

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET**

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

November 12, 2008

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

**Dr. Malik Watkins, Chairman
Brian Judson, Vice-Chairman
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Sidney J. Johnson
Richard Law, Sr.
Linda Ramsay**

HDRB Members Not Present:

**Gene Hutchinson
Eric Meyerhoff
Swann Seiler
Joseph Steffen**

City of Savannah Staff Members Present: Tiras Petrea, Zoning Officer

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

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

RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

Mr. Judson stated that he did not see signs posted at 236 Drayton Street, Motorini, and for the Coastal Canvas petition at 8 East Liberty Street.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she did not see a sign at 500 West Charlton Street.

Mr. Gay stated that he did not see a sign at Motorini on Drayton Street.

Ms. Reiter stated that Staff suggests placing the 500 West Charlton Street item to end of the agenda and to send a representative from the Marriott to go over there, take a picture of the sign and bring it back.

Dr. Watkins stated that they would move the petition of H-08-4067-2 to be considered at the end of the Regular Agenda. He asked about the other two petitions.

Mr. Aaron Glinsky (Operations Manager for Motorini) stated that the process was new to him and that he was not aware that a sign had to be posted. He said that he spoke with Staff before the meeting and made him aware that a sign was not posted, and they were looking for internal evidence that he was notified. He did not believe that he received a phone call or email.

Dr. Watkins asked Staff if they had any recommendations.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was minor enough that it could probably be heard.

Dr. Watkins stated that they would proceed and if there was any significant public comment, then they would revisit the issue.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

**RE: Petition of Branson Design
Clay Branson
H-08-4069-2
315 East Charlton Street
PIN No. 2-0032-09-006
Addition**

Continue to December 10, 2008, at the petitioner's request.

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

There were none.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

**RE: Petition of Hansen Architects
Patrick Phelps
H-08-4013-2
412 Williamson Street
PIN No. 2-0003-08-001
New Construction - Part I- Height and Mass of a Five-
Story Hotel**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Patrick Phelps.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of Part I Height and Mass for a five-story hotel and Finding-of-Fact of visual compatibility for a two-story height variance.

BACKGROUND:

Several planning efforts have been ongoing in this area including the MLK- Montgomery Street Corridor Revitalization spearheaded by the Savannah Development and Renewal Authority (SDRA) and the River Street Gateway and Master Plan being coordinated through the City's Tourism Department. Both of these efforts are working to improve the conditions of the major intersection at River Street and MLK and Montgomery Streets by providing better public access, establishing trolley stops, and ensuring that new development engages the corridor.

A meeting with the architect, City Infrastructure Departments, Savannah Development and Renewal Authority (SDRA) and MPC Staff was held on July 17, 2008, to discuss access issues and coordination with Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK), River Street, and the Montgomery Street revitalization plans. MLK and River Street are considered primary streets. As part of the City's revitalization plans, a grand staircase access has been proposed to extend public access along Montgomery Street from Williamson Street to River Street.

FINDINGS:

The property comprises an entire city block bounded by Williamson Street, Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, River Street, and Montgomery Street. It is zoned B-B (Bayfront-Business). The building provides for 116 parking spaces.

The project has been submitted to Site Plan Review (SPR). The following comments have been submitted from MPC and City staff:

MPC (Gary Plumbley):

1. Designate five parking spaces as handicap accessible. These should be located on the shortest possible route to an elevator.
2. Hotels are required to front onto streets classified as arterials. Neither Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. nor Williamson Street is classified as an arterial, at this location. A request to vary this standard can be made to The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals.

3. The Historic District Height Map designates this area as “3 stories above Bay Street.” A variance will need to be obtained from the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals to allow the proposed fourth and fifth stories.

Traffic Engineering (Cindy Cottingham):

1. The sidewalks and street lighting along MLK need to follow the MLK streetscape plan.
2. What appear to be stairs and a walkway or canopy are shown within the MLK right-of-way. Any encroachments within the right-of-way will require an Encroachment Permit from City Council.

Park & Tree (Gordon Denney):

1. Show all existing right-of-way trees on plans, noting existing canopy overhang on property which may be an issue when designing.
2. Show all required TQP and LQP for this site and note intention to pay into Tree Fund.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
<p>Development Standards: No setbacks are required in Bayfront-Business (B-B) zone. 100 percent lot coverage is permitted.</p>	<p>The hotel meets the property line on three sides. On the Williamson Street side there is a 108’ by 27’-4” setback for a drop-off drive.</p>	<p>Restudy of the setbacks above the first level on River Street. Buildings on River Street typically have no setbacks. An additional story might be added over the retail area to contain the restaurant.</p>
<p>Height: New construction on the south side of River Street shall not exceed three stories or 45 feet above Bay Street.</p>	<p>The height of the main structure is four stories above Bay with a fifth story on the west end at MLK. The four-story portion is 49’-4” above Bay Street and the fifth story is 62’ above Bay Street. The building comprises an entire city block and as such is not immediately adjacent to historic structures. A two-story dwelling exists to the east and two-story industrial buildings are to the west. The one-story Savannah Electric building is to the north and is 63’ above Bay.</p>	<p>A recommendation for additional height above the height map may be considered in meeting goals such as more pedestrian interface along MLK (see rhythm of structure on street below) and/or providing a ‘public benefit’ within the right-of-way by restoring portions of the Factors Walk overlay district. This is being considered in the rebuilding of the Montgomery Street ramp or ‘grand staircase’. The applicant is in discussions with the City regarding approaches for this public access point.</p>
<p>Proportion of Structure’s Front Façade:</p>	<p>Traditionally buildings along the river were very horizontal – long-ranges</p>	<p>Restudy the number and proportion of window openings. The proposed building does not follow the traditional</p>

	divided into three-bay wide sections.	bay divisions and is not consistent with the historic appearance of the riverfront buildings.
<p>Proportion of Openings: All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement, and top story windows, shall be rectangular and have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3. The distance between windows shall be not less than for adjacent historic buildings, nor, more than two times the width of the windows. Paired or grouped windows are permitted, provided the individual sashes have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.</p>	There are a number of differently proportioned openings – balcony doors, paired windows, single windows, windows with transoms, and arched openings that appear to be filled with louvers. Independent and paired openings are 2'-8" tall by 5'-4" wide. Openings onto balconies are 5'-4" wide by 8' tall.	Reconsider the percentage of openings and increase the width to meet the standards on the upper floors.
<p>Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:</p>	The percentage of openings as proposed does not follow the typical rhythm of solid-to-void. On Williamson Street for instance there is far more solid-than-void. On MLK there is no interaction between pedestrians and the building. Almost half of the River Street level is taken up with large vented openings for the parking garage.	<p>The lobby has been relocated and storefronts have been introduced on the corner of MLK and Williamson. Staff recommends strengthening this interactive ground floor pedestrian element on MLK and River Street in order to create a more active streetscape.</p> <p>MLK and River Street will someday be an important intersection. Putting a parking garage entrance here with no human-scaled interaction with the building creates a dead space. See recommendations for additional retail and entrances.</p>
<p>Rhythm of Structure on Street:</p>	Historically, the Williamson Street block between Montgomery and MLK was taken up with the Lathrop Cotton Warehouse and a three-story carriage repository, two-story frame and wood dwellings, and a two-story store facing MLK at River Street. There was	<p>The proposed orientation of the main façade is on Williamson Street.</p> <p>The lobby has been relocated to the SW corner of Williamson and MLK as requested by Staff. A second interactive space could also be located at the northwest corner of the building at MLK and River Street. Currently, there are no entrances fronting onto MLK.</p>

	<p>pedestrian interaction on Williamson, MLK, and River Street. The block was broken up by multiple buildings and the streets were defined by the edges of the buildings on all sides of the block.</p>	
<p>Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:</p>	<p>On Williamson Street a two-door main entry is proposed. Three additional entrances are provided within the recessed drop-off area.</p> <p>No pedestrian entrances are provided on MLK or Montgomery. Garage entries are provided on MLK to utilize an existing curb cut.</p> <p>On River Street there are three doorways within one-story glass storefront bays and an entry to the stair tower.</p>	<p>Provide pedestrian entries on MLK at street level and increase the number of entrances on River Street.</p> <p>Consider allowing the meeting rooms to open onto a balcony along MLK, which could also serve as a cover to the sidewalk below in areas where the grade would allow appropriate vertical clearance.</p> <p>Maintain the sidewalk surface material continuity across the driveways on Williamson Street and MLK and provide on plans for Part II.</p>
<p>Walls of Continuity:</p>	<p>A “U” shaped plan is proposed. A screen wall is proposed along the north property line (Williamson Street) to provide a wall of continuity.</p>	<p>Along the Riverfront, with one exception, buildings were built to the lot line and defined the street edges, even on irregularly shaped lots adding to the character of the area. On River Street, the one-story retail section is similar to the Huey’s infill on the River Street Inn. This could be mitigated by adding a second story which could serve the restaurant.</p>
<p>Scale:</p>		<p>Reconsideration of some of the elements discussed above will help mitigate the large mass of the building. The historic riverfront buildings were large buildings, but they appeared smaller because they were broken up into repetitive bays with storefronts.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of Part I with the following conditions:

1. Finding-of-Fact that the two additional stories and 17 feet above the allowed height are visually compatible and warranted due to the ‘public benefit’ evidenced in both of the following conditions which must be submitted and approved by Staff for the Finding-of-Fact to become effective and submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the height variance:
 - a. Provide written Memorandum of Agreement between the City and property owner for the improvements to the Montgomery Street access point to River Street; and
 - b. Providing multiple ground floor uses (including but not limited to retail, office, lobby, restaurant, etc...) with individual exterior entrances on all street fronting facades.
2. Add additional height along the one-story portion of the building fronting River Street.
3. Increase the proportion of the window openings to meet the standards and increase the amount of void within the solid walls, especially on the Williamson Street façade.
4. Provide pedestrian entrances on MLK at street level and increase the number of entrances on River Street (may coincide with Number 1.a.).

Maintain the sidewalk surface material continuity across driveways on Williamson Street and MLK to be illustrated in Part II.

Mr. Judson stated that with regard to the one-story section on River Street was Staff talking about additional stories when referring to greater height, and that he did not understand the reference “bringing it to the street line.”

Ms. Ward stated that the building was build to the street line on River Street, but in order to reinforce the wall of continuity along the street one-story buildings that front the river don’t exist except for Huey’s which was a later addition. Staff wanted it to look more integrated and it could be accomplished with an additional story or some other design technique like a taller parapet. The applicant was suggesting that a restaurant go on top of the wall and there could be a wall with some penetrations in it to give it a greater height without actually building a story.

Mr. Judson asked if Staff was talking about greater height and not changing the footprint.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Phelps (Hansen Architects representing Vesta Hospitality) stated that they looked at pedestrian access off Williamson Street and MLK and that there was a redevelopment plan for MLK. He said that it included streetscape with sidewalks, bricks, lights, trees, etc., that the work was ongoing,

and part of the agreement that the developers had with the City was that they would participate in the improvements of the sidewalk redevelopment to match the MLK master plan. As the continuation of the design, the master plan, and their site goes together, they hope that it will address some of the issues with access to the building along MLK.

They located the service entry along MLK to Williamson Street, they incorporated a service drive to get it off Williamson Street, MLK, and River Street, and they were talking about participating with the design and construction of the Montgomery Street access ramp. It would be coordinated with the City of Savannah and SDRA and be brought before the Board for final approval. Their intent was to work with SDRA and the City on the streetscape of MLK and the ramp. These plans should be in place by the time they go for Part II Design approval. There will be contractual agreements of the responsibility of the developer and the City, and a process of how the activities would coordinate with the development of the hotel. They were not asking for the development of the hotel to get approval and the other things not happen because they want everything to happen in concert with agreements from every party.

They have a steep grade to contend with on the MLK elevation and they understand the importance of creating more pedestrian activity. He said that historically there was no pedestrian interaction on the ramp streets, that steps have been added over time, and that retail or restaurant access has been put in. The ground floor interaction doesn't occur because of the grade of the street because it travels one-story to one and one-half story which cuts the first floor in half. The access could be functionally either at the base or the top of the street. They would continue to work with Staff on the best resolution for the entrances with part of it being the creation of a corner entrance into the lobby area to be accessible from MLK and Williamson Street. They will continue working on how the grade can be manipulated so that there will be access and a potential use. They will cooperate with the City on how the sidewalk was designed and the allowable access points. There were large oak trees that they have to maintain and work around.

The height of the retail section along River Street was added to continue the retail along River Street. He said it was about one-story and one-half with railing above intended to be an active space for hotel occupants for the restaurant as overflow space. There will be activity to give it some visual height, but they can work on whether it needed to go up an additional story, and they could create punched openings for access to it. The predominant norm is for buildings to reach the street line or the setback line of the property and there were conditions where buildings were set back and pockets created of space where the buildings come in and out. The history of the historic building was that there were some infill in locations to bring the background floor levels up to the street, and with looking at second-story porches that have been added on looking out to River Street, it would be similar to activity that was going to take place. They were willing to work with Staff to determine if it needed to be raised to address the street more or to leave it more open.

They have continued discussions with Staff regarding the proportions and openings. He said that the main reason they were present was to get the Height and Mass to continue the process with the Zoning Board of Appeals. Some of the concerns can be addressed during design review.

Ms. Ramsay stated that one of the recommendations Staff made was to have the balcony over MLK.

Mr. Phelps stated that the recommendation came from a previous plan. He stated that prior to the revisions the meeting rooms, the main lobby space, and guest rooms were in different locations. Since the revisions the guest rooms were changed and the meeting rooms were no longer along MLK. There are balconies on the elevations that are located on the second floor guest rooms, but on the ground floor guest rooms there would be conflicts with the sidewalk and vehicular traffic.

Dr. Henry asked if the petitioner was willing to comply to Staff recommendations in exchange for the height variance.

Mr. Phelps stated that they would continue studying Staff's recommendations to develop the best solutions. He said they were trying to get the Height and Mass so they could go to the Zoning Board of Appeals. He thought they could come to a good solution with Staff regarding the issues.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation/Architectural Review Committee) stated that HSF was opposed to the two-story variance because the burden for public benefit had not been met. She said that the public access on the ground floor at MLK was not provided as requested by Staff. They would support a one-story variance based on the other concessions that the developer made, they agree with Staff's comments regarding the developers working closely with Staff, and would request that it come back to the Board for further review.

Dr. Henry asked how the Board would deal with the proposal about it coming back to the Board.

Dr. Watkins stated that it would be based upon the motion. He said the Board should keep the Finding-of-Fact in mind with regard to the plans being compatible with the guidelines.

Mr. Johnson stated that the petitioner needed to get a permit from City Council and asked if getting the permit should be considered.

Ms. Ward stated that there were no encroachments being proposed and they would have to get the Review Board's approval before seeking a request from City Council.

Mr. Thomson asked if the Board was clear on Staff's recommendation.

Dr. Watkins asked if the Board had any issues with Staff's recommendation and if they needed to be repeated.

Ms. Ward stated that it would need to be broken into two motions and that there needed to be a Finding-of-Fact. She said that the additional two stories and 17 feet above the height were visually compatible and warranted due to the public benefit and the interactive ground floor use to be evidenced in the following conditions, and submitted to Staff prior to going to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

1. An agreement between the City and the developer on the improvements for the Montgomery Street access point to River Street.
2. Provide multiple ground floor uses, including but not limited to retail, office, lobby.

3. Provide individual exterior entrances on all street-fronting facades.
4. Make an approval for Part I Height and Mass to be visually compatible. Staff suggested that the following conditions apply:
 - a. Add additional height on the one-story portion on River Street, or explore it and work with Staff.
 - b. Increase the proportion of the window openings to meet the standards and increase the amount of void within the solid walls on Williamson Street.
 - c. Provide a pedestrian entrance on the MLK façade; and
 - d. Provide for sidewalk surface material continuity over the driveways.

Ms. Ramsay asked if these were two separate motions.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Watkins stated that the first motion would consider the Finding-of-Fact and weigh whether the increased height was justified for the public benefit for ground floor uses.

Dr. Henry asked how it would come back to the Board as was suggested by the Historic Savannah Foundation.

Dr. Watkins stated that would be considered in the second motion. He said the first part dealt with the Finding-of-Fact on whether the increased height was justified by the public benefit.

Mr. Judson stated that if there was a motion to approve Part I Height and Mass that it would have to be voted against to get it to come back to the Board. He said that once an approval was issued that it wasn't contingent upon them returning other than the fact that they were returning for Part II Design. Ms. Dolecki's comments spoke to the Finding-of-Fact for the height variance, and if they did not want to approve the two-story height variance, the procedure would be to vote against the Finding-of-Fact.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Dolecki if that was her understanding.

Ms. Dolecki answered yes.

Mr. Thomson stated that the Board could find fact for one additional story instead of denying or recommending against the Finding-of-Fact. He said that the applicant can carry two stories forward to the Zoning Board of Appeals for consideration, but they would have a Finding-of-Fact from the Review Board that would be different. Regarding the other recommendation and if there was concern on the contingencies with Part I, that when it comes back on Part II that all of the conditions that were in the Part I approval be documented prior to considering Part II.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Finding-of-Fact that the additional two stories (17 feet) are visually compatible with the following conditions:**

- a. **Participation in the improvements to the Montgomery Street ramp and access to River Street; and**

- b. **Providing multiple ground floor uses (including but not limited to retail, office, lobby, restaurant, etc...) with individual exterior entrances on all street fronting facades [excluding Montgomery Street].**

Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Judson asked that if the Board moved for approval that Staff clarify and include the correct contingencies. He said that they involved the increased height on the River Street side, and asked if the drawings addressed the concerns with the solids and voids on the William Street side.

Ms. Ward answered that it did not and said that the proportions were still off, but Staff felt if the Board specified it in the motion that when the applicant came back for Part II, that Staff would verify that the condition had been met before docketing it on the agenda. She said that Staff was recommending that the Height and Mass be approved with the additional height on River Street, the increased proportion of windows and increase the amount of void within the solid, that pedestrian entrances be added on MLK, and that the sidewalk surface area be maintained on the driveways.

Ms. Ramsay stated that instead of numerating all of them that it be stated that all of the recommendations be addressed prior to the Part II approval.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions to be provided and illustrated in the Part II submittal:

- a. **Study adding more height along the one-story portion of the building fronting River Street.**
- b. **Increase the proportion of the window openings to meet the standards and increase the amount of void within the solid walls, especially on the Williamson Street façade.**
- c. **Provide pedestrian entrances on MLK at street level.**
- d. **Maintain the sidewalk surface material continuity across driveways on Williamson Street and MLK to be illustrated in Part II.**

Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of 236 Drayton Street Vespa, LLC
dba Motorini
Aron Glinsky
H-08-4047-2
236 Drayton Street
PIN No. 2-0015-30-001
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Mr. Aron Glinsky.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to change the sign face for a freestanding principal use sign from the existing Sunoco sign to a sign for the new business Motorini. The existing pole and sign cabinet will be retained. The sign face is 50.1” wide by 62” tall (approximately 20 square feet) to fit within the existing cabinet. It is currently internally illuminated and will continue to be. The material is formed plastic, which is the current material, with embossed graphics. The background is opaque white with an orange (color to match original tile on building), gray, black, and white logo for Motorini with the Vespa logo in black below.

FINDINGS:

The one-story building at 236 Drayton Street was originally constructed sometime between 1936 and 1937 for the Texas Company, Texaco Service Station with Art Deco Style Elements.

The property is zoned B-C-1 (Central-Business) and the following standards from the Historic Sign District Ordinance (Section 8-3121) apply:

(3) Lighted signs. Lighted signs, except for 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 when back lighting is applied.

Staff recommends approval of the sign with the condition that the internal lighting be muted so the intensity of the white background will be decreased. While typically Staff recommends against the use of white backgrounds as it creates a ‘milk glass’ appearance, a milk glass sign on a building from this period is appropriate. Historically, they would have been dimly lit.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that a low-wattage bulb be used to control the intensity of the light.

Mr. Judson asked if there were any ordinances regarding the hours that if the sign would be lit.

Ms. Ward stated that Staff did not have any regulation on that.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Ms. Ramsay asked if they had a problem with the low-wattage light.

Mr. Aaron Glinsky (Operations Manager/Motorini) stated that he did not. He said that he had worked closely with Staff, and agreed that the vintage look would be achieved with the low-wattage light, and that it would be a panned and embossed sign that was also a vintage look. The building colors had been changed to an orange stripe that matches the orange on the logo to tie in together.

Mr. Judson stated that it was a nice-looking building and an improvement to the corridor. He said that the sign coordinated well with the whole color scheme.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that a low-wattage bulb be used to control the intensity of the light. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Abraham Scott
Bruce Floyd
H-08-4053-2
320 – 322 Lorch Lane
PIN No. 2-0045-26-005
Demolition/New Construction**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Bruce Floyd.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval of a partial demolition of a non-rated one-story duplex structure within the National Historic Landmark District and its reconstruction in a two-story form.

FINDINGS:

1. The building was constructed between 1898 and 1916. As a side gabled one-story cottage duplex. It had not been rated, although by age and design it would have been eligible for listing on the Historic Buildings map. The roof, flooring, and all interior and exterior historic fabric has been removed with the exception of the framing of the first floor. It is proposed to add a second story and change the form of the building to a front facing gable two-story duplex. It will essentially be a new building on the footprint of the old structure.

The following Part I Height and Mass Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Setbacks: No setbacks are required in RIPA zone:	The existing side yard setbacks are proposed. They are 2'-4".	
Dwelling Unit Type:	A semi-attached duplex is proposed.	The previous structure was a semi-attached duplex.
Street Elevation Type:	A low stoop entrance is proposed.	
Entrances:	The entrances face the lane.	
Building Height:	The height is 27' to the peak	On September 22 the petitioner was

	of the roof. The crawl space is 1'-6"; the first floor is 9'-6" and the second floor is 9'-0"	asked to provide an elevation showing height and width relationship to the adjacent structures. This has not been provided. This is an important document since staff has waived the need for a model.
Tall Building Principles and Large-Scale Development:	NA	
Proportion of Structure's Front Façade:		
Proportion of Openings:	Rectangular openings with a ratio of 3+:6 are proposed.	
Rhythm of Solids-to-Voids:	The original building had a four bay rhythm in a window-door-door-window Arrangement. A four-bay rhythm is found on adjacent historic structures.	On the front (lane) elevation the bay spacing is a four-bay rhythm on the ground floor and only two bays on the second floor. The ground floor spacing needs to be more regular by bringing the center windows closer together and then adding two windows to align with them at the second floor.
Rhythm of Structure on Street:		The new structure is to be built on the same siting as the previous structure.
Rhythm of Entrances, Porch Projections, Balconies:	The original house had a full porch with side steps. Two stoops with front steps are proposed. These stoops do not appear to meet code which requires 10" treads and a 36" deep porch. The treads appear to be only 6" and the stoop is only 18". The stoops encroach in the lane as did the previous porch.	Staff recommends that a full porch similar to the previous porch be used with side steps sized to meet the building code.
Walls of Continuity:	No fences are shown.	
Scale:		The height and width elevation showing the building in comparison to the adjacent structures needs to be provided.

The following Part II Design Standards Apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Commercial Design Standards:	NA	
Windows and Doors:	6/6 Windows are proposed. The trim has been revised to be compatible.	A specific window model needs to be selected.
Roof Shape:	The original building had a side gable roof. The proposed building had a front facing gable. One elevation indicates a one-foot overhang while the section indicates a two-foot overhang.	Clarify which overhang is correct. Staff had discussed an eave return on the front elevation of the house. This has not been provided. The purpose was to fill in some of the void created by the front facing gable. An attic vent would help with this also.
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:		The use of applied brick to a concrete foundation to simulate piers is inappropriate. If a wider front porch is used then real brick piers could be used on the porch and the main foundation could be solid (without pier expression).
Fences:	NA	
Overlay District Standards:	NA	
Materials:	HardiPlank siding is proposed and asphalt roof shingles.	Please specify that smooth-face HardiPlank is proposed.
Textures:	NA	
Color:	No information on colors has been provided.	Please provide colors.

Please note that the ordinance requires that parking, roof, or ground mounted HVAC locations be shown. These were requested also in the September 22 memo.

Mr. Judson asked if there was a permit process, a Review Board application, or did the disassembly happen subsequently.

Ms. Reiter stated that they were requesting an After-the-Fact because it was caught by Inspections and the work was stopped. She said they met with SDRA on several occasions also.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Bruce Floyd (Project Manager for Abraham Scott) stated that he met with Staff concerning the property and that he was hired after the demolition was done. He said that he met with Staff to get clarification on what Staff needed so that the project could go forward.

Dr. Henry asked how it got to the current status.

Mr. Floyd stated that he was not sure.

Mr. Albert Scott stated that the property was dilapidated and did not realize that a permit was needed. He said that they had started before speaking with Mr. Floyd who told them there were certain steps to take first.

Dr. Henry asked if Mr. Scott was the owner.

Mr. Scott stated that his father was the owner.

Mr. Judson asked if they intended to put up a porch. He said if he understood Staff's recommendation it might be a separate encroachment issue and asked if the porch was part of the submission.

Mr. Floyd stated that after meeting with Staff they determined that the porch encroached upon the lane. He said that they would have to get a permit for the encroachment because it would encroach approximately one-foot into the lane.

Mr. Judson asked Staff if it was something that needed to be included in the approval or if approval would be needed before going forward.

Ms. Reiter stated that it could be found visually compatible, but the applicant would still need an encroachment permit from the City.

Ms. Ramsay asked how did they not know what the lot coverage was.

Ms. Reiter stated that she could not get enough information to calculate it for the whole lot. She said that for half a lot that it was on was 66 percent but did not know the size of the main building facing Lorch Street. Staff can calculate it but it was a zoning issue and if it was found that it was over 75 percent, then the petitioner will come back for the Finding-of-Fact.

Mr. Gay stated they were using the same footprint that was there.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was extended a few feet and that may or may not make a difference.

Mr. Floyd stated that the intention was to use the exact footprint, but there was a discrepancy on the setback. He said the only part that encroached was the porch that the owner wanted put back.

Dr. Henry asked if the rule was that 25 percent of the lot had to be left clear and if they met the rule.

Ms. Reiter stated that Staff did not know, and that it was an issue that Inspections would look at.

Dr. Henry stated if the Board approved it and if they violate the standard then what happens next.

Ms. Reiter stated then the petitioner would have to come back to the Board for a Finding-of-Fact to get a variance.

Dr. Henry asked if they should have the information before approving it.

Ms. Reiter stated that she had been working with the applicant since July trying to get the accurate numbers and in essence moving it forward it was their choice. She said that inspections would check it.

Mr. Law asked about the age of the house.

Mr. Floyd stated that it was constructed between 1898 and 1960.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Henry stated that it was strange to be voting on it before having the facts regarding how much land was left vacant.

Mr. Gay stated that they weren't going to add to the size of the footprint. He said that there was a discrepancy whether they would use the footprint or not, and if they were, they weren't changing the lot coverage. There doesn't look like there was 25 percent of the lot because the front building appeared to have covered the entire front part of the lot. It would not represent a change if they build on the current footprint.

Dr. Henry stated that this was a situation with a violation of present standards even though the standard wasn't in existence when it was done. He asked the Board's position on it.

Mr. Law asked if they were going to restore the house that was gutted.

Mr. Gay stated that they were going to add a story to it and that it would be a two-story building.

Ms. Ramsay stated that when you look at the photograph in terms of visual compatibility, it looked like most of the buildings in the area cover over 75 percent of the lots. She said you would have to look at each area and what was built to determine the visual compatibility.

Mr. Gay stated that it was apparently had two owners and the lot was subdivided in half, and if that was the case, then the people in front were occupying 100 percent of the lot. He said it put the petitioner in jeopardy if they decide to do something else.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was all the same person and that it was one lot.

Mr. Thomson stated that the MPC Staff had worked for months trying to get a complete application for the Board to consider and that it was before the Board to act on it. He thought there was enough question such as if the new building would cover more than the footprint, and if it covered just the footprint of the historic building a lot coverage variance would not come to play. If it did, the applicant would have to come back to the Board again and they may want to continue it until the application was complete which could include whether they need a variance for a Finding-of-Fact to the Zoning Board of Appeals. It won't delay them because they can't go forward without a variance, and then the Board would have all of the information needed, and make a point to the applicant to get it right and submit to get a decision.

Mr. Judson stated that the Board had established procedurally that the Board cannot move for a continuance. He said it would be up to the applicant to ask for a continuance.

Dr. Henry stated that the Board should make sure that they have all of the information before they approve or disapprove.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she agreed.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board could not put forth a continuance, but it was the general consensus of the Board that there needed to be a completed application to move forward. He said the petitioner could ask for a continuance until the application was completed or take chances on whether the Board would or would not move forward.

Mr. Scott asked for a continuance.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review to continue the petition for additional information. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Mr. Roy A. Adilman
H-08-4066-2
Heart of Savannah Motels, Inc. – Quality Inn
300 West Bay Street
PIN No. 2-0003-25-003
Color/Rehabilitation/Alteration**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Roy A. Adilman.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting alterations to the façade of the Quality Inn Bay Street as follows:

1. Reconfigure the existing tower corner feature to have three piers and a hip roof element that extends above the parapet. Materials are EIFS painted SW 2834 Birdseye Maple with SW 2851 Sage Green Light accent medallion. The roof is standing seam metal to match the existing roofs painted Sage Green Light. The bottom piers are Tennessee River Stone veneer.
2. Three new vertical parapets of EIFS along the line of the existing standing seam metal roof. The second story metal railing will be replaced in line with the new vertical parapets with a solid EIFS railing painted Birdseye Maple.

3. The existing fence will have Birdseye Maple medallions added to panels created by adding a vertical strip. The fence will be painted Roycroft Mist Gray.
4. All doors will be painted Roycroft Mist Gray; the top of the cornices and top of cornice at new hip roof will be white. The walls will be Roycroft Mist Gray and Birdseye Maple per drawings.

FINDINGS:

The Tennessee River Stone is not a compatible treatment on the columns. Staff recommends deleting the stone, or, if it is necessary to protect the bottom of the column from potential damage, then use a brick which is a more traditional Savannah material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the alterations with the condition that the Tennessee River Stone be deleted and replaced with a continuation of the EIFS or brick to be brought back to Staff.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Terry Nielson (Representing Mr. Roy A. Adilman) stated that he brought four samples of brick for Staff to approve.

Mr. Judson asked if the applicant saw the need to have the EIFS.

Mr. Nielson stated that they have EIFS and cars back into it. He said that there was a green rail in front of it, they were hoping to do away with it, but they might put it back because cars back into it.

Mr. Gay asked if there was a question about the column with big pebbles.

Mr. Judson stated that it was Staff's recommendation to go with the brick rather than the stone. He said that he had never been a big fan of the building and it was a big improvement. The large expanse of the metal roof needed to be broken up and it would look better. He asked if Staff needed to review the brick or if the Board should make a motion subject to Staff's approval of the brick.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as amended to include brick veneer on the bottom of the piers. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Savannah College of Art and Design
Mr. Neil Dawson
H-08-4068-2
301 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
PIN No. 2-0031-47-004
Stabilization**

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

Present for the petition was Mr. Neil Dawson.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish and restore certain components of the ruins of the north sheds of the Central of Georgia Railroad along Turner Street, and to stabilize the remaining ruins in order to prepare for new construction. Plans for the new construction will be submitted later.

- Remove concrete block and stucco and lath portions at the east end of the shed
- Remove all non-historic infill
- Stabilize existing parapet
- Remove doors – historic doors and hardware assemblies to be stored
- Remove imbedded flashing
- Remove graffiti
- Remove vegetation and organic staining

FINDINGS:

- Elaborate on proposed temporary shoring
- Elaborate on parapet and wall stabilization particularly with regard to AD504 G1 and D7 typical
- Will stacked brick be placed in secure enclosure?
- Will mortar be lime-based? The mortar should match the mortar strength of the original.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval upon clarification of items listed above.

Mr. Gay stated that this was the second building SCAD owned where the interior and the roof were allowed to collapse. He said that the property was given to them and should have necessitated an obligation to maintain the property until something more was done. It was too bad that the property had gotten to this state.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it was the third building because there was also one on MLK.

Dr. Henry asked how do you stop it from happening and if there was a procedure.

Ms. Ramsay answered no. She said that you could not because it was demolition through neglect. She said that they had drawings indicating more clearly what they were going to do to keep it from falling down in the meantime. There were notations but she wanted to see something stronger.

Dr. Henry stated that he would like to see something else also.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Neil Dawson (Architect) stated that he was working on the project with Ms. Meg Needle and Mr. Joe Greco from Lord, Aeck and Sargent from Atlanta, who are the primary designers of the museum project, as well as Mr. Craig Clements from Sotille and Sotille who is helping with the civic and urban planning aspects, and Mr. Martin Smith who is the Facilities Manager and design director for SCAD. He said that he recalled seeing all of the projects like the Scarborough house and the one on Drayton, but a lot of the properties were donated to SCAD not because they were civic treasures, but because they were already in distress. He said that the buildings that SCAD has saved were design award winners and part of the history of the community, that as a whole it was a good thing.

Mr. Gay stated he did not find any fault there, but that it was a shame that SCAD picks and choose which ones they want to keep up and support and which ones they let fall down.

Mr. Dawson stated that a 60,000-square-foot warehouse building that was already in considerable disrepair was tough to maintain and transform into a viable project. He said they were getting around to it but, unfortunately, this building in its primary form did not survive until the funding and the student numbers supported it. He agreed that it was a shame and encouraged the Board to look at other cities like Charleston that had strong ordinances about demolition by neglect. He said this was not intentional, but a matter of managing assets.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Dawson to clarify Staff’s questions.

Mr. Dawson stated that Ms. Meg Needles was instrumental in putting the documents together and there was a substantial amount of detail; more than what would be seen on a stabilization project. He showed images of previous stabilizations and reconstruction with the News Place building, and said that they proposed to use the same type of system.

Ms. Meg Needles (Lord, Aeck & Sargent Architects) stated that the system was engineered by the vendor and made of modular components that could be reused. She said they would have it engineered, installed, and remain in place until the wall could be stabilized to the permanent wall behind it.

Mr. Dawson stated that the parapet had a number of areas that were fairly distressed. He said that the intent was to stabilize and freeze-in-time the building as it currently stands. If they could go back in time 20 years ago they would have a different approach to the design of the museum, but where they were today, they did not want to create a false history by restoring something that was not there. They did not want to tear down the history that remained, but to stabilize it the best way they could. They have 3D imagery of the building so they know how far out-of-plumb that certain areas were and indicated them as well as they could on the documents. There were areas where they needed to take more down to stabilize what was there, and there were some areas where they would have to add in order to save the arches and other delicate situations. They requested the Board to use the expertise of Staff to give them an idea on what was the appropriate amount of stabilization such as the parapet that was falling out. He said it may make sense to take down three or eight courses and build back five or six courses. With the design approach they were using, the exact reconstruction was a matter of getting a solid building that worked more than affecting the overall design concept.

They intended on stacking the bricks four years ago when they first collapsed and had gotten away from it. They will restack the brick and store it on pallets in the designated area behind the fence.

Ms. Needles stated that there were several different periods of brick in the building and the demising walls were later and were not Savannah Grey. She said they would do mortar testing so when they repaired the walls they could match what was in the wall, and they would work closely with Coastal Heritage Society to determine the proper mortar mix to match the strength of the existing mortar.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Law stated that when he went to the training in Milledgeville he went to the Governor's house and was amazed at how the house was restored. He said they took the time working with it and wished the people of Savannah would take the same time with restoration in the City of Savannah. He said that it might have taken a lot of time, but it was beneficial.

Mr. Gay stated that the difference was the tax payer dollars. He said it could be done the way it should be done, but unfortunately most don't have the money to do it.

Mr. Martin Smith (Savannah College of Art and Design/SCAD) stated that Lord, Aeck and Sargeant was the architect on that project in Milledgeville and that the exterior of Kiah Hall, the Central of Georgia's administration building to which the upfreight warehouse was connected, was restored with a Federal Save America's Treasures grant. He said they recently restored the Peter's Mansion in Atlanta and the Richard-Arnold School on 35th and Bull Streets. They were actively preserving and restoring Savannah and Atlanta's treasured buildings and did not want the Board to think they were not committed to preservation. They were excited to have the 16 million dollar funding for the project and wanted to clarify the point.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted with the following clarifications made by the petitioner:**

- 1. The temporary shoring will be pre-engineered modular components similar to the ones used at the southwest corner of Barnard and Bay Streets.**
- 2. The stabilization of the parapets and walls will be on a case-by-case basis on-site in conference with the Preservation Officer.**
- 3. The salvaged brick will be stacked within a secure enclosure in the yard between the two freight warehouses.**
- 4. The existing mortar will be tested working with Coastal Heritage Society and matched. There are several different mortars within the complex.**

Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Coastal Canvas Products
H-08-4072-2
8 East Liberty Street
PIN No. 2-0015-29-009
Awning**

The Preservation Officer recommends **denial**.

No one was present for the petition.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a valance to be attached to the top edge of a high stoop at 8 East Liberty Street. The valance is 8” deep with a scalloped edge. The material is Sunbrella black with 5” graphics, copy: “The Snooty Snout”. The valance is hung from a pink PVC trim channel piece. The entry to the shop is under the stoop. A principal use fascia sign is attached to the west of the entrance.

FINDINGS:

1. The valance was submitted as a Staff review. Staff is not able to recommend approval; therefore, the application has been forwarded to the full Board.
2. The valance placement is a visually incompatible treatment for a stoop and covers character defining features of the historic building.
3. Staff can find no Certificate of Appropriateness for the Principal Use Sign. The owner has been so notified.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial of the valance.

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

**RE: Petition of Cummings, Incorporated
Ms. Laura Scott-Adkins
H-08-4067-2
Residence Inn/Marriott
500 West Charlton Street
PIN No. 2-0031-18-007
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Ms. Aretha Swang.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to install three principal use signs for the Residence Inn at 500 West Charlton Street as follows:

1. Monument Sign

- Location: Freestanding double-faced monument sign located by the south elevation next to the main entrance.
- Size: 4’-3” tall by 6’-9” wide on a base with an overall height of 6’ (40.5 SF). The widest portion at the top is 1’-10 ¾” wide.
- Materials: Acrylic molded faces with vinyl graphics
- Colors: Brand Panel - Background is opaque burgundy; logo is yellow; border is gold over opaque sunflower yellow; text for ‘Residence Inn’ is white;
Core Panel – Background is opaque Marriott Red; text for Marriott is white
Base – warm gray with a metallic gloss
Note: The sides will match the face colors
- Illumination: Clear red neon surround on Brand panel. Internally illuminated letters only; the faces of the sign are opaque.

2. Building Sign

- Location: Fascia sign located on the east elevation on the third floor toward Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.
- Size: 5’-8” tall by 9’ wide; approximately 50 square feet.
- Materials and Colors: Will match those of the monument sign listed above.
- Illumination: Internally illuminated letters only; the faces of the sign are opaque.

3. Marquee Letters

- Location: Mounted directly onto the entrance canopy on the south elevation.
- Size: Individual letters that are between 8 ¼” tall to 10” tall that span 11’ for an approximate square footage of 8.25 (this number would be reduced if letters were calculated individually).
- Materials and Colors: Brass Plate letters for ‘Residence Inn Marriott’
Non-illuminated

FINDINGS:

The building(s) maintains 268 +/- linear feet of frontage on Charlton and Harris Streets. The property is zoned B-C (Community-Business) and the following standards from the Historic District Sign Ordinance (Section 8-3121) apply:

- (B) Requirements
- (2) Sign Clearance and Height

(a) Fascia and projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the structure and shall not project over the roofline or parapet wall of the structure.

The standard is met.

(b) Freestanding signs shall not exceed the following permitted heights as measured above the ground level (20 feet)

The standard is met.

(3) Lighted Signs. 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.

Staff recommends approval. The building sign has been reduced from its original submittal of 80 square feet to 50 square feet to be more compatible with the district and building.

(11) Principal Use Sign. 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 requirements whichever is the most restrictive: Fascia Sign (40 SF), Freestanding sign (30 SF with the maximum projection or outer edge of 6 feet, provided that no portion of the sign shall be erected within 2 feet of the curbline) provided that 1 additional square-foot of sign area per each 2 linear feet of building frontage greater than 75 feet along the street toward which the sign is oriented is permitted).

The standards are met.

(a) Within non-residential zoning districts, in addition to the permitted principal use sign, one canopy of awning principal use sign shall be permitted for each entrance providing public access. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than one square foot of sign face per linear foot of canopy or awning, or a maximum of 20 square feet, whichever is lesser; provided however, that the aggregate total principal use sign area for the subject use is not exceeded along that street frontage.

The standard is met.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. Gay asked if the Board decided to hear the petition even though they were not sure that there was signage.

Ms. Aretha Swain stated that she made some calls and that there were signs at both entrances into the hotel.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that. Mr. Judson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

**RE: Petition of Erika L. Snayd
H-07-3836-2
315 – 321 Berrien Street
PIN No. 2-0045-06-005
Extension**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Ms. Erika Snayd.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The petitioner is requesting approval for a one-year extension for new construction of three row houses along West Taylor Street, and four row houses along Berrien Street. The project originally received final approval on September 12, 2007.

FINDINGS:

No changes have been made to the design and the following details were approved by the Board in the previous submittal:

Standard	Proposed	Comments
Windows and Doors:	Taylor Street- Windows (6/6 and 9/9) and French Doors— Vetter Wood clad as per ordinance; Cast stone lintels/sills “sand” color Doors- raised panel wood Garage Doors- Nine feet in width, wood with applied trim, to simulate swinging hinged doors Shutters- Operable louvered composite shutters Berrien Street- Windows	Meets the standards. Window iron is from King Architectural Metals, The Pontalba Group 45-264.

	(6/6) and French doors- Vetter wood clad Doors- raised panel wood Dormer windows- HardiPlank siding; pilasters- materials Awnings above door- canvas	
Roof Shape:	Taylor Street- Parapet concealing low slope roof and roof mounted HVAC equipment; has metal- coping- 6” high and overhanging approx. 1”. Stringcourse- 6” wide and 1 3/8”. deep Berrien Street- Gable roof asphalt shingle; to have max slope of 8:12 to meet standards.	Meets the standards.
Balconies, Stoops, Stairs, Porches:	Taylor Street- High stoop with wood balustrade, newel and columns; doors have transom and flanked with fluted wood trim; rear has metal spiral stair Berrien Street- Low stoop with wood balustrade and columns with trim and sidelights.	Meets the standards.
Fences:	Wood fence with lattice panel on top; wood gate. Scored stucco garden wall; metal gate.	Meets the standards.
Materials:	Brick Taylor Street- “Monte Vista” queen size; Ivory buff mortar. Berrien Street- Carolina Collection Old Savannah queen size; premium light gray mortar. Copper scuppers and downspouts.	Meets the standards.
Color:	As noted on sheet A-6 and A- 11.	Approved.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for a one-year extension to expire on September 12, 2009.

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

Mr. Gay left at 3:50 p.m.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Roofing Professionals, Inc.
H-08-4060(S)-2
The Nugent Building
1 Bull Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
2. Petition of D & S Land Company, LLC
H-08-4062(S)-2
Ms. Sue Canady
506 West Jones Street
Color Change/Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
3. Petition of Coastal Heritage Society
H-08-4063(S)-2
Tracy Bakic
Northeast Corner of West Jones and West Boundary Streets
Existing Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
4. Petition of Re: Think Design Studio
H-08-4064(S)-2
Mr. Joel Snayd
114 West Jones Street
Existing Door
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED
5. Petition of Brannen Construction Company
H-08-4065(S)-2
202 East Gaston Street
Existing Door
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Coastal Heritage Society
H-08-4070(S)-2
Ms. Becki Harkness
303 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

7. Petition of Ethan MacDonald
H-08-4071(S)-2
109 East Jones Street
Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

8. Petition of Don Russon for
Gerilinde Stevens
H-08-4073(S)-2
16 West York Lane
Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

**RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE
OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Mr. Judson stated that the principal use signage at 8 Liberty Street was not approved and the sign was dominant. He said that the old Sear's building where Urban Outfitter's was had stenciled Christmas decorations on the second floor window that was covering a huge percentage of the glass. He did not know if they were within code, considered temporary, or not within the Board's purview, but felt that it was inappropriate.

Ms. Reiter stated that she would look at it but normally on Christmas decorations they have to be down within a week after the holiday.

Dr. Henry asked about the status of 401 East Hall Street because no work was being done at all and they have a new mobile home in the back.

Ms. Reiter stated that they submitted their monthly report this morning, the drawings were being finished by the architect, and they hope to have it to Inspections for the permit before Thanksgiving.

Dr. Henry asked about the mobile home and asked if it was against the rules. He said it could be seen from the lane. He asked how to get an ordinance to prohibit demolition by neglect and if City Council would have to create it.

Ms. Reiter stated that Staff was proposing under the Unified Zoning Ordinance to strengthen that section of the ordinance. She said that Staff tried to move it forward with what was being proposed for the Historic Review Board and it was moved to zoning. It would be seen within a year.

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

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

a. Unfinished Business

b. New Business

Mr. Judson stated that he wanted to thank Staff for the arrangement of the participation of the training in Milledgeville. He said that he found it beneficial and if there was any question of whether it was worth sending people in the future for statewide training, he thought it was a worthwhile event.

**RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS
MEETING – October 8, 2008**

Mr. Judson stated that the minutes stated that he welcomed Mr. Robert Allen and his class but that Mr. Allen was not present.

Minutes to be approved at the December meeting due to the loss of a quorum.

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp