is only the dimension lines. She said she mentioned to the petitioner that the Board has had several elevators on its agenda lately and it is important to keep it under the top of the roof, if possible. She said the elevator shaft ends below the parapet.

Dr. Williams said the parapet of the elevator appears to have a cornice molding.

Ms. Ward said it has a band molding. The staff is recommending approval of the band molding because it helps to break up the verticality. If the Board recommends against this specific type, she still would recommend doing some kind of horizontal band.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bounds said there is nothing more than they would like to see the ramp removed, but unfortunately the ramp was built under a federal grant several years ago for housing authorities across the United States which required the use of local labor. The Housing Authority owns the property, but his client will be renting space here. They have no interest in removing the ramp. Mr. Bounds stated that after some difficulty, they were able to locate a copy of Cletus Bergen's original plans. He confirmed that the chimney is original, but Mr. Bergen has it listed as being used as a plumbing stack originally. There is evidence at the site, however, that it was converted from a plumbing stack to a usable chimney and now it is converted back to a plumbing stack and since has been depreciated and is not used at all.

Mr. Overton asked what is the purpose of the elevator.

Mr. Bounds explained that this is a new site for the Curtis V. Cooper Health Center. They had a location in Hitch Village, but Hitch Village is in the process of being demolished. Under the Health Center's federal grants, they need to find another location. He said the Housing Authority offered them a site 349 West Bryan Street for \$1.00 a year. However, it was difficult to negotiate any changes to the exterior and their grant money to build a new location required that they have an elevator despite the presence of the ramp. Mr. Bounds

said the GSA grant money applied for says there must be mechanical means to access.

Mr. Engle wants to know if there was any way that this could have been brought inside.

Mr. Bounds answered no. The Housing Authority has no interest in the elevator shaft accessing their space. In fact, they don't want it accessing their space. He said with regards to the windows being stored off site, they will be store at the Housing Authority's main warehouse on Highway 17 in a quality controled environment.

Dr. Williams stated that his concern is that once the windows leave the site, there is a possibility that they will never find their way home. He said that this is a legitmate worry. He asked Mr. Bounds if there is anywhere on site where they could be stored.

Mr. Bounds said they could be stored in the attic, but there is worry about the humidity that might build up during the summer on the wood.

Dr. Williams stated that he is a firm believer that parts that are moved around stay with the building. He said if the windows could remain on site somewhere would enhance the likelihood of reuse in generations to come.

Mr. Bounds stated he believes they could work something out.

Dr. Henry asked that since the elevator is small, would the windows not fit where the chimney is being taken out.

Mr. Bounds answered no. The elevator will only be able to carry one person at a time. He said the Board may be aware of the elevator at Massie School; this is the same exact elevator that they are putting here. The entire shaft is approximately six feet wide and this is the bare minimum for a single ADA person sitting in a wheelchair and operate the cab. They identified this space because it already had two windows. Therefore, they could remove the top and simply continue to cut the existing opening to create the window without having to remove much historic fabric.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Bounds if he knew where the chimney space was.

Mr. Bounds answered that the chimney space was not enough space between two windows.

Ms. Ramsay asked if there is a color for the canopy. She asked if it is gable fronted and opened.

Mr. Bounds explained that the canopy will match the existing. They will stucco the front face of the canopy area. The sides are a standing seam. The color is zinc grey which matches some of the Housing Authority's other properties. The primary shaft and the front area will be grey also.

Mr. Overton asked that since this is a lease holding improvement will this be removed when the lease expires.

Mr. Bounds answered that he did not know if the Housing Authority would have an

interest at a later date in keeping it past the lease holder's occupancy.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the elevator addition. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Nay

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

8. [Petition of Kevin Grenier - H-100520-4265-2 - 5 W. Broughton Street - Principal Use Facia Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Giuseppe Evola was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for a principal use facia sign on the exterior of the building at 5 W. Broughton Street. This petition was on the consent agenda at the Board meeting on June 9, 2010. However, the petitioner indicated that he wanted to make a change to the design. Therefore, it was removed from the consent agenda and placed on the regular agenda. Ms. Ward said she has had some communication with the project's architect. However, she has not received any revised drawings to reflect the changes. But, the petitioner has told her that the drawings should be in her in-basket when she returns to her desk.

The petitioner is requesting approval for a principal use facia sign as follows:

Location: on the cornice centered above the entrance.

Size: 71.5" wide by 20" tall for a total of 10 square feet.

Illumination: an aluminum finish metal goose neck light will illuminate the sign from above.

Materials: wood fascia sign mounted to the cornice.

Colors: Green background (Pantone 383C); red lettering for 'gelato, gelato' (Pantone 187C); brown outline logo (Pantone 4695C)

The historic commercial building at 5 W. Broughton Street was constructed in 1867 and is a rated structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The façades of 5-15 W. Broughton Street were restored from 2002-2003. At that time, new storefronts and cornices were installed on the buildings. The subject business maintains approximately 20 linear feet of frontage on Broughton Street. The following standards from the Broughton Street sign district (8-3119) apply:

(2) Requirements. (c) Principal use signs.

1. One principal use sign shall be permitted for each business establishment. One such sign may be mounted or erected as a fascia sign.

The standard is met.

2. Size, Height, and Location. ...fascia signs shall be permitted one square foot of display area per linear foot of frontage occupied by each principal use...The fascia sign shall be located along the signable area of the buidlign façade, and not more than 40 percent of the display area shall be occupied by such sign copy.

The standard is met.

Ms. Ward said the applicant proposed to eliminate the gooseneck lighting and use an internally illuminated cabinet sign. The sign is to be flush mounted with back lit LED white lighting. The face of the sign will be acrylic and will project three inches from the face of the building.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff is recommending approval of what was submitted. She said she has a hard time recommending approval without further clarification from the petitioner to the Board with what they would like to go forward with. But if it meets all the standards and ordinance as at the petitioner is allowed to have the internally illuminated sign.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward that what the Board seems in grey is the gooseneck and is no longer a part of the petition.

Ms. Ward answered yes. She believes this is a good solution as she was not quite sure how the petitioner was going to attach this. However, if the new sign is the same size, same dimensions and only projects the three inches as indicated by the architect, she would recommend approval of it. Ms. Ward stated that if it varies from what the petitioner talks with the Board about today, she will bring it back to the Board at the July 14, 2010 meeting.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Evola agreed with Ms. Ward's report. The sign will be the same size. They will eliminate the gooseneck.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Grenier why he eliminated the gooseneck.

Mr. Evola answered that sign is already self-lighting. Therefore, they do not need the light above.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Grenier if their original proposal was not a back-lit sign.

Mr. Evola answered yes. They already have signs such as this and want to keep the same image.

Ms. Ramsay commented that the Board judges the visual compatibility. She said the little trees shown as being in a vacant lot on either side are very confusing especially when the basis for this sign is the other signs along the row are like this. She said it would have been more helpful to actually have a drawing showing the adjacent storefronts rather than the little trees on either side.

Dr. Williams asked, for clarification, that the change from the opaque sign with the light to the back-lit sign was for the back-lit to match the corporate signage used in other locations.

Mr. Evola answered yes.

Dr. Williams said just as Ms. Ramsay stated, the Board's task is to judge compatibility visually within its landscape as opposed to corporate visual compatibility.

Mr. Evola said they are trying to do the same thing. They want it to look right in the front. This is why they want to eliminate the light above as it is already "self-lighting."

Dr. Williams said page 7 shows Panera Bread is next door and the light is coming out over the awnings. He said Panera is illuminating their awnings and not their signage, but in the original proposal that the petitioner submitted is more compatible in some ways with its surroundings than the back-lit sign. He said he was curious as to what led to the back-lit sign.

Mr. Evola said it is because this is the design they chose. They are allowed to use this kind of light.

Mr. Judson asked if the picture shows that the Fed-Ex sign is internally illuminated and is on the same property.

Ms. Ward stated yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward if she said she likes the idea of getting rid of the lamp.

Ms. Ward said unlike Panera, where they have the very flat cornice, this cornice has a lot more definition, shape, and texture. She said she always questioned how they were going to attach it. She thought it would be on some type of base, but to just simplify the sign to go on the flat part of the cornice she thought was more in keeping with the design.

Dr. Williams asked what is the depth of the sign.

Ms. Ward said she was told it was three inches. However, she has not received the drawing.

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use facia sign with the condition that the amendment for an internally illuminated sign be resubmitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay
Second: Sidney J. Johnson
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Not Present
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Gene Hutchinson - Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Brian Judson - Abstain
Richard Law, Sr - Aye
W James Overton - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

9. Adjourned

Mr. Judson reminded the Board that their Annual Retreat will be held on Friday, August 6, 2010 from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. They will have a group of highly informative speakers highlighted by one of the Board members, Mr. Reed Engle.

Mr. Judson thanked everyone for their participation and acknowledged that they all are volunteers. He encouraged the Board members to come to the meetings as often as possible. Mr. Judson said especially as their agenda is getting longer, he asked the Board to block out enough time so that whatever quorum they have will remain for the entire meeting.

Mr. Judson extended congratulations to Dr. Williams as his son will graduate today from Savannah Arts Academy. His son is valedictorian and will attend MIT.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah Ward
Preservation Director

SW:mem

The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.