

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

January 9, 2008

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

Dr. Malik Watkins, Chairman
Brian Judson, Vice-Chairman
Dr. Charles Elmore
Ned Gay
Sidney J. Johnson
Richard Law, Sr.
Eric Meyerhoff
Linda Ramsay
Joseph Steffen

HDRB Members Not Present:

Gene Hutchinson
Swann Seiler

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

Thomas L. Thomson, P.E./AICP, Exec. Director
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Jack Butler, Development Services Planner
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant

RE: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3784-2
PIN No. 2-0016-04-003
501 West Bay Street
New Construction Part I Height and Mass –
Hotel/Condominium

Continue to February 13, 2008, at the petitioner's request.

RE: Continued Petition of Houston & Oglethorpe, LLC
Richard Guerard
H-07-3832-2
PIN No. 2-0005-30-002
143 Houston Street
New Construction/Rehabilitation/Addition Part I,
Height & Mass, Three-Story Condominium

Continue to February 13, 2008, at the petitioner's request.

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3862-2
PIN No. 2-0016-03-008
23 Montgomery Street
New Construction Part II, Design Details – Hotel

Continue to February 13, 2008, at the petitioner's request.

RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3916-2
PIN No. 2-0015-01-001
225 East President Street
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass for a Five-
Story Condominium

Continue to February 13, 2008

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Continued Agenda items as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

RE: Petition of Kern-Coleman & Company
Nathan Pollard
H-07-3937-2
PIN No. 2-0005-16-002
113-B Houston Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration/Rear Addition

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

RE: Amended Petition of Joseph L. Schmidt
H-07-3838-2
PIN No. 2-0015-34-001
15 East Liberty Street
New Doors

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Amended Petition of Greenline Architecture
Gretchen Ogg Callejas
H-07-3840-2
PIN No. 2-0045-19-007
605 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Rehabilitation/Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Amended Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.
Donna Swanson
H-07-3898-2
PIN No. 2-0031-20-007
320 Montgomery Street
Signs**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of The Spriggs Group, P.C.
Ken Spriggs
H-07-3939-2
PIN No. 2-0015-06-004
211 East York Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration to a Garage Door**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda items as submitted. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Dr. Elmore left at 2:10 p.m.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

**RE: Amended Petition of Dawson + Wissmach Architects
Josh Ward
H-05-3477-2
PIN No. 2-0004-07-03
126 West Bay Street
Rooftop Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Josh Ward.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting to amend a previously approved petition, significantly reducing the square footage of a previously approved elevator overrun and roof access.

FINDINGS:

The roof access consists of a 20'-11" by 22'-8" enclosed access to a roof deck. This enclosure includes the elevator and stair lobby. A second stair enclosure provides a second means of egress from the roof deck. The elevator overrun is clad in stucco and the roof access and stair enclosure is clad in metal interlocking tiles. The railing matches what was previously approved for Factor's Walk. The elevator overrun is 13'-7" above the parapet and the access enclosure is 8'-4" above the parapet. They are placed 22 feet plus from the south parapet and over 36 feet from the west parapet. The previously approved structure was placed closer to each parapet. The top 10 feet of the elevator overrun may be seen from Bay Street.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval, the amended structure is less visible than the previously approved structure, is less massive, and placed farther in from the edge of the building.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Ward to clarify the correct dimensions. The plan section showed 13 feet 8 inches and Staff said it was 13 feet 7 inches.

Mr. Ward stated that it was approximately 13 feet 7 inches. He said the angle of the front façade and the actual penetrations would be different and it depended on what corner the measurements were taken from.

Mr. Gay commended the petitioner for their work.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) commended the applicant and asked that the Board approve the change.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Steffen** made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. **Mr. Meyerhoff** seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: Amended Petition of Lindsay, Pope & Brayfield Assoc.
Buck Lindsay
H-06-3549-2
PIN No. 2-0004-16-009A
199 East Bay Street
Exterior Windows

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval of a Finding-of-Fact to permit the windows due to economic hardship.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Buck Lindsay

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of windows as installed within the Exterior Insulation Finishing System (EIFS) sections of the Holiday Inn Express.

FINDINGS:

1. The building was originally designed to have an all masonry veneer with finned aluminum windows and a three-inch reveal between the outer surface of the masonry and the window sash. The Board subsequently approved the use of EIFS in sections of the building. This resulted in a reveal of ½-inch to ¾-inch rather than the three inches required in the ordinance. In preparing the permit documents the change was noted in the specifications, but not on the drawings according to Jana Smolinski an Inspector in Development Services. Staff stamped the permit drawings, but did not look at the specification book. The contractor installed the windows using the specifications.
2. It is not possible to reset the windows without either changing the size of the window or changing the size of the opening. The alternative of adding a band on the outside of the window to increase the depth is visually incompatible.
3. Staff met with the architects and developer on-site to look at alternatives. The windows are on the upper stories. A Finding-of-Fact from the Review Board is required and a variance from the Board of Appeals. Staff recommends that the Board of Review make a Finding-of-Fact that the windows may remain based on an economic hardship. In order to avoid this situation in the future, Staff is attending pre-construction meetings to meet the contractor and is working more closely with the Development Services Department (Inspections).

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval to forward a Finding-of-Fact to the City Zoning Board of Appeals to let the windows remain due to an economic hardship

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Buck Lindsay (Lindsay, Pope, Brayfield & Associates, Incorporated) stated that they had made a mistake. He said the building was originally designed with a full masonry veneer. They had waited five years for the financial feasibility to occur and during the course of the deliberation parts of the masonry were changed to EIFS, and when they changed the designs and details to reflect the stucco EIFS finish, they neglected to figure that the three-inch recess would be gone. He said that he knew better and should have prevented it. Because of the way the windows were made there were aluminum FINS around the perimeter of the window. It was not possible to loosen them and push them back into the opening and the only way to correct it would be to tear the exterior walls completely to make the openings larger, and the FIN windows could be pushed into a larger opening. It was highly impractical but not impossible at this point (to correct the problem). They appreciated Staff's recommendation to allow it to exist as an exception.

Ms. Ramsay asked when it was changed from the brick veneer to stucco were drawings resubmitted to the City Preservation Officer.

Mr. Lindsay stated that it was presented to the city and during the process the City Preservation Officer reviewed it. He said that someone would have to go deep into the plans to find the details that would show it was not recessed three inches, and he did not catch it himself.

Ms. Ramsay asked if a new section was not drawn through the windows.

Mr. Lindsay stated that there were new sections drawn through the windows. He said they were small-scaled but that they were drawn.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she did not understand how it happened. She asked if Mr. Lindsay was aware that a three-inch recess was required, if someone did construction administration on the building, and if they did not pick up that it was not there.

Mr. Lindsay stated that was correct. He said the windows were all above the third floor and it was not something that could be walked by and looked at easily, but it could be noticed. There was a sill and a head that projected and a little of the shadowing relief can be seen that was associated with a recessed window, but in the course of the thousands of things that were looked at during construction, it did not pop out that it was wrong at a time when they could have done something about it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that they sympathized with the developer of the project, the Review Board for the heavy workload and the number of drawings received, and Staff's burden of having to review the specifications. He said if the Board allowed the building to stay as it was that it would become a standard and a built object in the Historic District that other people would look at. It would be cited as a precedent and the Board would have entered a Finding-of-Fact that it was visually compatible, which was what the Preservation Officer was asking the Board to do. The architect admitted that he had made a mistake and that they should have professional liability insurance that should cover the mistake. He asked the Board to not make the Finding-of-Fact that it was visually compatible and an economic hardship, but find that it was visually incompatible and since the architect had admitted his mistake he should bear the cost of making the repair and not make the National Historic Landmark District bear the cost of his mistake.

Mr. Bill Stuebe (Downtown Neighborhood Association) stated that there were instances in the past where other projects were built and the owners were made to change them. He said the Charthouse on River Street had windows installed that were inappropriate and they were forced to remove them and replace them with new windows. A small cottage on East Jones and Price Street had a front porch put on improperly and were forced to remove the porch and replace it with a proper porch. He said that there were other situations and that this was not unusual for something to be built improperly. The Board could require them to correct the situation.

Mr. Mark Smith (Developer) stated that he thought the Finding-of-Fact was that it was an economic hardship and not that it was visually compatible. He said that he was not happy with it either because it was brought to their attention the last week of construction. There was improper installation of all of the windows when they were about 60 percent installed. They took them all out and reinstalled them and throughout the process they did not catch the oversight and the city did not catch it. They were inspected thoroughly on electrical, plumbing, and every other type of inspection but there was no inspection process for compatibility. He was hoping that as a community they would address it in the future. He wanted to clarify that the Finding-of-Fact was that it was an economic hardship and not that it was visually compatible.

Dr. Watkins stated that it was open for discussion because the role of the Board was to assess the visual compatibility based upon standards. He said that he was not sure whether the issue of economic hardship was viable.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

Mr. Steffen asked how the problem came to their attention.

Ms. Reiter stated that a citizen had telephoned her.

Mr. Steffen asked how long ago.

Ms. Reiter stated that it had been a while back; possibly November.

Mr. Steffen stated that a point had been raised and he was questioning it also that Staff's recommendation to the Board was for a Finding-of-Fact to allow the windows to remain as an economic hardship. He said it was not a finding of visual compatibility.

Ms. Reiter answered no.

Mr. Steffen asked if the Board had made a finding that something could stand as an economic hardship before.

Ms. Reiter stated that the only time they spoke about an economic hardship was with the Purse Street demolitions.

Mr. Steffen asked if Staff wanted the Board to say that it was visually compatible.

Ms. Reiter answered no.

Mr. Gay stated that it was unfortunate that the style brought to mind very cheap construction and something you would see more on the south side. He said that with downtown, they were trying to save the integrity of things and this looked like something that was thrown up, which was the problem.

Dr. Watkins stated that to clarify what the Board was reviewing he asked if the economic hardship had been removed from consideration or did it need to be refocused.

Mr. Gay stated that he did not see where the economic hardship came in at all as far as the Board was concerned. He said the Board did not make the decisions, and if it were the case, the Board would let everyone build 60-story buildings because the petitioners would make more money. It was not a reason to approve something.

Mr. Steffen stated that he understood how it happened and the look had more to do with what was up there than it did the three-inch recess. He was not that concerned about the three-inch recess being seen from the street up three floors. He was inclined to support Staff but his concern was whether the Board could do it. He thought the Board had the ability to make a Finding-of-Fact to historic compatibility, but whether the Board could make a Finding-of-Fact as to economic hardship, he did not know. He thought that it existed but did not know if the Board could do it.

Mr. Thomson asked if the question and the statement about the Finding-of-Fact for economic hardship was because there was not sufficient information that said it was an economic hardship.

Mr. Steffen answered no, and said that he agreed with Staff's recommendation given the limits of it and the fact that the Board was not going to say that it was historically compatible. He said that if the Board was to say it was historically compatible then they would have the issue of whether it was a precedent. He was inclined to accept what Staff was saying, but was at a loss for whether the Board had the authority to make a Finding-of-Fact that there was an economic hardship in this case. The Board was charged to find historic compatibility and he did not recall it or might have missed it somewhere.

Ms. Reiter stated that the only place that economic hardship was addressed was under the demolition section and nowhere else.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she believed Mr. Smith said they had replaced all of the windows once.

Mr. Smith stated that was correct, and said when the building was under construction they had installed about 60 percent of the windows when it was brought to their attention that the windows were not installed correctly. They took all of the windows out and replaced them, including the ones with the proper recess, as well as the ones on the EIFS section. A high percentage of the windows are correctly installed and some of the windows on Bay Street were not installed properly. They were on the fourth floor on the north face of the building that was in the shadow, and there was a recess created by the sill and the lintel. The plans showed a one and one-half inch recess and the plans were stamped approved. The plans that were approved by the city and the Preservation Officer showed a one and one-half inch recess and the windows were installed with a one-half to three-quarter inch recess. It was a one-inch problem.

Mr. Steffen stated that his thought would be for the matter to be continued to next month and allow the Board to get an opinion from the City Attorney as to whether they could make a Finding-of-Fact. He was ready to make the motion but was concerned that if it were not a proper motion that it would get thrown back to the Board anyway. He said he could not find anything that said the Board could make that motion.

Mr. Thomson stated that he and the City Attorney suggested continuing the item. He said he did not know if the Board had to have the permission of the applicant in this particular case, but there was a question of whether or not the Board could do what was said. If the Board denied or rejected Staff's recommendation, then they could replace all the windows or do whatever was needed to remedy it, or they could appeal to an appeal body. Mr. Giusti raised an alternative that perhaps it was not the Board's business but the Zoning Board of Appeals business to address it as a variance and whether they would approve it or not.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board did not grant variances and someone pointed out that there was no way the Board can nor should say that it was compatible because it would be wrong, but he did not think that was what they were asking. He said they were asking for some relief that he was not sure the Board could give.

Mr. Thomson stated that he apologized to the petitioner if they had been led down the wrong path, but he thought that at this point the best thing would be to reconvene the thinking on it and see which path it should go down.

Dr. Watkins told the petitioner that the ball was in his court but in terms of a continuance that he had to ask for it.

Mr. Smith asked for a continuance.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review continue the petition to the February 13, 2008, meeting in order to research the legal grounds. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3711-2
PIN No. 2-0031-16-006
217 West Liberty Street
New Construction Part II, Design Details for a
Condominium Building**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

Mr. Meyerhoff recused himself.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of Part II, Design Details for a mixed-use office and condominium building at 217 West Liberty Street.

FINDINGS:

Demolition of the existing non-historic structure and Part I Height and Mass were approved February 14, 2007.

A change from the initial submission is that the first and second floors will now possibly provide 17,240 square feet of office space. Floors three through five will contain 16 condominiums. According to the applicant these numbers are subject to change.

Changes from the September 12, 2007, meeting of the Historic District Board of Review include:

1. Elimination of the transoms at the ground floor windows.
2. Clarification of the cornice return on the lane elevation. (Note that Sheet A-9 is mislabeled). The lane elevation is the south elevation.
3. Clarification of the stone return on the south (lane) elevation.
4. The stair penthouse has been made smaller in that it no longer engages the north parapet.
5. The ground floor front doors are wood with full glass panel.

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors:	<p>Weathershield double-hung and Crittall steel windows with fixed light. The Weathershield windows are the Life Guard model wood clad double-hung windows with historic grid profiles, muntin width 7/8 inches with spacer bar.</p> <p>Cast stone headers and brick sills the color of the cast stone headers (pecan) are proposed. The windows will be recessed a minimum of three inches.</p> <p>The solid entry doors will be wood painted Forest Black. The glazed doors will be wood painted “Almond Wisp”. The garage door is a flush, hollow metal door painted to match the brick masonry. The rear utility doors will be flush, hollow metal painted to match brick masonry.</p>	<p>The windows are visually compatible. The Crittall window system is a solid steel window system which is located within the multi-paned bays. This window material is visually compatible for a window of this type which is more contemporary in design and resembles a more industrial look which historically featured solid metal windows.</p>
Roof Shape:	<p>Flat with parapet. Wood cornice and brackets. There is an elevator penthouse on the roof. It will have a sand finish stucco painted to match the color of the brick masonry.</p>	<p>This standard is met.</p>
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:	<p>Rubbed, painted concrete balconies with 5/8-inch metal pickets and brackets below. The balcony slab edges and undersides will be rubbed and painted to match the stucco color. The brackets will be made of a ferrous metal painted “Forest Black”.</p> <p>The steps on the Tattnall Street side are cast-in-place concrete and the posts are ornamental cast stone.</p>	<p>The stairs and balconies are compatible.</p>
Fences:	<p>A solid 7'-7" brick fence broken into bays with piers is proposed for the east and lane elevations, and a portion</p>	<p>The fence encloses the service area.</p>

	of the Liberty Street elevation. Part of this wall on the lane encloses a service yard with two metal doors.	
Materials:	<p>Brick Body: Carolina Brown wirecut 420 with Polyblend “Light Smoke” mortar.</p> <p>Cast stone Base: Arriscraft “Pecan” with a band course separating the body from the base.</p> <p>Wood Cornice and Brackets</p> <p>Stucco on window bays with metal coping; elevator penthouse</p>	Staff recommends erecting a sample panel to include the brick, cast stone/stucco, and cornice detail prior to installation of these materials.
Color:	<p>Stucco: Match Arriscraft “Pecan”; Match brick on elevator penthouse.</p> <p>Windows, columns, and trim: ICI Almond Wisp</p> <p>Metalwork: ICI Forest Black.</p>	The colors are compatible.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with a sample panel containing the proposed brick, Arriscraft or stucco, and cornice detail to be erected and reviewed by Staff prior to installation.

Mr. Gay asked if the sample was the actual size of the bricks.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

PETITIONER’S COMMENT:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects) stated that they began the process back in October 2006, the Height and Mass was approved back in February, and the Design Detail that was brought today was something that was presented before. He said they had been very responsive with every request that had been made by Staff, the Board, and the public audience. They felt they had addressed every issue that had been presented to them and had a clean Staff report today. They would like to request that they get the design approval so they could move forward with the project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Owen Murphy (Attorney Representing the Beehive Foundation, the Historic Savannah Foundation, the Downtown Neighborhood Association, and Individuals in the Vicinity) requested that the Board continue the part two hearing in order to reschedule and rehear Part I Height and Mass. He said that because of a court order the original Height and Mass approval issued by the Board was void. He said that it had some history to it when back in November 2006, the Height and Mass came before the Board for the first time and the Board denied it based on the mass not being visually compatible. Later, because a member recused himself, it was determined there was not a quorum and it was reheard in February 2007. During that hearing the Board approved the Height and Mass but the approval was made on the basis of language in the ordinance that says, “...maximum heights on the

height map shall be permitted". At that hearing, the Board was told it meant that five stories had to be permitted for the entire project and building, that there could not be a partial step-down, and that there was no other way to do it. The Board was aware that a lawsuit was filed in connection with the process and on October 19, 2007, the Chief Judge found that the amended ordinance passed in 2003 that added the language "maximum heights on the height map shall be permitted", was declared void. At the time the approval was issued by the body back in February 2007, the term "maximum heights on the height map" had no legal effect because they were void. The decision made by the Board based upon the language was tainted and was void by virtue of the fact that the judge said the language was not effective at the time that the decision was made. He said the Supreme Court of the state was clear that when an ordinance was declared void, any permit or approval based upon the ordinance was likewise void. He believed that the Part I approval by the Board, in light of the courts order, had no legal effect and the only way to fix it so that the building permit that would be issued was valid, would be to rehear Part I now that the amendment had been reenacted. Otherwise, there would be a Certificate of Appropriateness that would be premised on a proceeding where a decision was based on language that had no legal effect at the time it was done. Now that the maximum heights language had been readopted, the law did not allow them to pretend that it was in effect on the actual of day of the proceeding back in February. On the day that it happened, the language had no force and effect and the decision based on that language had no force and effect. Their concern was if the Board went forward and issued Part II when the Part I approval was void, the building permit would be void and that meant they would end up back in court challenging the viability or validity of the Certificate of Appropriateness. The right way to go about it would be to rehear Part I so that if it was approved the approval would be valid rather than void. Otherwise, the Certificate of Appropriateness that would be issued would likewise be void. It was a lot to digest, but the only way to do it right would be to rehear it, because they could not change the fact that what happened in February was done under the auspices of a void piece of law. It seemed that the easiest way to correct the problem and the deficiency was simply to rehear Part I.

Mr. Judson stated that as a point of order, which had been discussed throughout the last year, that the Board could not move for a continuance. He said they were all aware of the ongoing legal battles, and that in the past there had been discussions between parties prior to it going to court. He asked if Mr. Murphy had presented the option to the petitioner because it would be the petitioner's onus to request a continuance and the Board could not make that motion.

Mr. Steffen stated that if the readoption of the statute was identical to the original statute, and the part that was actually voided was the adoption of the statute and the way it was adopted and not the statute itself. He said what Judge Brannen was saying was that the city went about approving the ordinance the wrong way without the proper notice. He asked if Judge Brannen made a decision that there was nothing wrong with the statute itself as far as the wording.

Mr. Murphy stated that Judge Brannen did not say nor did he have the power to say what the statute should or should not say. He said that Judge Brannen was saying that procedurally the amendment was not properly adopted, therefore, at the time the Board met the language was void and had no legal force. It tainted the decision of the Board because the decision was based on that language. Has the same language now been readopted? Yes, but you cannot retroactively apply the language and pretend it existed on the day that the Board met because the law did not allow them to do that.

Mr. Steffen stated that he would agree if the language was different, but it was the same language and it seemed to him that it was more of the nature of asking for another hearing by a different Board.

Mr. Murphy stated that legally he would take a different position. He said he understood Mr. Steffen's point because there was not a difference with the language being the same.

Mr. Steffen stated that if the city had slightly changed the language and said they were aware that Judge Brannen was worried about this or that part of it, then he would agree that it was a different statute or a statute that at the time was flawed in some way. He said his understanding was that the decision was not what was being objected but the way it was adopted. He just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Gay stated that the City Attorney came and spoke and in essence told the Board that they had to approve it and there was not an option. He said as he recalled he abstained.

Mr. Murphy stated that it spoke to one of their primary concerns because not only did the Board approve it that day, but they also approved it based on that phrase and on instruction from the City Attorney regarding how the phrase must be interpreted. On that day the phrase did not exist, it was not there, it was on paper, but it had no force or effect. You cannot wave a magic wand and make it go back to that day. The only way to procedurally cure the defect would be to rehear it.

Mr. Steffen stated that Mr. Gay's concern was a separate issue. He said that he was not going to disagree that he felt that way because he did not feel that way.

Mr. Gay asked if Mr. Steffen was there and said it was the only time that the City Attorney showed up.

Mr. Steffen stated he realized that, but his point was that Judge Brannen did not say that they would overrule the Board's decision because the City Attorney exerted some improper influence. He said that it was not his decision.

Mr. Gay stated his point was that nothing had changed as far as he could tell. He said that the first time the City Attorney told the Board they had to pass it.

Dr. Watkins stated one of the issues that came about was that the Board's charge was to consider the petitions at hand. He said it was not within their structure or process to go back and consider previous decisions unless the same petitioner had brought it up. A better venue for the process might be the legal system because the Board's function was to compare design guidelines and compatibility versus going back and interpreting a previous decision.

Mr. Murphy stated that he appreciated it and that they were not there to rehash the Part I issues. He said what they were asking was that before the Board gave a Part II recommendation, because the original Part I approval was void, that they should go back and do Part I again and then do Part II.

Dr. Watkins stated that he understood that but from the Board's perspective they had to consider the petition. He said it did not necessarily include the reconsideration of Part I.

Mr. Peter Giusti (City of Savannah Attorney) stated that he was present when Mr. Blackburn gave his opinion about the meaning of the phrase and that Mr. Blackburn was correct in the interpretation of the phrase. He said that Mr. Murphy neglected to tell everyone that after City Council readopted the ordinance in the same language, that they also ratified all of the permits that were issued under the previous ordinance to avoid this very argument. It was not only about this structure, but about every permit that was issued since the section was adopted in 2002. He said the argument was moot and had been mooted by City Council who was the ultimate decision-maker as a legislative body in this city.

Mr. Jon Hart (Representing the Owner) stated that he agreed with the City Attorney because the very purpose of the ratification was to correct this problem. He said it was the first time he had heard this argument and if it was an issue, it could have been raised. They started the process back on October 18, 2006, and they have been steady at it ever since. The building that they saw was not the client's building, but what Staff had recommended. They had made every single change in the process they had been asked to make. He had been practicing for 35 years and cannot remember a time when a client had come to him and said, "all they wanted to do was use their property in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance." To design the building, however, the professional Staff told them to design it so that it was compatible. They had been before the Board three or four times and the last time it was continued. In the last three meetings there had not been a single question from any Board member that told them that there was anything wrong with the design. There were questions for clarification like the band going all the way around the back. The answer was that Staff asked them not to take it all the way around (to the back so that it would be easy) to articulate the front and the back of the building. The issue here was not compatibility but a small group of people that did not want the building in this location. He asked the Board not to be fooled by that. They were taking down an auto parts store that was sitting vacant and putting up a splendid building. They had not balked about the kind of windows, the cost of the windows, the cost of the stone or brick, or anything else. They had been to court, and contrary to what the editorial page of the newspaper stated, the lawsuit had not been dismissed by the Supreme Court as being wrong because it was pending and would be heard in March on the issues of law. The City had their own reasoning and he would let them handle that, but they were the people in the middle. They came and did what they were supposed to do with the Height and Mass, spent about \$250,000 designing a building and redesigning the building repeatedly. No one could tell them anything else to do and if there were something to be done, they would do it. Beyond that, he did not think there were individuals coming up and saying, "tell us what you want and we'll do whatever you want." He asked if there was no reward for playing by the rules and that after 15 months the Board would approve the design. If not, tell them what the Board wanted them to do and they would do it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark McDonald (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that he agreed with Mr. Murphy's argument that it should go back to Part I. He said with Part II there were several problems with the design of the building and the visual compatibility factors that were a part of the ordinance of the City of Savannah, and not the guidelines. The front facade of the building was not visually compatible and the relationship of the height and width of the building was much wider than it was tall. This was not the case in the surrounding buildings on the Liberty Street façade, on the lane elevation, and on the Tattnall Street façade. The relationship of the width of the windows to the height of the windows within a structure shall be visually compatible to the contributing structure to which the structure was visually related. The rhythm of solids-to-voids in front facades and the relationship of solids-to-voids in the facades visible from the public right-of-way of a structure shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the building was visually related, and it was the same under opening and porch projections. The most egregious violation was under the scale of the building because the mass, structure, and the size of windows, door openings, porches, columns, spacing, stairs, balconies, and additions shall be visually compatible with the contributing structures to which the structure was visually related. There was nothing in the block that was in any way visually related to the large glass windows that took place in the two facades of the building. This was a function of the scale of the building, the building was very large, the scale of the elements were very large, and it was visually incompatible with the surrounding structures. The last time it was reviewed the petitioner had attacked the Board and every public body for not giving any guidance, and he felt the Board should give him some guidance today with the Finding-of-Fact that the elements were visually incompatible and deny the project.

Mr. Shay stated that the issues that were presented to the Board had been covered at the Part I Height and Mass hearing at great length. He said he did not believe that he had ever attacked the Board. The standards did not just apply to the buildings that were immediately adjacent, but to all of the buildings in the ward and the adjacent wards.

Dr. Watkins stated that he wanted to reiterate that all the Board was going to do was consider the Design Details for Part II, and that the Board was unable to revisit that because it did not matter.

Mr. Shay stated he wanted to make sure that the Board understood that what was voted on by the Board when they did approve the Height and Mass approval, even when it was denied, the maker of the motion stated that they had met all of the other compatibility criteria in the motion. For anyone to stand up and say that it was a five-story building and only a five-story building, although the drawings presented today were Design Detail drawings that were completely flattened out, it was a three-dimensional object. Through the course of the negotiations a number of areas of the building were lowered to four stories to mitigate some of the concerns today. They would like the Board to vote on the Design Detail issues that had come before them, had been answered and addressed, and stick to the Part II approval.

Mr. McDonald stated that they were Design Detail issues that he was raising with the windows, the doors, and the lack of porch projections. That was why they were objecting to them.

Mr. Murphy stated that the City Attorney mentioned at the hearing where the maximum heights language was readopted, that the city hereby reaffirmed and reapproved all approvals that took place during that span. He said the authority to approve Part I Height and Mass was vested in the Board, and the City cannot on the Board's behalf reaffirm its own approvals for them. Only the Board could reaffirm their own approval and he did not think it was necessarily the way it worked. At the hearing where the language was readopted it was made very clear by the City Manager that all visual compatibility factors were equal, and that all must be considered with no special difference or trump card given to height. He thought that the decision made by the Board back in February was given under the interpretation that the height did have a heavier hand than the other visual compatibility factors.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Murphy was involved with the case when it went to Judge Brannen.

Mr. Murphy answered yes.

Mr. Steffen asked if they requested that Judge Brannen stay all Board or Council proceedings related to the statute.

Mr. Murphy stated that Judge Brannen enjoined the petitioner Mr. Bennett from going any further in the process until such time that the ordinance was dealt with.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Watkins stated that everyone should keep in mind that all of the viewpoints were appreciated but as a matter of procedure, it was not within the Board's realm to go back and reconsider previous items that had been passed before the Board. He said the main objective was to consider the merits of the petition dealing specifically with the body and content.

Mr. Steffen stated that with due respect to Mr. McDonald's opinions there had been discussion about it since he had been on the Board regarding what was Part I and Part II. They had come to the

conclusion based on the advice they received from those above them in Atlanta and the people that tell them what historic compatibility meant, that it was essential to shrink-wrapping a structure. The issues that were raised were not the Design Details the Board was being asked to be considered by Staff. No one had brought up any objections to the Design Details and he added that Mr. Murphy made a very persuasive argument and one that the court would find interesting. He found it important that when Judge Brennan issued the order he specifically did not stay any proceedings of other Boards and Commissions. When the city went back and determined that they should readopt all of the approvals that were made, whether it was the right or wrong thing for them to do politically, they did it. Once they did it reinvigorated and reapproved the decision that the Board made with Height and Mass. It would be inappropriate for the Board to legally go back and revisit it at this time. If Judge Brannen had stayed the proceedings they would be in a completely different situation because the Board or City Council would be forced not to take any further action, but it was not part of the order. He said the petitioner had been through the Design Detail many times, and the last time they were present there was a passionate plea made by a member of the Beehive Association to look at various Design Details. The petitioner went back and made the changes. If there were no further objections he did not see why it should drag on any longer.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. A sample panel containing the proposed brick, Arriscraft or stucco, and cornice detail to be erected and reviewed by Staff prior to installation. Mr. Judson seconded the motion. Mr. Steffen, Mr. Gay, Mr. Judson, and Mr. Law voted in favor of the motion. Ms. Ramsay and Mr. Johnson were opposed. The motion passed 4 to 2.

**RE: Petition of A.M.F. Residential
Albert M. Faragalli
H-07-3938-2
PIN No. 2-0014-18-028
555 & 557 East Harris Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval with conditions.**

Present for the petition was Mr. Albert Faragalli.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations and repairs, demolition of existing rear additions, and new construction of a rear addition to the building at 555 and 557 East Harris Street as follows:

1. Remove rear additions on each side of the duplex.
2. Repair foundations and floor framing.
3. Remove chimneys and fireplaces; install new replica chimneys to replace the existing ones.

FINDINGS:

The historic cottage duplex at 555 and 557 East Harris Street was constructed in 1863 and is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. The duplex is sited on two individual parcels, one for each residential unit. Both are owned by the same person and are zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). The properties do not extend to the lane and as such, the rear of the building is minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

The following standards apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Lot Coverage: 75 percent maximum in RIP-A.</p>	<p>The proposed lot coverage for 555 East Harris is approximately 63.5 percent; the proposed lot coverage for 557 East Harris is approximately 77 percent.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval. The lot is unusually small with no rear access to a lane. The existing footprint already exceeds the 75 percent allowed coverage and the proposed addition is only 93 square feet larger. The Historic Review Board will need to make a Finding-of-Fact that the proposed lot coverage is visually compatible. The petitioner will need to seek variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the increased lot coverage.</p>
<p>Additions: Additions shall be located to the rear of the structure or most conspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure. Additions...shall be subordinate in height and mass...[and] shall be differentiated from the historic building.</p>	<p>Construct new 271-square-foot rear addition. The existing additions will be removed and materials will be recycled and installed on the new construction, including siding and windows. Where material is lacking, smooth finish fiber cement board siding will be installed and windows that have been previously approved by the Board will be installed. An engaged shed roof is proposed off the rear.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval with the condition that the roofline and corner board on the west side of the building be preserved so the original historic structure can read as it does now.</p>
<p>Windows: Historic windows, frames, sashes, and glazing shall not be replaced unless it is documented that they have deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement windows on historic buildings shall replicate the original historic windows in</p>	<p>Windows will be selected from the Historical Review Board list of windows (a list compiled by Staff of windows that have been previously approved by the board). A window opening on the west elevation will be enclosed and patched over with siding.</p>	<p>Windows on the existing historic building should be preserved. Staff does not recommend approval of enclosing the opening on the west elevation – the applicant should allow the opening to be obvious for future restoration and to</p>

<p>composition, design, and material. Double-glazed windows are permitted on new construction, provided that the windows meet the following...muntin shall be no wider than 7/8"; muntin profile shall simulate traditional putty-style glazing; lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. Windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>		<p>preserve the character of the building. Window specifications for the addition must be submitted to Staff for final approval.</p>
<p>Materials:</p>	<p>Replace original standing seam metal roof with asphalt shingle. New addition to feature recycled materials from existing addition or smooth-finish fiber cement siding and windows previously approved in the district. Replace masonry chimneys with new wood frame chimneys surfaced in stucco.</p>	<p>Staff recommends that the roof be repaired or replaced in-kind with standing seam metal. Window specifications should be provided to Staff prior to final approval. The photographs provided indicate three chimneys visible from Harris Street. Two are shown on the proposed drawings. Chimneys should be preserved or reconstructed when they cannot be preserved; petitioner to indicate why third chimney is not shown. Chimneys, roof materials, porch details, windows, etc... are character defining features of historic buildings, especially on simpler buildings such as this that lack ornate architectural detailing. All efforts to preserve the historic materials should be made or the materials should be replaced in-kind.</p>
<p>Colors:</p>	<p>Siding, trim, and porches: Sherwin Williams Super White – 6995 Shutters and doors: Sherwin Williams Rockwood Shutter Green – 2809</p>	<p>Staff approval.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Finding-of-fact that the proposed lot coverage is visually compatible.
2. Approval for the proposed addition and rehabilitation with the following conditions:
 - a. All historic fabric, including chimneys, roof, siding, windows, etc. should be preserved or replaced in-kind, to match existing when deteriorated beyond repair.
 - b. Preserve the historic outline of the original building, i.e. roof line and corner boards.
 - c. The historic window opening on the west should be visible for future restoration.
3. Final details, including windows and doors, to be submitted to Staff. Drawings submitted should clearly indicate what is being preserved and what is being replaced.

Mr. Johnson asked what the siding was for the addition.

Ms. Ward stated that they were going to salvage all of the siding from the existing addition and what they could not salvage, they would use the smooth finish fiber cement board siding.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that Staff had recommended several changes with the chimney, roof material, siding, and windows and that it would extensively change the drawings. He wondered if Staff wanted to undertake reviewing the whole project again or if the petitioner should come back to the Review Board with the changes.

Ms. Ward stated that it would change the drawings but they were basically recommending repairs and replacement in-kind that normally would not require approval from Staff. She said that Staff wanted them to stay with what they had because the drawings had shown changes to the existing fabric.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated the one change he would concur with would be distinguishing between the existing building and the new addition with a four-inch setback. He asked if it would be reviewed by Staff once they altered the drawings.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Albert Faragalli (A.M.F. Residential) stated that he had reviewed what was said about the project. He said to preserve the back corner they would like to come back in and step it back at the original corner to make the room smaller. It would preserve that side to have the original outline of the building. The window that had been taken out had been replaced and the top of the window would be able to be seen from the street over the fence.

With the standing seam metal roof many of the surrounding examples had an asphalt shingle roof (like the house next door). There were two new construction buildings across the street with asphalt shingle roofs, along with another building that was similar to their building across the street that had been upgraded to an asphalt shingle roof. He showed photographs of new construction up the block with an asphalt single roof. The original structure had a wood cedar shake roof that was underneath the five-v crimp roof that currently existed. Going back to the asphalt shingle roof would replicate the wood cedar

shake roof than putting metal back on it. He said the metal that currently existed would have to come off because it was not in great shape.

The two center chimneys were original chimneys, the other chimney was for an old oil flue and was put in non-historically but they would remove it. Because both fireplaces were in the center they were proposing to rebuild the chimneys from the roof up and take the current chimneys out because they had deteriorated badly and would not stand up or hold repointing. In addition, most of the original bricks were gone.

He said that they did not have a problem with applying to the Zoning Boards of Appeal to see if they could get the extra two percent on the lot coverage. It had gone down from what it was originally with the decks that were planned for the back. On the original plan, the deck would cut across the property line onto someone else's property and then come back. The addition and the other deck with the living space added that had porches on the back was bringing the lot coverage down one percent from what it was originally. He said if they needed to move forward and go to the Zoning Board to ask for it they would.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that they had showed many asphalt roofs and said that the metal roof was in such disrepair that it would have to be replaced. He asked if they were conceding to put on an asphalt roof.

Mr. Faragalli stated that they would like to go back to the asphalt shingle roof like everyone else had on the block had. He said there was a five-v crimp roof underneath that he did not think was allowed in the Historic District if they were to duplicate what was presently there. Underneath the five-v crimp is a cedar roof that he thought was the original roof.

Mr. Meyerhoff wanted to make a motion to approve the petition with Staff's recommendations.

Mr. Gay asked with the exception of the roof.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated it included the roof.

Mr. Gay stated that the petitioner wanted to make it asphalt and Staff recommended the roof be metal.

Dr. Watkins asked what Mr. Faragalli's understanding was in terms of the roof.

Mr. Faragalli stated that the Historic Review Board wanted them to put a standing seam metal roof on and his argument was that they did not have a standing seam metal roof but a five-v crimp roof that was overtop of a cedar shake roof. He said the precedence on that street was to go to an asphalt shingled roof and that was what they would like to do. They did not want to put a metal roof back on.

Mr. Judson stated that other than the evidence of having a cedar shake roof underneath, did they have any other evidence of what the original roof was on the house.

Mr. Faragalli stated that he believed it was wood cedar shake.

Mr. Judson asked what Mr. Faragalli was conjecturing it from.

Mr. Faragalli stated that it was from the layers that were on there. He said it did not appear that anything had been ripped off.

Dr. Watkins asked that if the recommendation was for a metal roof was Mr. Faragalli willing to put on a metal roof.

Mr. Faragalli stated that they would rather put the shingles on, mostly for the spacing of the roof rafters and that they would have to take the metal roof off anyway to sheave the roof. He said they wanted the asphalt shingle roof because it was on the houses next door and across the street.

Mr. Johnson asked what shape the cedar was in.

Mr. Faragalli stated that it was not in great shape and did not extend all the way across. He said if you took the two end windows off the front elevation that it would come to about the outside of the next window end jamb because they were additions to the building. When you look at the foundation, the building was not originally as wide as it was currently. He assumed that might have been when they put the metal roof on.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that in either case, with the wood shingles underneath they would have to place plywood on it.

Mr. Faragalli stated that the rafters were spaced at two feet to four feet on center. He said there was only one example of a standing seam metal roof put back on a house within a blocks radius from there. The new roofs that had been replaced were all asphalt shingle.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that with the house being how it was that his motion stood and that they should go back to the tin roof.

Mr. Faragalli asked if they go back to the metal roof did it need to be a standing seam metal roof or could it go back to what was on the roof now.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it would have to be a standing seam.

Dr. Watkins asked Mr. Faragalli if he was willing to comply with Staff's recommendations and Mr. Meyerhoff's motion.

Mr. Faragalli answered no.

Mr. Johnson asked from what information and why did Staff recommend the petitioner go back to metal.

Ms. Ward stated that based on the photographs submitted by the applicant, although they were hard to see because they looked like they were taken at night, it looked like an original standing seam metal roof. She said it did not look like v-crimp, had a build up of tar, was not a new roof because it had been there a long time, and the typical practice was if you were going to replace a historic material due to deterioration that it be replaced in-kind to match the existing, and to preserve the integrity of the building. They would require that wood siding be replaced because they do not allow hardi-plank or clad windows. The materials in essence make up the building.

Mr. Johnson asked if they knew of the condition of the cedar underneath and if they were able to see it like the petitioner was explaining.

Ms. Ward stated that the cedar roof was not noted, it was not visible, and she did not know anything about it.

Mr. Johnson stated that the other buildings that were pointed out had shingled and not metal roofs.

Ms. Ward stated that most were new construction. She said the cottage that was immediately adjacent was one of the examples of demolition by renovation that she had talked about earlier. The Harris Street example that came before the Board by Mr. Howard Reid was mostly new construction because they had rebuilt the whole building.

Mr. Johnson asked if Staff would not change their mind on the metal.

Ms. Ward stated that it was Staff's recommendation.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the asphalt shingles on the building were Review Board approval.

Ms. Ward stated that when the project came to the Review Board nothing was left; not even the studs. She said it was just the foundation and it was a new foundation.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that the wood shingle roof underneath would have to be covered with a smooth plywood surface whether it was asphalt shingled or metal standing seam roof. He said a standing seam roof was there and a standing seam roof was longer-lasting than an asphalt roof and had less maintenance. With all of the considerations he wanted the standing seam roof in his motion.

Dr. Watkins stated that considering that Mr. Faragalli did not want to do the standing seam roof that the Board had the floor in terms of the motion.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board could amend the petitions and approve them as they found them historically compatible. He said the petitioner could build it along with the guidelines; they could come back and ask for a change or an amendment, they could file a new petition, or ask for a continuance. He said that he agreed with Mr. Meyerhoff that it was the appropriate roof and that was what the standards say.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Meyerhoff made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the roof with the condition that the petitioner comply with Staff recommendations. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion. Mr. Johnson was opposed. The motion passed 6 to 1.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Finding-of-Fact that the proposed lot coverage was visually compatible. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of William R. Lee, Sr.
H-07-3940-2
PIN No. 2-0015-20-007
21 East McDonough Street
Rehabilitation/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval with conditions.**

Present for the petition was Mr. William Lee, Sr.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to extend the third floor addition and to perform fire damage repairs.

FINDINGS:

It is proposed to demolish the existing non-historic rooftop addition, deck, and portions of the historic parapet in order to extend the walls up to infill this corner of the building. Marvin Wood Clad Ultimate Double-Hung insulated windows will be installed in the new addition; four on the north McDonough Street side and one additional on the Drayton Street (east) side. (Note the amended drawing for this attached to your packet). The size of the opening will match the existing window openings. Since this is an addition, insulated windows are permitted in the addition. Please clarify that there will be spacer bars used in the windows. Insulated windows may not be used in place of historic wood windows elsewhere in the project.

It is also proposed to add a wrought iron balcony supported by scroll brackets (detail provided). Please provide detail of where the brackets will be located. One window in the existing building will be converted to a door and a multi-light door installed.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the windows be clarified, a section through the north wall be provided, and a detail showing where the balcony brackets will go.

Mr. Gay stated that his understanding was that they were tearing the third floor addition off.

Ms. Reiter answered yes. She said the non-historic addition was put on approximately eight years ago.

Mr. Gay asked why the two windows were next to each other instead of being over the windows on the second story. He said there was talk about an existing window and that if it was being torn off there could not be an existing window.

Mr. Joseph Kessler stated that it was an error in the architect's drawings because the windows were supposed to be symmetrical.

Ms. Reiter stated that she had brought it to the architect's attention that the drawings did not match the plan and what they sent back matched the plans.

Ms. Ramsay stated that on the floor plan the windows could not be directly over the windows below because of a closet that was not noted and it gets in the way.

Mr. Gay stated that they could have a window in the closet.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it was disturbing and should be redesigned for the interior.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Kessler had any problems with getting the accurate drawings to Staff if the Board approved it.

Mr. Kessler stated that he did not. He said the addition would have the Marvin insulated true divided light windows.

Ms. Reiter (inaudible).

Mr. Kessler stated that they were double-pane and there were a certain number of Marvin windows. The windows on the existing west end of the building would remain the same.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if any existing part was being demolished.

Mr. Kessler stated that the stucco odd-shaped addition would be demolished. He said the parapet wall went above and beyond the original brick line for the original north facing roofline, and the roofline would be continued to the McDonough Street corner.

Mr. Meyerhoff asked if the parapet was the only thing being taken down.

Mr. Kessler answered right. He said the parapet and where the two windows were because it was one open room that would be taken down.

Mr. Meyerhoff stated that it seemed like within the last two or three years the addition was approved by the Board, and now the Board was approving another addition on the roof.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was approved After-the-Fact after it was built.

Mr. Kessler stated that a fire made it financially feasible to continue the roofline to make the building look symmetrical and more original. He said they did reclaim many of the bricks from an interior wall and would have enough brick to match.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the conditions that the window clarification and an updated and accurate drawing be submitted to Staff. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

F. STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Scott Smith
H-07-3930(S)-2
546 East Congress Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Steve Day
H-07-3931(S)-2
424 East State Street
Stucco Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Lukejohn Dickson
H-07-3932(S)-2
1504 Habersham Street
Porch Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Lance Cohen
H-07-3933(S)-2
414 West Broughton Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Sharon Galin
H-07-3934(S)-2
426 Abercorn Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Lott + Barber Architects
Scott Barber
H-07-3935-2
PIN No. 2-0004-54-007
110 East President Street
Sign
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products
H-07-3936(S)-2
199 East Bay Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

G. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes – December 12, 2007

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Minutes as submitted. Mr. Meyerhoff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

H. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Reiter stated that there were three appeals. She said the two-foot eight-inch difference on 210 East Taylor was being appealed to the Board of Appeals. She did not know the basis for the appeal.

Ms. Ward stated that (inaudible).

Ms. Reiter stated that the same individual was appealing the trellis. She said that 210 East Taylor was appealing 214 East Taylor, and they were being appealed for the demolition of the Purse Street

properties to City Council. The 90 days were up and the day before the 90-day stay was up Mr. Scott Smith appealed to have the stay of demolition extended.

I. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

J. INFORMATION ITEMS

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp