



C H A T H A M C O U N T Y
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
January 5, 2011 - 2:00 P.M.
DRAFT - Meeting Minutes

January 5 2011 CCHPC Meeting

I. Call to Order and Welcome

1. [Order](#)

Chairman Goode-Walker called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

2. [Meeting Minutes October 6, 2010](#)

Attachment: [October 6, 2010 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: George Cohen

Second: Stephen T. Lindell

George Cohen - Aye

Jane A. Feiler - Aye

Vaughnette Goode-Walker - Aye

Stephen T. Lindell - Aye

Dr. E. G. Daves Rossell - Aye

Lisa L. White - Aye

III. Posting

IV. Consent Agenda

V. Regular Agenda

3. [COA20101216-10-1 9924 Pin Point Avenue New Construction- Pin Point Heritage Museum](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Architectural Drawings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Supporting materials.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Location map.pdf](#)

Ms. Anne Smith was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to construct four new buildings within the Varn's Oyster Factory Complex as part of the development of the Pin Point Heritage Museum. The petitioner received staff approval for the rehabilitation of the existing buildings within the complex.

This is a complicated project and is being submitted in three different phases. The first phase is the rehabilitation of some of the buildings, which was approved at staff level. The phase today is for the new construction and the third phase will be the signage and site element such as paving, which will be submitted later.

Ms. Harris reported that the standards are met for Buildings 1 and 2, but the standard addressing windows has not been met for Building 4. Therefore, staff recommends approval on the condition that the window configuration on Building 4, the Company Store Building, be redesigned to better meet the Pin Point Historic District Design Standards and be resubmitted for staff approval.

Mr. Cohen asked Ms.Harris if the Commission had a picture of the window options.

Ms. Harris stated that the packets sent to the Commission contains not only drawings, but also some renderings. The renderings that were submitted were an earlier phase. The Company Store was demolished in the 1980s; therefore, a reconstruction is shown. It is not a replication, but it draws from the elements of the original Company Store. It almost has the appearance of a screened-in porch, but it is glass.

Ms. White wanted to know what kind of merchandise the Company Store will sell.

Ms. Harris answered that she did not know and this question would be deferred to the petitioner.

Mr. Lindell asked Ms. Harris if the staff's concern is that the windows do or do not open.

Ms. Harris answered that the windows are fixed storefront windows. This is a new window type within the district. Staff believes that with this particular design shown in the renderings, the windows are not functioning as windows, but rather as glass walls. However, if they are going back to a more feeling of a real window type as shown in the drawings, then staff believes that they should draw upon existing window types that are already here which includes single hung, double hung, triple hung, casement or awning. There are a lot of different options to come up with solutions on how to make this work.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Anne Smith, architect for the project, stated that is a wonderful project. They have gotten the community involved in this project. The project will be a wonderful center for the community. Ms. Smith stated that a question was raised regarding the use of the community store. They realize for the museum there needs to be a control point. She

pointed out the area where an individual would enter the site, learn about the buildings, and get guidance. Some souvenirs may be available pertaining to the oyster factory. There has been a lot of activity regarding working with the residents and doing documentaries that will be a part of their exhibits. It has been very rewarding working with the exhibit consultants.

Ms. Feiler asked if more darkness or light is needed.

Ms. Smith answered that they were hoping that since this is sort of at the center of the site and with that much glass, one person could possibly run the museum when it is open and visually see what is going on throughout the site. She believes this is one of the reasons for having a lot of glass. Ms. Smith stated that Ms. Leah Michalak, the petitioner, was present also and that they would be happy to answer any questions. Ms. Michalak serves as their historic preservationist.

Ms. Goode-Walker asked what is the completion time line.

Ms. Smith answered that their expected completion date is late this year. They are moving along with the selective demolition; their building permits are in progress; and they are hopeful of getting approval from the Historic Preservation Commission today.

Ms. Feiler asked staff if there were any problems with the flood zone.

Ms. Harris believes that all the flood zone issues have been resolved.

Ms. Smith stated that they met with the Flood Plain Manager and had to do some special things to some of the buildings because of the low grades so that are basically wet/flood proof.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Attorney Robert McCorkle was present on behalf of Mr. Morris Farmer, adjacent property owner to the site. Attorney McCorkle stated that they are not opposed to the project. Mr. Farmer is in favor of the project and believes it is a good thing for the community. However, as the adjoining property owner, he has some concerns that he wants placed into the record.

Attorney McCorkle pointed out that the project will be located on Lot 19 and part of Lot 20. His client owns a portion of Lot 20. Mr. Farmer has never owned the property that is in the middle, but when the persons who at one time owned the entire lot conveyed out the 100 by 80 foot lot, reserved for themselves (the benefit of the high ground) a ten foot easement running down the side of the property to the water. They did so in order to access what they refer to as the "landing." The old oyster factory building is on the corner and crosses over Mr. Farmer's property line by 12 feet. The stripe line runs down the edge of the property line and there is a drawing of his ten feet easement. The area of Lot 20 is what the petitioner intends to use will be a parking lot.

Attorney McCorkle said Mr. Farmer has three main issues that he wants to be assured of when the final plans are approved and the museum is built. Since the factory is built on his

property, this makes it virtually impossible to walk down the side of the building without walking on Mr. Farmer's property. The construction workers that are working here are putting debris and equipment on Mr. Farmer's property. The problem is if someone was to get hurt here or something happens, they want to be sure that an agreement is in place to have an easement for them to do what they need to do without Mr. Farmer getting sued. **Concern #1** is that any construction that gets done, demolition and rebuilding, on the site that it not take place on Mr. Farmer's property without having the proper easement to do so. **Concern #2** is the parking area that cuts across Mr. Farmer's property. They are concerned that some of the plantings will block Mr. Farmer's easement so that he will not be able to access it. Mr. McCorkle said that the parking issues may or may not come back for staff approval, but they want to be sure that the staff and MPC take into consideration that they not wall off with landscape access to Mr. Farmer's property. **Concern #3** is that they are hoping to somehow work with the petitioner to install a gate or something on the easement. Because of the way it is drawn, there is a walkway that runs into Mr. Farmer's easement. All the walkway from the parking lot is coming across to Mr. Farmer's property. Many persons will be visiting here for the sole purpose of looking at these buildings. It will be difficult for them to look at the side of the factory building without walking on Mr. Farmer's property. They certainly don't want to encourage people to do so because of the same liability concerns they have stated already.

Attorney McCorkle said hopefully they will be able to work with the petitioner before the project is finally approved so they can come up with whatever will be placed here to prevent their customers/clients from walking onto Mr. Farmer's property to get to the side of the factory building or walk down to the river. This is a beautiful spot and view. He believes the petitioner will have plenty of area where the visitors can walk, but they just want to be sure that they are discouraged and do not walk on his client's property.

Attorney McCorkle stated that his friend, Attorney Danny Falligant, is the petitioner's lawyer. Attorney Falligant and he had a conversation yesterday regarding this matter. Attorney McCorkle believes they will get this worked out. However, they just want to ensure that whatever is approved by staff or MPC takes into consideration that anything that happens on the outside of the building is not happening on Mr. Farmer's property. Attorney McCorkle said he wants to ensure that his client's easement rights to access the waterfront property are not blocked by whatever is built or planted.

Ms. Goode-Walker thanked Attorney McCorkle for his comments. The Commission appreciates the property owner concerns. However, today the Commission is reviewing the new construction for the property. The issues raised by Attorney McCorkle are site plan review issues. Therefore, this will be completed by the MPC staff. She asked that staff work with the Mr. Farmer and Attorney McCorkle to ensure that their concerns are addressed.

Attorney Falligant acknowledged that Attorney McCorkle and he had a conversation yesterday and they recognize Mr. Farmer's easements and rights. He wanted to assure that nothing would be done to try to terminate or impede the use of Mr. Farmer's easement rights. Attorney Falligant said he agrees with Attorney McCorkle about having a construction easement. In fact, he had a copy of an easement that he drew-up in 2008 when the property was purchased. At that time, they talked with Mr. Farmer. The construction has been delayed because of the economy and so forth. Attorney Falligant said he will give a copy of the easement agreement to Attorney McCorkle for him to

review, mark-up and get back to him. They do not want to go onto Mr. Farmer's property without giving him an indemnification and assure him that they will be responsible for any damages done. This is what is provided in the agreement that he prepared in 2008. Attorney Falligant stated that all the issues Attorney McCorkle raised, they will go on record saying that they will be worked out.

Board Action:

Approval on the condition that the window configuration on Building #4, the Company Store Building, be redesigned to better meet the Pin Point Historic District Design Standards and resubmitted for staff approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Jane A. Feiler
Second: Lisa L. White
George Cohen - Aye
Jane A. Feiler - Aye
Vaughnette Goode-Walker - Aye
Stephen T. Lindell - Aye
Dr. E. G. Daves Rossell - Aye
Lisa L. White - Aye

4. [COA 20101221-11-1 9942 Pin Point Avenue New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [New mobile home.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Existing mobile home.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Location map.pdf](#)

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting permission to replace an existing mobile home with a new mobile home that is approximately 160 square feet larger than the existing. The new mobile home will be installed in approximately the same location as the existing. The request will be reviewed as new construction.

Ms. Harris stated as the Commission will recall when they went through the process of adopting the Pin Point Historic District ordinance, the area had to be rezoned from RMH which allowed mobile homes. The Georgia Historic Preservation Act states that an historic designation can not prevent a use and mobile homes are considered a use and the standards essentially prevent mobile homes from being here as most mobile homes are not going to meet the standards. Therefore, the area had to be rezoned to R1 which does not allow new mobile homes. She explained that what this means for the existing mobile homes is that they are allowed to continue to exist and simply become nonconforming.

They can be replaced; for example if the mobile home burns down or if there is a hurricane, they can be replaced, but only within the same footprint. They can not be expanded and no new mobile homes are allowed.

Ms. Harris reported that the petitioner is before the Commission today as the new mobile home is slightly larger than the mobile home that is being replaced. The petitioner has met with the Zoning Board of Appeals and requested a variance for the expansion of a nonconforming use which was approved unanimously on December 22, 2010. The proposed new construction does not meet the design standards for Pin Point. Mostly, it does not meet the design standards dealing with windows. However, because this is a replacement of an existing mobile home with a new slightly larger mobile home, staff feels that there will not be an adverse affect on the district. Additionally, due to the deteriorated nature of the existing home, staff feels that strict application of the standards will create undue hardship on the owner.

Ms. Harris stated, therefore, staff recommends approval as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lauren Jennings of Hinesville Home Center stated that her firm is selling Ms. Osborne the new mobile home. She stated that a lot of concerns in many communities are with the issues of the mobile homes having the wheels under then, the ad valorem taxes and property taxes. She said, however, this is not the case with Ms. Osborne as the closing is done as real estate, there is no title of issuance of a mobile home and Ms. Osborne will be taxed accordingly. This will increase revenue for Chatham County. The new mobile home will go back into the same position as the existing mobile home. The existing mobile home is 24 feet wide by 62 feet and the new mobile home is 28 feet wide by 60 feet. Consequently, it is 192 square feet difference. It will be brick skirted around the bottom. The mobile home is electric.

Ms. Feiler stated that other mobile homes are in this area. She asked Ms. Harris if she believes that approval of this petition would set a precedent that would be received as negative in the future.

Ms. Harris answered no because this is the replacement of an existing mobile home.

Ms. Jennings said Ms. Osborne's lot size is a quarter of an acre. She knew that zoning requires a certain number of feet away from the abutting property. Therefore, any others would have to meet the guidelines also.

Ms. Feiler asked if this petition meets all the setback requirements and so forth.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

The proposed new construction does not meet the design standards established for Pin Point. However, because this is a replacement of an existing mobile home with a new slightly larger mobile home, staff feels that there will not be an adverse affect on the district. Additionally, due to the deteriorated nature of the existing mobile home, staff feels that strict application of the standards will create undue hardship on the owner. - PASS

Approval as submitted.

Vote Results

Motion: George Cohen

Second: Lisa L. White

George Cohen - Aye

Jane A. Feiler - Aye

Vaughnette Goode-Walker - Aye

Stephen T. Lindell - Aye

Dr. E. G. Daves Rossell - Aye

Lisa L. White - Aye

VI. Request for Extensions

VII. Staff Reviews

5. [COA20101008-09-1 9924 Pin Point Avenue- Addition](#)

Attachment: [COA Decision.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

Board Action:

No action required. Staff approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

6. [COA 20101221-11-1 9942 Pin Point Avenue Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff decision \(demo\).pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

Board Action:

No action required. Staff approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

VIII. Other Business

New Business

7. [Establishment of a Nominating Committee](#)

Ms. Goode-Walker stated each year, the Commission elects new officers as chair and vice-chair. The current officers are eligible to serve another term. She explained that the Commission has two options on how to accomplish this. They could establish a nominating committee to report back on April 6, 2011 with nominations and the Commission could vote on the nominations at that time. If the Commission wants to, they could accept nominations from the floor at the meeting today and vote now.

Ms. Feiler was in favor of the Commission re-electing the existing officers for 2011. Upon motion of Mr. Lindell, seconded by Mr. Cohen and carried unanimously the present officers were re-elected for 2011. They are **Chair, Ms. Vaughnette Goode-Walker** and **Vice Chair, George Cohen**.

Mr. Cohen asked Ms. Harris if there was an update on the the Unified Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Harris explained that the Commission is aware with the anticipated adoption of the Unified Zoning Ordinance, that this Commission would become essentially a joint City/County Board. Therefore, the local Historic Districts that currently exist within the City with the exception of the Landmark District would come under the purview of this Commission. They are presently wrapping up the final edits on the Unified Zoning Ordinance. The ordinance is presently in the public comment phase and hopeful it will be presented to City Council and County Commission before year end 2011. As they get closer and the additional responsibility will be placed on this Commission, they will have workshops to go over the different districts, provide them with the standards and so forth.

Mr. Cohen asked Ms. Harris if she had an idea of what the workload would be for the Commission.

Ms. Harris answered as for as the workload, within the local historic districts currently staff reviews all the applications. Therefore, they do have numbers in terms of how many applications the Commission would be reviewing. She feels that the Commission would have monthly meetings. Ms. Harris stated that she would get a better idea about how many applications are reviewed in the local Historic Districts every month and give the Commission a report at the next meeting.

Ms. Cohen asked Ms. Harris if there would still be a fair amount of applications that will be reviewed at staff level.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

IX. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

X. Adjournment

8. Adjourned

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Ms. Goode-Walker adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 6, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room at MPC.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Cultural Resource and Urban Planning Manager

EH:mem

The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.