



Historic Preservation Commission

Virtual Meeting
June 9, 2020 10:00 am
Meeting Minutes

JUNE 9, 2020 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Members Present: Karen Jarrett, Interim Chair
Travis Coles
Dwayne Stephens

Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, MPC Executive Director
Leah G. Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation
Ryan Jarles, Cultural Resources Planner
Alyson Smith, Historic Preservation Planner
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Sally Helm, Administrative Assistant
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

[1. Call to order and Welcome](#)

Ms. Jarrett called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the role of the Historic Preservation Commission and explained the process for hearing the various petitions. Staff will present each application with a recommendation. The petitioner will have the opportunity to respond to the recommendation. The petitioners are asked to limit their presentation to 10 minutes or less and only address the items identified as inconsistent with the ordinance and questions raised by the Board. The public will have the same allotted time, 10 minutes, to comment. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[2. Adopt the June 9, 2020 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby adopt the June 9, 2020 Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Travis Coles

Travis Coles

- Aye

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Karen Jarrett | - Abstain |
| Dwayne Stephens | - Aye |

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

3. Approve May 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes

[📎 05-19-2020 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve May 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Travis Coles - Aye

Karen Jarrett - Abstain

Dwayne Stephens - Aye

VI. ITEM(S) REQUESTED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL AGENDA

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

VICTORIAN DISTRICT

4. Petition of Ethos Preservation | 20-001730-COA | 220 East Anderson Street | Addition

[📎 Context information.pdf](#)

[📎 Project Description.pdf](#)

[📎 Supporting documentation.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Research.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Recommendation 20-001730-COA.pdf](#)

Ms. Ellen Harris present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for a rear addition and fence alterations for the property located at 220 East Anderson Street, which is the western half of the building. This proposal was first heard by the HPC at the April 28, 2020 meeting. At that meeting, staff recommended approval with the following conditions:

1. Revise the addition soffits to be perpendicular to the building wall;
2. Relocate the refuse storage area to be inside the rear fence to be screened from the public right-of-way; and
3. Paint or stain the wood fence.

Ms. Michalak explained that the Board had concerns about some design aspects of the building at the last meeting. In particular, the length of the shed roof and its visibility from Lincoln Street. The Board

recommended that the addition be redesigned. The Board continued the project in order for the applicant to address the design concerns of the staff and Board.

Ms. Michalak stated that the addition has not been redesigned; the one change is that the side yard fence is proposed to be increased in height from 6 to 8 feet. The drawings have also been updated to address the staff conditions. The applicant has provided site-line drawings of the addition from public rights-of-way as well as examples of other shed roofs with the submittal packet.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for a rear addition and fence alterations for the property located at 220 East Anderson Street with the following condition to be reviewed and approved by staff because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the drawings are updated to reflect the 8 foot fence height.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

Mr. Stephens asked Ms. Michalak if she stated that the graphic did not show the two feet addition to the fence.

Ms. Michalak explained that the construction drawings do not show the additional two feet, but the renderings show the two feet addition.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the eight feet fence would need a variance.

Ms. Michalak answered no. The NewZO allows an eight feet maximum height.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Harris thanked the Commission for hearing the petition again. She said at the last meeting, a lot of discussion was had regarding the length of the shed roof and whether it was possible to break it up in some other form, etc. Ms. Harris said they attempted to do this, but felt it was not successful. The shed roof looked contrived and made the addition more massive. Therefore, she did some more research and wished she would have been able to provide this to the Commission at the last meeting. She realized that without this it would be difficult to make an informed decision.

Ms. Harris explained that her research revealed that the proposed building is setback 80 feet from Lincoln Street. There is a maximum view shed just a bit over 13 feet between two buildings which will block the maximum view amount that would be seen from Lincoln Street. Therefore, there is an 80 foot setback and 13.4 feet between the two buildings. She said she superimposed the drawings onto photographs to show the Commission exactly how this would look from each angle as you come down Lincoln Street as this was the Commission's main concern. Ms. Harris stated that she also did some more research on findings examples of shed roofs, including the example that Ms. Michalak mentioned in her presentation. She stated to answer Mr. Stephens' question that on Duffy Street which is approximately two to three blocks north of this site, they are certainly within the visual proximity.

Ms. Harris stated that since she put the package together, she found other examples of longer shed roofs. But, she believed the ones she has presented were relevant and are contributing buildings with additions that have a similar form. The visibility is mostly from the lane with limited visibility from the street. She said they will update the drawings to reflect the eight foot fence. Ms. Harris entertained questions from the Commission.

Mr. Stephens thanked Ms. Harris for the supplemental information. He believes the additional contextual pictures help and the renderings that show the actual building with the additional two feet on the fence helps as well. He said, however, even though there is precedent of such a length on the roof, he believes that architecturally it is the best solution. He feels that Ms. Harris has made a sound and solid case.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed that all the standards were met involving this petition. They were in agreement with the staff recommendation

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve a rear addition and fence alterations for the property located at 220 East Anderson Street with the following condition to be reviewed and approved by staff because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the drawings are updated to reflect the 8 foot fence height.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Dwayne Stephens

Travis Coles - Aye

Karen Jarrett - Abstain

Dwayne Stephens - Aye

5. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 20-002261-COA | 906 Drayton Street | Alterations and Additions

📎 [Victorian Staff Recommendation 20-002261-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Project Narrative and Specifications.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Renderings.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Images.pdf](#)

📎 [SEDA-HPC-Preliminary Review Response-6-03-2020.pdf](#)

Mr. Keith Howington was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street. The scope of work consists of the following:

- Covered drop-off entrance canopy addition;
- Elevator addition
- Two stair tower additions;
- Rooftop terrace addition;
- Modifications to existing openings;
- Replace all windows and doors;
- New awnings;
- New paint and finishes.

Ms. Michalak stated that the applicant did not provide a complete application (used an outdated version of the checklist and did not use the "ADDITIONS" checklist) and did not attend the required pre-meeting with staff. She said she spoke with the petitioner who is in agreement to accept the

continuance as staff has recommended. This building was constructed in 1959 for the Independent Life Insurance Company and is not a contributing resource within the National Register Victorian Historic District or the local Victorian Historic District.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to continue the request for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street in order for the petitioner to address missing information, visual compatibility, and design standards as identified in the staff report.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Howington thanked the Commission for hearing their petition today. He explained that as Ms. Michalak explained in her presentation, they had a little mix-up over the last few months. He inadvertently got the wrong application. Due to changes, they believed that they had the right application. He apologized and said they will submit the right application for the next meeting. He said he would respond to the staff's concerns.

Mr. Howington said they missed showing the setbacks on the drawings, but will include this along with the correct application. However, has the Commission can see, they submitted what they believed would meet their lot coverage. They did not catch the NewZO change of the 2,500 square feet maximum footprint, but what they have is an existing site of 2,800 square feet and the addition of 285 square feet for the egress and stair elevator tower. This will not be habitable spaces, but simply egress and elevators. This total comes to 5,791 square feet, plus the service canopy drop-off for a total wide coverage of 24 percent. Mr. Howington said he believed they were allowed up to 60 percent. They are below this, but has the understanding that they will need to get the Zoning Board of Appeals approval for anything over 2,500 square feet. He said they will go to the ZBA and they appreciate it if the HPC would recommend approval to the ZBA for the 285 square feet. As he has said, it is on the egress; the existing building is over the lot coverage now on a very large lot.

Mr. Howington the pergola and the rooftop terrace is 9 feet tall. The existing parapet is shown as 24 feet. Therefore, they have an additional 9 feet to the top of the pergola which is about 7 feet to 10 feet lower than the two buildings on the north and south. The northern apartment building is approximately 44 feet. The church to the south is about 42 feet counting the bricks. The ordinance has an average of the blockface and they have nothing over 40 feet. Therefore, they believe this is well within the height limit. They will show this on their next document submittal.

Mr. Howington said regarding the projections, the staff was concerned about the new canopy drop-off on the lane. He said they believed it was visually compatible. They tried to keep it as thin as possible. The primary entrance remains on Drayton Street. The secondary service area will be from the lane. The new area will have no parked cars. They will have a drop-off and they believe this will cleanup the sidewalks. This will be for delivery and pick-up of goods. The building will be used by SEDA, the Film Office and the World Trade business. They will have business coming in from all over the world that will come to this building. The desire is to have a place for these businesses to use as a drop-off shelter. Therefore, they believed this would be a better addition than leaving this side as a parking lot as they did not view it as visually compatible. The lane would be utilized for delivery and drop-off.

Mr. Howington said they believed that the materials met the ordinance. However, they will revise and reconsider the materials for the railing, trellis roof and submit to staff for review. They will omit the wire mesh if this is what the staff recommends. The roofing material which was a seam translucent will be revisited. The doors and entrances will be the same material. They will include this in their next submittal. The doors and windows will be from the same manufacturer. They specified a Marvin window but this will be revised so that the doors will be from the same manufacturer. The primary entrance will be on Drayton Street. The canopy is accented over this entrance. Mr. Howington said they have deleted the later addition to the building. He pointed out that if the Board looks at the photos, they will see that this is clearly an addition. The previous owners added an ADA ramp on the front of the building and added the awning canopy over the door. However, they want to take the building back to originally what it was. They want to add to the primary entrance by the fin; delete the ADA ramp as they are putting the ADA ramp beside the service entrance; get rid of the steps in the front; get rid of the boxed out planters that were a later addition; cleanup the front facade and install it back to its original configuration. He said the way they have always understood this particular part of

the ordinance is that every 60 feet would need an entrance, but that at a 120 feet, you would need two entrances. Therefore, due to the fact that if they minus the door, they would be approximately eight feet over the 60 feet requirement. Therefore, they felt that restoring this back to its original opening and getting rid of those awful additions that were made at a later date, they would meet the intent of the ordinance by keeping the main entrance on the front of Drayton Street. The fact that they are 70 feet minus the edge of the door would be about eight feet more. This would be a compromise to the building's architecture just as what was done in the past. Mr. Howington said, therefore, they felt the standard is met. They want to keep this as is.

Mr. Howington stated they felt that the height and setback of the pergola was established by an existing condition, which is the fin on the front of the building. Their new pergola would not be higher and would setback to the edge of the existing fin. Therefore, they felt very strongly that this met the intent of the ordinance. They would like to revisit this and will set it a little further to the east and north to set it back off the site. He said of course you would not see the view unless that was shown on the monitor unless you were flying in an airplane. But if you were to stand on the sidewalk on Drayton Street or Bolton Street looking upward, you would not see it. Mr. Howington explained that the reason you see so much of the facade is because of the space between the two buildings. Consequently, just like other rooftops downtown and rooftops in the past, when you have a large open expanse there is hardly anywhere you can get back far enough and not see any rooftop addition when there is a very large open space. As he has said, they thought the intent of the standard was met by setting it back one bay. As far as the lighting fixtures and fencing, they understand the condition and will submit them to the staff in their next submittal. Mr. Howington entertained questions from the Commission.

Mr. Stephens asked Mr. Howington if they intend to keep the primary entrance on Drayton Street.

Mr. Howington answered yes. The primary entrance is on Drayton Street and it will remain there.

Mr. Stephens asked if the primary parking will be at the rear of the building and the side driveway is the closest access to the parking, how would the front serve as the front entrance? Is it only for pedestrian traffic?

Mr. Howington explained that this is an existing condition. The front entrance is there and so is the parking lot. Therefore, they are not changing anything, but what they are doing is actually adding an additional door to a long facade on the south that is not there now. They are creating something that the ordinance is in favor of by adding an additional entrance. They are not changing the conditions of the parking lot or the front entrance along Drayton Street. They believe they are getting rid of the ADA ramp on the front which is not allowed now and the added awning which is out of character of the building and cleaning the front where all the brick planters and steps, etc. that were added at a later time. Mr. Howington said, as their renderings show, they want to cleanup the front facade.

Mr. Coles told Mr. Howington that if they are going to put this back to originally what it was, there is a need for them to justify some of the items in photos for context of the original design if they can find them would help during his presentation.

Mr. Howington stated that they have not found any early photos of this before the awning addition. But, during their investigation, it was revealed that it was an addition.

Ms. Jarrett said there are quite a few differences between Mr. Howington and staff. Staff has recommended a continuance might be the best solution. She asked Mr. Howington if he felt he could work with staff and come up with something more in line with staff's observation and still maintain the aesthetic that he is looking for?

Mr. Howington answered yes. The staff and he have already talked about some things. They are willing to move the pergola to the east and north in order to get it off of the facade. They will show the setbacks and will meet all the conditions that staff has set. The three items that they would not like to revise would be the door based on the discussions that they have had. He believed their discussion is valid and he believed also that having the one primary entrance and getting rid of the other. They are confused about the two doors not side-by-side are confusing as they are a later addition. They would like to keep the door where it is. They want to cleanup the parking lot that is on the southside and not have it as a parking lot. They want to create this as a service drop-off as the ordinance requests.

They want to keep the covered entrance here for multiple reasons. Mr. Howington said he would love to leave the HPC meeting today with a recommendation for the variance for the 285 square feet addition just for the service towers that only houses the stairs and elevators; these are not habitable spaces, but are egresses that allow getting down from the rooftop.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated that their Architectural Review Committee met and discussed this property. A couple of years ago, some plans were presented requesting that this building be demolished. But, they are glad to see that this building is going to be reused. They are not excited about the treatment of the building. They do not feel that the original design and intent are being respected. The HSF understands that this is not a contributing building; but it is eligible to be such. Therefore, they believe that it is under this context that it should be reviewed. They agree with staff regarding the pergola being on top of the building. Mr. Arvay said they believe that staff has clearly demonstrated that it does not meet the intention of the standards or ordinance. It is clearly visible from multiple right-of-ways. The height is really irrelevant to their way of thinking because this is more about visual compatible. He does not know how this would be redesigned, pushed back or removed so that it will not be an incongruous design element. They believe this design element should be eliminated. Likewise, the addition of the canopy that Mr. Howington described as thin could well be, but it is still unbalancing the design of the building. As they all know, over the last five or ten years, Mid-century architecture has found a new appreciation among preservationists and architects. Mr. Arvay said they feel that the design and intent of the building is really being interfered with several superfluous details. He was not sure why the original materiality of the building is not being retained, the windows on the original facade seems to be superfluous details. Mr. Arvay said he, too, is not sure why the original concrete portions are being resurfaced in stone. He understood that the Mr. Howington said it was for consistency, but they feel that the original design intent of this 1959 building should be preserved. Mr. Arvay said he realizes that Mr. Howington argued for such when he talked about the front facade and the doorway, but they wished that this philosophy was carried over little more in the design overall. The point made about having historic photographs being included in the application packet is a must or may be they can include the earliest photos that are available. They need to see how this building was configured or redesigned. The HSF recommends, too, that this petition be continued.

Mr. Howington, in response to public comments, stated that he wanted everyone to keep in mind that this is a noncontributing building as Mr. Arvay said. They are not looking to demolish the building or construct a four-story maximum lot coverage building, but they are utilizing the existing structure. He explained that the windows cannot be used because they are 1959 windows, they leak and have an air infiltration. The windows are in horrible condition and no matter what, they must be replaced. Mr. Howington said they understand the concern about the pergola, but he wanted to remind everyone to consider that the existing fin is there. From the argument that was just made, this fin would be out of place, he said, because of its height and size. Therefore, they have kept their additions below the fin height and they would consider moving the pergola back. The addition and stairs are to the rear of the building and not to the front, which the ordinance requests. Therefore, they feel that they have met the intent of the ordinance. As has been said, this is a noncontributing building and they are not going to demolish it, but improve it. Therefore, they are hopeful that what everyone has seen thus far is an improvement. He clarified that they are not removing any stone. They are leaving the stone and brick as is as they will only be painted.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed their appreciation that efforts are being made to try to rehabilitate this building. However, staff has raised some very valid concerns. They appreciate also that the petitioner is in agreement with most of staff's recommendations. The Commission believes that there are a lot of good elements forthcoming. They were glad to see that the building will not be demolished. The Commission did not believe that today is the appropriate time for them to recommend approval to the ZBA for a variance as changes will be forthcoming at a later meeting. Consequently, they were in agreement with the staff recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the request for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street in order for the petitioner to address missing information, visual compatibility, and design standards as identified in the staff report.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Dwayne Stephens

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Travis Coles | - Aye |
| Karen Jarrett | - Abstain |
| Dwayne Stephens | - Aye |

[6. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 20-002250-COA | 818 - 820 Abercorn Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

[HPC-818Abercorn Street -Writeup-05-12-20.pdf](#)

[HPC-818Abercorn Street -Drawings-05-12-20.pdf](#)

[Staff Recommendation 20-002250-COA.pdf](#)

Mr. Keith Howington of Greenline Architecture was present on behalf of petition.

Ms. Alyson Smith gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval to rehabilitate the non-contributing building located at 818(820) Abercorn Street. The alterations include: the addition of new Bahama style shutters over the upper level windows; metal awning style canopies over the lower level; new entrance door at west elevation in existing opening; new windows on the north elevation in existing openings; new paint and finishes. A metal framed green wall and planters are proposed at the west elevation. Signage will be applied for under a separate COA.

Ms. Smith reported that staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation of 818(820) Abercorn Street with the following conditions, because the requested work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the non-operable replacement windows at the north elevation to a single-hung, double-hung, triple hung, awning, or casement window.
2. Glazing shall be transparent.

Ms. Smith entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Howington thanked the Commission for hearing their petition. He said they did not have any concerns with staff recommendations. They will comply with what the staff has recommended. Mr. Howington explained that the reason they chose the non-operable windows is because they were simply matching what is on the building. Therefore, they felt it would be odd to replace the windows with a double hung or a type of window that would not match what is there. Mr. Howington said he understood the requirement for the glazing to be clear; however, all the windows are tinted. Therefore, this was their reason to match what was existing. However, they have no issue with the glazing being transparent. Mr. Howington entertained questions from the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Mr. Coles asked staff if the ordinance requires a double, triple window? Does it make sense contextually with the building?

Ms. Smith answered yes, she believes it does because the existing windows are not storefront windows. These windows do not match the rest of the windows on the building. Staff believes this standard should be upheld. No other windows on the building are being proposed to be changed. Ms. Smith said staff believes further that the windows should be operable as well. The windows should meet the standard.

The Commission was in agreement with the staff recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the rehabilitation at 818(820) Abercorn Street with the following conditions, because the requested work is visually compatible and meets the design standards:

1. Revise the non-operable replacement windows at the north elevation to a single-hung, double-hung, triple hung, awning, or casement window.
2. Glazing shall be transparent.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Travis Coles

Second: Dwayne Stephens

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Travis Coles | - Aye |
| Karen Jarrett | - Abstain |
| Dwayne Stephens | - Aye |

STREETCAR DISTRICT

[7. Petition of CDH Construction | 20-002260-COA | 410 East 31st Street | New Constructions Small Parts I and II](#)

- [☞ Drawings For Agenda.pdf](#)
- [☞ Adjacent buildings.pdf](#)
- [☞ Window Brochure.pdf](#)
- [☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation Format.pdf](#)

Mr. Jason Hendricks of CDH Construction was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Parts I and II for a 2-story single family dwelling at 410 East 31st Street. The New Construction is proposed to be 29'-5" in height, 21'-0" wide, and 48'-0" from the front to rear façade. This is a vacant lot. The submittal also includes a 6'-0" in height privacy fence to the rear of the property.

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction Parts I and II for a 2-story single family dwelling at 410 East 31st Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the drawings to incorporate additional openings on at least 30% of the ground floor towards the front of the east facing façade.
2. Revise the door selection to be made of glass, wood, clad wood, or steel.
3. Revise the window specification to a previously approved window specification found on the

MPC's "Windows in Savannah's Historic Districts" brochure included with the agenda.

4. Provide staff with a brick and mortar specification for review and approval prior to submitting drawings to be stamped for permitting.
5. Provide the shutter material specification to staff for review and approval prior to submitting drawings to be stamped for permitting and ensure that the shutters are operable, sized to fit the window opening, and that the placement of the horizontal rail corresponds to the location of the meeting rail(s) of the window.
6. Revise the drawings to include the location of refuse areas prior to submitting plans to be stamped for permitting.
7. Ensure that if lighting is to be included that the drawings be revised to show the proposed light fixtures.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commission.

Mr. Stephens asked Mr. Jarles if staff was comfortable with viewing the modifications for the windows to meet 30% of the ground floor.

Mr. Jarles answered yes.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Hendricks stated that his sister and he are business partners in CDH Construction. They will revise the conditions as outlined by staff. He asked staff to please provide them the information that was shown on the screen.

Mr. Jarles ensured Mr. Hendricks that the information would be sent to them.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed that there are quite a few conditions, but due to their nature, they felt this could be done at staff level. The staff has said that they are comfortable reviewing condition #1 - Revise the drawings to incorporate additional openings on at least 30% of the ground floor towards the front of the east facing façade.

The Commission was in agreement with staff recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve New Construction Parts I and II for a 2-story single family dwelling at 410 East 31st Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the drawings to incorporate additional openings on at least 30% of the ground floor towards the front of the east facing facade.
2. Revise the door selection to be made of glass, wood, clad wood, or steel.
3. Revise the window specification to a previously approved window specification found on the MPC's "Windows in Savannah's Historic Districts" brochure included with the agenda.

4. Provide staff with a brick and mortar specification for review and approval prior to submitting drawings to be stamped for permitting.
5. Provide the shutter material specification to staff for review and approval prior to submitting drawings to be stamped for permitting and ensure that the shutters are operable, sized to fit the window opening, and that the placement of the horizontal rail corresponds to the location of the meeting rail(s) of the window.
6. Revise the drawings to include the location of refuse areas prior to submitting plans to be stamped for permitting.
7. Ensure that if lighting is to be included that the drawings be revised to show the proposed lighting fixtures.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Dwayne Stephens

Second: Travis Coles

Travis Coles - Aye

Karen Jarrett - Abstain

Dwayne Stephens - Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[8. Tide & Country LLC | 20-002074-COA | 1702 Bull Street | Staff Approved - New Illuminated Sign](#)

[📎 HPC Decision COA, 20-002074, 1702 Bull Street.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[9. Petition of Donna Summers/Mayor & Alderman | 20-002180-COA | 1700 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - demolition of a non - contributing building.](#)

[📎 Signed COA Decision 20-002180-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[10. Petition of Patrick Phelps | 20-002243-COA | 1201 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - amendment to previous COA \(file no. 18-003930-COA\)](#)

[📎 Victorian Signed Staff Decision 20-002234-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[11. Petition of Shauna Kucera | 20-002366-COA | 1616 MLK Jr. Blvd | Staff Approved - amendment to preciously approved COA \(19-002853-COA\)](#)

[📎 Mid-City Signed Staff Decision 20-002366-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[12. Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 20-002283-COA | 201-301 W. Victory Dr. | Staff Approved - Signs](#)

[📎 COA Signed Decision 20-002283-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[13. Next Regular Meeting - Tuesday, June 30, 2020 at 10:00am. Location: Virtual Meeting](#)

Ms. Jarrett stated that the next meeting [virtual] will be held on Tuesday, June 30, 2020 at 10:00 a.m. This will be the final meeting for the HPC Interim Commission. The newly elected HPC will have their first meeting on Wednesday, July 22, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.

[14. Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic Preservation Interim Commission, Ms. Jarrett adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah G. Michalak, Director
Historic Preservation

LGM:mem

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