

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW  
REGULAR MEETING  
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

APRIL 11, 2007

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Joseph Steffen, Chairman  
Swann Seiler, Vice-Chairman  
Dr. Gerald E. Caplan  
Eric Meyerhoff  
Gene Hutchinson  
Dr. Malik Watkins  
Sidney J. Johnson  
Dr. Charles Elmore

HDRB Members Not Present:

Ned Gay  
Dr. Lester Johnson  
John Neely

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Thomas L. Thomson, Executive Director  
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director  
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner  
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: CALL TO ORDER

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: INTRODUCTIONS

**Mr. Steffen** introduced the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD) Preservation Planning Class and welcomed new Board member Dr. Charles Elmore.

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-07-3784-2  
501 West Bay Street  
New Construction Part I Height and Mass –  
Hotel/Condominium

Request to be continued to May 9, 2007, by the petitioner.

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay  
Patrick Shay  
H-06-3711-2  
217 West Liberty Street  
New Construction Part II, Design for a  
Condominium Building

Request to be continued to May 9, 2007, by the petitioner.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the continued items as presented. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Meyerhoff recused.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Petition of Albert Nordine  
H-04-3190-2  
PIN No. 2-0014-12-012  
405 East Liberty Street  
Fence/Color Change

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Southern Hemisphere Books & Gifts  
H-07-3789-2  
PIN No. 2-0004-41-003A  
Regina Metzger  
41 Habersham Street  
Sign

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Richards Masonry LLC  
Kenneth Richards  
H-07-3790-2  
PIN No. 2-0004-19-002  
17 Price Street  
Fence

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Petition of Paul Robinson  
H-07-3791-2  
PIN NO. 2-0015-45-015  
122 West Jones Street  
Rehabilitation/Alteration

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Consent Agenda items as presented. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

RE: Amended Petition of Poticny, Deering & Felder  
Keith Howington  
H-06-3652-2  
PIN No. 2-0015-28-008  
4 West Liberty Street  
Rehabilitation/Addition

The Preservation officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Keith Howington.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to amend a previous submittal for exterior alterations and additions to the property at 4 West Liberty Street. The following items are being amended from the previous submittal, approved on August 9, 2006:

1. The previously approved side porch addition on the main house will feature double doors on the south and east elevations as per plans submitted. The parlor level entry currently contains double doors to access the porch. The existing historic openings will be maintained.
2. The entrance to the parking area west of the historic house is being relocated to the center of the south wall fronting Liberty Street at the request of the City's Traffic Engineering Department. The change in grade for the vehicular entrance will be accommodated within the drive entry and not within the adjacent sidewalk as previously submitted.
3. The rear wall (north) on the parking structure will extend to the lane to be adjacent with the neighboring property fronting West Perry Lane. Previously, it was setback approximately five feet from the north property line to allow for additional off-street parking spaces. They are now accommodated within the parking structure.
4. The wall will be reconfigured to simulate a carriage house at the lane. It features three 8'-6" wide arched garage openings containing vertical board automatic gates with false window opening above containing fixed louvers and a stucco coping. The overall height is approximately 21 feet tall. Previously approved plans called for a stucco wall with a single vehicular opening with no gate and a wrought iron railing above.
5. A 6'-4" stucco privacy wall is proposed above the parking structure within the interior of the garden and will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building at 4 West Liberty Street was constructed in 1879, and is one of the most well preserved Second Empire style residences in the Landmark Historic District. The historic building maintains a high level of historic integrity having undergone few alterations, with the exception of the ground floor commercial conversion. Both this property and the vacant lot at 8 West Liberty Street are zoned RIP-C (Residential, Institutional, Professional). Historically, the

vacant lot contained a three-story townhouse, which was razed sometime between 1916 and 1954 for a parking lot.

1. **Building Coverage:** Maximum 75 percent in a RIP-C zoning district. It appears that the proposed development is requesting 100 percent lot coverage. The proposed plan is similar to what was previously approved by the Historic District Review Board (HDRB) with the exception of the increased lot coverage by extending the parking structure to the lane.
2. **South Elevation:** The proposed wall at Liberty Street with the central vehicular entrance is similar to what was previously approved by the HDRB. The central entrance and slope within the ramp is more pedestrian friendly than what was previously approved. The opening will feature a wood board-on-board automatic sliding gate.
3. **North Elevation:** The rear wall has been extended to the lane, creating continuity of building walls on the north side of the property. A faux carriage house wall has been created to provide privacy to the garden and to be visually compatible with lane buildings within the Historic District. A second plan featuring a garden wall with an iron fence above has been submitted as an alternative, if the faux carriage house wall is not deemed visually compatible by the HDRB. Wood, board-over-board vertical plank, overhead garage doors are proposed. Garage door openings are approximately 8 feet wide.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval as amended of the “carriage house” wall at the lane because it is visually compatible.** The Historic District Review Board previously approved a similar proposal on this parcel, and Staff finds that the amended proposal is in keeping with the design and layout of the prior submittal. The one-story parking structure is on a 30-foot-wide lot. While staff does not typically support 100 percent lot coverage in an RIP zoning district, the proposed structure is visually compatible with neighboring historic structures in both height and mass and design details. A 25 percent lot coverage variance will need to be obtained by the Zoning Board of Appeals, and the Historic District Review Board will need to make a finding of fact that the proposed development is visually compatible.

**Dr. Caplan** asked what was the previous lot coverage.

**Ms. Ward** stated it was had already exceeded 75 percent, but the applicant could answer when he comes forward. She stated it was very slight because they were shifting the wall five feet toward the lane.

#### **PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Keith Howington** stated the existing lot coverage was about 84 percent, and they had extended it approximately eight or nine feet for a car. Originally, there were two cars that were not covered and the applicant wanted to cover the parking spaces.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked where did they propose to place the trash pick up and the meters.

**Mr. Howington** stated they were on the east side of the east side of the entry, on the side of the Six Pence building, and would remain there.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated they supported the application and the alternative of the two-story wall facing the lane, because it resembled the two-story carriage house that may have been there originally. They thought the lot coverage was justified because green space was not being eliminated but adding green-like space with the second story garden, and hiding parking. They feel they were picking up screening parking that needed to be done more in the Landmark District, commended the architects for the design, and they hope the Board approves the application.

**Mr. Steffen** explained to the SCAD students and the new Board members that the Board was asked to give visual compatibility determinations on how big a project and how big the lot coverage it, but it was up to the Zoning Board of Appeals to decide whether or not they obtain the variance. The Review Board cannot give a zoning variance, but could recommend it's visually compatible.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as amended with the carriage house type rear privacy wall. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**HDBR ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby find that the proposed 100 percent lot coverage is visually compatible, due to the Height and Mass of the addition. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of H. O. Price LLC  
Richard Guerard  
H-07-3785-2  
PIN No. 2-0032-07-001  
342 Drayton Street  
New Construction Part I – Condominiums**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Richard Guerard

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass for a three- and four-story condominium.

**FINDINGS:**

The project meets all the part one height and mass standards.

A nine percent building lot coverage variance will be requested from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The applicant has attempted to mitigate the mass of the structure through a number of devices including multiple entrances, varied heights and setbacks, recessed porches, and shuttered porches. Staff recommends that the Review Board find that this nine percent variance is visually compatible and forward that recommendation to the ZBA.

**The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:**

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone. The R-I-P-A zone allows a maximum 75 percent building coverage.</p>	<p>A seven-foot setback is proposed on the East side. The three-story section is setback 9 to 10 feet in order to allow a planting area. The four story section is set back three to five feet. The applicant is requesting 84 percent lot coverage or a nine percent variance.</p>	<p>The previous structure occupied 80 percent of the lot.</p>
<p>Street Elevation Type: The proposed street elevation type for new construction shall comply with the following: 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. Where the aforementioned conditions cannot be met, the proposed building shall meet the visual compatibility factors.</p>	<p>Three low stoops are proposed. The immediately adjacent dwelling has a low-stoop entrance.</p>	<p>The structure has been divided into a four story and a three-story section. In addition the center entry section of the building has been recessed. This device helps give the impression that this is a multiple entry row and helps to reduce the mass.</p>
<p>Entrances: A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.</p>	<p>The entrance is proposed on Charlton Street.</p>	<p>This standard is met. Multiple entrances have been used.</p>
<p>Building Height: The building is located in a four-story height zone. A basement that is entirely underground; a crawl space or partial basement that is four feet or less above grade...shall not count as a story.</p> <p>For residential buildings the exterior expression of the height of the first story shall not be less than 11 feet. The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet.</p>	<p>The parking has been depressed with only four feet above grade. These four feet do not constitute a story.</p>	<p>The proposed structure meets height map standards.</p> <p>The floor-to-floor height standards have been met.</p>
<p>Large Scale Development: Development whose ground floor footprint is equal to or greater than 9,000 square</p>	<p>The ground floor footprint is approximately 9,911 square feet. The heights are varied in several sections each less</p>	<p>The Large-Scale Development standards are met.</p>

feet is subject to the Large Scale Development standards. These are Large scale development shall be designed in varying heights and widths such that no wall plane exceeds 60 feet in width. Primary entrances shall not exceed intervals of 60 feet along the street.	than 60'. There are three primary entrances not exceeding intervals of 60 feet.	
Proportion of Structure's Front Facade	The proportions of the front facades have been varied so as to appear to be several buildings.	The proportion of height to width is compatible.
Proportion of Openings and Rhythm of Solids to Voids	Rectangular openings, vertically aligned are proposed. The windows have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3 and are vertically aligned. The space between windows is not more than two times the width of the windows.	The rhythm of solids to voids is compatible.
Rhythm of Structure on Street	The three entrances give the appearance of a series of bays.	The width of each section approximates the width of other historic structures on the street.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies	Recessed porches are proposed on the sides with shutters on the west end to suggest the shuttered porches elsewhere on the block. Balconies are proposed on the Charlton Street elevation.	Porches and balconies are typical of this Ward.
Walls of Continuity	It is understood that in the Part II design phase a low fence will be used along the front property line to create a wall of continuity along the streetscape.	
Scale	The scale of the building has been addressed by window groupings, recessed balconies, varied heights and setbacks and varied cornices.	The elements of the building are in scale.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval of Part I Height and Mass and recommend approval of the nine percent lot coverage variance.**

**Mr. Steffen** asked if it was an additional four percent lot coverage from the original structure.

**Ms. Reiter** answered yes.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the east and west elevations should be reversed. He said what was listed as the east elevation was actually the west elevation, and otherwise.

#### **PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Richard Guerard** stated since the last submittal was continued, they had gone through great lengths and expense to redesign for the third or fourth time, and Staff was right because this building turned out much better. He felt it fit in better and that the Height and Mass model depicts how it fits into the area. He said with the help of Staff and others on the elevation, it turned out to be a good-looking building that they were happy with in presenting to the Board today.

**Dr. Caplan** stated he was not present at the last meeting and did not see the previous presentation. He understood it was a tremendous improvement and thanked the petitioner. He said in two or three recent situations the Board made an attempt to allow the big condominiums to merge into the surrounding properties. The individuals complied by taking the highest story and moving it further away from the lower height adjacent properties to phase it down. He asked the petitioner to think about inverting the four- and three-story sections to phase down into the adjacent property. This way the three-story would be closer to the property adjacent and would not overshadow it as much as the four-story property.

**Mr. Guerard** stated they had considered that design, and the reason they chose this design versus the suggestion was the top of the building was roof top gardens for that section of the unit, and for privacy for the sake of the building next door. He did not think they wanted people standing on the rooftop staring at them. He said whatever side the three-story is on versus the four-story was insignificant, but it was just a matter of flipping over the building.

**Dr. Caplan** stated if you look at the model that was not the case because it would still be higher. He said the windows on the backside of the home were obscured now, and would also be obscured by his building, and he did not think people could look down on anyone unless there were skylights. It would be a consideration that would allow them to integrate it into the surrounding neighborhood more appropriately. He asked if the petitioner would consider the suggestion.

**Mr. Guerard** stated he agreed and would consider it.

**Dr. Caplan** stated it would be a better view from the roof garden if you were looking east instead of west, but he was concerned for the square adjacent to it.

**Mr. Guerard** stated flipping it would give a better view of you were looking at the cathedral in the square.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation - HSF)** stated the HSF holds a preservation façade easement on the Battersby house, which is the adjacent historic structure to the east on Charlton Street. He said he had not conferred with Dr. Caplan, but came today to make the same request to the petitioner, and had spoken to the petitioner on the phone yesterday after their Architectural Review Committee (ARC) meeting. They recommended and asked the Board to make it a condition of the approval for reversing the orientation of the two buildings. From the model he said you could see how much more compatible in scale the project would be if the house was next door to the two-story building, and the four-story building



like a book end holding the corner of the block. The larger building would terminate the row, asked the Board to have the petitioner make the change because he thought it would bring the building into compatibility. He said they applauded what the petitioner had done with breaking up the units to look like building segments instead of one mass. That was a problem with the boxes that had been built in the past, felt there were some improvements needed with Design and Details, but they would like to see the buildings reversed.

**Ms. Seiler** asked when Mr. McDonald and Dr. Caplan were talking about doing a flip; she asked what would happen to the shuttered covered porches.

**Mr. McDonald** stated the shuttered porches belong on the interior of the block also. If they were building it they wouldn't want the shuttered porches hanging out over the race track they know Drayton Street was. If it was turned toward the inside of the block, Mr. Hartridge has shuttered porches that turn toward the east, and it would be in keeping of the orientation of that building. He would like to see the shuttered porches remain because they were a softening feature as pointed out by Staff.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she wondered because she frequents Drayton Street also she thought the shutters looked nice on Drayton, but she could see Mr. McDonald's point.

**Mr. McDonald** stated they would look nice but from a use standpoint, they would not be as enjoyable.

**Ms. Louise Howard (National Society of the Colonial Dames of America for the State of Georgia)** stated nationwide they have over 15,000 members, and she represented over 1,400 members in the State of Georgia. She said part of the mission of their society was to preserve and maintain historic houses, and to educate the citizens on the history of the country. Their group was second to the National Park Service in the ownership and maintenance of historic museums and properties that were priceless monuments to the country's past. In Georgia, the combined state headquarters and museum house was the Andrew Low house at 329 Abercorn Street. The lot was purchased in 1847, and Andrew Low II completed the house in 1850. The house stands on a trust lot, bound on four sides by streets, and overlooking the Lafayette Square. It is bounded on the south by Charlton Street and directly across from the proposed condominium. The Low house is part of the historic fabric of Savannah and valuable to the City. Robert E. Lee stayed at the house and special recognition is paid to the bedroom. They understand that Mr. Guerard has a right to the use of his property, but they protest the mass and scale of the design. Parking was limited and 20 parked cars would create a hardship. They felt the congestion and noise that would be created was not in keeping with the ambiance of the quiet and historic neighborhood, and was not in keeping with the history that visitors to the house expect and appreciate. They request further study be done on the project.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the organization took a position in the demolition of the historic façade to the service station that was there previously.

**Ms. Howell** stated she could not answer because she did not know.

**Mr. Steffen** stated demonstrations of support for the speakers were out of order, and if you like or don't like what someone says clapping or booing was not appropriate at a professional meeting. He said the Board deals with historic compatibility, but they do not have any jurisdiction over congestion, noise, or parking. They were not within the Board's purview and they could not make decisions on those considerations.

**Mr. Walter Hartridge** stated that the amount of lot coverage of the previous structure was not relevant to the issue because the building was gone. He said the ordinance states that the mass of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure was visually related. The contributing structures were the Colonial Dames house museum and its carriage house, his residence, the Battersby-Hartridge house next to the proposed structure, and behind it was the property owned by Mr. Claude Dryden, which is a carriage house, a three-story residence, and a house to the east. On the Drayton Street, side was a parking lot owned by EMC Engineering. Should the flipping take place the larger structure would overlook the parking lot, and there wouldn't be an over-shadowing of 119 East Charlton Street, which was subject to a historic preservation façade easement of HSF. The house was regularly open to the tours of Savannah. They have lived there for 26 years, and entreat the Board to adopt the suggestion of Dr. Caplan and Mr. McDonald. Mr. Guerard stated his willingness to comply, but if it was not done there would be a massive structure next to the Battersby house, and across the street from the Low house. If it were flipped, it would not be massive. Regarding the porches, they were present for Height and Mass today, and should leave that issue to the design phase rather than grappling with it today.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that with Height and Mass the Board had been instructed by the experts was that it deals with shrink-wrapping the project. The existence of a structure that protrudes in such a way as a porch would be considered under Height and Mass. What it was built from, the color, the material used comes later in Design Details, but the fact there was a projection at all was something they would consider today under Height and Mass. He said if Mr. Hartridge wanted to address it to go ahead.

**Mr. Hartridge** stated on the east and west end the mass was going to be there. It was an additional factor injected by Ms. Seiler's questions, and they need to consider what the impingement of what and where the porches should be. There are 20 air conditioning units on the roof of the four-story area. They could produce a lot of noise and the sound ordinance was not within the Board's purview and he understood that, but that was why the building should be flipped so the air conditioning units would be near Drayton Street. The three-story parts without a/c units on the roof, the Battersby-Hartridge house overlooking the garden of the Colonial Dames, and facing back toward Mr. Dryden's property in the rear. They oppose the lot coverage but it was not within the Board's purview; he was dealing with the factors. He said in their findings they would find the way it was presented; it was not visually compatible with the contributing structures, which was a criteria in the ordinance. They were not asking the Board to do anything that would produce an adverse opinion from the City Attorney.

**Mr. Steffen** stated if you come to speak on a project, you were not required to answer the questions. He said Mr. McDonald and Ms. Howard were kind enough to do so, and he encouraged people to answer questions from the Board. When you come up to make a comment, if you were the petitioner you will need to answer, for anyone else it was up to you.

**Dr. Caplan** stated it may be premature and not appropriate to discuss the various design items like balconies, porches, and windows. What needed to be done was for Mr. Guerard to bring back the plan with it flipped, and then it could be discussed. He said he could not visualize how it would look until he saw the plans. Any discussion on the other things may be inappropriate at this time.

**Mr. Hartridge** stated he agreed with Dr. Caplan's observation.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated that under Height and Mass it was defined also as the open spaces and articulation of the wall so that balconies were a part of mass because they create a void in the building elevation. Mass was broader than if it were four or three stories. Any discussion on balconies and setbacks of the balconies was part of the mass that would be voted on today.

**Mr. Guerard** stated he did not have a problem with flipping the building.

**Mr. Steffen** stated there were three possibilities raised. He said Dr. Caplan indicated that continuing it was what he wanted, the Board could approve it as submitted, approve it as flipped on the site. The petitioner indicated a willingness to flip it, and they had done it in the past on other projects where the Height and Mass were approved with something being flipped. He did not see anything out of order in respect to Dr. Caplan's suggestion that they could not do it. He said they could, but whether or not was up to the Board.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he wanted to make points for Mr. Guerard to consider when he returns with Part II. He said the open bottom of the staircases on the north elevation had a void, and he thought it would be better to make it solid rather than on pillars. Secondly, he thought there was not enough ventilation in the garage, and it could be addressed when he goes to the Building Department, but he thought they should consider enlarging the amount of ventilation for the 20 cars.

**Mr. Guerard** stated he wanted the Board to vote with the condition of flipping the building because they had spent the last six months redesigning it, and it costs thousands of dollars. Another continuance would cost them another 60 days and it could be handled in Phase II.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the Chairman expressed that the Board could approve the Height and Mass today with the proviso of flipping the building. The Board would see it when they bring in the second phase.

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Caplan made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve Part I with the condition that the plan be flipped so that the four-story portion will be on the Drayton Street end. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the request was correct

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby find that the lot coverage variance request is visually compatible. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion and the motion passed 6 to 1. Ms. Seiler was opposed.

**RE: Petition of Coastal Canvas  
John Casteel  
H-07-3795(S)-2  
PIN No. 2-0004-60-001A  
108 East York Street  
Awning (At the rear of this property.)**

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

Present for the petition was Mr. John Casteel.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to install a ground-supported awning over an outdoor eating area. The awning will be 30 feet by 13 feet 6-inches and attached to the west side of the

carriage house behind the Cluskey Buildings. The color is Coastline Plus “Dawn” (yellow) with red copy on ends “Zunzi’s” and red copy “Zunzi’s” along the valance.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The application indicates the awning will be 30 feet long and the drawings indicate 20 feet.
2. There is a seven-foot by three-foot cut out on the President Street end of the awning. It is not clear what this is for.
3. The single entrance to the business faces York Street. There is an existing principal use sign. An additional awning sign is permitted at the entrance. The proposed awning and its signage are not located at an entrance, but rather on an adjacent parking lot.
4. The bright color of the awning and contrasting lettering, together with its length is visually incompatible with the surrounding historic structures.
5. Although written for sidewalk cafes, Staff recommends that the outdoor eating area conform to the City’s outdoor café ordinance, which does not permit the permanent covering of the eating area. Where this awning is proposed to be located is highly visible from three streets. Staff recommends that if shade were required, that umbrella tables would be more appropriate and consistent with other similar outdoor cafes in the Historic District.
6. Staff has in recent years consistently recommended denial of ground supported awnings. On sidewalks, they can pose impediments to pedestrian passage and on private property or decks, actual past history has been that once they are approved additional requests are received for enclosing, weatherizing, installing fans, televisions etc.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Denial of a ground supported awning.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the Board had jurisdiction over awning tables.

**Ms. Reiter** stated there was a separate ordinance that was handled through the tourism department of the City that handled tables and chairs.

**Mr. Steffen** asked if the petitioner wanted to do that, they did not have to come back to the Board.

**Ms. Reiter** answered no.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if the five names were considered signage or awning design.

**Ms. Reiter** stated if the letters were no more than six inches they could put it on an awning, but she did not think the awning was compatible much less the graphics.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. John Casteel** stated he took complete blame for the discrepancy between 20 and 30 feet and for the cutout. He said he was on his way out-of-town and grabbed the wrong file. It was 30 feet without the seven by three cutouts. The owner wanted to provide covered eating area for the customers to provide shade and protection from the rain. The simplest and cleanest way to support it would be from the ground rather than trying to attach it to the building. He showed a sample of the yellow awning color, which he felt was not as yellow as was suggested. He said they were looking for a way to provide a comfortable area for people to eat, they thought was the proper way to provide it, and requested that it be approved.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if it was possible to have the awning without ground support on a 30-foot-long awning.

**Mr. Casteel** stated they could not solely support it from the building with the projection they have, without an attachment either below or above. They had considered how they could attach it to the building.

**Dr. Caplan** asked what would be the maximum projection that would be acceptable.

**Mr. Casteel** stated seven feet, which was roughly half the projection seen.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if that was not enough.

**Mr. Casteel** stated no, because seven feet away was about the size of one table. He displayed a picture of how it currently looked showing the proposed covered area, and said the awning would be the same color as the awning on the front. There were presently three covered umbrellas, but the concern was they can blow down in the wind, they could be stolen, and they fade faster. They use a more expensive fabric than what was commonly available for umbrellas. It was covering private property and they knew the Board had purview over private property that could be seen from the road, and he reminded the Board that it was still private property.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** stated he loved Zunzi's, that it was a great place, the food was good, and could understand why they wanted to provide seated outdoor dining because it was a walk-in place. He said the HSF holds a façade easement on the building that the owner Paul Robinson donated to them. They completely agree with Staff that it was an inappropriate addition to the building, was highly visible from the public right-of-way, was not the color, and was not the poles supporting it, but that it was visually incompatible with the building. They thought the most simple and temporary solution was the umbrella tables they were using now, and if they want to add more, it was a good thing. They thought it was a dangerous precedent to add covered awnings to buildings, and asked the Board to deny the application.

**Mr. Joe Saseen** stated there were ruined awnings along River Street and said the answer was no. He said the awning takes away from the architecture of the building.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Seiler** stated she would speak in support of findings number six that talks about what the Board had seen happening before was that before they knew it was there would be weatherizing, power and fans added, subsequently televisions, and then it could not be controlled from there with additional weatherizing. She said it was a very popular and good

restaurant, but it again sets a bad precedent and highly visible in that location, and she was for denial of the project.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated there were more than three umbrellas that were multi-colored, and were not pretty because of the multiple colors. He thought a resolution would be a tiered free-standing awning so that it wasn't one continuous surface and look like a part of the building, and if it was a color that was more compatible would be more appropriate. He said it did not have to be the same color as the entrance awning, but a more muted color. He did not have any strong feelings about it being free-standing rather than attached to the building. He thought it would work better than what was there presently.

**Mr. Steffen** stated as long as it was not windy.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated it would have to be ground supported.

**Dr. Elmore** stated when looking at the previous picture of the existing yellow awning, what was wrong with similar awnings along the side.

**Ms. Seiler** stated it would defeat the purpose of covering the tables and the weather protection in a consistent manner.

**Mr. Steffen** stated he would entertain a motion at this point but there was a precedent issue. He said these types of awnings were not seen within the Historic District with the sole exception of River Street. He was reminded of something he read in the paper regarding some visitors from France who thought there was a lot about Savannah that reminded them of Paris being an old European city. The large tabletop umbrellas was a big part, the applicant had their reasons for planning it and he didn't want to second guess it, but was not sure the benefit achieved by doing something that was precedential and against what was done in the past, incompatible in his view, would not gain anything that they already have, which were multicolored umbrellas that draw peoples attention. There was noting to prevent them from putting a logo on the umbrellas that would let people know it was a dining establishment because you could put an awning over a car wash. He wondered what was the real benefit from something that would ask the Board to set a precedent that would cause a lot of problems.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated they should ask the petitioner whether they want a continuance whether than voting for a total denial. If they agree to restudy it from the standpoint of not having a ground supported awning, its size, and the presentation.

**Ms. Seiler** stated it would be an entirely different project and proposal than what was presented today.

**Mr. Steffen** stated there was a motion on the floor, and he wanted the Board to go forward on the motion. If the motion failed, then the Board could entertain a motion for a continuance. He thought it was appropriate for the comment, but he did not want a second motion at that point, which had to do with procedure.

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby deny the petition as submitted. Dr. Caplan seconded the motion. Dr. Caplan, Ms. Seiler, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Steffen were in favor of the motion. Dr. Elmore, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Meyerhoff, and Dr. Watkins were opposed. The motion failed.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he would ask the petitioner whether they wanted a continuance.

Mr. Steffen stated he was not trying to shut anyone down, but once they get into Board discussion they could not go back.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the continuance to further restudy the petition. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Gabriella DeBeer (Owner) stated she thought the awning looked ugly. She said the umbrellas fall over all of the time, and in the afternoon there was a lot of sun that was hot. They proposed a framed lattice with little planters surrounding it that would close it in and the metal post would not be seen. It would be more like a garden retreat, but more comfortable and cozier with using the planters and umbrellas they have now.

Mr. Steffen stated when Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the petitioner wanted a continuance. The way the Board would consider it would be with a continuance, but they could not continue it without an agreement.

Ms. (Owner) agreed with and asked for a continuance.

Ms. Ward asked what was the continuation regarding.

**HDRB ACTION:** Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Ward asked why there was a continuance.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the Board had already expressed the fact they don't like what was submitted, and so did the owners. There was an alternate plans and options the owner's were thinking about and would like to engage in, and that was why there was a continuance.

Mr. Steffen stated he knew that Staff's concern was what was being suggested was a new proposal that needed to go through the whole process. Whether or not it was continued as this proposal or not, the result was it would come back on May 9<sup>th</sup>, and he would have them move on to something else if it was being continued.

Dr. Elmore stated when the petitioner comes back to have things in order so the Board could see what they were proposing to keep from getting a negative result.

**RE: Petition of Keller Williams  
Matthew Allan  
H-07-3799-2  
PIN No. 2-0004-40-004  
48 Abercorn Street  
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Matthew Allan.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval to install two projecting signs for the second floor business within the building at 48 Abercorn Street as follows:

1. The entrance for the second floor business is located along the Abercorn Street elevation. The business maintains approximately 40 linear feet along Abercorn Street and 62 linear feet along Broughton Street.
2. Projecting signs are proposed on the masonry pilasters; one above the main entrance on Abercorn and another between two bays of windows on Broughton Street. Both are on the second floor.
3. The signs will hang from black iron brackets, approximately 62-inches (5.2') wide and 20.5 feet (1.7') tall.
4. The proposed signs are oval shaped and are five feet wide by three feet tall (approximately 15 square feet).
5. Colors: Background – red  
Text – white  
Border – black
6. The sign is made of wood and will not be illuminated.

**FINDINGS:**

The historic building at 48 Abercorn Street (aka 202 East Broughton Street) was constructed ca. 1917, and is a rated building within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned BC-1 (Central Business). The following standards from the Broughton Street Sign District Ordinance (Section 8-3119) apply:

**(2)(c) Principal use and supplemental identification signs.**

1. **Number of principal use and supplemental signs per establishment.** One principal use sign shall be permitted for each business establishment. One such sign may be mounted or erected as a fascia sign, or one such sign may be erected as a projecting sign. Where a business establishment fronts on more than one street or pedestrian walkway providing public access, one principal use sign for each frontage shall be permitted; provided, that only the maximum sign area computed for a given street frontage shall face that street. The copy area shall not exceed 40 percent of the display area of a principal use sign...

*The business maintains two elevations, on Broughton and Abercorn Streets. Only the Abercorn Street provides public access. Staff recommends eliminating the second sign on the Broughton Street façade where there is no public access to the business establishment. While the sign may meet the allowable square footage and number of signs permitted by the ordinance, the intent does not appear to have been met. The proposed Broughton Street sign appears disconnected from its associated business establishment and does not indicate to the public where the business is located within the building or how to get to the business. Staff recommends incorporating window graphics onto the Broughton Street elevation to provide exposure along the façade. This*



*indicates that the business is located on the second floor behind the marked windows.*

**2. Size, height, and location...** (i) Projecting Signs

- 1) For all principal uses occupying 125 or less linear feet of street frontage, projecting signs shall be permitted one-square-foot of display area per sign face per linear foot of frontage occupied by each principal use; provided that a maximum sign area of 45 square feet shall be permitted per sign face for each projecting principal use sign allowed.
- 2) The outer edge of a projecting sign shall not extend more than six feet from the building to which it is attached.
- 3) The height of the projecting sign shall not extend above the parapet wall of the building, and the lowest point of the projecting sign shall not be less than ten feet above the established grade.

*The standards are met.*

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with the condition that the Broughton Street sign is eliminated from the submittal.** Window graphics are typical of second floor businesses along Broughton Street to identify the location of the business within the building, and Staff encourages the applicant to explore this method of signage along Broughton Street. Window signs no greater than ten percent of any window area do not require HDRB approval or a permit.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Matthew Allan** stated when they originally spoke with Staff they asked what did they think. Being real estate people, they recognized the importance of visual compatibility. They also realize people come to Broughton Street from all over the world and the country, and they want people to see the sign and to buy real estate to become part of the fabric and culture in Savannah. He said they could understand if the sign on Broughton Street does not indicate the entrance. There was more frontage and window space on Broughton Street, and they would like to indicate to people when they come to the office that they were going upstairs, and wanted it to be seen. They thought about doing a corner sign. They were open to ideas, would like to have a sign that would be visible from both Broughton and Abercorn Streets. With the ordinances, they recognize they could put window graphics on Broughton Street. There was no oversight on it, hammer it out, and have the Board tell them what was best. They have worked with Staff and said whatever works for them works for the petitioner, but they wanted a nice sign to let people know where they were, how to get to them, and be visible.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated it was a unique building where the entire second floor was entered on the Abercorn Street side with a small pediment over the entrance door. Perpendicular signs indicate where you enter a building or shop. The sign shown on the sheet that was perpendicular over the door was in order, but putting the sign at the corner or half way down on Broughton Street would have many people going into the coffee shop and asking where the real estate office was. They should consider something else on Broughton Street that doesn't say it was the entrance, which would be a sign parallel to the façade of the building rather than a projecting sign.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that Staff's recommended the Board approve the sign on Abercorn Street, and not approve the sign on Broughton Street.

**Dr. Elmore** asked what the conditions were for Broughton Street; should it run parallel to the building.

**Ms. Reiter** stated an individual could have a projecting sign on Broughton Street, but the ordinance says that the sign should be where the public entrance was, and historically on both Broughton and Whitaker Streets in that commercial area when there were businesses upstairs there was a gold leaf or white lettered sign on the second story window.

**Ms. Ward** stated it was a unique case, but asked if the building was three stories and another business was on top of it, would they be allowed to have another sign where there was no public access to it.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** asked if they had the petitioner had the entire second floor or half of it.

**Mr. Allan** stated they had the upper six windows, there was another business, and possibly another residence. There seemed to be a consulting firm, but it might be a live/work space.

**Mr. Johnson** asked how many entrances go upstairs.

**Mr. Allan** answered just one right where the pediment was.

**Mr. Johnson** asked if there was any direction to the other businesses once you go upstairs.

**Mr. Allan** stated at the top of the stairs you would go right into their office, and if you go left, you go into the other business.

**Mr. Johnson** asked if the other businesses were in question and if they had any sign.

**Mr. Allan** stated it seemed they did not. On the other hand, he thought it was a small operation. He said they were set up differently because they want foot traffic, people coming in, and to show them Savannah.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the key was that historically Broughton Street was more foot then vehicular traffic, and the City's plan was to eventually return to that direction. It supports Dr. Elmore's question and Staff's answer that on Broughton Street the most appropriate thing was to have window-based signage.

**Mr. Allan** stated they weren't denying it and wasn't there to make a case or plead, he did not disagree. When they originally wanted to see what it would look like if they put a sign on the Broughton Street side. If they had a preference, they would go with the corner sign, but did not know whether it was something that needed to be rethought.

**Dr. Caplan** stated if they put the sign anywhere else other than the entrance it would cause confusion. They may disagree, but he was one that if he was trying to find a place, he would want the sign where the business was. If it was on Broughton Street, he would be walking back and forth looking, and if it was on the corner, he would not know where the business was. It seemed logical for the sign to be over the entrance of the business.

**Mr. Allan** stated the Board's preference was the single hanging projecting sign over the entrance as opposed to some type of small window graphic over the entrance. The public was not looking down Abercorn much if they were going down Broughton Street. If you tell someone

to come to the office at 48 Abercorn you wouldn't need a sign, just tiny lettering over the door, but that's not what he was suggesting. To get foot traffic, having something on the corner that was visible from Broughton Street, someone would be momentarily confused, but maybe they'll see the smaller sign over the pediment.

**Ms. Seiler** stated she concurred with Dr. Caplan, and said when you come near the intersection, the building could be clearly seen that it wasn't a matter of getting on Broughton Street, it could be seen and was open from every direction except for coming from the west.

**Mr. Allan** stated that more of the commercial district and foot traffic was happening on the west, and there wasn't much to the east.

**Ms. Seiler** stated that's why there were addresses.

**Mr. Allan** stated that was correct, but he was referring to the tourist traffic, people who were visiting, and people who had recognized but had not formulated they love the town and there would be a real estate sign. Then, there would be more people reinvesting in the community. If you were off Whitaker and don't see the sign...you won't know what you want until you see it sometimes.

**Mr. Steffen** stated the more discussion there was about the businesses exposure to potential clients, it was getting the Board further away from historic review and compatibility. All of those things were appreciated and was why signage was allowed, but the primary mission was to make sure what was done was historically compatible.

**HDRB ACTION:** **Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the sign at the entrance on Abercorn Street only. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**Dr. Elmore** asked why they couldn't put the condition in the motion.

**Mr. Steffen** asked to which condition was he referring.

**Dr. Elmore** stated if they were going to put a sign on Broughton Street flat on the building and the window signage as discussed

**Mr. Steffen** stated Mr. Meyerhoff's motion was only to approve the sign over the entrance on Abercorn Street. They were saying nothing about Broughton Street because they had not come to the Board with anything on Broughton Street except for the sign. If they would do window treatment, it wouldn't come before the Board.

**Mr. Allan** stated the ordinance allowed small signs of three square feet, and they would not want to do that. What was allowable to them without having to get the approval of the Board who were trying to maintain the visual compatibility, what was permissible to them was they could do nothing. He said they could do ugly window graphics, small three square feet signs, and he wasn't holding it over anyone's head but it was peculiar.

**Mr. Steffen** stated they would not do that because they had a business with a high degree of commercial respect and he was sure they would do something respectful with the windows.

**RE: Petition of Giffels, Inc. /CVS  
Anthony Ricciuti  
H-07-3797-2  
PIN No. 2-0004-44-002  
119 Bull Street  
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Monica Dragon.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

**NATURE OF REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting approval of storefront alterations, signage, awning, and lighting at 119 Bull Street.

**FINDINGS:**

1. 119 Bull Street was originally built in 1907, and was a jewelry store for many years. At some point the lower floor was covered with metal panels and the façade was painted.
2. The applicant proposes to remove the metal panels and restore the historic features that are uncovered.
3. The existing storefront entry will be replaced with a new aluminum storefront entry system.
4. The existing first floor storefront window system will be replaced with Extruded aluminum painted black. On the inside of the building louvered shutters will screen the backs of the pharmacy and checkout bays. Staff and the SDRA are working with the applicant to develop a series of historic pharmacy photos for the window glass as a part of CVS's urban windows program. Shed awnings are proposed in each window bay Sunbrella Dubonnet Tweed style 4606 with white lettering on the valance.
5. On the lane elevation, the first bay will be restored with an awning and display window. This area of the building has been particularly prone to graffiti and it is hoped that this treatment will discourage further vandalism.
6. Two 42" x 22'-6" aluminum panels with applied three-quarter inch red Sintra letters will be placed over the entry door and on the first bay south elevation. The panels will be beige. The signs will have gooseneck external lighting fixtures in a beige color as illumination.
7. Similar gooseneck fixtures will be placed over the new awnings.
8. A revised elevation has been submitted to indicate the revised color for the gooseneck fixtures and the addition of decorative relief panels on either side of the entry.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval with the following conditions:**

1. **Final approval of the panels above the windows to be made after the metal panels are removed to see what existing historic fabric remains.**
2. **Final approval of window graphics to be delegated to Staff in conjunction with SDRA.**
3. **Consideration to be given to moving valance graphics to window glass per historic photos.**
4. **If rusticated piers are intact under the metal panels on either side of the entrance the decorative relief panels should be deleted.**

**Mr. Steffen** stated he took it from the presentation that the petitioner had been cooperative.

**Ms. Reiter** said absolutely, and had met with SDRA and with Staff.

**Ms. Seiler** asked if what was proposed and presented, the applicant was interested in working with Staff.

**Ms. Reiter** said she thought so.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the Bull Street elevation did not show the 15 or 20 brochure-dispensing machines and asked if they were going to be gone.

**Ms. Reiter** stated it was part of the deal and they were working with the City to place them elsewhere.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated the proposed display window on the corner of the lane he presumed would be a display window that could not be converted into a pharmaceutical pick-up or drive-by pick-up.

**Ms. Reiter** stated that would be something for Traffic Engineering.

**Mr. Steffen** stated that he did not know that it was within their purview. They could tell them what it looked like, but what use they put it to was not the Board's.

**Ms. Reiter** stated at the moment the public was not supposed to be going down the lanes.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated they did not want to open a can of worms by putting in a window.

**Ms. Reiter** stated it was more like a display case.

**PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Monica Dragon** as the architect she was representing CVS as their client. They proposed the rehabilitation of the building as a façade improvement, including an interior renovation that would be done after the new awnings were installed. They noticed the ceiling was damaged and as soon as they remove the panels and old structures, and find out what would be happening with the two elevations, they would try to fix it.

**Mr. Steffen** stated she listened to and saw Staff's presentation with the four suggested conditions and asked if she had any objections to them.

**Ms. Dragon** stated when she met with Staff approximately three weeks ago the basic design was the initial proposal, but they decided they needed to research the window programs when it was recommended to use old images of Savannah, they liked the idea. They did not receive the material and pictures from SDRA, the Savannah Library and archives in time, so they submitted the project with the shutters as a base design with the promise they would go back to the initial proposal of urban graphics and implementing the pictures, and they were committed in using them. She thanked everyone who helped in finding and researching the pictures because it was good material. She said Anthony Ricciuti was the Project Manager of the project.

**Dr. Caplan** asked if they were agreeable to the changes that Staff recommended. He said he and his wife walked Broughton Street just two days ago and marveled at the changes and how wonderful the street looked, then they turned up Bull Street. His wife said it was not visually compatible and they needed to do something about it. When he received his packet he was elated and wanted to give more of a statement of appreciation.

**Ms. Dragon** stated it was their pleasure and like the fact they were in downtown Savannah and wanted to bring the building back to its historic look.

**Dr. Elmore** stated they did excellent homework and should be commended.

**Mr. Meyerhoff** stated he remembered when the façade was at they propose it to be again.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Chastity Malloy (Savannah College of Art and Design Student - SCAD)** stated she wanted to acknowledge their work to restore the building. She said she had a classmate last quarter in Preservation Research do extensive research on the property, and was why she came in today to see what alterations would be considered. On behalf of a preservation student's perspective, she thought it was a great direction and was anticipating that the façade under the coverings still had its integrity because it would be great to stick to what was there. She hoped the Board would continue to get more renovation proposals like this one as opposed to new construction.

**Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation)** wanted to thank everyone involved; Giffel's, Inc., CVS, SDRA who had been working on the project for several years, Mr. Bill Steube who wrote the CEO of CVS several letters, and to Staff for the sound advice given. He asked the Board to endorse it and to approve the submission.

**HDRB ACTION:** Dr. Elmore made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition as submitted with the conditions that:

1. Final approval of the panels above the windows to be made after the metal panels are removed, to see what existing historic fabric remains.
2. Final approval of window graphics to be delegated to Staff in conjunction with SDRA.
3. Consideration to be given to moving the valance graphics to the window glass per the historic photos.

4. If rusticated piers are intact under the metal panels on either side of the entrance, the decorative relief panels should be deleted.

Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**F. STAFF REVIEWS**

1. Petition of Colin Brotherton  
H-07-3788(S)-2  
137 Bull Street  
Color  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
2. Petition of Linda Schoonover  
H-07-3792(S)-2  
500 Montgomery Street  
Color Change/Roof Repair  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
3. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-07-3793(S)-2  
John Casteel  
42 Drayton Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
4. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-07-3794(S)-2  
John Casteel  
11 West Bay Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
5. Petition of River Street Inn  
H-07-3796(S)-2  
John Bussert  
124 East Bay Street  
Color Change  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
6. Petition of Dr. William S. Ray, Jr.  
H-07-3798(S)-2  
128 Habersham Street  
Rehabilitation/Alteration  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**
  
7. Petition of Coastal Canvas  
H-07-3801(S)-2  
John Casteel  
14 East State Street  
Awning  
**STAFF DECISION: APPROVED**

**G. MINUTES**

Approval of Minutes – March 14, 2007

**HDRB ACTION:** Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the Minutes as submitted. Dr. Watkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**H. OTHER BUSINESS**

**I. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Mr. Tom MacDonald  
H-07-3800-2  
24 East Jones Street  
New Construction of Accessory Shed at the Rear

**Ms. Ward** stated the petitioner had submitted an application but was not received in time to be placed on the agenda, and would be heard at the May 9, 2007, meeting.

**J. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- ❖ Earth Day – April 21, 2007 – 11:30 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. – Forsyth Park
- ❖ Donovan Rypkema – May 24 & 25, 2007  
Speaking on Economics of Preserving Historic Structures
- ❖ Stanley Lowe – May 23, 2007  
Present Unveiling of the Draft on the Downtown Master Plan

**Ms. Ward** stated she wanted to remind the Board that Earth Day was Saturday, April 21<sup>st</sup>. The Recycle-Rama and run would be in the morning, there would be booths, a farmer's market, and a rain barrel workshop.

**Ms. Reiter** stated if they had paint to recycle to be sure and get there at 8:00 a.m. because last year they had so much paint they had to cut off the line.

**Ms. Ward** stated they will recycle anything but not glass. She stated the Mr. Donovan Rypkema would be speaking on the 24<sup>th</sup> in Richmond Hill and the 25<sup>th</sup> in Brunswick to speak about the Economics of Preserving Historic Structures. SDRA would be bringing in Stanley Lowe to present the Unveiling of the Downtown Master Plan on May 23 at 6:30 p.m., but a location had not been determined. She said the Downtown Master Plan impacts the Historic District.

**Ms. Reiter** stated Mr. Stanley Lowe was a very dynamic speaker who was the Vice President of the National Trust, but got his start in Pittsburg and was very much instrumental in the restoration of the inner-city neighborhoods of Pittsburg. She said he does fabulous work.

**Mr. Steffen** stated if City Council makes the new appointees for the Board tomorrow, which they were expected to do, it would be Dr. Caplan's last meeting with them.



**RE: ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Reiter,  
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp