

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

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

MARCH 10, 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
Gwendolyn Fortson-Waring**

Members Absent:

Swann Seiler

MPC Staff Present:

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

RE: Call to Order

Dr. Caplan called the March 10, 2004 meeting of the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to order at 2:00 P.M.

RE: Sign Posting

Mr. Deering stated that 24 East Broughton Street did not have a sign today.

Mr. Webb stated the signs were provided and picked up by the applicant.

Mr. Dawson, agent for petitioner, stated they received the signs and posted them on site. He said they were posted behind the storefront in the display window that faced Broughton Street.

The Board agreed to hear the petition.

RE: Consent Agenda

**RE: Petition of Bonnie Sawyer
HBR 04-3153(S)-2
308 East President Street
Window/Door Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of India King
HBR 04-3160(S)-2
203 West Charlton Street
Alteration/Garage Door**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of R. K. Construction & Development
HBR 04-3163(S)-2
121 West River Street
Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDBR Action: Mr. Deering made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Regular Agenda

**RE: Amended Petition of Dawson & Wissmach
Architect
Bryan Harder, Agent
HBR 03-3013-2
9 West Gordon Street
Alteration to Carriage House**

Present for the petition was Bryan Harder, agent for the petitioner.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff Report:

The petitioner is requesting approval to amend a prior approval for 9 West Gordon Street to include converting a garage door to a window on the lane elevation of the carriage house and selection of paint colors.

FINDINGS

Carriage House:

1. As a component of the approved rehabilitation of the main house at 9 West Gordon Street, the carriage house will undergo a complete interior and exterior rehabilitation. The existing left half of the garage will be converted into livable space.
2. The garage door will be removed and infilled with a stucco veneer and a new window.
3. The new window will be a wood, true-divided, double hung window by Kolbe and Kolbe.
4. The window proportions and light pattern will match the existing window configuration of the carriage house.
5. The petitioner provided a wall section of the carriage house façade with the propose window.

Paint Color:

1. The body of the main house and the carriage house will be painted Acrocrete Baywood AC-38. The petitioner provided a sample of the paint color.
2. All existing trim, windows, and wrought iron on the main house will be painted to match their existing colors.
3. The existing windows, doors, and frames on the carriage house will be painted white to match the main house.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval with the condition that the infill be brick, painted to match the existing brick.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if they concurred with Staff's recommendation?

Mr. Harder stated they would like to use stucco, until told otherwise.

Mr. Deering stated it would be more unified if they used brick and painted it, rather than have another material.

Mr. Harder stated there would still be stucco over the garage door's steel header. There also was stucco around the door that went up to the upper floor of the carriage house.

Mr. Gay stated the windows seemed to be out of proportion with the windows and the door that was next to it.

Mr. Mitchell asked if they scaled down on the windows?

Mr. Harder stated the window size resulted from a steel header where the garage door was, so they could not push the window any higher than proposed.

Mr. Deering asked if they used a smaller window if it could be slightly wider? Also, if they could change the light configuration, so that it matched better the light configuration on the upper windows.

Mr. Harder stated they could change it to 2/2.

Ms. Brownfield asked the petitioner for clarification that they have agreed to change the window to 2/2 and that they were in agreement with Staff's recommendation about the infill being brick and painted to match.

Mr. Harder stated if that was what the Board recommended regarding the brick.

HDBR Action: Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review does hereby approve the petition with the following conditions: (1) Window to have 2/2 lights in order to be closer to the size of the existing window panes, and (2) Infill to be brick painted to match the existing brick. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Amended Petition of Dawson & Wissmach
Architects, Neil Dawson, Agent
HBR 03-3068-2
24 East Broughton Street
Alterations**

Present for the petition was Mr. Neil Dawson, agent for the petitioner.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to amend a previously approved application for 24 East Broughton Street. Proposed changes to the front façade include relocation of new cornice, a new building dedication stone, color change for stucco, finish change for metal cornice and trim, and a new awning.

FINDINGS

1. During the ongoing rehabilitation of the front façade, unknown historic decorative elements were discovered, including cast stone bands and a metal steel beam with decorative medallions. The petitioner is proposing to keep these features, which would lead to relocating the prior approved new lead-coated copper cornice. The new cornice will be raised above the existing steel beam, just below the second floor windows. The new cornice will be 2'2" wide. The existing awning recess that was uncovered during the rehabilitation will be covered with a new decorative metal cornice. The area between the existing steel beam and lower new metal cornice will be stuccoed, and mostly obscured by a new awning. Areas between the existing cast stone bands will be infilled with new brick. The petitioner provided a new elevation and section showing these changes.
2. The decorative metal cornice and trim will change to a natural finish, lead-coated copper rather than the painted aluminum finish in burgundy as approved previously.
3. A new dedication stone is proposed, to be located below the "Charles Lamas" in the façade. The sign will be 1'6" x11'3" and will have a cast stone border with ¾" MDO sign within border. The border color will match the color of the existing stone trim. The type face shall be "Garamond", with 6" tall letters, and the text will read "George Joyner – 1989."
4. The stucco color has been changed from buff to Pittsburgh Paints "Silver Bells #540-4". The petitioner provided a paint sample.
5. The proposed new shed-style, canvas awning will be located above the existing storefront, projecting 4' from the façade, and have a total height of 3'11 ½". Manufactured by Sunbrella, the proposed awning will be black.
6. These proposed changes are visually compatible and meet the ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

Board Comments:

Mr. Dawson stated for clarification the owner in a fax to him yesterday afternoon ask that the date be dropped after his name, which he felt was good because it just added confusion as when things were built. He said the owner also asked that instead of mdo inside of cast stone banding that the entire piece be made out of a cast stone.

Mr. Deering asked if he knew where the halogen lights would be placed because he just pointed to the cornice.

Mr. Dawson stated originally they thought they had room to mount them, but it was a moot point.

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

**RE: Petition of John Bauer
HBR 04-3161-2
42 – 44 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.
Sign**

Present for the petition was John Bauer.

Mr. Webb gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to erect a principal use sign at 42-44 M.L.K., Jr. Blvd.

FINDINGS

1. 42-44 M.L.K., Jr. Blvd is a non-rated building within the Landmark District.
2. The proposed fascia sign will be constructed of Alumacorr, and a sample was provided by the petitioner.
3. The sign will be located under the existing awning, to the left of the main door, and mounted with 3 ½" x ¼" masonry screws.
4. The sign will be will be 15' x 16", and have a square footage of approximately 19 square feet.
5. The sign will be white with black lettering.
6. The text, in New Roman Bold type set, will read "Savannah Pizza Company." The letter height will be 10".
7. The proposed sign meets the Historic District Sign Ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval.

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

**RE: Petition of Edwin Swift
HBR 04-3162-2
214 West Boundary Street
Parking Lot Attendant Booth/Signs & Lighting**

Present for the petition was Edwin Swift.

Mrs. Reiter gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval to

1. Place a miniature trolley as a parking lot security booth on private property in the north west corner at the West Boundary Street entrance to the parking lot. It will be 8' x16' and will have Old Town Trolley logos and signage on it.
2. Erect a principal use free standing internally illuminated sign in front of the business. The sign face is 4'x6' wide and will be 8' in total height including posts. The posts are 6" diameter poles. The material is lexan in an aluminum cabinet. Colors are green, orange and white.
3. Erect a principal use free standing internally illuminated principal use sign on the corner of Oglethorpe and West Boundary Streets. The face of the sign is 4' x 6' with a 3'x6' internally illuminated sign below for two additional eating establishments that will be located within the structure. The material is lexan. The eating establishment sign has an illuminated white background with two logos. It will be 20 feet tall in total. It is attached to 10" diameter poles.
4. The existing perimeter lighting poles are to be painted. No color given. It is also understood that the lamps are to be changed. No design presented.

FINDINGS

Standards:

1. The site is zoned B-C. Internally illuminated signs are permitted in B-C zones, however the use of reverse silhouette or "cut-out" letters is encouraged in order to reduce glare where back lighting is applied. The "milk-glass look is discouraged. Both signs are within the permitted square footage and height allowed.

Compatibility Factors and Guidelines

1. The Historic District Guidelines state that "Signage should consider the pedestrian nature of the Historic District. Artistic graphic or hand crafted identification signs are appropriate. Signs should be indirectly lighted. Monument signs are more compatible than taller signs...plastic faced signs are not appropriate in the Historic District." The welcome center-food court is situated at a gateway to the local historic district and a few blocks from the National Historic Landmark District. The national importance of this historic district should be reflected in the signage leading into it. A 20 foot high sign is inappropriate at the entrance to the Historic District. Indirectly lighted monument signs are more appropriate than plastic faced internally illuminated signs

Other:

1. The proposed attendant's booth is on wheels and not permanently affixed to the ground. Please provide a written statement from the Department of Inspections that a parking lot attendant's booth can be movable.
2. There is an unapproved chain link fence shown in the photos and on the drawing. Chain link fences are not compatible in the Historic District.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Revise signs to be indirectly lighted with a material other than plastic. Use monument style sign. Reconsider background color on the Subway-Taco Bell sign to better blend with the other signs.
2. Provide color of light poles and design and intensity of any new lamp heads.
3. Remove the chain link fence.
4. Provide letter from Inspections that the movable parking lot attendant's booth is allowed in this zoning district. Approve use of trolley design as a booth with removal of all signage except any referring to parking. No tour ticket sales are permitted from this ancillary structure.

Board's Comments:

Mr. Deering asked if the taller sign was located on West Boundary Street?

Mrs. Reiter stated, yes at the corner of Oglethorpe and West Boundary Street. Mrs. Reiter stated that the monument sign is located on the corner and the tall sign is in front of the building.

Petitioner's Comments:

Mr. Ed Swift, Director of Operations for Historic Tours of America located in St. Augustine, Florida as well as Savannah. He stated in reference to the parking lot booth, there were similar booths around the City, which is why he selected this style. He stated that he also has one in the Historic District of St. Augustine. He stated that there are some trolley styles as well as a regular kiosk booth that is movable. The booth will serve for security purposes. They have about 50 parking spaces. At one point they had a problem with vagrants on the property. When they first came onto the property there were a few people sleeping behind the dumpster area which will have to remain since this will be a food court as well as a welcome center. Only about 500 square feet of the building will be the welcome center and they will sell the tickets inside the building.

He said there will be four different food vendors on the inside of the building. One of the challenges in getting four or five different vendors in a building is making sure you have enough signage for the outside of the building to make it viable for them to operate. They have 85 seats of common area along with the restrooms that will also be common area. If they don't have dividing walls they will not be allowed the extra signage basically. They decided to take the signage that they have and use the two anchor tenants to try to draw people in as well as the welcome center. There will be two tenants with no actual signage on the outside of the building, which is a hard sell when trying to lease space. He asked that the Board consider the signage that they are looking at. The proposed colors are the company colors. The colors are trademarked and no one else can use them on a trolley vehicle. They would like to tie this into what is being done on the property. The roof of the Howard Johnson's has been historically orange for a very long time and that is what is going to remain. It will match the signage and the proposed booth. The proposed sign does meet the height requirement and is smaller than the allowable square footage. The illuminated sign is in the car traffic path of the people coming over the Talmadge Bridge. To put a monument sign down low when the bridge is located up high would be even more of a disaster.

Mr. Swift stated that the last issue is the lighting. He stated that he honestly did not notice the spillage into the street and he hopes that Savannah Electric can adjust the lighting. He said Savannah Electric suggested the liberty style 16 foot post, which he has with him for the Board to see. He the Liberty one on the front of the property on West Boundary would be on the

Monterey post. The other ones that were 35 foot, which lighted the parking lot would be on the fiberglass post, which was the Calhoun.

Board Comments:

Mr. Meyerhoff asked for clarification on number 2, nature of request, it says erect a principle use freestanding internally illuminated sign in front of the business. He said the sign face was 4 X 6 and will be 8 feet in total height including post.

Mr. Swift stated that was not true.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if that was B?

Mr. Swift stated this one was the principle use sign and will be on West Boundary Street and the monument sign was on the corner.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it also said that it was 4 X 6, but neither one of the drawings indicated anything that was 4 X 6.

Mrs. Reiter stated the sign man faxed the revised sizes.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the sign at the corner was 4 feet high and 6 feet wide?

Mr. Swift stated yes.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the other one was 4 X 6 at the top and 3 X 6 below that, which was in front of the building?

Mr. Swift stated yes.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it appeared to him that it was sort of conflicting to have a 4 X 6 sign in front of the trolley, which would block the view of the trolley. He asked why he could not have the sign on the trolley, so that it would be more congruent?

Mr. Swift stated he never considered that.

Ms. Brownfield stated she agreed. She asked if this was their sign on the trolley that sits there?

Mr. Swift stated the front part of it was supposed to act as a security booth.

Ms. Brownfield stated she also was concerned that as people came across into Savannah and they were on Oglethorpe Avenue, that it says Welcome Center and how confusing that was going to be for people who were actually looking for the Visitor's Center.

Mr. Swift stated there were already two welcome centers across the street. He said they owned numerous Welcome Centers around the country and it was a common name that people used for basically the same thing.

Dr. Johnson asked what was the size of the revised sign that will carry the logos of the food court?

Mr. Swift stated 3 X 6.

Dr. Johnson asked if he was asking for a larger sign?

Mr. Swift stated no.

Mr. Mitchell stated he felt due to the design of the trolley itself, he did not think the petitioner would be able to put a sign on the mock up of a trolley.

Ms. Brownfield stated she agreed with Mr. Meyerhoff. She said she did not see why this small 4 X 6 sign could not fit on the side of that.

Mr. Swift stated he would need to think about it, as well as measure to see if it fit.

Mr. Deering asked if this was considered a structure?

Mrs. Reiter stated it was her understanding that a structure had to be tied down. She said this was on wheels.

Mr. Deering stated he felt the Board could not really object to the size of either of the signs, which met the requirements of the Ordinance. However, because other people had plastic signs did not mean that he could not do better and have the background opaque, so that only the letters were lit at night and not the entire plastic face. He said he felt that would be an improvement. He said the other lighting fixtures were fine. If he wanted to do something interesting and whimsical he would not suggest using this particular trolley. He also suggested that he may want to take cues from the other historical architecture that exists in the railroad district. He said there were many fine brick structures. And the entrance to the real Visitor's Center on M.L.K. Jr., Blvd. had little guard booths at each corner. He said if he took some cues from that and did something that was really more permanent, interesting, and appropriate to the dignity of the district, he felt that it would be far better than using this trolley.

Mr. Swift stated he understood. He said when he first got into this process he asked questions and he would not have spent money to build it if he had thought he was going to be before the Board today. He said his understanding was that the different booths as long as they were roll-away booths were allowed. He further stated that his intent was for it to have a duo purpose for sitting, so that people could wait for the trolley, as well as a security booth.

Mr. Deering stated he still felt there was a better architectural solution.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that he would suggest that if he was going to have the trolley, rather than having it on the corner, to have it closer to the building. He said it would have the same visibility and it would connect to the building.

Mr. Swift stated he could make it a permanent structure if that is the way he is instructed. He said he has only been in the City for about nine months and has asked a lot of questions, which in some instances were hard to get answers. However, he would be more than happy to make it a permanent structure closer to the building.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the question as to whether this is a structure or not has to be answered by City Inspections. He said he may need a continuance in order to think this through and have some other concepts and ideas.

Mr. Swift asked if he should try to make it a permanent structure?

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Board did not know the answer. He said he felt if he talked to the Inspections department it would help him to make that decision. He said with all these possibilities, he may want to continue his petition.

Mr. Swift stated sure.

Ms. Brownfield stated she agreed with Mr. Deering and Mr. Meyerhoff. She said it looked like a permanent structure. She said it looked to her as if there is a permanent structure and still a Howard Johnson's restaurant. She said what Mr. Meyerhoff suggested about putting this particular structure closer to the Howard Johnson's, she would think that the correlation would be better for him in advertising than having it look like this booth that sits there separate from Howard Johnson.

Mr. Swift stated he understood.

Ms. Brownfield asked if he would consider something liked Mr. Deering mentioned about something a little different at the corner?

Mr. Swift stated it really served the purpose for seating. And it also served the purpose that it has an office. In addition there was no seating in the Welcome Center, which was about 500 square feet, so you could not actually see the trolley. Therefore, he wanted them to wait outside. He said the importance with the trolley loop was they were on an 1½ hours schedule and they wanted to be able to give a tourist a schedule and if the people were not there waiting to get on/off in an exact spot it made it extremely difficult to run the schedule and for the tourist to get around the City.

Mr. Deering stated there were architectural solutions that could serve for both his booth and seating area.

Mr. Neely asked the petitioner if he had any comments to the suggestions related to the modification of the material of the sign?

Mr. Swift stated that was fine with him.

Mrs. Reiter stated in reference to signage she felt that the foot of the bridge was beginning to look like Abercorn Extension. She said she felt the Thunderbird sign would probably go at some point and the signs across the street were not in the Historic District. She said she felt at some point the Board needed to make the signs come down to a one story level than to keep going on and on with different heights.

Mr. Swift stated it was still a commercial use and had to be viable. He said to have the small signs and five tenants inside a food court was very difficult and he would probably have a difficult time renting the other two spaces because he had no signs for them.

Dr. Johnson stated signs on the exits on the highway were no bigger than this and they would sometimes have a significant number of logos on them.

Ms. Brownfield suggested that he ride over onto Hilton Head because all of Hilton Head had small signage and people were able to find everything they needed with regard to food, gasoline, motels, or whatever.

Mr. Deering stated he agreed with Mrs. Reiter that the Board did not have any control across the street.

Dr. Caplan asked what were the color of the poles?

Mr. Swift stated black. He added that one was made of fiberglass and the other was a composite material.

Dr. Caplan stated Mrs. Reiter raised a question about removing the chain link fence.

Mr. Swift stated it was for safety purposes and would be removed after construction.

Public Comments:

Mr. Bill Stube (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated HSF concurred with Mrs. Reiter that a 20 foot high sign was not visually compatible in the Historic District. He said HSF felt that monument signs, such as when you found when you went to Hilton Head were much more appropriate. He said HSF felt that because there were existing signs there that did not mean that there should be more. HSF felt that it was important the signs be toned down and not continue to be allowed to proliferate. Also, HSF was concerned about the colonial style lighting fixtures, which were not visually compatible with the Howard Johnson style building.

Discussion:

Mr. Neely asked Mrs. Reiter whether on the grounds of visual compatibility, the Board could not approve a 20 foot sign even though the Ordinance allowed it?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes.

Mr. Deering stated he felt that visual compatibility in this petition could be questioned because even though it was not in the district, there were 20 foot tall signs and taller all around it. He said he agreed with the Board that they were necessarily appropriate, but they were there. And if you are talking about visual compatibility the Board would be lying to themselves if they said the sign was not visually compatible.

Mr. Neely stated it was with the rest of the district.

Mr. Deering stated once you get beyond M.L.K., Jr., Blvd. it would be easy to say that it was not visually compatible.

Mr. Gay stated he felt the Board was dealing with the Historic District period.

Mr. Deering stated he understood that, but if you read the Ordinance and Guidelines it says – “to the things to which it is related.” And it is related to the site that was here and not four or five blocks up Oglethorpe.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated in light of the fact that the petitioner was willing to reconsider the moving of the trolley and/or the sign closer to his building and had some questions about what he has presented, he felt the Board should ask the petitioner if he would like a continuance, so he could consider some of these other thoughts before the Board makes a decision.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated she did not have a problem with the location.

Mr. Deering stated he felt that with the right architectural guidance he could have a monument sign on some sort of structure that was both his gate house and a seating area and could be far more successful than anything he has begun with so far and get a lot more attention

Dr. Caplan asked the petitioner if he would like to ask for a continuance?

Mr. Swift stated when he referred to a continuance earlier he was talking about the security booth. He said he would really like to get the lights and signage approved. He said the problem was if he continued they were looking to open in approximately 45 days – 60 days and he would like to have signs when he opened, so he would like a vote on the other two items if the Board could.

Dr. Caplan stated the Guidelines stated that if you ask for a continuance the Board has to specify what items a continuance addresses.

Mr. Swift stated yes, if they just ask for a continuance on the booth he was fine. But the other two he would like a vote.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated if you are going to ask for a continuance then he felt it should be a continuance on the booth and the sign adjacent to the booth and leave the other items for passage concurrently.

Mr. Swift stated he was willing to do that on the monument sign in the front that was near the booth. He said he felt as long as he had one sign he felt he could open his business.

Mr. Neely stated he felt the Board was still undecided on the height and had mixed feelings on a 20 foot high sign.

Mr. Gay stated he felt that it was important to point out that if he has a continuance for the booth the others come up for a vote right now. And there was a real question as to whether they would be approved.

Mr. Deering pointed out that if he did not win the vote necessary for approval then he would have to bring back those items to the Board.

Mr. Swift stated he understood.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the lighting portion of the petition and continuance of the two signs and trolley as to size and location.

Mr. Swift stated he did not want a continuance on the larger sign because he needed that one to open his business.

Mr. Deering stated he did not think there was any one on the Board that was willing to make a recommendation to approve the signs, lighting, and trolley booth. He said Mr. Meyerhoff was only willing to make a motion to approve the lighting.

HDBR Action: Dr. Johnson seconded the motion.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring suggested that instead of making a motion to approve a specific part of the petition, that the Board move to continue as to certain aspects. She said approving part of a motion and then continuing in the same motion was very confusing. She said if you continue as to the things that you want to change then she believed that the Board's policy or procedural manual states – "that we are not going to come back on those things that are not to be changed." She said she felt if the Board specified the things that they wanted the petitioner to come back to then that might make a cleaner motion.

Ms. Brownfield stated in consideration of this conversation it could be that taking Mr. Deering's advice about getting a total design for the total project that the petitioner may decide his lighting would even be different. So, she would be reluctant to even ask the Board to vote on approving the lighting separate from the total design package. Perhaps the petitioner wanted to consider continuing the petition and come up with a total project.

Mr. Swift stated because of the construction schedule it would be easier for him if the Board approved the lighting or if the Board told him to use a different light fixture, he would. He said if the problem were the ones in front of West Boundary Street, he was more than willing to use a different one. So, he would like to get the lights approved if the Board liked them. And if the Board did not like them then he would come back with a different design.

Mrs. Fortson-Waring stated the point of her comment was if she wanted to vote in favor of the continuance, but not for the lighting, she have to vote to deny the motion.

Mr. Gay stated if the Board approved the lighting this time nothing would prevent the petitioner once he gets the other scheme (new design) to come back with something different.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated in an effort to help the petitioner out if the Board approved the lighting at this point he could go forward with that. However, in reference to the signage and trolley he felt they all had questions about those items.

Dr. Caplan asked if there was any further discussion?

Ms. Brownfield asked if the motion the Board was voting on could be restated?

Mr. Meyerhoff repeated the motion.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the lighting portion of the petition as amended and continuance of the two signs and trolley as to size and location.

Dr. Johnson stated he seconded the motion earlier, but he would not want to make the second with the continuation. He said he felt there should be two motions.

Dr. Caplan asked if there was a second to the motion because as he understood it Dr. Johnson has rescinded his second.

HDBR Action: The motion failed.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition as to the design of the parking attendant's booth and signs and its height. Dr. Johnson seconded the motion and it was passed 7 – 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Deering.

HDBR Action: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the amended lighting as provided at this hearing. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed 5 – 3. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Deering, Dr. Johnson, and Mrs. Fortson-Waring.

**RE: Petition of Laura Kessler
HBR 04-3164-2
400 Block – East State Street
New Construction – Part I Height/Mass**

The aforementioned petition was continued at request of petitioner.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review continue the petition until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Request for Extensions

RE: Staff Reviews

1. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 04-3151(S)-2
410 East Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 04-3152(S)-2
508 West Jones Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Beauty & Beyond
HBR 04-3154(S)-2
628 M.L.K., Jr., Blvd.
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
4. Petition of SunTrust Bank
HBR 04-3155(S)-2
33 Bull Street
Door Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
5. Petition of Coastal Canvas
Jim Morehouse
HBR 04-3156(S)-2
427 East River Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
6. Petition of Vicki Kleindienst
HBR 04-3157(S)-2
418 East Gordon Street
Color
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
7. Petition of Gonzalez Architects
Jose' Gonzalez
HBR 04-3158(S)-2
15 East York Street
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
8. Petition of Savannah Restoration
Ralph Anderson
HBR 03-3159(S)-2
550 East York Street
Color/Stucco/Window
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

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

Mrs. Reiter reported that the banners were down in City Market. She said 116 East Oglethorpe Avenue had been notified to appear before the Board. She also stated that she had left a message trying to follow up on the demolition of the carriage house on Gordon Lane.

She stated regarding 400 Whitaker Street the petitioner had his building permit. She said this was the petition where the Board requested that the top three blocks be removed from the wall. She said the petitioner says that if he removed the top three blocks he needed to put a cap on the top of the wall, which would be 3 inches and would make it 5'-7" instead of 5'-4". She said if a motion is made she would like for it to have a deadline.

Dr. Caplan asked Mrs. Reiter if the motion stated that this would go back to Staff for approval?

Mrs. Reiter stated the motion stated that the top three courses needed to be removed and the wall to be 5'-4" high. She said she would not be able to sign off on it until that is done. She said the petitioner is asking if it could be 5'-7" with the cap. She said she was asking for a drop-dead date because there were complaints.

HDBR Action: Ms. Brownfield made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the petition as amended to put a 3" cap on the 5'4" wall with the understanding that this will be completed within 6 weeks. Mrs. Fortson-Waring seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

Mr. Neely stated at the rear of 615 Tattnell Street was a wood garden wall, but they have installed industrial warehouse type rollup doors. He suggested that Staff go by and look at it.

Ms. Brownfield asked if Staff could look at the shutters on the house in that same area of Tattnell Street.

Mrs. Reiter stated regarding the shutters she has gotten the person's name and they are working on it.

RE: Report on Items Deferred to Staff

Mrs. Reiter stated there were no items to report.

RE: Notices, Proclamations & Acknowledgements

RE: Other Business

- I. Unfinished Business
- II. New Business

Dr. Caplan stated there were a number of items of unfinished business. The first item is the approval of the Bylaws that were discussed at the Retreat and given to the Board at the last meeting and brought to the Board for action at this time. He said this would take the vote of a majority of the entire Board.

HDBR Action: Mrs. Fortson-Waring made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the Bylaws as presented. Ms. Brownfield seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

Dr. Caplan stated they have been attempting to get a meeting set up with the Mayor, but he has been out of town.

Mrs. Reiter stated she has talked to his office twice and they were working on getting with the Mayor.

Dr. Caplan stated the Board appointed a Public Relations committee with Swann Seiler, John Deering, and John Neely. He asked if they have done anything on this?

Mr. Deering stated he had not.

Dr. Caplan asked Mrs. Reiter if there was any information on the utility box meeting?

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

Dr. Caplan suggested that she email them again.

Dr. Caplan stated the Board has been working on application form revisions and Mr. Meyerhoff has done a good bit of work on this. He said Staff added to it as well. He asked Mrs. Reiter if she had it ready to present to the Board today?

Mrs. Reiter stated yes and that she has given it to the Board if they would like to go over it.

Dr. Caplan stated he felt if the Board could just look at it and maybe make some suggestions would be better.

Mr. Neely asked if they had included requesting on submittals location of utility boxes and air conditioning equipment?

Mr. Webb stated under design approval on page 5.

Mr. Neely asked if they could add utility boxes?

Mr. Webb stated okay. Mr. Webb suggested again that the Board take the application home and look over it and if they find something to go ahead and send it to them, so they could go ahead and incorporate the changes.

Dr. Caplan stated they have requested the names of possible candidates for Board members and Mrs. Reiter had not received any of that information. He said they also requested that they get a CV on these folks.

Mr. Mitchell stated he had a name. He said the gentleman is an architect and professor at SCAD. He said he has been dying to get more involved in the community. He said his name is Gene Hutchinson.

Dr. Caplan stated there was a new program that they were going to initiate. He said it usually takes a month to get the Certificate of Appropriateness signed and mailed to the petitioner. He said they will now start getting a Certificate of Appropriateness out within one week and it will be mailed to the applicant.

RE: Approval of Minutes

1. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes – February 11, 2004

Dr. Caplan stated on page 1, where it says he said the citizen said the date had not been changed on the sign. **He said it should say that the citizen said it had not been promptly changed on the sign.**

Dr. Caplan stated on page 13, other business, **paragraph 2 it should say they have handed out the changes made to the procedural manual at the Board Retreat.**

HDBR Action: Mr. Neely made a motion that the Savannah Historic Board of Review approve the minutes of February 11, 2004 as amended. Mrs. Fortson-Waring 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 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR:ca