

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET
ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

FEBRUARY 11, 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
Eric Meyerhoff
John Neely
Swann Seiler
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring

MPC Staff Present:

Beth Reiter, Preservation Officer
Lee Webb, Preservation Specialist
Christy Adams, Secretary

RE: Call to Order

Dr. Caplan called the February 11, 2004 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

Dr. Caplan stated that a citizen from the community called about the project at 1 West Bull Street, which is a continued petition. He said the citizen stated the date had not been promptly changed on the sign.

Mrs. Reiter stated she talked with the City Attorney and he said that the first meeting was properly advertised and posted. It was continued to a date specific in the public hearing and it was put into the decision on-line and in the minutes, therefore it is properly posted.

RE: Consent Agenda

RE: Amended Petition of Poticny, Deering, Felder
Keith Howington
HBR 03-2994-2
27 West Charlton Street
Alterations

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed. Abstaining to the motion was Mr. Deering.

RE: Regular Agenda

**RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay
Patrick Shay
HBR 03-3125-2
309 West Bay Street
New Construction**

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Present for the petition was Patrick Shay.

The petitioner is requesting Part II design detail for a proposed six-story hotel at the corner of Bay and Montgomery Street.

FINDINGS

1. Entrances: In response to Board concerns a prominent lobby entrance has been made on Bay Street. A drive through entrance is also located on Montgomery Street.
2. Tall building standards:
 - a. The frontage is divided into architecturally distinct sections by implied piers and each section is taller than it is wide.
 - b. The window bay groupings comply with the ordinance.
 - c. The roof has a parapet.
 - d. There is an entrance on the E-W street as well as the N-S street.
3. The facades form continuous planes along the street frontages.
4. The windows align vertically and are inset 3" from the façade. Upper windows are off white in color.
5. Balconies: project from the face of the building with a "fin" wall in the center separating two balconies.
6. Materials:
 - a. The ground level is distinguished from the levels above through the use of cast stone – color: "Cornsilk". The aluminum storefront is dark green. The glass is clear. The main entry has brick surrounds.
 - b. Levels 2-6 consist of brick "Menawa,"
 - c. Cast stone string course and lintels, aluminum windows with 2/2 lites and ornamental metal grilles covering air conditioning systems.
 - d. Balconies have metal railings per detail. Painted Green.
 - e. Sixth level has stucco at balconies and as shown on drawings; east elevation is all stucco due to proximity to adjoining building, lane elevation has more stucco. Color to match cast stone.

Please identify what the rectangles are on the sixth level stucco piers – are they open? Windows? some have grills?

7. The top floor is separated by a band and has various design devices such as the elliptical windows, which extend into the parapet to “cap” the building.
8. No information given on exterior lighting. Also on a previous hotel on Bay and MLK a large gas line or other utility was installed prominently in front of the MLK elevation. Is any such feature proposed for this hotel?

RECOMMENDATION

Approval pending clarification of the items listed above and with the understanding that signage and lighting will come back to the Board.

Board Comments:

Mr. Shay stated the rectangles in the center were reveals. He said there was no plan for a gas line on the sidewalk. The plan is that they have a place for that that off the lane, inside the garage door.

Mr. Mitchell asked if he could be more specific about the color?

Mr. Shay stated it would be a Charleston green.

Ms. Brownfield stated she was concerned that the main entrance looked too heavy for the metal brackets.

Mr. Shay stated it was a shallow projection that only went out about 4 feet and the brackets were very heavy.

Ms. Brownfield asked if the balconies protruded over the right-of-way?

Mr. Shay stated yes, about 2 feet past the property line.

Ms. Brownfield stated she was concerned with the rhythm on the Montgomery Street elevation of the ground level and the ornamentation of the grills.

Mr. Shay stated the grills were made of metal in shapes and showed the pattern. He said what they tried to do was draw more attention to the shapes of the balconies by having a detail in the center, which was more eye catching.

Ms. Brownfield asked if he could explain the line on the lane elevation?

Mr. Shay stated it was an opening in the wall, a screen for the swimming pool area.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated new hotels were coming to dominate the Bay Street corridor. He said the size alone should be enough, but the elaborate level of detail was threatening to overpower the historic structures. He said 225 West Bay

Street, an Eichberg building built for Simon Guchenheimer in 1892 should be allowed to retain its position as the elaborate anomaly. To this end and based on the simple straight forward general pattern of commercial structures along Bay Street, HSF would like to suggest the following regarding visual compatibility factors on page 7, of the Historic District Zoning Ordinance: Rhythms of solids-to-voids. Concern with balconies, which neither follow the historic pattern as added-on elements or are completely recessed. HSF is also concerned about the stucco fins protruding from the façade to divide the balconies in defiance of the relatively flat plane of the Bay Street streetscape. An alternate dividing element should be used. Relation of materials, colors, and textures. The alternating material changes both horizontally and vertically out-do the aforementioned Guchenheimer building. He said changing stucco to brick between the base and parapet except for the contrasting bands would be more in keeping with Bay Street. Roof shapes. Though obviously inspired by the Guchenheimer building, the number of different shapes composing the parapet also out-do the original in complexity and should be simplified. He said HSF appreciated the overall design effort on the façade, but felt the hotel would still demand a great deal of attention if the simplifications were made to better integrate it into the historic streetscape. Conversely, HSF ask that the petitioner to consider continuing design elements to grade on the rear façade, which would have a high visibility from Franklin Square.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Shay stated they added a lot of details since the height/mass submittal, which he felt added a lot to the building. He said they added the vertical elements on the façade to create a more explicit rhythm of pilasters. He said what they did close to street level was to use the highest performance and most expensive materials. He said up higher where it was not going to be discernible they used the stucco that was the same color as the cast stone. As far as the parapet they studied the pattern of parapets in the district and found that they were usually highly articulated. However, they did not feel there was a real attempt to overshadow or upstage the Guchenheimer building. He stated they spent a lot more attention on the rear façade than when the Radisson was designed. However, it would still have to relate to the lane. He said what they tried to do was to introduce the most pronounced and architecturally relieved articulated façade to that side. He said they felt although that was not the prettiest of the four elevations that it was clearly much more than just backside.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Neely stated as a point of clarification he would think that a building would eventually be built between Franklin Square and the rear of this building, so this façade would be shielded.

Ms. Seiler stated she loved the building, but the only thing that was of concern to her was the sign graphics.

Mr. Shay stated that was not intended as the final signage. He said it would be better than that when he comes back for signage.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Forston-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with lighting and signage to be brought back to Staff. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion and it was passed 7 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Ms. Brownfield.

**RE: Continued Petition of Poticny Deering Felder
John Deering
HBR 03-3144-2
1 West Jones Street
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

John Deering recused himself.

Present for the petition was John Deering.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting height and mass approval for alterations and additions to the property at 1 West Jones Street. A number of design changes have been made in response to Review Board concerns at the previous meeting.

The alterations and additions are as follows:

1. Reconfigure the existing one story shop on the West one half of the lot to be four stories, separated from the existing historic structure by a four-foot alley, 36' deep.
2. Add a stoop to the main house and replicate on the new addition.
3. Reconfigure existing one story addition on the Bull Street side to be two stories with a 3' inset for 18' behind the existing three-story addition. Reduce width of lane structure by 10' and add a fire stair in this space.

FINDINGS

1. The existing site is non-conforming with regard to building lot coverage.
2. The petitioner has provided a written statement concerning how the alterations and additions meet the Standards.
3. Regarding height, the new addition is one foot lower than the main house. It may be more consistent that they be the same height.
4. There are some existing corner lots in the vicinity of this proposed developed which have over time been almost 100% developed. 101 West Jones was built as a commercial structure and still retains commercial uses; 412 Whitaker Street and 22-24 West Taylor Street have both commercial and residential. 402 Bull was built as a commercial structure and retains a commercial use and 2-4 East Jones Street which was institutional and professional in more recent times and is now institutional-office.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of Part I Height and Mass based on the changes made in response to previous comments and precedent for dense lot coverage on corner lots within a one-block radius of this development. Also the proposed addition does not touch the west wall of the main historic house. Continue for all material, color and design detail.

Petitioner Comments:

Mr. Deering stated there were some principle design changes made since the first proposal. He said the 2½-story structure was over the existing 1 story that was there now. Also, this particular area was setback as it is at present. He said they changed both of those features. It is now a 2-story structure that reflected a carriage house structure. He said there was an open space and then there was a 2-story existing carriage house, which they were maintaining and will restore. He said the 4 story and 3 story structures that were at the corner of Bull Street and Jones Street will also be restored. The stoop will be put back based on historic photographs. He said they thought after responding to Staff's comments in the last write up and other input from the public that this particular portion would be best served designed as a townhouse that would front Jones Street very much like the other townhouses on Jones Street. He said he could go through all of the visual compatibility criteria and the development standards criteria and how it met each one of the criteria, but it was included in the Board's packets.

He further stated the Bull Street side of the structure was very much as it is at present. He said for the materials they were thinking of stucco and wood windows and details. He added that all the details would follow the visual compatibility criteria and the other standards in the Ordinance.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff asked how did he intend to treat the 4' X 36' gap between the two buildings on ground level?

Mr. Deering stated at ground level there is a lane that would probably be brick paved with some thin strips of planting along the side. He said the main reason they did this was to maintain the existing windows on the historic structure, so that none of them were obscured.

Ms. Brownfield stated she felt the front looked so much better than it did last time. However, she was still concerned about the massing being visually incompatible with the neighborhood. The 4-story height she felt envisioned a 75 percent lot coverage. She said it was almost like two wrongs to her did not make a right. The lot has been over built all these years as it is now with nothing on it.

Mr. Deering stated yes, that the lot has been over built for all these years and they wanted to maintain the lot coverage that exists. But that was not something that the Board really should be talking about at this meeting. He said he felt they have handled the mass of the proposed additions very sensitively with the respect to the street and streetscape.

Ms. Brownfield asked if someone could come along in a couple of years and add 4-story height to the building across the street?

Mr. Deering stated he felt with the permission of this Board that was a possibility. However, they were not speaking of Mr. Smith's present building either.

Ms. Brownfield stated she felt the decision was being based on an economically driven perspective rather than aesthetics.

Mr. Deering stated even though the Board does not address economics in this meeting the Board had to still look at that it met the criteria in the ordinance, which was the goal in going back and redesigning the project.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated last time they presented eight units. He asked how many units were being proposed now?

Mr. Deering stated the unit-mix was still being worked out by the developer.

Mr. Mitchell asked if there was an error on the site plan where it showed the alley it said 22?

Mr. Deering stated that was a site plan representing the existing conditions.

Public Comments:

Mr. Dirk Hardison (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF wanted to make clear that they were not questioning the owners or designers as was mentioned last time and concede that the revised design was superior to the original submittal as far as visual compatibility. However, HSF respectfully disagreed on one major point. Letter J, page 8 of the ordinance considering the scale of the building. He said unfortunately the loss of a 75 percent lot coverage restriction resulted in the 4 story addition continuing too far back on the lot causing the overall building mass to be too large in relation to the general historic pattern of residential development along Jones Street. This was particularly regrettable due to the importance of this antebellum structure that once stood apart from its neighbors as a reminder of its role as a dignified home to a high status occupant. He said it survived the worst of times only to now fall in line as just another building in a line of buildings as it never had to before. He said HSF regretted the loss of the historic nature of this property and the dilution, however slight, of the historic aesthetic of the Bull Street corridor.

Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF was also concerned with the over massing of this building on the site. HSF pointed out the size of a structure that could be built (on projector) if this were a vacant lot of 60' X 100' square feet. Given, the 75 percent lot coverage would require a 25 foot wide garden under the ordinance where you would have a 20 foot carriage house in the back 2 stories tall, you could build 2400 square feet of structure on the lane. And the main structure would be 4 story at 3300 square feet a story or 13,200 square feet. He said if you were to add that all up, you would have total structures of 15,600 square feet. He said HSF felt if you took the site plan as part of the package the total building is 18,268 square feet or 2600 square feet more than would be allowed here if this were a vacant lot. He said HSF felt that was the over building and why they felt this submittal should be turned down.

Petitioner Response:

Mr. Deering stated he respectfully disagreed with Historic Savannah Foundation. He said there were many lovely historic houses that have had structures built next to them. He said the lot coverage was grandfathered and was a zoning issue and that the Board was only considering the visual compatibility issues. He said the scale/mass of this particular infill was not any different than many of the other structures along the street.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Neely stated one possible solution to reducing the mass would be to reduce on the rear of the new building, which would be on the west side to reduce the rear of it no deeper than the existing building. He said if you look at the model the existing step down building, if the new building mimics that in scale it would be less imposing and less overall mass. He said he felt it

would not overshadow the existing historic building on the corner. He said that maybe something the petitioner could consider.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated in his view the Jones Street elevation revised had more compatibility than before, in that most of the Jones Street residences going down the block and into other blocks had full elevations. The one story element that was there now was out of sync he felt in compatibility. He said he concurred with the presentation on the Jones Street elevation.

Mr. Neely asked the Board if there were any comments to his suggestion?

Mrs. Waring stated she did not think the Board should redesign the architects project.

Mr. Gay stated that would seem preferable what was suggested, but was not sure that it was practical.

HDBR Action: **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition for Part I – Height/mass because the petition was in compliance with the visual compatibility criteria and standards as set forth in the Historic District Ordinance. Mrs. Waring seconded the motion and it was passed 5 – 3. In favor of the motion were Mr. Meyerhoff, Mrs. Waring, Dr. Johnson, Mr. Neely, and Ms. Seiler. Opposed to the motion were Ms. Brownfield, Mr. Gay, and Mr. Mitchell.**

**RE: Petition of Digital One Wireless
 David Merrill
 HBR 04-3148-2
 1 East Broughton Street
 Sign**

Mr. Neely recused himself from the petition.

Present for the petition was David Merrill.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a principal use sign for a new business at 1 East Broughton Street.

FINDINGS

1. As proposed, the signage would be as follows: 18” individual black aluminum lettering with text “DigitalOne Wireless,” with a span of 13’; 14” red and black plastic logo with text “verizon wireless, authorized retailer,” with a span of 8’.
2. The sign will be located in the fascia area, above the green awning and below the second floor windows. The bottom of the proposed sign is 14’ ¼” from the sidewalk.
3. No lighting is proposed.
4. There are existing signs on the East Broughton Street façade of the building, composed of 10” individual mounted aluminum letters and contain one line of text. The proposed sign is inconsistent with the existing signage for the building.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the signage be reduced to 10" in height to be consistent with existing signage on the building, and that all the text be located on one line.

Board Comments:

Ms. Brownfield stated Staff recommends that all the text be located on one line, but what the Board had was two lines.

Mr. Webb stated as proposed the petitioner had it on two lines, but what Staff was recommending was that they reduce the height and put everything on one line. Staff showed a revised drawing showing the change as recommended.

Mr. Deering asked if they had seen the revised drawing?

Mr. Webb stated no, the petitioner brought it with him to the meeting.

Petitioner Comments:

Mr. Merrill stated they have agreed on the changes as recommended by Staff.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Seiler stated she felt the Board get the signs fixed and now the lettering on the building may seem to be another issue. She felt it was something the Board needed to address because now the signs were fixed, but now she felt there will be a multitude of different letters and fonts on the buildings, which would be another problem.

Mr. Deering stated he somewhat agreed and felt that signs all through the district were going all over the place, but there were no graphic standards. He said there were size, height, width limits, and those sorts of things, but every person's business would want a different representation. He said if all the signage on the buildings were the same it would be a more attractive building from that standpoint, but he did not know if the Board could not approve this petitioner's sign. He said it maybe something that Board needed to take a look at

HDBR Action: **Mr. Deering made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended based on it was visually compatible in size with the other signage on the building and met the standards set forth in Historic District and Broughton Street Signage Ordinance. Mrs. Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Second St. Luke's Baptist Church
Dirk Hardison, Agent
HBR 04-3149-2
622 – 624 Ruben Court
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of alterations as follows:

Remove rear restroom additions. North rear door to remain fixed in place with steps removed. Reside with wood siding to match existing.
Add 1 ¼ “ wood pickets to front porches at 5” o.c.
Replace exterior doors with 6-panel wood doors;
Infill between brick piers with cmu curtain wall with smooth stucco finish painted black-green.
Any replaced windows to be wood, single pane, double hung to match existing.

FINDINGS

This double cottage was built in 1884 for a blacksmith with the Central of Georgia Railroad.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval with the condition that the cmu foundation infill be recessed so that the brick piers “read”.

Petitioner Comments:

Mr. Hardison stated they accepted Staff’s recommendation that that brick piers “read.” He also stated that the cottages were originally purchased to be demolished for parking and the Church decided on there own to integrate their future plans and become stewards of these buildings.

Board Comments:

Mr. Deering stated one of the corner photographs showed that the siding did not line up, which was a charming feature. He asked if they could ensure that when they replaced the siding it would be nice if they did the same thing, so it did not look new.

HDBR Action: **Mrs. Fortson-Waring** made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the c.m.u. foundation infill be recessed so that the brick piers “read”. **Ms. Brownfield** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Dirk Hardison, Agent for
Richard Mopper
HBR 04-3150-2
612 Barnard Street
New Construction – Part I & Part II**

Present for the petition was Dirk Hardison.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a new carriage house for 612 Barnard Street.

FINDINGS

The proposed carriage house would serve the main house facing Barnard Street, which is a two-story, with raised basement, wood residence, with a hipped roof. Access to the carriage house would be from Howard Street.

1. Height: The height for the proposed two-story, carriage house is 21' to the eaves. The main house has a height of 30' 1 ½" to the eaves. An adjacent existing carriage house has a height of 21' to the eaves. The height is visually compatible.
2. Setback: The carriage house will align with other existing buildings on Howard Street. The setback is compatible.
3. Width/depth: The carriage house will be 28' in width fronting Howard Street, and will have a depth of 24' into the rear yard. These dimensions are visually compatible to the adjacent area.
4. Floor-to-floor height: Each floor of the proposed carriage house will have 10' exterior expression of floor heights.
5. Roof: A hipped, composite shingle roof is proposed for the carriage house, which is visually compatible.
6. Material: Hardiplank siding is proposed for the exterior of the carriage house. The Hardiplank will be smooth finished, with a 5" lap. All trim will be painted wood. Wood dentil molding will be used at the eaves.
7. Windows and Doors: All windows for the carriage house will be Kolbe and Kolbe double-hung, true-divided-light, wood windows with a two-over-two pane configuration, with the dimensions of 2'8" wide and 4"8" tall. A four panel wood door with a single pane wood transom is proposed for the Howard Street façade. The door will be on the left side of the façade, due to the location of a tree on Howard Street.
8. Garage doors: Two, sectional wood overhead garage doors with traditional carriage door trim are proposed. The garage openings are each 9' wide and 8' tall. The garage doors will be located next to one another.
9. Fence: A 7' wood plank fence with gates will enclose the property. A section of the fence was provided by the petitioner.
10. Other: Utility meters and trash receptacles will be located behind the fenced area and not visible from Howard Street.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated 612 Barnard Street appeared to have a separate unit on the top floor with a fire stair coming down towards Howard Street, which would be in the way of this proposed carriage house. He asked how did they propose to address the fire stair?

Mr. Hardison stated the back portion of the house was not going to be a separate unit and the fire stair will be taken off and the balcony simply repaired to match the rest of the balcony that was already there.

Mr. Deering asked as a point of clarification so that the door was being moved if you are looking at the drawing to what was shown there?

Mr. Hardison stated yes.

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

RE: Request for Extensions

RE: Staff Reviews

1. **Petition of Richard Fogaley**
HBR 04-3146(S)-2
509 Tattnall Street
Window/Door Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. **Petition of Elaine Berk**
HBR 04-3147(S)-2
536 – 538 East Gaston Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

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

Mrs. Reiter stated she referred the issue that was brought up about the wall at Whitaker and Jones to the City Inspections Department because it has not been reduced yet.

Mrs. Reiter stated they also have developed a computer work sheet that they can pull from Lotus Notes all the approved projects with a file number. She said Staff will fill out the computer sheets by hand, the date of final decision, conditions of the decision, amendments and conditions, and any Staff items of when they come in, building permit approval, and field check. She said they would also be able to put comments about whether or not it matches what was approved. She said once they catch up they will be able to do it each month.

Mr. Deering asked how many years would they go back?

Mrs. Reiter stated in this case it would be 13 months because they went back to the beginning of 2003.

Dr. Caplan asked if this would be an ongoing project?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

RE: Report on Items Deferred to Staff

Mrs. Reiter stated when they fill out the information previously discussed they will provide a report to the Board.

RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements

RE: Approval of Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – January 14, 2004

Ms. Brownfield stated she had some corrections. She said on page 22 it said Ms. Seiler said she would like to state that she has a lot of respect for Mr. Deering and his capabilities.

She further stated that she is concerned... She would like to note that she (Ms. Brownfield) made this statement.

Ms. Brownfield also stated on Page 22 that Ms. Seiler did not **state 75% would be ideal. She would like to note that she (Ms. Brownfield) made this statement.**

Ms. Brownfield stated on Page 24 it said Ms. Seiler **stated that economically for someone to make this happen, if they...She would like to note that she (Ms. Brownfield) made this statement.**

Ms. Brownfield stated on Page 25 under Work Performed Without Certificate of Appropriateness there were some that were left off and she would like to make sure they were added back. She said there was a sign that she mentioned at Gaston and Lincoln Streets that was on the sidewalk.

Mrs. Reiter stated she reported it had been removed.

Ms. Brownfield stated okay.

Ms. Brownfield stated on the building at City Market there was banners attached advertising food.

Dr. Caplan stated on the Barnard Street side.

Dr. Caplan asked if there were any additional additions or corrections?

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion to approve the minutes of January 14, 2004 as amended. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Other Business

- I. Unfinished Business
- II. New Business

Mrs. Reiter stated she would like to point out that she has handed out the By Laws to them for their review, so that they could vote on them at the next meeting.

Dr. Caplan stated that they have a copy of the revised By Laws and that the Board has to bring it up at this meeting. He said the next meeting it required a majority vote. He also stated that they have been handed out the changes made to the Procedural Manual at the Board Retreat.

He further stated that it was necessary for the Board to appoint a Parliamentarian. He said Mrs. Fortson-Waring has agreed to serve in that capacity.

Dr. Caplan stated that Mrs. Reiter has handed out some revisions on the application form that will be given to all petitioners. He said they would like for the Board to look at it and offer their opinions, so it could be discussed at the next meeting.

Mr. Deering asked if this was the draft?

Dr. Caplan stated yes.

Mrs. Reiter stated Staff felt that it needed more bulleting and that there was too much paragraphing.

Dr. Caplan stated they wanted to make it absolutely clear what was Part I, Part II, etc. He said Mr. Meyerhoff has been working on the application very diligently over the last month and appreciated his efforts.

Mr. Neely asked if the application addressed the idea about where to put the utility boxes?

Mr. Meyerhoff stated he did not address that on the application. However, he did address location of condensers and air conditioning.

Mr. Deering stated he felt that was good because he did not think a lot of people knew they had to include those.

Mr. Neely stated maybe it could easily be inserted in the section where it states condensers and air conditioning.

Mr. Webb stated his preference would be that the Board look at and make the comments to Staff before the next meeting, so he could incorporate the changes and the Board could vote on the application at the next meeting.

Dr. Caplan stated they were really looking for a comprehensive document with a lot of check off, so that there could be no question as to who does what, who is responsible, what part you are dealing with, for instance Part I, Part II, etc. He said the desire is to make everything as clear, easy, and understandable as possible for all the applicants and the Board.

Dr. Caplan asked Staff if they have made any progress on meeting about the utility boxes?

Mrs. Reiter stated she emailed the City Manager, but she has not heard back from him.

Dr. Caplan stated there was also a recommendation that the Board try meeting with the Mayor again.

Mrs. Reiter stated she needed to get with Swann Seiler to see what dates rooms would be available.

Ms. Seiler suggested to Mrs. Reiter that she gives her the Mayor's dates first because it did not have to be a huge room.

Mrs. Reiter stated she would get with the Mayor's office.

Ms. Brownfield asked on number 6, Certificate of Appropriateness it says "document that a building classified as historic is incapable of earning economic...by a qualified real estate appraiser or structure report by licensed structure engineer if it was enough to have because that was saying that only one or the other could make that determination?"

Mrs. Reiter stated they have not even addressed the demolition section because when the new revisions go before City Council it was going to be different. She said they felt there was no need to address it now because it was going to be changed.

Dr. Caplan stated the Board had discussed the possibility of vacancies on the Board and submitting names to the Mayor and City Council. He said if the Board would please make these suggestions to Staff, so that they could be discussed at the next appropriate time.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring asked if they wanted to submit resumes'?

Mrs. Reiter stated it would be helpful.

Dr. Caplan stated it was also helpful to know if the person would be willing to serve. He said also in the Board's packets there was a brochure that talked about the image of the Board, public relations, etc. He said there were a few changes, but it was still pretty much up to date.

Dr. Johnson stated he felt the minutes of this meeting also needed to reflect the Board's appreciation to Savannah Electric Power Company for allowing the Board to have their retreat at their facility.

Dr. Caplan stated a letter has also been written to Savannah Electric Power Company thanking them.

Dr. Caplan stated in regard to the public relations issue and image issue he would like to appoint a committee or ask a volunteer to make some recommendations to the Board on this issue. He asked if there were any members who would like to volunteer and work on this?

Ms. Seiler, Mr. Neely, and Mr. Deering volunteered.

Dr. Caplan stated that there would be SDRA meeting tomorrow on 714 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. at 6:00 P.M. at the Con Ed Family Resource Center. The announcement is to review and comment on the preliminary land use strategy and zoning framework for the Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard and Montgomery Street corridor development area from Jones Street to 52nd Street.

Ms. Seiler reminded the Board that tomorrow is Georgia Day.

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