

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

March 12, 2008

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

**Dr. Malik Watkins, Chairman
Brian Judson, Vice-Chairman
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Gene Hutchinson
Sidney J. Johnson
Richard Law, Sr.
Linda Ramsay
Swann Seiler
Joseph Steffen**

HDRB Members Not Present:

Eric Meyerhoff

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

**Thomas L. Thomson, P.E./AICP, Exec. Director
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant**

RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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 April 9, 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 April 9, 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 April 9, 2008, at the petitioner's request.

**RE: Petition of Mechelle Gladney
H-08-3958-2
PIN No. 2-0032-16-003
15 West Jones Street
Stoop**

Continue to April 9, 2008, at the petitioner's request.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler 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: Amended Petition of Bacha Koslosky Design Works, LLC
Barrow Koslosky
H-07-3883-2
PIN No. 2-0032-14-009
119 East Jones Street
Addition of a Rooftop Deck**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of William Lee and Joe Kesler
H-08-3953-2
PIN No. 2-0015-20-007
21 East McDonough Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of R. K. Construction Company
H-08-3959-2
PIN No. 2-0016-25-006
221 West Broughton Street
Alteration to Bridge at Lane**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Rhondda Netherton
H-08-3965-2
PIN No. 2-005-26-007
125 East Broad Street, Unit 1C
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

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

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

**RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3523-2
PIN No. 2-0031-20-007
320 Montgomery Street
Alteration to Windows**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting the following alteration to correct the areas in the stucco portion where the windows were not recessed three inches.

FINDINGS:

1. The stucco (EIFS) portion facing Harris Street will be applied again to achieve a minimum thickness of three inches as required.
2. In the same manner, the stucco (EIFS) facing Charlton Street, on the portion of the wall closest to the street will be reapplied to achieve the minimum 3” thickness.
3. The portion recessed 92 feet from the sidewalk on Charlton Street and partially blocked by the existing building is requested to be left as is since it is minimally visible.

4. Please verify that the coating will cover the entire face of the stucco areas in question and not just a band around the windows.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval as submitted pending clarification that the stucco will cover the entire affected area. Approval to compromise and leave the recessed portion as is.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay) stated that he would answer any questions.

Ms. Seiler asked Mr. Shay if he was amenable to the changes.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Ms. Ramsay asked what caused the problem.

Mr. Shay stated that because the owner chose to use a different architect to do the construction drawings that they had made a mistake in not following through on the detailing that was given, and did not catch it during shop drawing review. He said it was brought to their attention, they contacted the owner, and because the building was under construction, it was possible to make a retrofit without delaying the construction.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Shay to explain how it was done.

Mr. Shay stated that the layers of a polystyrene-based insulation are laid on the wall and glued together, then every so often a fastening head is fastened through the sheathing. He said it was possible through the construction stages to add an additional layer.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation - HSF) stated that HSF agreed with Staff that it was a fair solution to bring the building up to the design standards of the Board. They did not agree that the 92-foot recessed portion should be exempted. If they lose the existing building on Charlton Street, then the 320 Montgomery façade would not match the rest of the building. She said that all sides of any building visible from the public right-of-way should conform to the Chadbourne guidelines.

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

Ms. Seiler stated that she agreed with Staff that the recessed wall was minimally visible.

**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 **alternative mitigation.**

Present for the petition is Mr. Mark Smith.

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 windows as installed do not meet the standard that states “Window sashes shall be inset not less than three inches from the façade of a masonry building”. Section 8-3030 (l) (9) (g).
2. Previous property owners have been required to remove and correct windows that were incorrectly installed on Broughton Street and on River Street.
3. 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 for EIFS.
4. It is not possible to reset the windows without either changing the size of the window or changing the size of the opening. The cost to reset the windows, replace and refinish the walls could be as much as \$349,000. While the windows do not meet the Standards, the EIFS system, which was previously approved by the Board, makes it difficult to meet the Standard. The alternative of adding a band on the outside of the window to increase the depth is visually incompatible.
5. A similar situation has arisen at another hotel site. In that case the architect has submitted a proposal to add an additional layer of EIFS to the affected areas to make the depth of three inches. That would appear to be an applicable solution for this case also.

RECOMMENDATION: Submit revised detail to add additional depth of EIFS to the Stucco areas on the Bay and Abercorn Street elevations to make the three inch recess.

Ms. Seiler stated that the hotel was open and asked when was it first noticed that it was not to the three inches.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was on November 19.

Ms. Seiler stated that the difference between this hotel and the previous one is that the previous one was caught during construction. She said The Holiday Inn Express was built and open and that concerned her.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark Smith (Owner of Hotel) stated that he had not been through anything like this, and was upset that it had happened, and that it was damaging to him and the company’s reputation. The building was originally approved in 2000, but after the 9/11 incident they did not move forward with the project. When they came back in 2006 they were working on moving forward with the project and eliminated the wall air conditioning units

which was an additional cost increase. A cost saving feature was to eliminate the Arriscraft brick and replace it with the EIFS system. It was originally supposed to be a white stone and in the transition between the brick and the EIFS, the detail of the window recess was missed in the construction drawings, which was their fault. He was sorry the architect made the mistake and was unhappy and upset to be present today. They had spent a lot of money to build and get the plans right and it failed.

They came before the Board in January when Staff had recommended that this was an economic hardship issue. After meeting on the site and reviewing the options, Staff's recommendation was to do nothing. The Board had entered into a discussion about the legal rights, responsibilities, and how to proceed, and asked him to continue the petition. They came back and tried to get some legal clarification. He was asking for a Finding-of-Fact that the property was compatible as a whole with the Historic District and asked the Board not to dwell on the window issue. If he was to move ahead and obtain the Certificate of Occupancy he would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals to obtain a variance. He said he knew some of the windows were not correct, but said that the vast majority of the windows were correct. There were 12 windows at the fourth level of the building, and a couple of bands along Bay Street on either side of the tower that start at the second floor. The majority of the windows in question were on the fourth level. From the photograph there was a recess on a part of the façade so that parts of the fourth floor windows were obscured from public view. The north façade of the building was always in the shade, created a shadowing affect, created an illusion of a recess. He said the lintels and the sills were correct, and what was being discussed were the sides of the windows. They did create the recess with the lintels and the sills. In his view it was a design detail that was hardly noticeable.

If they accepted Staff's recommendation they would have to scaffold the building, close the sidewalk, which would create the appearance that they were not open for business, and it would be disruptive to their operation. He asked the Board to use some judgment because we thought it was a beautiful building and had received numerous compliments. He said the building was not perfect, but if you look at it as a whole it was a very attractive addition to Savannah. When they came before the Board in 1999 they asked the Board to use some judgment on the height of the building, and they did. They were allowed to exceed the height map and go to the parking deck height to complete the obstruction of the parking deck from view.

Ms. Seiler stated that on Bay Street it was difficult to look up because of the tree line. She asked Mr. Smith to point out the windows.

Ms. Seiler asked Mr. Smith when he knew about it.

Mr. Smith stated he received a letter in late November. He said it was a flaw in the process because during the course of construction they were inspected for mechanical, structural, electrical, and life safety items and that there were seven or eight different city departments that came by on a weekly or bi-weekly basis to see what was being done. The sheet rock could not be hung until the plumbing and electrical connections were done. In Ms. Reiter's first recommendation in January she stated that it would be appropriate for Staff to attend the pre-construction meetings and he agreed. If they were going to ask for significant expenditures to be made to resolve something then there needed to be an inspection process. He would have welcomed it and they could have fixed it while the building had scaffolding. They paid a lot of money for the building permit, they should have caught it, but they did not.

Ms. Seiler stated that the Historic Review Ordinance Committee had this suggestion and they were looking at it.

Mr. Smith stated if they had to put another fee on the building permit or something then that was what they should do. He said it was a horrendous resolution to what he thought was a minor problem.

Mr. Judson stated that he did not have a problem seeing what the issue was because he had been on Bay Street several times and could see it as a pedestrian on each side of the street and westbound from the other side of the street.

Ms. Seiler stated that you had to get out of the car and once you got out of the car you had to look up.

Mr. Judson stated that he could see it by walking on the other side of the street and while driving westbound.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it was clearly visible without the tree canopy on the Abercorn Street side. She said she had no trouble seeing how unfortunately flat it appeared.

Dr. Watkins stated that one of the things the Board had to make sure they considered during the deliberations was that while they could appreciate the economic hardship issue, he wanted to remind the Board that their specific charge was to look at design standards and visually compatibility. He said that one of the reasons it was continued was because it was not a part of the Board's charge to consider any kind of economic hardship, but specifically focus on the compatibility of design factors for the community. When he went by it was fairly easy to see, and for one of the most significant historic districts in the country to have hotel siding that was similar to what was out at the airport or any other kind of low-cost facility, this did not hold well for what they were trying to do. He said that the architect pretty much admitted on record that he made an error in the process, and asked if Mr. Smith had any discussions with the architect about errors and omissions insurance or some type of measure to correct the procedures on his part.

Mr. Smith stated that they had a 30-year relationship on projects, that they were a team, and that they go up or down with the ship together. He said he would not take legal action because it would delay things longer.

Dr. Watkins asked if Mr. Smith was holding that issue higher than the veracity or the viability of the standards.

Mr. Smith stated that the buck stopped here and whatever was going to be done they would have to bite the bullet and do it.

Mr. Steffen asked whether the objection to the last solution proposed was not based solely on the cost of the solution and creating the extra EIFS but based on the fact that they would have to place scaffolding on the building and create the appearance that the hotel was under construction or closed.

Mr. Smith stated that it was correct. He said that he was asking for a Finding-of-Fact that it was compatible.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation - HSF) stated that the HSF Architectural Review Committee agreed with Staff and Dr. Watkins that the visual compatibility factors were what the Board was charged with and not economic development hardships that might be incurred, although, they sympathize with Mr. Smith.

Mr. Buck Lindsay (Lindsay, Pope & Brayfield Architect) stated that he was not fully responsible because they were permitted for the project as shown in the plans and that was what was built. The permit process took approximately four months with the city. They were reviewed by the historic preservation staff, and he admitted that when you look through a set of plans 200 sheets thick that it was not unforgivable if you don't find a particular item that might be an infraction of the rules. He said that architects should understand that when you put a set of plans together you make thousands of decisions and that every line on a piece of paper was an opportunity for something to be right or wrong. Having done it for 33 years he had made his share of mistakes because we all make mistakes. The Board was charged with making value judgments of how the applications fit

the circumstance. If it was a black or white, yes or no issue, the Board would not be needed. They often found themselves in circumstances of sins of degree, and Mr. Smith was saying that in the spectrum of opportunity for a serious infraction of guidelines, that this was minor. When the building was taken in the context of its environment and how it fits into the fabric of the adjacent buildings and the context of the city, he thought it was a successful solution. He asked the Board to be fair in their judgment of how serious of an infraction of the guidelines it was, the appropriate solution to rectify it, and if a solution was in order.

Dr. Watkins stated that because there needed to be consistency with the previous scenario on the first item on the docket, what were some of the similarities or contradictions between this project and the previous one when discussing the three-inch recess.

Ms. Reiter stated that they both did not meet the standards, but this one was completed and occupied and the other one was still under construction.

Dr. Watkins stated that it was the same issue with one being under construction and one was not in terms of what was worked out in the first scenario and in making sure that the compatibility standards were met.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Ms. Ramsay stated that they requested the Board find it visually compatible and it was hard to do when it violated the guidelines. She asked if it was an option, because she recalled at the last meeting, it was not an option.

Ms. Reiter stated that Staff would not recommend that it was visually compatible, because it was not.

Mr. Steffen stated that he was persuaded somewhat by Mr. Lindsay's comments and that it was in fact the Board's role to make value judgments in tough cases. He said that if it was a matter of saying whether something was in compliance or not, then they would not need the Board. He was concerned that with placing scaffolding it would create a disruption to the Historic District, in spite of what was being done to the hotel, but it goes to the greater community. He was also concerned that the Board's charge was to protect the historic community and the general architectural guidelines. In order to do that properly they had to maintain public support for what the Board did. Sometimes that meant that the Board needed to make compromises in order not to appear as a draconian Board that had no sympathy to situations that happened through no true fault. He said they should make a Finding-of-Fact that the windows were non-compliant and a Finding-of-Fact that the building as a whole was in compliance and, therefore, approve the petition. This way it would not cause undue hardship on the applicant and make a clear statement that creating windows in situations like this that were non-compliant was not appropriate for any architect to construct things that were non-compliant. There was an affirmative duty on architects not to create precedence for someone else to come and say that the Board approved the windows. He wanted to make it clear that the Board did not approve the windows that they were non-compliant, and because of what had happened with the building already built that the building as a whole was non-compliant.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review make a Finding-of-Fact that the windows are non-compliant. However, the building as a whole is appropriate. Ms. Seiler seconded the motion. Mr. Gay, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Steffen, Mr. Judson, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Law and Ms. Seiler were in favor of the motion. Ms Ramsay and Dr. Henry were opposed. The motion passed 7 to 2.**

Dr. Watkins asked Mr. Lindsay if he was aware that they still had to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Lindsay answered yes.

**RE: Petition of Paul Hansen
Independent Presbyterian Church
H-06-3629-2 (Ref. H-02-2793-2)
PIN No. 2-0015 -13-010
212-214 Whitaker Street
Building Partially Collapsed on February 1, 2008**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval to demolish**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Walter Hartridge, Mr. Michael Sikes, and Mr. Paul Hansen.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

In February, 2008, a major portion of 212 - 214 Whitaker Street, undergoing renovation and additions, collapsed. The applicant is requesting the demolition of the remaining walls in order to continue with the new construction previously approved.

FINDINGS:

1. The east and south walls are all that remain of the 1901 residential lane structure. These walls have through wall settlement cracks. The two-story Whitaker Street building consisted of three buildings built at separate periods and later stuccoed. A 1960's or 70's brick veneer was placed over the underlying Savannah Grey brick wall. The interior historic trim had been removed possibly when the brick veneer was added. It was proposed to remove the brick veneer during the new construction. The approved construction plans placed a concrete block interior structure within the walls and use the historic brick wall as a veneer. Due to masonry failure and mortar deterioration, it is likely that if the brick veneer were to be removed the Savannah Grey wall would completely collapse.
2. Eight years ago the petitioner requested demolition of these buildings. Staff recommended approval of the demolition at that time because, in their opinion, the buildings had already lost their historic integrity due to previous changes. The Board did, however, deny the demolition.
3. After the collapse in February 2008, the building retains very little if any historic or structural integrity.
4. Photos and a letter from a structural engineer are attached.
5. The petitioner needs to clarify how the elevation where the three-story lane building stood will now be treated.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval to demolish the remaining walls because the buildings have lost their structural and historic integrity.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Walter Hartridge (Representing Attorney) stated that it was their position that the demolition was required to alleviate a threat to public safety and avoid difficulty. He said that the Board had the structural report done by Mr. Michael Sikes.

Mr. Michael Sikes (Structural Engineer, Saussy Engineering) stated that there were numerous cracks within the existing wall that were there prior to the construction back in 2000. He said they had stated earlier that they recommended the building be demolished at that time. During the construction process the contractor removed temporary shoring in order to construct parts of the building, and was in the process of replacing it when the collapse happened. He said it was an act of God and that it was not intentional. Based on his opinion, the condition of the existing construction was subpar even by standards of that day. There were several cases where the two withes of Savannah Gray are usually tied together with row locks approximately every four to five courses. On this particular building the row locks were tied in every ten courses, the cavity between the two withes was completely void, and normally the withes were filled with mortar. He said if you looked at the Whitaker Street wall it was a hodge-podge of construction because there were several different cracks that occurred over time, the construction was substandard, and based on the condition and the threat to public safety the contractor would have to provide a more permanent means of scaffolding in order to repair the wall. It was right on Whitaker Street and there was approximately five feet of sidewalk between the face of the building and the edge of Whitaker Street. A more permanent engineered system would require the closing of one lane of Whitaker Street in order to do construction, and the contract would have to allow the temporary scaffolding on the inside to be removed to proceed.

Mr. Paul Hansen (Hansen Architects representing IPC) stated that there were questions raised when they met with HSF and other individuals regarding why the project sat so long. He said that when they asked for demolition, it was not granted and they proceeded with the rehabilitation plans. During the process, the Independent Presbyterian Church experienced some major problems with the steeple on the church. The major repairs that had to be undertaken for the steeple diverted funds away from the Whitaker Street project and it had to wait until the church was able to raise additional funds.

When talking with the contractor and looking at the wall while up on the scaffolding, there was no mortar left between the bricks, but basically sand and you could stick your finger through the depth of the wall. To make the project work, the whole wall would have to be dismantled and rebuilt which contradicted the fact that you were preserving the wall. The wall that was originally approved by the Board would be totally encapsulated within the exterior and interior wall surfaces, and there would not be an exposure of the wall in the future if it was preserved. They would like to get an approval so they could move forward with the building. There were questions raised about if the building was demolished what would the church rebuild. He said that they would rebuild a new building and would have to come back to the Board to get approval for Height and Mass and Design. By approving demolition it would circumvent the process to get approval for a new building.

Mr. Hartridge asked if the wall was taken down and rebuilt would it be seen.

Mr. Hansen stated that it would not.

Mr. Hartridge asked was it because stucco was on the other side.

Mr. Hansen stated that originally there was a stucco exterior along Whitaker Street and a sheet rock interior wall partition.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Joe Saseen stated that the Board was not dealing with a building that had a door that had not been painted right, or an awning that did not follow the guidelines. He said what the Board had to decide today would affect the Historic District for generations. He went through the process of what had happened in the past for the Board to get a better focus on what he wanted and to persuade the Board to do for the good of the Historic District.

Dr. Watkins asked Mr. Saseen to focus the comments on the issue at hand because they did not want to spend a lot of time going back through the past.

Mr. Saseen stated that he was going back through the past of what had been before the Board, and what he was attempting to persuade the Board to do today.

Dr. Watkins stated that he wanted to make sure that most of the time was focused in on the current issues.

Mr. Saseen pointed out the present parking lot facing Chippewa Square, and pointed out the building to be demolished that were all in the same block. He said that back in 1972 there were three buildings facing the square which were torn down to make a parking lot. The Board made motions all of the time with conditions to go back to Staff for further review. It was the scar they were looking at today and would be looking at for generations because the church would never sell the lot to a private developer to put in a building to fill in the gap. He felt it was a perfect opportunity for the Board to follow the prior Board's suggestion and not allow the demolition of another building unless they agreed to replace the new building to fill in the gap on the square.

Dr. Watkins asked Mr. Saseen to get to his point because in actuality the Board had no control over where to tell them to put in a parking lot.

Mr. Saseen stated that he was a lawyer and was well aware of what the Board could and could not do.

Dr. Watkins stated that procedurally the Board was dealing with the wall and instead of making critical comments Mr. Saseen was going to have to deal with the issue or they would move on. He said it was not the place to consider the alternative plan because that was what Staff would deal with.

Mr. Saseen stated that he was trying to deal with the issue by telling the Board...

Dr. Watkins stated that because of the way that Mr. Saseen was dealing with the Board that they could not take too much time focusing on that. He said they had to deal with the issue at hand which was what the Bylaws and the procedural manual state.

Mr. Saseen said no, and that the issue was that two things could be done at one time. He said that by denying...

Dr. Watkins stated that it was not what the applicant had requested and the Board was dealing with what the applicant had requested. Since Mr. Saseen was not the applicant he could not put in the request for them.

Mr. Saseen stated that he was putting in the request to the Board because it was their duty and that was why they were up there.

Dr. Watkins stated they were dealing with comments that dealt specifically with the application and what Mr. Saseen was talking about was not the application. He said it was an alternative solution that had nothing to do with the application.

Mr. Saseen stated that it was not to demolish the building.

Dr. Watkins stated that he would have to ask Mr. Saseen to close it out in a minute or so.

Mr. Saseen stated that by standing pat on not demolishing the building, which was the issue before the Board, that he was addressing it.

Dr. Watkins stated that the demolition of the building was the issue, but the alternative solution was not the issue. He asked Mr. Saseen to get to the point.

Mr. Saseen stated that the point was that by denying them permission to demolish the building, then they had to make the decision on whether they should stay there or move to the parking lot. He said if the Board denied it today they would be forced to repair the damage. The Board could not tell them to do that, but if they saw that they were blocked by the Board by not tearing it down, they might not have an alternative. He hoped the Board would give it some attention and felt there was not a single person on the Board who was not proud of it or had to walk by Bull Street and look at something like that. By blankly refusing demolition they could possibly be forced into correcting something that should have never been allowed before. It had been done, but now was a golden opportunity to correct it.

Mr. Julius Hornstein stated that he had lived in Savannah his entire life like Mr. Saseen and adored it. He said he had always looked at the eyesore and that it was what it was, which was a parking lot. The wall was hewn out of nice and beautiful English marble that could easily be incorporated by the church stewards into a building that would replace and make correction to the damage. He supported Mr. Saseen's argument and the logic of it that the building under consideration for demolition was an excellent place for a parking lot. The church could reassess and redirect its thinking toward a structure that was appropriate. In his conclusion they had gotten into a coulda, woulda, shoulda situation that was significant with so many buildings that they had allowed things to be done and made no effort to correct them.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation - HSF) stated that when HSF fought eight years ago to save the building it was primarily because a compromise could not be reached about what would replace it. She said it was the position of HSF today, as it was eight years ago, that new construction on the lots should be broken up into units so that it would not appear as one, large, monolithic structure. HSF had met with architects and believed that a compromise could be reached with the design of the new structures. They asked that the Board not grant a demolition permit today until the Board saw concept drawings about what should replace it.

Mr. Walter Hartridge stated that with respect to the request that the permission to demolish be denied until plans were presented, they had presented overpowering evidence that it was a danger. He said that anything constructed there would have to come before the Board. The reference that was made to demolition in 1972 was before the Historic Zoning Ordinance was even enacted by the city.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board was not dealing with the history lesson, but focusing specifically on today.

Mr. Hartridge stated that he would respectfully submit that Mr. Saseen and Mr. Hornstein's proposition was not presented before the Board properly, but what was before the Board was the demolition request.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Steffen stated that what happened as far as the partial collapse of the building as an act of God was not the way that things were described in the newspaper a few weeks ago by a representative of the petitioner. As a member of the Board and as one who served at the time it was originally considered he did not like to be lobbied in the newspaper. He was extremely offended to see an article written by a person who reported to be a religious representative of the church who accused the Staff and the volunteer Board of putting children at risk by the fact that they tried to save the building at a time when the church owned the property, allowed it to fall into disrepair, and then diverted their funds and attention to working on a steeple while the project was put on the back burner. For this to take place and accuse the hard-working Staff and volunteer Board of somehow being complicit in putting the children of the community and the members of the church at risk was abhorrent, was unchristian, and should have never been in the paper. In the time that he spent on the Board it was the most offended he had ever been, and to be offended by a church organization made it doubly so.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Judson seconded the motion. Mr. Gay, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Steffen, Mr. Judson, Ms. Seiler, Mr. Hutchinson, and Mr. Law were in favor of the motion. Dr. Henry and Ms. Ramsay were opposed. The motion passed 7 to 2.

Mr. Thomson stated given that the building could not be torn down by St. Patrick’s Day he would ask the owners to contact the city and develop a plan. He said with the thousands of people that would be present on St. Patrick’s Day Friday and on the weekend. They could accidentally be harmed by the walls falling.

Ms. Seiler stated that it should go through Monday because the visitors would stay through because of Holy week.

Mr. Thomson stated that extra buffer around the building would be in order and asked them to consult with the city inspectors.

Mr. Hansen stated that they would not be demolishing the building this afternoon or tomorrow. He said they would get with the general contractor to make sure things were stable and protected through the holiday weekend.

**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**

The Preservation Officer recommends revisions to certain details.

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

New Construction Part II Design Details for a six-story hotel. Part I approved October 10, 2007. ZBA approved height variance request on October 23, 2007.

FINDINGS:

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards:	Previously reviewed Part I	Please comment on whether the setback over the historic structures has become less deep since the Part I approval.
Windows and Doors:	Historic facades: Windows: Existing wood windows to be refurbished or replicated in kind. Doors: New metal storefront to replicate existing deteriorated storefront with wood framed	Historic Buildings: Provide Staff with colors; design details were not provided in the 01 and 03 submittals. The new construction windows and doors meet the standards in the brick veneer and terra clad facades.

	<p>glass doors. The middle historic structure will have new metal storefront and doors in existing openings. Add two new wood windows to match existing second floor middle historic building.</p> <p>Brick veneer façade: Windows: Dark bronze metal double-hung window 3” recess cast stone lintel Rowlock brick sill Doors: Dark bronze aluminum storefront door</p> <p>Stucco facades: Windows: Dark bronze metal double hung window recessed 3” Doors: Aluminum storefront (Montgomery)</p> <p>Terra clad panel facades: Windows: Dark bronze aluminum storefront Doors: Dark bronze aluminum storefront</p>	<p>The vertical VPAC openings are not visually compatible, especially on the Bryan and Montgomery Streets elevations which can be seen from the square. They should be replaced with an interior unit.</p>
<p>Roof Shape: Parapets shall have a stringcourse of not less than six inches in depth and extending at least four inches from the face of the building, running the full width of the building between one and one and a half feet from the top of the parapet. Parapets shall have a coping with a minimum two-inch overhang.</p>	<p>Flat with parapets and caps except on the terra cotta portion.</p>	<p>Since this is a modern structure the top contrasting terra cotta band meets the intent of the stringcourse, however, there is no perceivable finish “cap” on the top of the Terra cotta panel wall parapets.</p>
<p>Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches: Canopies:</p>	<p>Extruded metal fascia system on metal framing cantilevered support structure Dark bronze anodized aluminum</p>	<p>Compatible with the design of the building</p>
<p>Fences:</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>Overlay District Standards:</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>Materials:</p>	<p>Brick Veneer: Palmetto brick “Dark Red Wirecut” Stucco: Sand finish painted Pittsburgh No. 316-5 “Applesauce” (SM-4014) Terra Cotta Panels Field:</p>	<p>The brick and terra cotta materials complement the historic materials around the square and give a fine grained human-scaled texture to the façade. However, it is not clear from the elevations how they will appear on the façade. The arrow on drawing</p>

	<p>“Terra Cotta” Dark Accents “Mocha” Ribbed terracotta panel for banding (not provided)</p>	<p>A-10 points to “Terraclad panels smooth” but it is a dark color – Is this a different treatment that is repeated over and under the windows and on the parapet in this corner building?</p> <p>On large-scale and tall buildings stucco does not provide the fine grained detail that helps break up the mass of a large structure. The stucco expanse along Bryan Street further emphasizes the mass of this building, and the light color emphasizes the numerous VPAC openings. Alternative materials should be explored for this elevation.</p>
Textures:	See above	
Color:	See above	
HVAC	Vertical VPAC grills	The grills which are almost as large as some of the windows in the building are inappropriate, particularly on the square facing end of the structure.

RECOMMENDATION: Reconsideration of parapet cap detail on Terra Cotta panel portion; elimination of VPAC grills; clarify band material and what colors of terra cotta are going to be used where (particularly in the parapet). Discuss changes to setback over historic structures.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay) stated that the First African Baptist Church was the co-developer of the project and since they would be the beneficiary of it, that they had worked with someone who had begun removing the cement on the outside of the church building. The cement came off easily and revealed the historic Savannah Grey brick underneath without doing damage to the brick or the mortar. The removal of the stucco will reveal the way the building looked in 1855.

He displayed an image of the proposed hotel project pointing out where some areas had been slightly modified because of where they proposed to originally place the elevator core. They had decided to move the core to the middle of the building and the façade was smoothed out. He said that on the plans that were submitted the line that had the jog in it was made smooth, but there was a depth of 14 feet from the façade to the back side and the reveal was still prominent from the façade. He stated that Ms. Dolecki pointed out that the above floor line continued over further because the story stopped at one level. It would make an unbroken plane that would be longer than 60 feet and the ordinance said you had to have a break within the plane. It would be appropriate to introduce a recess in the façade so that there was a break in the façade at that level. The rendering that was presented at the Height and Mass stage showed a jog in the parapet line, and what they were proposing with the final colors would smooth out the cornice to make it a straight line. It would make it deeply recessed behind the planes of the buildings in front of it. He said that Ms. Dolecki thought that It should be broken with a recess and they would be willing to do that.

Ms. Seiler asked if the image was the current or the proposed steeple.

Mr. Shay stated that it would be the appearance of the church if the church was restored to approximately 120 years ago. He said the body of the sanctuary now had cement on it. The tall steeple and the part that would be added as part of the renovation was already approved by a previous Board.

Ms. Seiler stated that she was aware of that but wanted to know if what was shown was the complete package.

Mr. Shay answered yes. He said the colors shown were what was presented to the Board today. He felt he had addressed Staff's question about the recess. The questions about the details for the parts of the façade that were to be restored or preserved were two buildings that were approved for renovations and they went back to revisit them. They did not submit details of the window in the storefront at that time because since it had been approved and he felt that it would not be appropriate.

He showed an image of details that was used in 2001 and said at that time the storefront was wood. They would like to try to restore the wood but he was not confident that it would be the case having been boarded up for seven years. On the drawings it would be replaced with metal to match and they would measure the wooden elements that were present. If during the course of construction they discover that wood could be restored, then they would come back and ask the Board permission to make it as it was. He showed an image of a window in a masonry wall with the same detail presented in 2003.

In regard to the vertical VPAC openings, it came up during the design development because the hotel rooms were suites. They thought they could conceal the air conditioning units under the windows using terra clad materials. After discussions with the mechanical engineer, because it was two rooms, it had to have a small air conditioning system that circulated air with ducts. The VPAC system was the most efficient system. They tried to come up with a solution where the louvers would be larger than they needed to be and made to fit into the module of the windows. (Remainder inaudible...stepped away from the microphone.) The Montgomery Street elevation presented did not have any of the louvers in it. There was never the intent of having the VPAC louvers facing Montgomery Street, but Staff was accurate on the part that faces the louvers that were incorporated into the terra cotta from the square.

The finished cap on the top of the terra cotta wall materials lends itself because of the finish, and it was in panels. He said they were able to find a precast panel with a bull nose and that it could definitely be added into the cornice of the terra cotta material. He displayed an image of the bull nose piece being used as a sill and said that it could be used as the piece by the parapet that would meet the ordinance. That there was confusion in the differences between the terra clad panels. It was hard using black and white elevations to show that there were three different panels proposed in the terra cotta portion of the building. Two were flat...(inaudible, stepped away from the microphone). It introduced a horizontal element to the composition. The brochure had examples of what the serrated panels looked like. It was a combination of three types of panels with only two colors. They wanted to save the third much lighter sand color for the stucco and the recessed area on the building. The idea was that the bland color would recede and allow the front edge to be the thing to catch the eye. If you were standing in front of City Market you wouldn't be able to see any of the building because there were trees in between there. When walking along the street, you would only see the top of one building and not the other because it was setback entirely.

They reconsidered the parapet detail and added a bull nose, they wanted to retain the VPAC grills because they felt they were integrated into the look of the building in proportion and color. They clarified the band material and what color the terra cotta would be and discussed the changes to the setback over the historic structures. They agreed that the 60-foot unbroken plane should be broken up with a reveal in the building.

Ms. Ramsay stated that on the Montgomery Street elevation that showed the church on Page 13.2, that it had two vertical elements flanking the door and those don't have the horizontal dark band across them.

Mr. Shay stated that was because the rendering was in black and white. He said that the horizontal bands in those areas of stucco would be continuous and the same mocha color as the terra cotta.

Ms. Ramsay asked if it would be stucco

Mr. Shay stated that it would.

Ms. Ramsay stated that the sample had EIFS but there appeared to be real stucco in the drawings and asked which one would it be. She asked if it was styrene-based and said that the color appeared to be much darker than light sand.

Mr. Shay stated that it was the actual color. He said the sample was from their office...(remainder inaudible).

Ms. Ramsay asked if it was true stucco on a hard base or was it stucco on an EIFS system.

Mr. Shay stated that they preferred to have hard stucco. He said they had to work through it in the final construction drawings. It would have the acrylic finish coat and what would be seen was the same.

Mr. Law stated that the steeple looked better than the other one but it looked as if they were losing the whole square.

Mr. Shay stated that in order for the two buildings to be seen in context, they had to pretend that there was not a Haitian monument and live oak trees. He said if he did a one-point perspective rendering from standing on the corner you would not be able to see anything.

Mr. Gay asked if it was possible to have a central air conditioning system for the entire building and do away with the ones for each room.

Mr. Shay stated that it was an issue with the floor-to-floor heights on the buildings. He said that in order to make the buildings not tall as possible and get it down to the minimum code allowance, it made it impossible to have central forced air conditioning systems.

BOARD COMMENTS:

Dr. Henry asked if the original recommendation of Staff remained the same.

Mr. Gay stated that they had been addressed and if the Board made a movement to approve it in accordance to the recommendation of Staff, that the petitioner was willing to do all of it.

Ms. Reiter stated that she did not think that the VPAC system should be in the National Historic Landmark District because it was visually incompatible.

Dr. Henry asked if the recommendation had been changed.

Ms. Reiter stated that she had raised issues that needed to be addressed. She said that he had addressed the cap at the top and that the VPAC systems were unfortunate.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Staff did or did not like the parapet addition.

Ms. Reiter stated that it would help it, but if you looked at the original rendering of Part I she thought it was a handsome detail and that it might not come in the terra cotta.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as amended with the condition that the changes to the stucco wall be brought back to Staff, and that a sample panel will be erected on site. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. Dr. Henry, Mr. Gay, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Steffen, Mr. Judson, Mr. Hutchinson, and Mr. Law were in favor of the motion. Ms. Seiler and Ms. Ramsay were opposed. The motion passed 7 to 2.

Mr. Steffen stated he indicated his personal feeling that the solution being proposed by the applicant on the VPAC grills was enough of a blend. He disagreed with Staff a little.

Ms. Seiler stated that she voted against Part I, and with respect to Reverend Tillman and the congregation she thought it was a very beautiful and most historic church in the southeast and the state of Georgia. She said that she voted against Part I because she felt that the mass and the height would overshadow the square, the ward, it would dominate the historic beauty of the church, and would make it indistinguishable. She voted against it on Part II.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she would have to agree with Ms. Seiler because the First African Baptist Church was a gorgeous, wonderful church and the proposed building would overshadow the church. She said it was very busy and the VPAC system did not make it any better. It deserved a building that recognized First African Baptist for what it was, and not that it made a loud statement with a busy façade.

Mr. Judson asked if Mr. Shay was willing to break up the 60-foot span on the upper portion of the wall.

Mr. Shay answered yes.

Mr. Steffen stated that was why he included it in the part about going back to Staff so that they could give approval to it.

Mr. Thomson stated that if the Board chose to approve the VPAC element, Staff would like a panel constructed with the materials suggested. He said his personal concern was the textural difference between the terra cotta and the metal. There may be a treatment that could be put in like the sample panel that was constructed.

Mr. Steffen stated that he would be happy to add it to the motion.

**RE: Petition of Cecil W. Nelson for
Art2Go
H-08-3962-2
PIN No. 2-0045-23-011E
517 Tattnall Street
Roof Trellis Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to erect a deck and pergola over the existing garage. Also, to extend existing rear second floor deck to square it off and cover with standing seam metal roof; screen in porch and add railing to exterior. The structure of the deck is redwood tone wood with planters and stucco panels for railings.

FINDINGS:

The stucco panels will match the existing stucco on the main house.

Please clarify whether the stair is going to change position or be removed.

Staff believes that the posts and railing etc of the porch should be painted rather than left raw. The same is true for the planters and posts of the arbor treatment so that it will look more a part of the house. The arbor trellis part can be left redwood color as it will probably be covered in vines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with clarification.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Cecil Nelson stated that he was the designer and builder of the project.

Mr. Judson asked if he was amenable to Staff's recommendation of staining the wood.

Mr. Nelson answered yes, said that he spoke with the clients, and that they agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay) stated that he completely supported what was being proposed. He said that he worked with Mr. Nelson who had asked him some questions about what was structurally possible and that he would continue to offer support for the project.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the condition that the posts and porch woodwork be stained. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Sign Mart, Incorporated for
Savannah Association for the Blind
H-08-3963-2
PIN No. 2-0015-15-009
214 Drayton Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

Present for the petition was Mr. J. R. Dandy.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to install an internally illuminated principal use projecting sign on the building at 214 Drayton Street as follows:

Size: The sign is 66” (5.5’) wide by 36” (3’) tall and 12” deep.

Location: It is located on the west façade fronting Drayton above the entrance on the projecting canopy. It hangs from a metal bracket projecting a total of 73” (6 feet) from the façade and maintains a 10’ clearance above the sidewalk.

Colors: Opaque blue background with white lettering for SAB – Savannah Association for the Blind, Inc.

Illumination: The sign will be internally illuminated with only the white lettering being lit.

FINDINGS:

The building at 214 Drayton Street is not historic and is not a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned BC-1 (Central Business) and the following standards from the Historic Sign District Ordinance (Section 8-3121) apply:

(B) Requirements.

(2) Sign clearance and height... Minimum clearance shall not be less than ten feet above pedestrianways...

The standard is met.

(3) Lighted signs. Lighted signs of an enclosed lamp, neon or exposed fluorescent design are not permitted within any “R” zoning district. However, such lighted signs, except those of exposed fluorescent design, are permitted within the non-residential zoning districts. Such signs shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open spaces. The use of reversed silhouette or “cut-out” letters is encouraged to reduce glare where back lighting is applied.

The proposed sign is not in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures. The internally illuminated sign may be compatible if the projection were reduced from 6’. This is a large sign to be internally illuminated and the Historic Review Board has, in the past, worked with petitioners to develop appropriate signage in the immediate vicinity to enhance the pedestrian character of Drayton Street and not encourage further auto-related signage. Staff recommends reducing the size of the sign or submitting a sign similar to what is existing (wood sandblasted sign) with external illumination from above.

(11) Principal Use Sign Requirements. For each non-residential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than one square foot of sign area per linear foot of frontage along a given street or shall meet the following size [30 feet] whichever is the most restrictive. Maximum projection of out sign edge for projecting sign is 6’, provided that no portion of a sign shall be erected within 2 feet of a curb line.

The standard is met. The existing principal use fascia sign will be removed. The sign is 16.5 square feet and the building maintains 90 linear feet along Drayton Street.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial because the illuminated sign is not in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures unless it is either 1) reduced in size by or 2) externally illuminated.

Mr. Gay asked if externally illuminated would mean that the sign would be flat against the building or would it protrude out.

Ms. Ward stated that it could still be a projecting sign, but it would be lighted from an external source shining on the sign from goosenecks or mounted below and shining on the sign.

Mr. Steffen asked for an appropriate size.

Ms. Ward stated that she did not have a recommendation, but thought four feet would be more compatible. She said the sign projected six feet from the face of the building and was rather large. If it were scaled-down it would be more compatible with a maximum of four feet.

Dr. Henry asked if it was completely within the law and met all of the standards.

Ms. Ward stated that the standards for lighted signs say that a sign shall be in scale and harmony with the surrounding structures and open space. She would say that it was not in scale and harmony. If it was scaled down she thought it would be appropriate, but the proposed size was not in scale and harmony.

Mr. Gay stated that it still had to be compatible. He said that the Board could say they had met every single rule, but if it was incompatible with everything surrounding the project, the Board would not approve it.

Dr. Henry asked who created the standards.

Ms. Ward stated that they were adopted by City Council for the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Savannah.

Dr. Henry asked if it would be a good idea for City Council to change the standards.

Mr. Gay stated that not every time is a sign this large out-of-scale and not appropriate. He said it just happened that in this particular spot that was out-of-scale and inappropriate and the Board wanted it smaller. If it were some place else the size might be fine.

Ms. Ward stated that if it were not illuminated there would not be a problem. She said it was just the lighted signs.

Dr. Henry asked if the sign was judged by the length of the street fronts.

Ms. Ward stated that they met all of the size and clearance requirements in the ordinance. She said it was the lighted signs section of the ordinance that Staff did not feel they complied with.

Dr. Henry stated that he thought Ms. Ward had said that they met it.

Ms. Ward stated that it was under Section B3 on the first page of the Staff report for lighted signs. She said they met all of the size and clearance requirements by the ordinance, but felt they were not meeting the lighted sign section of the ordinance.

Mr. Steffen stated that there were two hurdles. He said the first hurdle was the sign ordinance itself that applied whether someone was in the district or not. There was a certain amount of size that could be placed on a particular sized building. The second issue of compatibility was one that the Board was charged with to decide whether it was compatible to the surrounding structures. Sometimes they were the same and sometimes they could be in addition to one another.

Dr. Henry asked if the recommendation was that it was fine in terms of the metrics.

Ms. Ward stated that it was not the aesthetics but the size and scale for an illuminated sign. She said if it were not illuminated that they would be alright with the size. Because they want it internally illuminated, it was not in scale and harmony.

Ms. Seiler stated that something that large and internally illuminated would stand out at you and that was not what the Board wanted in the middle of the Historic District.

Mr. Steffen asked if Staff was concerned with any comparison to the large sign that was placed on a structure two blocks south from Drayton Towers that protrudes out over Drayton Street.

Ms. Ward stated that it was large, it was investigated, but it was not an illuminated sign. She said if this sign were not illuminated then Staff would be alright with it.

Mr. Steffen stated that he was talking about the size.

Ms. Ward said yes. She said if it was not illuminated that they would be alright with the sign.

Mr. Judson asked if Staff knew the width of the sidewalk.

Ms. Ward stated that it was wide and that the sign ordinance allowed you to build over the sidewalk but you had to maintain two feet of open clearance. She believed that they were within it.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Dr. J. R. Dandy (Chairman of the Board for the Savannah Association of the Blind - SAB) stated that the Savannah Association for the Blind cannot be compared to Parker’s next door because they serve a different clientele. He said that SAB was in the business of rehabilitating the blind and visually impaired and that they serve 29 counties from Florida to Macon. One of the problems they had was that people cannot find them, there were different levels of blindness and sight, and they had clients who could find them after dark with the sign. The other proposed sign would not work for them because they needed an internally illuminated sign so that the clients walking down the street from both sides with their canes can actually see the sign. Some blind people zero in on things they can see; especially those who have light perception, and an internally illuminated sign would really work best for them.

Ms. Ramsay asked if Dr. Dandy had investigated another kind of lighted sign.

Dr. Dandy stated that another sign would not work for them. He said the sign with the logo and little bit of white around the logo would be easily seen by their clients.

Mr. Gay stated that if the light emanated from the sign it would be more visible than external lighting facing in.

Dr. Dandy answered absolutely.

Mr. Judson asked if they operated during hours of darkness.

Dr. Dandy answered yes.

Dr. Watkins stated that Staff was recommending denial unless the size or the external illumination is addressed. He asked if there were any thoughts to the reduction in size.

Mr. Bill Norton (Sign Mart) stated that three by six sounded large, was ten feet up, but gets much smaller. He said that the letters on the sign were approximately four and one-half inches tall and was smaller than the letters on the back of the wall. The letters on the logo are small and a light behind it would make it so small that it would not be seen. He did not think that a three by six up ten feet was large. If it was non-illuminated the size would be fine, but since it was internally illuminated it was not. It would not be lit all day long, would be turned off at 11:00 at night, and would not be glaring all night long.

Dr. Watkins asked if they had any thoughts on changing the proposal to match what Staff suggested regarding a smaller sign or an externally illumination sign.

Mr. Norton stated that they would not like to do that because they already have the “Savannah Association for the Blind” letters.

Ms. Seiler asked if they had thought about going to the smaller size using the logo “SAB” and not putting all of the letters on the sign.

Dr. Watkins stated that it was said that the clients were looking for the illumination and not necessarily the letter size.

Ms. Seiler stated that if it had the address of 214 Drayton Street and “SAB”, the clients looking for the Savannah Association of the Blind would know what that meant because that was what they were looking for. Someone who was delivering something would be looking for 214 Drayton Street. On the door the whole name could be clearly stated for anyone else walking up. It would help you to go to a smaller size just using the logo and you would meet the guidelines. By the way the conversation was going the Board would not approve the illuminated size, but they were trying to help you keep the illuminated sign by going smaller and meeting the visibility needs.

Dr. Dandy stated that they would make it work by making the size a little bit smaller.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board would require for them to meet with Staff to make sure that the adjustments were in line with consideration to the size.

Mr. Steffen stated that if it became agreeable with Staff that they would not have to come back before the Board since it had been discussed in great detail.

Ms. Seiler stated to Dr. Dandy that the Board still had to vote on it.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review made a motion to approve the petition with the condition that the sign is reduced in size and scale and resubmitted to Staff for final approval. Mr. Steffen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Thomson complemented the applicant because they were a trendsetter with placing the address on the sign, and that in the future zoning ordinance it would be a requirement.

Mr. Judson stated that would be his other suggestion to make the 214 bigger. He said that if you took the rest of the text out you could identify the building more easily.

RE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

**RE: Petition of W. Kenneth Swing, Sr.
H-07-3772-2
PIN No. 2-0004-49-007
401 East Broughton Street
One-Year Extension**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

**RE: Petition of Dr. Kevin Brown
H-06-3733-2
PIN No. 2-0014-02-005
212 Houston Street
Approved 2-14-07
One-Year extension**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Seiler made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition for an extension as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Commercial Design & Construction
H-08-3950(S)-2
Anuk Withers
536 East State Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of Mark McDonald
H-08-3951(S)-2
317 East Jones Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-08-3952(S)-2
John Casteel
310 West Broughton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Fred A. Johnson
H-08-3954(S)-2
501 & 503 St. Julian Street
Replacement of Existing Rear Fence
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of Steven Spoon
H-08-3955(S)-2
310 West Charlton Street
Color Change/Roof Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas
H-08-3956(S)-2
Jim Morehouse
42 East Bay Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Michael J. Rhee
H-08-3957(S)-2
23 & 25 West Broughton Street
Stucco Repair
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Petition of Mechelle Gladney
H-08-3958-2
15 West Jones Street
Color/Shutters
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

9. Petition of O'Dell Architects
H-08-3960(S)-2
7 East Bay Street
Awning/Exterior Gas Lights
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

10. Petition of Multiple Owners Condo Association
Don Ferguson
H-08-3961(S)-2
321 – 325 Broughton Street
104 & 106 Montgomery Street
Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

There were none.

**RE: NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Dr. Watkins recognized the new Board member, Dr. Nicholas Henry, former president of Georgia Southern.

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Reiter stated that the Ordinance Revision Committee was meeting on Monday nights from four until six and that the public was invited. She invited the Board members to come as members of the public to observe and speak, thought it was informative, and said that the discussions were fascinating. They were discussing the issue of Height and Mass and it had been educational.

Dr. Watkins stated that he and Ms. Seiler had been attending and that it had been informative. He said they were discussing many issues that were pertinent to what the Board did and commended the MPC Staff for their excellent job.

Mr. Thomson stated that Mr. Patrick Shay said that the MPC had a really great Staff. He said there was a page set aside for the Revisions Committee and everything that they were doing was available on the website at www.thempc.org.

Dr. Watkins stated that some of the materials could be downloaded so that anyone could participate in the discussion and follow along.

a. Unfinished Business

Bylaws

Ms. Reiter stated that Ms. Ramsay asked six very good questions which were:

1. Did Board members fill out the form each time they recuse themselves?

Yes, and you have to give a reason for recusal.

2. If working or ever had worked for a neighbor of the project should she recuse herself or disclose it?

The test was financial or personal interest. You might disclose you had worked in the past but had no business relationship now.

3. What if I know the applicant?

You don't need to recuse yourself unless you or a relative have a financial relationship with the applicant.

4. If I were a politician and received a monetary contribution from the applicant should I recuse myself or disclose it.

If you were a Board member and gave dollars to a politician applicant, you would need to recuse yourself if it were \$250 or more over the past two years. If you were the politician yourself and a Board member and received the \$250 or more contribution from the applicant, you would probably recuse yourself.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it came up because the last time she served on the Board Mr. Shay was on the Board and an issue came up where he was criticized, then he resigned.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was State law that if you had received or given a \$250 donation you would have to recuse yourself.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was State law if you were given a \$250 contribution for the office in which you were serving. He said it was a little bit of a trickier question like when he ran for legislation which had nothing to do with the Board, but there were people who gave contributions that could potentially come before the Board.

Mr. Thomson stated that the example fell into should it be disclosed if it came up and say that it would not affect my vote. He said the best way to deal with it would be to err on the side of caution and say I had a relationship but I don't any more or, even though they did have a relationship that it was not financial. It would not be appropriate if you did have a direct or indirect financial relationship, but as long as it was disclosed, explained, and was indicated that you wanted to vote, then you could. There was an incident with the Planning Commission where it was disclosed later that the individual had done work for the applicant and under an open contract to do future work. Although there wasn't a conflict, it could have been perceived that way and would have been better if it was acknowledged in the meeting and had said that they would vote but could be objective. The conflict of interest came down to the personal assessment of the situation and it was generally better to disclose it than not to.

Ms. Reiter continued:

5. The institution you work for or church you go to had a petition before the Board, do you disclose or recuse.

If you were not on the building committee or the vestry, then just disclose.

There was a member in the past who stepped down completely because her husband was on the building committee at that time. She said that you did not need to if you were not directly involved.

6. What if you go to lunch with the applicant and discuss the application

You need to disclose what you learned or recuse yourself.

Ms. Ramsay stated that in the Conflict of Interest portion she read, "No Board member should take part in the hearing, consideration, or termination of any petition in which he/she is a party or has a financial interest. This includes a member of the Board presenting an application at a public hearing to the Board which he/she serves." She said that she represented the local AIA chapter as the advocacy person trying to get architects to serve on boards. It was a severe handicap to a sole petitioner who served on a Board and had no one else to present their applications. You would then not present any work to the board that you served on during the time you were on the Board. She asked if that was the intent.

Mr. Thomson stated that it was the intent and that it was more than a perceived Conflict of Interest when you serve on the Board. He said if you have a direct financial interest you were supposed to recuse yourself which meant to technically leave the room, certainly leave the dais, and not participate in any discussion. By presenting it you were participating. If you have a client and you were the sole proprietor and no employees to represent your presentation, then the applicant or you would need to hire someone there were to give the presentation. Mr. Adam Ragsdale from Kennedy-Ragsdale was in front of the Board all the time and he goes way back in the corner to recuse himself while someone else makes the presentation. Mr. Ragsdale had an internal rule that he does not get involved in the business end at the office. He said it was part of the penalty you pay if you were on the Board and you were a sole practitioner.

Ms. Ramsay asked if it was true for all Boards.

Mr. Thomson stated that it was as it related to the State law.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was not that difficult to deal with in the sense that you could ask a fellow architect or hire an attorney to make the presentation. He said there was a Board member who was not on the Board any longer who asked Mr. Steffen why he always recused. As an attorney they were sworn from the beginning of practicing law to avoid even the appearance of something that was improper. In those cases, even the appearance of being there, even though you were not influencing anything, did damage to the credibility of the Board.

Ms. Seiler stated that you could not use a recusal just because you wanted to dodge a vote.

Mr. Steffen stated that was the other side where that happened also because some people did not want to vote. He said he liked the fact that you would state the reason you were recusing. Either there was a real conflict or it might be perceived as having a conflict and no one would question your judgment.

Mr. Gay stated that Mr. Eric Meyerhoff would recuse himself even though he was no longer with the firm.

Mr. Judson stated that having lunch with a petitioner brought up a point that it was a good excuse not to talk about anything with somebody else out of the chambers. He said it had been discussed before and he had been approached by people wanting to vent or lobby but his ears were closed. He did not want to be responsible for communications that happen outside of the room. It was not a point of the Bylaws but a good point for all to be aware of. There was always that opportunity, it was a small town, Board members all know people who came before them and interacted with them in the community, and he had fallen back on it several times. He would say that he was sorry because it was not appropriate for him to discuss anything outside of the Board meeting.

Ms. Reiter stated that Ms. Janine Person had gone through the Bylaws and caught inconsistencies and spellings and would be editing the document.

Dr. Watkins asked Ms. Ramsay if her issues had been addressed.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes.

Ms. Seiler stated that she appreciated Mr. Steffen pointing out the editorial and that she was not amused about it either. She said that Mr. Saseen brought up a very good alternative solution and she wished it could have been entertained because it actually made sense.

Dr. Watkins stated that Mr. Saseen and others made sense. He said that he was trying to get to the point where there was actual discussion about what they were supposed to discuss. Someone might make sense but they would have to get with Staff or approach the applicant.

b. New Business

Revisions Committee Meetings

RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Meeting Minutes - February 13, 2007

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

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp