

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET
ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

OCTOBER 13, 2004

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

Members Present:

Dr. Gerald Caplan, Chairman
W. John Mitchell, Vice-Chairman
Dian Brownfield
John Deering
Ned Gay
Dr. Lester Johnson, Jr.
Eric Meyerhoff
John Neely
Swann Seiler

Members Absent:

Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring (Excused)

MPC Staff Present:

Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer
Lee Webb, Preservation Specialist

RE: Call to Order

Dr. Caplan called the October 13, 2004 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

All signs were properly posted.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay
Patrick Shay
HBR 03-3125-2
309 West Bay Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Jonathan Rhangos
HBR 04-3273-2
205 East Hall Street
Fence

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Kim Malphus
HBR 04-3274-2
16 Price Street
Alterations**

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

Ms. Brownfield asked that this item be moved to the regular agenda.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, For
Laura Kessler
HBR 04-3277-2
138 Habersham Street
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Kathy Ledvina, For
Marley Management
HBR 04-3280-2
202 West Broughton Street
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Charles A. Weston, For
Martha Barnes
HBR 04-3282-2
538 East State Street
Alterations**

Dr. Caplan requested that this item be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

HDBR Action: Ms. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the remaining items on the consent agenda as submitted. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Regular Agenda

Dr. Caplan stated that this month copies of the order of procedure are available on the outside table. He said this would eliminate the need for the chair to read the script and allow petitioners an opportunity to follow the proceedings more efficiently.

**RE: Amended Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
John Deering
HBR 03-3144-2
1 West Jones Street
New Construction – Part II Design**

Mr. Deering recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report:

The applicant is requesting a Part II design detail approval for 1 West Jones Street.

FINDINGS

1. Part I Height and Mass was approved February 11, 2004.
2. Design details submitted for part II approval are as follows:
 - Windows: In the original building the windows will be repaired. In the new building Kolbe and Kolbe Ultra Clad double hung will be used. New operable wood louvered shutters will be installed on both buildings. Metal window guards will be installed at all ground floor windows. A metal fire stair will be added on the rear in an alcove.
 - Doors: French doors with transoms will allow access to the roofs of the carriage houses.
 - A new wood stoop based on historic stoops of the same period will be installed on the Jones Street elevation of the original building. The piers will be stuccoed, the steps wood with decorative metal railing and newel. A covered portico will be placed on the new building with a different column, canopy and newel design.
 - Carriage Houses: A metal railing in a Wickersham wire iron design will be used on the carriage house and addition parapets. Two 10' wide x 7' high and two 9' wide x 7' high vertical plank overhead garage doors will be used on the lane elevations of the carriage house. A privacy screen separating roof areas will be placed on the roof of the eastern carriage house addition.
 - A metal gate will be used on the lane elevation at the recessed alley.
 - Colors: Original building – Stucco Benjamin Moore Waterbury Cream with Benjamin Moore Linen White trim; New building – stucco Martin Senour Katmandu with Kolbe and Kolbe Abalone. All shutters to be Benjamin Moore Black Forest Green (Charleston Green).
 - The applicant has submitted a thorough description of the design details using Ordinance criteria and has submitted detailed sections and elevations of each item.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Board Comments:

Dr. Johnson asked if there was a typo error on the site plan because it had Bull Street three times?

Mr. Deering stated yes.

Dr. Caplan asked if it was supposed to be a window or a door on the front elevation in the space between the two buildings on the ground floor?

Mr. Deering stated a window.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if there was going to be a gate at the niche where the windows were between the two buildings?

Mr. Deering stated they will consider it and submit a gate design back to Staff.

Public Comments:

Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF would like to applaud the excellent presentation with extensive detailing of the design elements. However, they would like to suggest a few refinements which they felt would further enhance the project as well as help to delineate the new and old structures thereby reducing the overall apparent mass of the project. He said HSF felt the petitioner should eliminate the scoring on the new building and to differentiate the crown molding across the top with a slightly different detail. HSF also felt a different approach to the ironwork on the stair cases may also help because it was the same vocabulary on the two and also on the rear façade.

He further stated that on the existing carriage house there was no banding on it, but on the plan banding was being added and HSF wondered why the original historic structure was being changed to add banding which did not exist before. He said HSF also felt that the height of the porticos needed to be increased because they seemed a little squat. He said the entrance doors on the porticos were glassed doors and typically a house of this era would have solid wooden doors at the front door. A major concern of HSF was the fire stair in the rear and its visibility from Bull Street. He said they were wondering if the fire stair could not be enclosed with a porch in louvers.

Mr. Deering stated he understood their desire to eliminate the scoring on the new building, but he felt it was important to help to reduce the mass of the building for it to be scored. He said stucco that was not scored on a vertical plane this tall looked very peculiar. He said they were happy to alter the cornice on the new structure and present those details to Staff, as well as the iron balustrade on the new portion of the project. He said the Wickersham iron railing on the rear was very expensive to produce, but they could do something different on the new portion. He said they would also remove the carriage house banding. He said in reference to the entry portico height they based it on examples on Jones Street and oftentimes they did not go up very far unless they had some sort of gable or a larger hip, so they would like to keep them as they were. He said he could also make the doors different. He said regarding the fire escape on the rear they looked at different porch designs and things to cover it, but all it seemed to do was to make it bigger in mass. He said right now it was iron and somewhat transparent and seemed to disappear better in the form that it was now.

HDBR Action: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the following amendments as agreed to by the petitioner: (1) A gate will be placed at the front recess, (2) The cornice of the addition will be different from that on the original structure, (3) The front iron railing will be different on the addition than on the stoop of the main house, (4) The iron railing on the original carriage house will be different from the new carriage house, (5) The front doors will be solid rather than with glass, (6) There will be no banding on the original carriage house. Dr.

Johnson seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed. Mr. Deering recused himself.

RE: Continued Petition of BMW Architects
Frank Neagle
HBR 04-3261
410 West Broughton Street
Alterations

Present for the petition was Fred Neagle.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to replace an existing non historic façade with a new commercial storefront façade as follows:

1. Add a shed awning Sunbrella 4624 "Sky Blue".
2. Divide the first and second story with a preformed urethane cornice painted Sherwin Williams "Angora"
3. Windows: Jeld Wed "Caradco" Tradition Plus series double hung aluminum clad "Brilliant White"
4. Façade to be Hardcoat stucco by Sto (10700 Terra Cotta) Limestone finish with 10622 Indiana Limestone swirl finish.
5. Top cornice to be preformed Urethane cornice with brackets by Fypon #695 painted SW "Angora".
6. Rectangular molding by Fypon painted "Angora"
7. Lintels and Sills: Hard coat stucco by Sto 6050 "White Linen"
8. YKK YHS 50 Storefront champagne anodized with preformed urethane panels.
9. All glass will be clear.

FINDINGS

The following Standards apply:

1. Section 3030 (k) (1) Preservation of historic structures within the historic district. An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenances related thereto visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs, shall only be moved, reconstructed altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include but not be limited to the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors and signs. In considering proposals for the exterior alterations of historic structures in the historic district and in applying the development standards, the documented original design of the structure may be considered.

Comment: The original façade has been lost and the top story lost. The proposed façade does not duplicate the historic, but utilizes the features in a traditional way.

2. Section 8-3030 (l) (5) Commercial design standards.

- a. The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront. This standard has been met.
- b. The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course. This standard has been met.
- c. The height of the first story shall be not less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single story above the first story. This standard has been met.
- e. Retail storefront area glazing shall not be less than 55 percent. Such glazing shall be transparent; provided however, black glass may be used in the sign area above the storefront window transoms. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18-24" base of contrasting material to the lintel. This standard has been met.
- g. Entrances shall be recessed and centered within the storefront. This standard has been met.

Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system; bronze, glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront; provided, however, the historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the developer that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate. The petitioner needs to discuss the materials of the base.

Section 8-3030 (I) (8) (c)

Commercial exterior walls shall be finished in brick, concrete formed or assembled as stone, precast concrete panels with finish to simulate stucco texture, polished stone and glazed brick or tile where similar historic examples exist along the same block front; provided however, the historic review board may approve other materials upon a showing by the developer that the product is visually compatible with historic building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate. Stucco has been proposed. The buildings on either side are stucco.

The following Guidelines apply:

Reflective films and coatings on glass are not recommended for storefronts in the Historic District. The glass is clear.

Within the Historic District, windows have the following characteristics;

- a. Recess from the exterior wall; they are not flush with the surface of the building. This guideline has been met.
- b. Tend to align vertically on the façade; This guideline has been met.
- c. Tend to be arranged in a three or six bay rhythm; There are other historic four bay buildings in this block.
- d. Represent a small percentage of the total surface area of the wall, appearing as punched openings in a solid mass; This guideline has been met.
- e. Are taller than they are wide; This guideline has been met.
- f. Are mostly double or triple hung; This guideline has been met.
- g. Divided light sashes have true divided lights. The windows are 1/1.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with clarification concerning material of the base.

Board Comments:

Ms. Brownfield stated the Board has approved a lot of preformed urethane before and were seeing more plastic additions added to the back, which she did not have a problem with. However, it does concern her when it is on the front of buildings.

Mrs. Reiter stated she felt it was alright for the cornice because it was a small detail.

Mr. Deering stated when its painted it actually looked like a wood bracket.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated there was no front elevation submitted other than the rendering. He asked did not the rules ask for elevations?

Mrs. Reiter stated the Board received the plans and the rear elevation in their packets last month (September), but the petition was continued.

Mr. Webb stated the September agenda the petitioner requested a continuance. He said when petitions are continued the Board should keep those plans, so the Board received all that information in September.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Neagle stated that the lower panel underneath the windows was a product called Azek, which was similar to plywood and was a dense urethane material that was resistant to rot. He said on top of that to create the rectangular panels they were going to use a profile of Fypon, which would be similar to the molding that they were going to use at the top of the building. He said it was the same type of product as the Azek.

Public Comments:

Ms. Casey Greer (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF would like to recommend that the fypon items be deleted from the design. She said they understood that the material was being proposed for a nonrated building, but it was surrounded by rated buildings in the Landmark District. She said the material has been known to disintegrate and in this situation simplifying the design would be a good alternative. She said HSF recommended deletion of the brackets and moldings from the design, as well as the pilasters which would simplify the design.

Mr. Neagle stated the fypon product was a warranted product. He said it has clean, sharp edges and from the projects that they have used it on they have not had a problem with it deteriorating. He said it was the same sort of product as the Azek that he showed to the Board.

Discussion:

Dr. Caplan asked if he would say that it was more durable than wood?

Mr. Neagle stated yes.

Mr. Neely asked Staff what was their opinion about the product?

Mrs. Reiter stated fypon product has been approved before.

Mr. Deering stated that Mr. Neagle was correct that unless you bought very expensive wood, it would out last a wood product.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated his feeling was the same. He said the materials were better materials than wood from the standpoint of longevity. But if it was a design problem and HSF felt that the bracket should not be there that was another issue.

HDBR Action: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Kim Malphus
HBR 04-3274-2
16 Price Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Kim Malphrus.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to add a rear addition that will be connected to an existing rear porch for 16 Price Street.

FINDINGS

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

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

DISCUSSION

1. The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a 6'x11' rear addition that will be connected to the existing rear porch. The upper portions of the addition will be slightly visible from Bryan Street and the walkway behind the property.
2. The petitioner provided a wall section and floor plans of the addition.
3. The materials of the addition will match the existing house.

4. The addition will have an asphalt shingle shed roof matching the porch roof line.
5. An existing window will be reused on the east/outside wall of the addition.
6. The color of the exterior and trim will match the previous color change.
7. It appears the proposed addition is visually compatible.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Board Comments:

Ms. Brownfield stated she was concerned about the windows in the back. She asked if the petitioner would consider elongating the windows making them more vertical to match the other windows?

Ms. Malphrus stated there was a mistake on the drawing. She said the actual window that was there was elongated and matched the other windows. She said it was the one that was going to be reused.

HDBR Action: Mr. Mitchell made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the clarification that it is the existing 6/6 window that will be reused. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison
HBR 04-3276-2
539 East Congress Street
Alterations**

Present was Mark McDonald.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish additions; rehabilitation of the exterior and addition of a rear porch as follows:

1. Remove two story addition to the East of the front porch and restore front porch.
2. Remove two story rear addition. And install a rear porch. Please provide a rear elevation.
3. Install a wood four raised panel front door.
4. Remaining repairs are in-kind,

FINDINGS

539 East Congress Street is a rated structure what was built prior to 1884 as one half of a double 1½ story cottage duplex with a one story porch. Between 1884 and 1888 the roof was raised and a full second story was added. The 1891 Koch view shows a two-story house with a hip roof and one story porch and it remained this way until 1902 when the house was extended to the East about 7'. The façade was partially extended forward probably at the same time.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated he did not feel the Board had enough information to properly review the petition. He said they were supposed to have a site plan, dimensioned floor plan and dimensioned elevations. He said there was no rear elevation, yet there was a lot of work being done on the rear of the house. Also, there were no appropriate sections for the different exterior elements that were new. He said he felt this was a high profile project.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked Staff if they received the rear elevation as requested?

Mrs. Reiter stated no.

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated they will get that information to the Staff and Board. He said they did not need approval on the petition today because there were no plans for HSF to do any of the work that they were proposing. He said as they were showing the house questions were being raised about the structural integrity of it. The front section was failing because it was an addition and was not built properly. He said HSF's intent was to get concept approval from the Board because what they were recommending to a buyer was that they actually take the addition off of the building. He said the rear addition was also failing, which was even in worse condition. He said the petition was really a concept approval for the Board to tell them how they felt about the idea of demolishing the addition. He said they were trying to restore its historicity without coming up with some conjectures. He said they wanted to take it back to its original building line.

Mr. Deering stated even what was shown was sort of conjectural. He said it was not taking it back to the Koch view.

Mr. McDonald agreed. He said HSF just wanted the Board's feedback on it because they were trying to sell the building. He said they hoped that there would be a real proposal to the Board someday.

Dr. Caplan stated he did not think the Board had any provisions for a concept approval. He said usually a petitioner makes application and the Board approves it. He said what the Board would appreciate them doing is submitting appropriate drawings to the Board, so that they could review it for approval. He said the Board did not want to go on record as disapproving this building because they felt it was a wonderful thing that HSF was doing. But they have to have enough information to do this.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked the petitioner if they were proposing to do the demolition?

Mr. McDonald stated no. He said they were not proposing to do anything what-so-ever.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if he was proposing that the Board approve a concept with one elevation?

Mr. McDonald stated that was the only elevation there was.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if they were not going to do the demolition and they did not have drawings for what they were going to be doing, what was he asking the Board to do?

Mr. McDonald stated he was asking the Board to give them feedback about the concept of the front elevation only. He said if the Board was unable to do that then that was fine.

Dr. Caplan stated the Board really did not have a concept approval. He said it was hard for the Board to give an approval prior to submission of appropriate drawings. He said the Board would like for them to ask for a continuance, so that they could bring it back next month, so the Board could help them.

Mr. McDonald stated he was not sure that HSF wanted a continuance because he was not sure that they wanted to invest all the time into full construction drawings when they did not have a buyer who wanted to do this particular scheme.

Dr. Caplan stated if HSF did not want a continuance then they would need to withdraw the petition.

Mr. McDonald stated they withdraw the petition.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, & Shay
Patrick Shay
HBR 04-3278-2
318 East Broughton Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay, Agent.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself from the petition.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

1. Infill rear industrial window openings with brick of similar color to existing.
2. Repoint rear brick façade.
3. Replace storefront with aluminum storefront.
4. Install five canvas awnings on front elevation. Color Licorice. Projection – 4'-0".
5. Paint stucco and existing C.M.U. Pittsburgh Paints "Dusty Yellow" 214-3. The awning at the entry has an intersecting front-facing gable portion.

FINDINGS

The structure is not rated as historic on the Historic Building Map.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval with the condition that a sample of the yellow be placed on the building and reviewed with staff prior to painting the whole structure. It may be too bright for such a large area.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering asked if there was a way for him to leave the metal windows on the back?

Mr. Shay stated the proposed use for this location was going to be a gourmet food store and they will have a lot of inventory. He said it was more of a security issue.

Mr. Neely asked if the brick infill windows would be inset?

Mr. Shay stated yes, they would be recessed so that it will be obvious that they were infilled.

Public Comments:

Ms. Cynthia Johnson (Graduate Student at SCAD) stated she felt there was something unsettling with the front awning (intersecting gable). She said along Broughton Street she could not think of any other examples with multiple massing or layering of awnings. She said she would recommend that it be simple like the others

Mr. Shay stated what was there now was one long linear horizontal awning, so it made the dominant expression of the façade horizontal. He said they felt dividing it into five awnings and having the heads of the awning up very high as opposed to where they were now, broke up the façade and made it into something that was less 50's post industrial. He further stated that they wanted to clearly delineate where the entrance was.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the provision that a sample of the paint color be placed on the building for final review by Staff. Mr. Neely seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Erik Puljung
HBR 04-3279-2
109 West Liberty Street
Renovations**

Present for the petition was Erik Puljung, Agent.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate 109 West Liberty Street and add a three level rear porch.

FINDINGS

The following Standards and Guidelines are applicable:

Section 8-3030(k) Development Standards:

- (2) Preservation of historic structures within the Historic District: An historic structure and any outbuildings, or any appurtenances related thereto visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior features of the historic structure or appurtenance thereto. For the purposes of this section, exterior architectural features shall include, but not limited to the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of

the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors, and signs.

- (6) Visual Compatibility Factors: New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances thereof in the Historic District which are moved, reconstructed, materially altered, repaired, or changed in color shall be visually compatible with structures, squares, and places to which they are visually related.
- (11) e. Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding.
- f. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails and the distances between balusters shall not exceed 4”.

DISCUSSION

1. The petitioner is proposing a comprehensive rehabilitation of the property, a four-story brick building, with a majority of the exterior work being the result of deferred maintenance, including cornice repair.
2. Primary façade window repairs have previously been submitted and approved on the Staff level.
3. The petitioner is proposing to add a three level rear porch. Elevations were submitted. The porches will project approximately 9’8” from the façade and will span the width of the house. A 7’8”x9’ dormer addition will also be added at the forth level, in wood siding.
4. The ground level of the porch will be brick pier construction, with the brick to match the existing. The remaining levels of the proposed porch are wood construction with finish floors set 4” below the main house finish floor. 12” square treated box columns are used at each level with wooden rails and pickets between. The porch floors will be painted 4” T&G treated pine. The ceilings will be painted 6” T&G pine with a “V” groove.
5. Paint colors for the porch and main house have not been selected at this time and will be submitted for a Staff review once chosen.
6. The rear or south wall of the property is in disrepair. The petitioner would like to remove the deteriorated wood siding, reframe the area, and apply new 6” horizontal wood siding to the repaired wall. Additional window and doors openings will be added to this elevation, to allow access to the proposed porches.
7. The windows on this elevation are deteriorated and will be replaced with new Kolbe and Kolbe double-hung wood windows with true divided lights, which will also be used in the new openings.
8. Door units to the proposed porches will be painted Mahogany with true divided lights to replicate the existing French doors on the Liberty Street elevation.
9. New operable, sized Cedar wood shutters with copper caps will be added to the north and west elevations of the property.
10. The petitioner plans on submitting an amendment to this application at a later date to seek approval to repair the Liberty Street parlor level balcony.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval. The proposed rehabilitation and new rear porch addition appears to be visually compatible and meets the requirements of the ordinance.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated there was not a section thru the porch and he felt it was important that the Board saw a section thru the porch.

Mr. Puljung stated okay.

Mr. Neely asked if the roof mounted air compressors will be screened?

Mr. Puljung stated the visual site lines up to the roof were difficult to see, so there was no plan to screen them other than just to have them set back from the edge of the roof. He said they were also adding the porch extension, which would diminish the site line even more.

Mr. Neely asked how far from the west wall were the compressors?

Mr. Puljung stated approximately 10 feet.

Ms. Brownfield stated several years ago she was so concerned about this project being endangered that she took pictures and went to Historic Savannah Foundation in hopes that someone could save this building. She said she would like to congratulate Robbie Bell for taking this project on. She said it was beautifully being done and felt it was a great addition.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the provision that a section through the new porch be submitted to Staff for the file. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Gonzalez Architects
Jose' Gonzalez
HBR 04-3281-2
210 – 212 Gwinnett Street
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass
Part II Design**

Present for the petition was Jose' Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting Part I and Part II approval to construct two duplex structures with rear garages for a total of 8 units.

FINDINGS

The following standards apply:

1. Section 8-3030 (I) Design Standards
 - (1) Height Map. This is in a four story zone. The exterior expression of the height of the raised basement shall not be less than 6'-6" and not higher than 9'-6". The exterior expression of the height of the second story in the case of a raised basement shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each subsequent story shall not be less than 10 feet.

- (2) Street Elevation Type: a. 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.
- (3) Setbacks: There shall be no front yard setback except on tithing blocks where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.
- (4) Entrances: A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the East-West street.
- (5) Residential Windows facing a street shall be double or triple hung, casement or Palladian.

Double glazed (simulated divided light) windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8"; the muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding; Snap-in or between-the-glass muntins shall not be used; the centerline of window and door openings shall align vertically; 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 precludes an arched window being used. Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building. The distance between windows shall not be less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. Windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.

- (1) Roofs: Pitched roofs parallel to the street with less than a 4:12 pitch shall have an overhang and be bracketed or otherwise projecting eave detail, or be screened from the street by a parapet wall.

Parapets shall have a string course of not less than 6 inches in depth and extending at least 4 inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and one-and-a half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two inch overhang.

- (2) Stoops: Front stair treads and risers shall be constructed of brick, wood, precast stone, marble, sandstone or slate.

Section 8-3030 (k) (5) Non-rated structures. The construction of a new structure...shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, structure, material, texture, color and location on a lot as will be compatible with other nearby structures designated as historic.

Section 8-3030 (l) 13 Lanes and carriage houses. New carriage houses may provide up to a four-foot setback to allow a turning radius into the garage on a narrow lane.

Garage and carriage house roofs shall be side gable, hip with parapet, flat or shed hidden by a parapet.

Garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.

The Following Guidelines apply Section 8-3030 (k) (6) Visual Compatibility Factors

- a. Height
- b. Proportion of structure's front façade
- c. Proportion of openings
- d. Rhythm of solids to voids in front façade
- e. Rhythm of structures on the street
- f. Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection
- g. Materials, texture and color
- h. Roof shape
- i. Walls of continuity
- j. Scale
- k. Directional expression

DISCUSSION

- 1. See petitioner's description of how the proposed plans meet the criteria.
- 2. Will there be a fence along Tattnell Street?

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if this were a Part I request for height/mass he felt the Board could discuss it further. But the application was for Part I and Part II and had no detailing. He said the Board did not know what the railings were, cornices, and it did not have any sections. He said he felt the Board could not discuss the application as Part II because of insufficient documents.

Mr. Deering asked if a model was submitted?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Gonzalez stated in regard to the detailing this project is subject to an easement with Historic Savannah Foundation. In negotiating with HSF with regard to the design one of the major components was to make the building extremely clean in its detailing and not to mimic any other more traditional historic details. The detailing was strictly banding and there was no additional elaboration or intricacy within that banding. It was clearly simply a stucco relief and there was no additional components to it. So, the elevations reflect the final detail form. He said HSF wanted to make the structure to be of similar mass and scale to the very significant Victorian structures, but with detailing that was not trying to mimic what was going on in the area. This particular submission submitted to the Board was in keeping with HSF's wishes.

He further stated that he felt they had provided the Board with the detailing and they were not going to do any more detailing in order to achieve this, because it was basically a stucco relief. There would be no further elaboration.

Additional Board Comments:

Ms. Brownfield asked if there was another building in the Historic District with that (color) intensity?

Mr. Gonzalez stated across the street there was a hybrid brick and clapboard siding structure. They have tried to match the brick color in the building across the street. He said they were amenable to make any variations on the color. He said as the structures to the east were lighter, therefore that was the color that was submitted for the other two structures.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he still felt that for approval of Part II the Board did not have enough information. He said they did not have a section thru the porch. They did not know how long the front stair was. What the railing was other than the sketch of the wrought iron railing.

Mr. Gonzalez stated he could not draw it any more complex because it was a simple wrought iron railing as clean as the Board saw it in the elevation.

Mr. Deering added that it was still necessary to have sections. He said the Board needed sections thru the front porch, back porch, garage, rustication, window details, door details, etc. all of which were not here.

Mr. Gonzalez stated they provided window, door, and garage details. He said this was a section thru the structure as provided. He said they reviewed these submissions with Staff in terms of what was considered complete.

Mr. Deering stated those were cut sheets, not details.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated there was no dimension as to how far the front door sits back into the foyer. There was no dimension on the depth of the porch. He said he felt that there was not enough information to make a decision on Part II.

Mr. Gonzalez stated it was his understanding that Staff as well as some members of the Board review the petitions for completeness prior to submission, which allows the petitioner to provide any additional material. He said this would be the third time that they have been before the Board. It was not the intent of his firm to not provide the Board with whatever information they requested. But in good faith there has to be a certain amount of reliance by an applicant, that if they review with Staff and Staff has deemed something complete that it was only appropriate that they at least be advised if indeed if it was not complete, so that they have an opportunity to provide it. He said in this case he felt somewhat at a loss because he did not know how to respond without an opportunity to have been given in essence to make an application that was now being deemed incomplete, complete.

Mr. Mitchell asked if he was saying that the previous drawings submitted had the measurements and everything on them?

Mr. Gonzalez stated no. He said this was the third design that they have presented to the Board. And each time they submit packages with Staff they review them with Staff. He said they receive comments from Staff with regard to additional information and they were always willing to submit whatever else that has been requested. He said as the Board has indicated in some of the previous approvals they granted today they have requested a significant number of

details from other applicants to be submitted to Staff. They would be equally desirous to do the same.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he has been present during the whole meeting and he has heard the Board question at least half of what was submitted as to completeness of the submission. He said it was not anything personal, but it was not a complete submittal in accordance with the guidelines. He said in his view he felt the Board was going to have to be more rigid in that, so that everyone complies with the submittal requirements.

Mrs. Reiter stated she felt the Board needed to state what was needed because to her it was all there and clear. She said she felt it was complete because it was so simple.

Dr. Caplan stated to the petitioner that the Board no longer has a Details Committee. He said it was done by Staff, which they preferred and they have been doing a wonderful job. He said he felt he was to be congratulated because his Part I design plan was a vast improvement over what he had before. And his working with Historic Savannah Foundation on that has been great and felt they both needed to be commended for coming up with a compatible design. He said whether or not the Board felt that he had enough for Part II would have to be decided. But at least for Part I he was to be congratulated.

Dr. Johnson stated he would think that on plate 11 (building section) there was a cross section there, but there was no indication as to what was the size of the numbers. There was a scale, but the Board did not have scales at the podium. He said he felt those dimensions should be put onto the drawing. He also asked on drawing plate 5, the unit that was on the ground floor, if there was intention for bedrooms to be in that apartment?

Mr. Gonzalez stated no, that was a studio design.

Public Comments:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF worked with Mr. Gonzalez on the scale of the buildings and felt the appropriate thing was done to break it up into two buildings. He said as far as the comments about Part I and Part II they would agree that the Part II drawings needed some more detail. He said there were conflicts in a couple of areas and HSF felt they could provide Mr. Gonzalez some clarification on that. He said the first floor plan showed a continuous line with no windows down the side elevation, but there were windows on the side. He said they felt sure the intent was to have windows on all the side elevations. Also, the front elevation showed some engaged columns at the front entrance and they did not show on the plan. He further stated that HSF had other problems with some of the other details that they could talk about next month or they could talk with Mr. Gonzalez between times. It involved the back portions of the masonry columns with an iron balustrade and rails and they felt that would make more sense for the whole thing to be iron.

Mr. Gonzalez stated with regard to the plan and the window issue HSF was correct and it was an oversight. However, it was shown on the elevations. Regarding the engaged columns this was a design that was requested by HSF and they reflected it on the elevations. HSF was correct that the engaged columns were not shown on the plan, but they were shown on the elevations. He said in reference to the rear he was amenable to any variation.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated in one of the two previous submittals he asked about the height of the wall on Tattnell Street between the building and the carriage house and he explained to the

Board what he wanted. But, now he noticed that there was no wall at all there. He asked what was the rationale eliminating all the privacy in the backyard?

Mr. Gonzalez stated they have not separated or isolated the back area in between the houses and the carriage house as an individual garden for any particular tenant. So, there was no fence contemplated at this time and if there was at some point in the future they would bring it back to the Board.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve Part I Height and Mass as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Charles A. Weston, For
Martha Barnes
HBR 04-3282-2
538 East State Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Charles Weston.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to install a block wall around three sides of the lot behind 538 East State Street. The wall will be seven feet tall to match the height of the existing wall. It is proposed to stucco the wall on the lane facing side with masonry paint on the two side walls. The existing chain link fencing on the property will be removed and a double wood gate installed in a 12' opening.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval. Petitioner needs to clarify color.

Board Comments:

Dr. Caplan stated that he asked that this petition be put on the Regular Agenda because Staff they did not have the color. Staff now has the color.

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Deering seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Request for Extensions

1. Petition of Samuel A. & Ida George
HBR 04-3014-2
101 East Oglethorpe Avenue
Renovations & Additions
Request for 1 year Extension
The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

2. Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects
T. Jerry Lominack
HBR 03-3060-2
611 West Jones Street
Addition
Request for 1 year Extension
The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

3. Petition of John Roszkowiak
HBR 03-3094-2
519 East Perry Street
Fence
Request for 1 year Extension
The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the aforementioned requests for extensions as submitted. Ms. Brownfield seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Joshua Keller
HBR 04-3264(S)-2
407 East Charlton Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Bloomquist Construction
David Bloomquist
HBR 04-3265(S)-2
510 East St. Julian Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 04-3266(S)-2
201 West Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

4. Petition of Arnold Bates
HBR 04-3267(S)-2
526 East Gordon Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

5. Petition of Bonnie Retsas
Soho South Café”
HBR 04-3268(S)-2
12 West Liberty Street
Door
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

6. Petition of Ann Stephens
HBR 04-3269(S)-2 – Ref # 00-2516
7 East Macon Street
Burglar Bars
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

7. Petition of Sign Mart
Bill Norton
HBR 04-3270-2
202 West Bay Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

8. Petition of Kim Malphrus
HBR 04-3271(S)-2
16 Price Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

9. Petition of Peter Jackson
HBR 04-3272(S)-2
520 East State Street
Gas Lantern
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

10. Petition of Patti Monsees
HBR 04-3275-2
9 Drayton Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

11. Petition of Eric Meyerhoff
HBR 04-3283-2
425 East President Street
Window Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

12. Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects
Ellen Harris
HBR 04-3284-2
546 – 548 East Huntingdon Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVAL

Ms. Seiler stated with regard to Staff approvals if they could go ahead and paint before they come before the Board.

Mrs. Reiter stated yes. She said applications can come in prior to the Board's scheduled meeting date and after the meeting date. The applications that come in prior to the meeting date are put on the agenda for that month. Any applications for Staff review turned in after the meeting date but still in the same month will go on the next regularly scheduled meeting agenda. So, there could be 4 – 5 weeks before it appears on the agenda because Staff reviews can be submitted daily.

**RE: Work Performed Without Certificate
Of Appropriateness**

Ms. Brownfield asked if you could have neon signs in the window on the interior of a building on Jones Street advertising a business?

Mr. Webb stated as long as it was on the interior it was outside the Board's jurisdiction.

Mr. Deering stated it becomes a lamp, a drapery or something like that.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the Police Department received approval for the color of their lintels that they just did on Habersham and Oglethorpe?

Mrs. Reiter stated no. She said Staff will check into it.

Mr. Deering stated in the 200 Abercorn block before you got to Liberty there was double house that faced the cemetery there was a brick infill underneath a stoop. He asked Staff if they could check into it?

Mrs. Reiter stated Staff checked out Coop's and they checked out okay.

RE: Report on Items Deferred to Staff

RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements

RE: Other Business

Dr. Caplan stated they met with the Mayor and City Council and he felt they had a very productive workshop meeting. He said they provided them with some interesting statistics. For the record the Board has a 95% approval rate. He further stated that there was no information about filling the current vacancy. He said the Mayor has promised that this will be done by the end of the year as well as information relative to the two members whose terms are expiring at the end of the year.

Mrs. Reiter stated she has a brochure that says – “does it seem that meals taste better at classic diners that you drive a few more miles on empty just to fill up at a vintage gasoline station...If this appeals to you, you can join the society for commercial archaeology.” She said they were here today to declare the Thunderbird Motel sign a historic sign. She said it has been done in the past when the Matthews Fish Market sign was declared historic. She said they had a policy that was never formalized into an ordinance but was worked out with Inspections that the nonconforming, but wonderful classic, commercial, archaeological signs deserved to be

repaired and used. However, in order to do that the Board has to declare it historic so that they can take down the sign, properly repair it and put it back. She said the motel was also being restored to its retro glory.

HDBR Action: Mr. Mitchell made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the request that the Thunderbird Motel sign be declared historic. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mrs. Reiter stated that they were going to have an open house on Monday, November 8, 2004 from 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. She said notices will be made available to the public. She said the public will be able to come in and ask questions about the revisions to the Ordinance. The revisions will also be published on MPC's website and the City's website. She said pending the comments they would hope to go forward to MPC on Tuesday, December 7, 2004 at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Webb stated the Historic Preservation Division and the State Preservation office have asked MPC to host a Section 106 Environmental Review workshop. He said it will be held at MPC in the Hearing Room and would be a day long workshop (9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.). He said it was only dealing with the environmental review Section 106 process, which is a federally mandated review process for federally funded programs. He said it will be held November 17, 2004.

Dr. Caplan stated with regard to the nominating committee, the Bylaws state that a nominating committee will be appointed at the October meeting. At the November meeting the nominating committee will report. And the December meeting they will vote on officers for the upcoming year. He said he would like to ask that John Neely, Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring, and Eric Meyerhoff serve on the Nominating Committee.

Mr. Neely stated he felt that the Board needed to discuss whether or not to establish a procedure for concept approval or just say "no" we don't. It seemed to him that the Board in the past has allowed projects to be brought to them for a presentation where they had not requested action. He said he felt that it could ultimately make for a better project if the Board had time for an informal feedback. He said if a person walked away from the meeting without getting any feedback at all he felt it was unhealthy. He said he felt it was useful to get some feedback even though the Board does not approve or disapprove the project.

Dr. Caplan stated he could only recall one prior project, which was the Johnson Square office building where the Board said we really did not do that. He said he felt before the Board took action on this that they sit down and look at the ordinance and their Bylaws to see if it was necessary to change them in order to do this. He said he did not think that the Board could just say that they were going to do this without looking at those documents.

Mr. Deering asked if he was talking about a concept submittal?

Dr. Caplan stated that was what Mr. Neely was talking about.

Mr. Deering stated the Board has done it (refused to comment) on several things, such as the County Courthouse project with Scott Barnard. As mentioned, the Board did it on the Johnson Square office building. He said he did not think it was unusual to say no.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated 30 years ago when the Historic Review Board was formed he was appointed to it in that he was the first architect on the Board. And within the week he was called

by the local A.I.A Chapter to come to a special meeting. And all the practicing architects in town questioned him as to what the Historical Review Board was and what was it going to do and not do. He said the main thing that they were very much frightened of was that the Historic Review Board would sit on the podium and design or redesign buildings that were being submitted. Consequently, the six years that he served at that time and then all the ensuing years that he stood before the Board and now he was back on it he has been a very strong opponent to designing from the podium. He said he felt when somebody comes before the Board and wants guidance that the only guidance the Board can give is response to what he/she presents to the Board as a concept rather than the Board giving him a concept. He said he felt very strongly that the Board should not be designing from the podium. The Board could make suggestions or they could tell what they felt was not in compliance. But he did not think that architects or lay people as they come before the Board should ask them what can I do here and then the Board responds to it.

Mr. Mitchell asked if he felt the Board comes pretty close to the line when they “may suggest?”

Mr. Meyerhoff stated what the Board was doing at that point when they make a suggestion they were expressing to the applicant what they felt objectionable or not in compatibility and letting him respond to that, which may alter the Board’s vote.

Mr. Neely stated he felt that was a separate issues. He said his question was should the Board have a procedure that was not approval or disapproval. He said he was sensing the consensus was probably no.

Mr. Deering stated he felt it becomes opinion and it was all conjecture. He said he felt the Board should not have anything like that. He said it ends up being a critique, which was not appropriate.

Dr. Caplan stated he did not think the Board had the right to really do that.

Mr. Mitchell stated the concept and the intent of doing it he saw as something helpful. He said he felt the Board needed to look at the Bylaws to see how to do it and if it the Board could do it at all. And when the Board does approach it from the standpoint of trying to strike a balance because it could only help the applicant.

Dr. Caplan stated he did not know why people were confused because the Board has changed the application form to clarify this and make absolutely clear what to do. He said he did not think that they read the application form. He said the Board has really tried hard to accommodate everybody.

Mr. Deering stated he has been on the other side of podium longer than he has been Board member. He said he has had on two different occasions where the Board refused to hear his projects because his submissions were incomplete. He said after twice he did not ever come back before the Board without proper information because he was not going to be turned away because he did not have a complete submittal.

Mr. Webb stated on the Gonzalez project it was a matter of difference of opinion. He said Staff felt that it was adequate and the Board felt it was inadequate. He said he felt what needed to be done was Board members call Staff before the meetings and say they feel this can not be heard.

Ms. Seiler stated she talked at length with Brett Bell of Savannah Morning News and told him what the Board was trying to do. She said that Brett had also gotten a report from Scott Larson. She said she basically told him what the Board was trying to do in changing their image in the community. However, with a 95 percent approval does not leave a whole lot to do, but there still seemed to be some misunderstandings out there especially with regard to the purple house incident. She said there seemed to be some people who thought that the Board could fix that. But from the standpoint of geographic jurisdiction they do have a little bit of clarification to do. She said she asked him what would be the possibility of them taking a look at doing another overall story on the Board in regard to filing, when the meetings are held, who could come, how you get appointed, etc. She said just in general fun facts to know and tell. And as a matter of fact Brett had written the infamous Telfair story during that time when the Board was not at its most congenial. She said has really changed since then. She said Brett will talk to his editors, especially since the Board was going through the new ordinance changes. She said Brett will be talking to Beth and Dr. Caplan about that.

RE: Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – September 8, 2004

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of September 8, 2004 as submitted. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca