



Historic Preservation Commission

Virtual Meeting
September 23, 2020 3:00 PM
Meeting Minutes

SEPTEMBER 23, 2020 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Members Present: Virginia Mobley, Chair
Chelsea Jackson-Green, Vice-Chair
Rebecca Fenwick
Darren Bagley-Heath
Vernon Jones
T. Jerry Lominack
J. Haley Swindle
Dr. Robin Williams

Member Absent: Kendra Clark

Staff Present: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director
Leah Michalak, Historic Preservation Director
Ryan Jarles, Cultural Resources Planner
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner
Sally Helms, Administrative Assistant
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

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

Ms. Mobley called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the role of the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Mobley explained that staff will present each application with a recommendation and then the petitioner will then present his/her comments. The public will make comments. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments. Then the HPC will make its decision.

[2. Commission Member Introductions](#)

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[3. Adopt the September 23, 2020 Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby adopt the September 23, 2020 Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

[4. Approve August 26, 2020 Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 08-26-2020 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve August 26, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Darren Bagley-Heath

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

[5. Petition of Jal's Pena Construction | 20-002889-COA | 300 West Henry Street/1207 Jefferson Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Darren Bagley-Heath

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

VICTORIAN DISTRICT

[6. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 20-004230-COA | 906 Drayton Street | Amendments to Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

- 📎 [Victorian Staff Recommendation 20-004230-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Opt-Out Letters.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Previously Approved Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting recommendations for amendments to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street [File No. 20-002261-COA]. The amendments consist of the following:

- Remove the rooftop structures in their entirety.
- Remove the louver system at the west (front) façade.
- Add a roof use to the top of the drop-off canopy (deck and railing).
- Revise the replacement windows to “YKK, 600 Series” storefront.
- Revise the exterior finish of additions to stucco.

Ms. Michalak stated additionally that the Georgia Preservation Act of 1980, Section 44-10-27, (b) states:

“The Department of Transportation and any contractors, including cities and counties, performing work funded by the Department of Transportation are exempt from the requirement to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) under the Georgia Historic Preservation Act of 1980. Local governments are also exempt provided; however, that they provide notification to the Historic District Board of Review 45 days prior to beginning any work that would require a COA and allow the HDBR an opportunity to comment.”

Ms. Michalak said that the Savannah Economic Development and Renewal Authority (SEDA) is a state commissioned entity that has now chosen to opt-out of the COA process. The representative for SEDA is providing notice to the Historic Preservation Commission of the proposed project within the Victorian Local Historic District and allowing the Commission the opportunity to comment pursuant to the Georgia Historic Preservation Act of 1980. This also excludes the project from the posting requirements and providing all supplemental documents and other items typically required to be submitted for a project.

Ms. Michalak stated that this project was most recently heard by the Interim HPC at the June 30, 2020 Meeting. The Commission voted as follows:

Approve the petition for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Screen the covered drop-off canopy addition from view of Drayton Street.
2. Ensure that the required shrubs are planted between the parking lot fence and sidewalk.

Approve the Special Exception from the standard that states: *"There shall be a primary entrance along the primary street at intervals no greater than 60 feet."* To allow one primary entrance along Drayton Street which is 71 feet wide because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the Base Zoning District standard that states: *"Nonresidential building footprint (max sq. ft.): 2,500"* To allow additions to the existing nonresidential building for a total footprint of 7,408 square feet (the existing building footprint exceeds the standard at 5,850 square feet) because the variance criteria are met.

Ms. Michalak informed the Commission that this project was first heard by the Interim HPC at the June 9, 2020 Meeting. The Commission voted to continue the project in order for the petitioner to address missing information, visual compatibility, and design standards as follows:

1. Provide the building coverage percentage;
2. Building footprint exceeds maximum permitted in the district (request a variance);
3. Provide setbacks for the additions;
4. Provide the height of the existing building and the height of the contributing building to the south on the same block face;
5. Remove the covered drop-off canopy addition;
6. Reduce the height of the trellis and set it back further from the street facing facades;
7. Revise/redesign the trellis translucent panels and the wire mesh railings;
8. Provide specifications for the new/replacement doors;
9. Include a second primary entrance on the front façade to meet the standard;
10. Provide details for the parking lot fence;
11. Provide lighting specifications.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends the following comments be provided for consideration related to the proposed amendments to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street in order to be visually compatible and meet the design standards:

1. Remove in its entirety or reduce the size of the vehicular canopy (to the minimum size necessary).
2. Remove the uncovered deck on the canopy roof to meet the design standard (which requires that roof decks be at the rear of the building and not visible from the public right-of-way).
3. Ensure that the roof mounted HVAC equipment is screened from view of the street.
4. Ensure that the refuse storage area is screened from the public right-of-way.
5. Ensure that the required shrubs are planted between the parking lot fence and

sidewalk.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

Ms. Mobley asked if access to this building is the purview of the Traffic Engineering Department. The traffic will have to turn off Drayton Street and access the lane to get to this building.

Ms. Michalak answered yes. This is the purview of Traffic Engineering. She explained that an existing curb cut is on Bolton Street; It is no longer permitted by the ordinance, but it is there.

Ms. Fenwick asked if there is a precedent for a new projects formerly opting out of the COA process.

Ms. Michalak answered that because the HPC is a new Commission, there is not a precedent for new projects formerly option out of the COA process. But under the Historic District Board of Review [HDBR] there have been multiple projects.

Ms. Fenwick asked staff if the construction has begun on this project.

Ms. Michalak answered that the petitioner has applied for a building permit, but she does not know if the building permit has been issued.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Howington thanked the Commission for reviewing their petition. As the Commission can see, they have adhered to many of the previous Commission's comments. They took off the rooftop addition. The porte cochere covered entrance from the side was discussed at great length the last time it was heard by the Commission and was considered to be as minimal as possible in order to park a car underneath. The porte cochere is pushed to more than half of the back of the building. This building is open from all sides and there is no way you can put a covered entrance without seeing this. However, they feel the improvements of removing the additional louvers on the front and the rooftop deck that was on the third story is a great improvement.

Mr. Howington stated regarding the staff's comments, the canopy was approved at the last meeting as is, minus the addition of the uncovered deck. This was considered to be reduced as much as necessary. They added the uncovered deck as they decided not to put the deck on the rooftop. They believed this was less obtrusive and brought the building back to what it was originally. They do not believe that HVAC will be seen from the right-of-way. Obviously, if you step back far enough, you will see it. But, if so, they will consider screening. He said that the refuge storage area is screening as shown on the plans and is in the back of the parking lot. Mr. Howington said that at the last meeting, they agreed that the shrubs and plants would be between the parking lot fence and the sidewalk.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Ms. Fenwick believed the design is improved, but she still has concerns with the drive-in canopy.

Mr. Lominack said this is a prime example of why the contributing structure ordinance of listed properties and buildings need to be updated. This is a prime example of Mid-Twenty Century architecture.

Ms. Michalak explained that we had a grant project in 2016 that updated this survey. The consultant recommended to not extend the period of significance to include buildings past 1923 which is the end of the period of Significance. Therefore, these buildings have been surveyed. In the new zoning ordinance, a clause was included about being able to add buildings outside that period of significance using the exceptional significance clause. However, no one has applied to add these buildings.

Mr. Bagley-Heath shared the concerns stated by Mr. Lominack. They need to be looking at how they can preserve these buildings as well.

As reported by Ms. Michalak, **the Savannah Economic Development and Renewal Authority (SEDA)** is a state commissioned entity that has now chosen to opt-out of the COA process. The representative for SEDA provided notice to the Historic Preservation Commission of the proposed project within the Victorian Local Historic District and allowing the Commission the opportunity to comment pursuant to the Georgia Historic Preservation Act of 1980. The Historic Preservation Commission was in agreement with the staff comments.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby recommend the following comments for consideration related to the proposed amendments to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation, alterations, and additions for the property located at 906 Drayton Street in order to be visually compatible and meet the design standards:

- 1.Remove in its entirety or reduce the size of the vehicular canopy (to the minimum size necessary).
- 2.Remove the uncovered deck on the canopy roof to meet the design standard (which requires that roof decks be at the rear of the building and not visible from the public right-of-way).
- 3.Ensure that the roof mounted HVAC equipment is screened from view of the street.
- 4.Ensure that the refuse storage area is screened from the public right-of-way.
- 5.Ensure that the required shrubs are planted between the parking lot fence and sidewalk.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[7. Petition of Carroll Construction | 20-004175-COA | 313 West Waldburg Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations and Additions](#)

📎 [Victorian Staff Recommendation 20-004175-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [rear image - oct 2014.pdf](#)

Mr. Andrew Carlton of Carroll Construction was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval to rehabilitate and construct two additions for the fire-damaged townhouse located at 313 West Waldburg Street. The additions consist of a one-bedroom addition above the previous parlor floor kitchen on the rear and a three-story wood porch on the rear. The fire was primarily isolated to the rear (south) of the building on all floors, and caused significant structural damage to wood framing, portions of the historic brick, and the roof structure.

Ms. Michalak said per the applicant: *"The most significant historic brick damage is severe spalling that occurred on the parlor level, southernmost facade. It has been structurally determined as damaged beyond repair (see images attached). Petitioner proposes removing this damaged section (see 1.0/D3.0). Much effort in the renovation design is given to preserve the garden level historic brick wall and demising walls between the property boundaries. Due to modern building codes, and concern for reduced load capacities after the fire, these historic walls have been structurally relieved of bearing additional structural weight (other than supporting the brick themselves) and can be preserved around the new renovation. These structural modifications occur on the interior of the structure and do not affect the exterior appearance. The front (north) facade fared much better and there are more minor repairs needed. Most of the effort in the front will be repairing and replacing damaged window panes/sashes, in-kind. Effort will be made to keep existing sashes if they can be salvaged (see attached images). The existing front porch also has minor, non-fire related, damage to some of the wood trim components, that will also be repaired/replaced in-kind and repainted."*

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval to rehabilitate and construct two additions for fire-damaged townhouse located at 313 West Waldburg Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise and provide the following for the rear porch addition:
 - Revise the piers on the garden level to be brick.
 - Revise the columns to be wood or wood composite.
 - Add capitals to the posts.
 - Revise the railing heights to be a maximum of 36 inches.
 - Provide a railing detailing clarifying the design of the railing and balusters, and ensure the baluster spacing doesn't exceed 4 inches.

2. Paint the wood fence and gates.

3. Relocate refuse storage area into the yard to be screened by the fence.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Carlton said they do not have any exceptions to the staff recommendations. They are open to all of the staff's suggestions. He entertained questions from the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission was in agreement with staff recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve to rehabilitate and construct two

additions for the fire-damaged townhouse located at 313 West Waldburg Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise and provide the following for the rear porch addition:
 - Revise the piers on the garden level to be brick.
 - Revise the columns to be wood or wood composite.
 - Add capitals to the posts.
 - Revise the railing heights to be a maximum of 36 inches.
 - Provide a railing detailing clarifying the design of the railing and balusters, and ensure the baluster spacing doesn't exceed 4 inches.
2. Paint the wood fence and gates.
3. Relocate refuse storage area into the yard to be screened by the fence.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Darren Bagley-Heath

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[8. Petition of Array Design | 20-003674-COA | 524-526 East Anderson Street | New Construction Small, Parts I and II](#)

📎 [Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

📎 [Updated Lane Drawings.pdf](#)

📎 [20-003674-COA Stamped Drawings Add and Fence.pdf](#)

📎 [Recommendation September Meeting.pdf](#)

Ms. Shauna Kucera was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for New Construction Small, Parts I and II, and an addition to the rear of 524 and 526 East Anderson Street. The applicant is also requesting

TN-1. Building Setbacks (ft).

For blocks with contributing structures.

Side yard (interior): 3 (min)

To allow for a 2'-0" west side yard setback.

Mr. Jarles explained that the addition to the rear of 524 and 526 is to be constructed onto the existing non-historic rear addition, and the non-historic rear addition is proposed to be delineated from the historic building by including a vertical trim where the historic building meets the non-historic addition. The addition will project from the existing non-historic addition an additional 14'-0" and will be full width across the rear of the building. The east side of the addition is proposed to have a 3'-11 1/2" setback while the west side is proposed to have a 2'-0" setback. Due to the existing structure having a 2'-0" west side yard setback, the applicant is requesting approval for a Special Exception to the development standard requiring a 3'-0" side yard setback within the TN-1 zoning district, to allow for a 2'-0" side yard setback on the proposed addition.

Mr. Jarles said that the proposed New Construction accessory dwelling on the lane is to be 10'-0" from the rear of the proposed addition, is to have a 3'-0" setback from the lane, and is to have 5'-0" side yard setbacks. The New Construction accessory dwelling is to be 20'-0" in width at its widest point closest to the historic main building, 32'-3" in depth and it will step in to be 11'-3" in width at the lane. The step in allows for a single parking space next to the accessory dwelling.

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction Small, Parts I & II, and an addition to the rear of 524 and 526 East Anderson Street with the following conditions to be provided to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Omit the clerestory window on the New Construction accessory dwelling.
2. Provide material specifications for all door and windows, the brick and mortar, and the roofing for the addition.
3. Ensure that the space between the foundation piers of the addition is filled with heavy gauge wood lattice with at least one-half (0.5) inch thick lattice boards, horizontal boards, brick or stucco over concrete block and that the infill material is recessed a minimum of three inches behind the front edge of the pier.
4. Revise the soffits to be perpendicular to the building wall.
5. Revise the fence location to only be forward of the rear façade and ensure that the fence be painted or stained.

AND

Approval for a Special Exception from the Article 5 Base Zoning standard that reads:

TN-1.

Building Setbacks (ft).

For blocks with contributing structures.

Side yard (interior): 3 (min)

To allow for a 2'-0" west side yard setback because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commission.

Ms. Mobley asked if the original Sanborn Map shows four lots. Have these lots been done away with? Does the existing construction occupy both of these lots or just one lot?

Mr. Jarles explained that the existing lot covers the entire four lots. There is now one large lot and what is existing there is one duplex. At the last meeting, the Commission approved an addition to the rear. This proposal for the new construction is within the rear section of the existing lot.

Ms. Mobley asked if the map that the Commission is looking at today shows addresses as 523, 525, and 527. Are these legitimate post office addresses or is it assumed that these are the addresses?

Mr. Jarles explained that this is currently one lot with a 524 and a 526 address. The rear lane will receive a new address.

Ms. Mobley asked since the rear structure is going to have a separate address, would it not have to meet the full requirements of the Victorian District?

Mr. Jarles stated that the address is meeting the full requirements for the dwelling on the lot. All of

the standards and requirements have been put forward to the structure as a new construction accessory dwelling.

Mr. Bagley-Heath asked if the accessory building would be on Henry Lane. Would the address be 525 and 527 East Henry Lane?

Mr. Jarles answered yes.

Ms. Michalak explained that you cannot have two principal dwelling units on one parcel. This is why this building is an accessory and not a principal building.

Ms. Mobley asked if you have a separate address, does this not identify it as a separate building?

Ms. Michalak answered no, it is one parcel.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Kucera stated that she was returning to the Commission today with a revised carriage house design. They have simplified the design. If the Commission remembers the initial design had two different gable roof lines. They have now made it one roof gable design and have increased the width of the structure. They have added three same size windows facing the lane. They have maintained the one off-street parking space which is not required under the new zoning, but was important for their client. She said they believe this benefits the community. The pergola was added to the side of the building.

Ms. Kucera entertained questions from the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission was in agreement with the staff recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve for New Construction Small, Parts I & II at the rear of 524 and 526 East Anderson Street with the following conditions to be provided to staff for review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Provide material specifications for all doors, windows, and light fixtures.
2. Ensure the pergola is painted or stained.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain

Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

CUYLER-BROWNVILLE DISTRICT

[9. Petition of City of Savannah Code Compliance | 20-002642-COA | 726 West Victory Drive | Contributing Building Demolition](#)

- 🔗 [20-002642-COA June 2020 DECISION.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [726 W Victory Drive Court Order.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [726 W. Victory Dr. Building Observation Stamped and Signed.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [726 West Victory Drive photograph.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [HSF letter of Tax Sale Reschedule.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Original HSF Letter on Tax Sale.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [COA 19-002821 June 20 2019.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Recommendation September Meeting 20-002642-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [FINAL_Sixth-SJEO \(1\).pdf](#)

Officer Downs of the City of Savannah Code Compliance Department was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of a contributing building in the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District located at 726 West Victory Drive. The City's Inspection Worksheet states that there is wall rot as well as front roof rot and collapse. The Inspector states that he recommends demolition. The building's demolition was ordered in Recorder's Court on June 2, 2014.

Mr. Jarles explained that on June 25, 2019, the MPC made the decision to continue the petition for demolition of a contributing building in the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District located at 726 West Victory Drive [File No. 19-002821-COA]. The order for demolition made by the Recorder's Court of Chatham County was ordered in the name of the defendant and property owner Jesus Castillo (Mayor and Alderman of the City of Savannah v. Jesus Castillo). It appeared the City of Savannah had no legal standing to apply for the demolition based on this court order because the defendant named on the legal document is the property owner Jesus Castillo. The court ordered demolition did not vest ownership of the property to the City of Savannah. The applicant (The City of Savannah) was told to go to The Recorder's Court of Chatham County to retain a new order either vesting ownership of the property to the City of Savannah or go through the process of having the property deemed as a blighted property and the authority be given to the City for its demolition.

Mr. Jarles stated that on May 14, 2020 staff was provided a document via Lester B. Johnson, III, Assistant City Attorney explaining the legal standing of the City of Savannah allowing for heirs of a deceased property owner to act as personal representatives (executors) of a property in cases of demolition. On June 30, 2020 the Board made the decision to continue the petition to demolish the building located at 726 West Victory Drive to the September 23, 2020 Historic Preservation Commission Regular Meeting to allow for the building to be included at the September 8, 2020 Tax Sale. The staff was contacted by Historic Savannah Foundation on August 26, 2020 and were informed that the September Tax Sale was rescheduled for November 3, 2020 due to the ongoing global Covid-19 pandemic.

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends continue the petition to demolish the building located at 726 West Victory Drive to the December 23, 2020 Historic Preservation Commission Regular Meeting to allow for the building to be included at the November 3, 2020 Tax Sale.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commission.

Ms. Fenwick stated that she was reading the attachments and it appears that this item was moved because of the pandemic. Therefore, is it correct that no tax sale has been held for this item?

Mr. Jarles answered yes. The expected tax sale date was September 8, 2020. But, due to the COVID-19 epidemic, the tax sale now is scheduled to be held on November 3, 2020.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Officer Downs stated the City of Savannah has been maintaining this property for more than 10 years. They have been cutting the grass and cleaning on a regular basis; they have secured the property three different times. Since the last HPC meeting, they have had to secured the property twice. There are more than \$10,000 in back taxes on this property. The COA originally was brought to the Commission in June 2019. Now, it is September 2020 and they are still waiting for the tax sale to take place. Officer Downs said they are asking that the Commission approve the COA so they can go ahead and remove this blight, unsafe condition from the neighborhood. They have dealt with many police issues of vagrants breaking into the dwelling. Consequently, they believe that the best outcome is to allow this structure to be removed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated he wanted to express their acknowledgment of everything that Officer Downs said. The HSF does not dispute the code violations, the frustration to the neighbors that this property represents. However, the HSF feels that the building being a contributing structure is worthy of preservation and is structurally salvageable. He said that the HSF should already own this structure. They are the ones who initiated the judicial in rem process last summer in order for the HSF to be able to purchase the property. This process typically takes an average of six to seven months for it to go to a judge and be approved for sale. Therefore, the HSF was originally set to purchase the property in April. Then COVID-19 hit and it was moved to June. They were ready to go to the June tax sale, but the judicial order extended all tax sales to September. But, now as Mr. Jarles has reported, the September meeting has been extended to November, 2020.

Mr. Arvay said he talked with representatives at the tax office yesterday. At that time, he asked the representatives what is the real over/under on actually holding a tax sale in November, 2020. He said the representatives felt confident that the property would proceed to the tax sale in November. However, no one has a crystal ball, but HSF has every intention; the purchase has been approved by the HSF Board, to buy this building and save it at the earliest opportunity. While he acknowledges the City of Savannah's ten years of having to deal with this headache, it would be a shame to lose this building for not waiting another six weeks. Mr. Arvay said, therefore, HSF respectfully requests that the HPC continue this petition and give them at least one more time to purchase this building at the tax sale in November, 2020. He entertained questions from the Commission.

Officer Downs, in response to public comment, stated that as Mr. Arvay reported, the HSF did begin the process in hopes of purchasing the property. however, he wanted to acknowledge the court order from Recorder's Court which stated that the building was deemed unsafe and needed to be demolished. In response to the statement of what is another month, through the time sale process it will not be another month. HSF has its process of marketing setup and they are looking at probably another year before things begin taking place with this property. Therefore, it is not another month; it will be at least another year and this is if the tax sale takes place in November. Officer Downs said he really would like to see this taken care of now. He knows there is a desire to save this structure, but they have the court order ordering the demolition of the building. This is something that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Jarles stated that the court order that Officer Downs spoke of did require that all necessary permits be applied for by June 16, 2014. Obviously, they are well passed this date. Therefore, they did not meet the requirements of that court order. Consequently, the court order has expired.

Ms. Mobley asked if this was the request by the City of Savannah that the building be demolished or by Historic Savannah Foundation?

Mr. Jarles explained that this was the court order requiring that the property be demolished. But, the

requirements of the court order were not met.

Ms. Mobley stated, therefore, presently there is no court order in place. Is this correct?

Mr. Jarles answered presently, there is no valid court order in place.

Officer Downs explained that the court order required that the defendant in the case obtain the permits by that date. But, they failed to do so. This is why the City of Savannah has now picked up the process of carrying out the demolition.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission was in agreement that they did not believe that it was fair for them to move forward with demolishing the building due to things that could not be done due to the pandemic. There is a buyer for this building, which means that the building could be saved. They believed that another month or so waiting for the tax sale is not too much time as a buyer wants to purchase the building. It would be a shame to lose this building.

The Commission unanimously concurred with the staff recommendation.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition to demolish the building located at 726 West Victory Drive to the December 23, 2020 Historic Preservation Commission Regular Meeting to allow for the building to be included at the November 3, 2020 Tax Sale.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

STREETCAR DISTRICT

[10. Petition of Rockbridge Energy | 20-003657-COA | 18 East 34th Street | Solar Panels and Special Exception Request](#)

🔗 [Written Description - Drawings - Specification.pdf](#)

🔗 [Solar Panels for 18 E 34th St.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Recommendation 20-003657-COA.pdf](#)

🔗 [Sandborn Maps.pdf](#)

🔗 [View from Drayton Street.pdf](#)

Mr. Grant Tallon was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the staff report. This petition was originally placed on the Consent Agenda, but

it was requested that it be placed on the Regular Agenda. The applicant is requesting approval for the installation of 19 solar panels to be installed on the east facing roof portions on the rear as well as the flat roof of 18 East 34th Street. A total of 19 solar panels are proposed on the roof of the historic building. Seven (7) solar panels are to be placed on the east facing roof slopes of the rear and side roof structure which will be facing, and minimally visible, from Drayton Street. Twelve (12) solar panels are proposed to be placed on the flat roof and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Jarles said the applicant is also requesting approval of a Special Exception from the Streetcar Historic District Design Standard that states:

Mechanical Equipment and Refuse.

Alternative energy source devices may be permitted on contributing resources provided they are not visible from the street and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

to allow for the solar panels to be visible from Drayton Street.

Mr. Ryan reported that staff recommends approval for the installation of 19 solar panels to be installed on the east facing roof portions on the rear as well as the flat roof of 18 East 34th Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and minimally visible.

AND

Approval of a Special Exception from the Streetcar Historic District Design Standard that states:

Mechanical Equipment and Refuse.

Alternative energy source devices may be permitted on contributing resources provided they are not visible from the street and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

to allow for the solar panels to be visible from Drayton Street, because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams stated that a photo is included in the packet that shows a view from Drayton Street. He said in looking at the side that was shown to the Commission, will any parts of the solar panels from Drayton Street be visible?

Mr. Jarles explained that portions from Drayton Street will be minimally visible. He pointed to the rooflines behind the trees.

Dr. Williams asked if the panels were put on the dormer gable on the rear west side rather than the east side would it be less visible? Do the panels on the east side get more sun during the day than on the west side? Is this the case or is it that they are less noticeable on the east side?

Mr. Jarles said it is staff's understanding that the solar panels will get more sun light on the east side.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Tallon said, in response to Dr. Williams's question regarding the sun light, they follow the southern annotation. If they installed the solar panels on the northwestern side would be at a disadvantage to the customer. He was in agreement with the staff recommendations. Mr. Tallon entertained questions from the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said they are totally in favor of all alternative energy sources. They are not only in favor of solar, but they have approved them for some of their revolving fund easement properties. They think the placement of the majority of the panels on the top roof portion are completely acceptable in an ideal situation. But, they do take great exception with the placement of all the other panels. They are clearly visible from the right-of-way, mainly Drayton Street. As the standards state, this is not permitted. The HSF's thoughts are along the lines

of Dr. Williams's. Maybe the placement could be slightly altered and moved to the other side of the dormer. Mr. Arvay was hopeful that the petitioner would go back and restudy this some more. The HSF understood that the best exposure for solar panels was southern and the second best option would be a western elevation. The HSF is not in favor of the panels that can be seen.

Mr. Jarles clarified that staff has worked with Mr. Tallon on this request for quite a while. The original petition that Mr. Tallon presented requested solar panels be placed on the southern exposure portion of the building. But, the southern exposure of the building is the front facing and street portion of the roof. Therefore, any solar panels put on this portion of the roof would be very visible from the public right-of-way on the main street that this building fronts. Consequently, staff worked with the petitioner to make this the least visible from the public right-of-way; and this happens to be the side facing Drayton Street.

Ms. Mobley asked if there is a reason why the three panels next to Drayton Street could not be moved over towards the driveway side. This would put them behind the gable.

Ms. Michalak said the panels would be visible from the main street. The staff is saying that anywhere else, other than where they are located now, would be visible from the front facade.

Ms. Katie Easterlin of the Episcopal Diocese of Georgia stated that their goal, given the nature of where they are located and how they engage with the community to provide little impact to the structure, they want to follow as many of the guidelines as they could. They worked well with Rockbridge Energy. She explained that they are looking to model alternative energy sources for their churches as well. Therefore, they see this as an opportunity to engage themselves in this process. They want to ensure that the panels are seen as little as possible from the street. Ms. Easterlin said they mapped out a couple of alternatives in other locations from 34th Street as well as from Bull Street. So, this is why they came up with this model.

Ms. Easterlin thanked the Commission and staff. She hoped their petition would be approved to be modeled for their congregations across the state of Georgia.

Mr. Jarles pulled up a picture on the screen showing the roofline along the driveway from the street. He reported that staff found the panels to be minimally visible from the secondary roadway rather than from the main fronting street.

Ms. Fenwick asked staff that as proposed, does the placement of the panels meet the ordinance?

Mr. Jarles explained that the petitioners are asking for a Special Exception because the panels are visible from a public right-of-way. However, staff felt that due to multiple reasons, which are labeled in the Special Exception requirements and criteria, that this was an acceptable placement to approve a Special Exception for these items due to their minimal visibility and the fact that they are not on the historic roof material. Although they are not meeting the ordinance, staff is requesting approval for a Special Exception from the ordinance.

Mr. Lominack asked that the south side facade of the building be shown again.

Mr. Jarles, pointing to the south side facade, said this is the front facade.

Mr. Lominack said one of the problems that he has with this is the way they are shown on the roof. There is a lack of order as to how they are arranged. He believes that if the panels faced the south or if they respected the symmetry of the building and had a sensible order, they would be less distracting to the public.

Mr. Tallon explained that the layout is oriented due north. Whatever angle the building is at is the true north orientation of how the building is positioned.

Mr. Bagley-Heath stated he believes what is before the Commission is about reducing the minimal visible impact of solar panels. The placement on Drayton Street reduces the visible impact.

Dr. Williams said the set of three panels behind the dormer on the east side of the building are less

visible. He believes staff is saying because of a tree and the adjacency of a close neighboring building, the panels are less visible here than where Ms. Mobley was suggesting they be placed. Is this the case?

Mr. Jarles answered yes. This was the staff's determination.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed the placement of the solar panels at great length. **Ms. Jackson-Green** moved to approve the petition as recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by **Ms. Swindle**. **Mr. Lominack** said he was going to make a motion to give the petitioner an opportunity to go back and restudy the location of the panels other than the ones on the flat roof. Ms. Mobley informed Mr. Lominack that the Commission could consider his motion, however, the first motion was already made and was seconded. If the first motion fails, then she would entertain Mr. Lominack's motion.

The motion to approve the petition as recommended by staff passed five to three. Voting for approval were **Ms. Fenwick; Ms. Jackson-Green; Mr. Bagley-Heath; Mr. Jones; and Dr. Williams**. Voting against the motion were **Mr. Lominack; Ms. Swindle; and Ms. Mobley**.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the installation of 19 solar panels to be installed on the east facing roof portions on the rear as well as the flat roof of 18 East 34th Street as requested because the work is visually compatible and minimally visible.

AND

Approval of a Special Exception from the Streetcar Historic District Design Standard that states:

Mechanical Equipment and Refuse.

Alternative energy source device may be permitted on contributing resources provided they are not visible from the street and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

to allow for the solar panels to be visible from Drayton Street, because the Special Exception criteria are met.

to allow for the solar panels to be visible from Drayton Street, because the Special Exception criteria are met.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Second: J. Haley Swindle

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Nay
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Nay
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Nay

[11. Petition of Barnard Architects | 20-003677-COA | 211 East Gwinnett Street | Additions](#)

[📎 Victorian Staff Recommendation 20-003677-COA.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Previous Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[📎 Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

[📎 8-6-2020 Letter of Support.pdf](#)

Mr. John Clegg of Barnard Architects was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. This petition was originally on the Consent Agenda, but was asked to be placed on the Regular Agenda. This petition was on last month's agenda and was continued by the Commission. The applicant is requesting approval for an addition and window restoration for the property located at 211 East Gwinnett Street. The rear 3-story addition includes a partially submerged ground floor, a sunroom on the second floor, and porch and trellis on the third floor (along with a small enclosed space). A non-historic uncovered wood deck will be removed from the rear to construct the addition. The existing windows on the west, north, and south facades (including the stained-glass windows) are proposed to be repaired in-kind "using the same materials, details, and appearance".

Ms. Michalak explained that the project was originally heard at the August 26, 2020 HPC Meeting; the Commission continued the petition in order for the applicant to consider the following:

1. Remove the polycarbonate roof that is over a portion of the trellis.
2. Revise the aluminum windows and doors to be materials that are permitted by the ordinance. If the revised product is not one that has previously been approved by the Board, provide a full-sized sample. Ensure that the muntins and rails meet the design standards.
3. Remove all "transom windows" that are not located over a door or a window, redesign them to be windows that are taller than they are wide OR redesign the them to be a contemporary interpretation of the Italianate corbels and banding found under the eave on the historic main building.
4. Add headers, surrounds, and pronounced sills to all windows.
5. Remove the Juliette balcony and doors (and replace with windows), or redesign to be a traditional balcony with French doors.
6. Ensure that the railing height is noted as a maximum of 36 inches high and revise the baluster spacing to 4 inches on center.
7. Extend the eaves to a minimum of 12 inches deep (consistent eave depth over the full width of

the 2nd floor) and redesign the soffit to be perpendicular to the building wall.

8. If more HVAC units are to be added due to the addition; ensure they are screened from view of Gwinnett Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for an addition and window restoration for the property located at 211 East Gwinnett Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the window muntins and rails meet the design standards.
2. If more HVAC units are to be added due to the addition; ensure they are screened from view of Gwinnett Street.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Clegg went through the eight points that staff recommended. He believes they came up with a reasonable solution. He was hopeful that the Commission would vote favorably on their project. He entertained questions from the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] explained that they wanted to point out that they appreciate many of the design changes that were made by the petitioner since the last meeting. Many of the concerns of the HSF's Architectural Review Committee have many addressed. However, they feel that a few of the concerns have been perpetuated in this most recent revision. He said #1 is the paneling around the top floor. Originally, there were several glass panels such as little submarine windows on the top floor. The HSF felt that this was incompatible, but they have been removed and replaced with a nearly equally incongruent feature. The glass has been replaced by panels. Mr. Arvay said #2 is the transom above the French doors on the top floor should be a traditional transom instead of the separated little units; #3 on the top floor there is a casement window that also has the little transom above it which is a highly unusual design feature. They feel this is visually incompatible. If the intent is for there to be more light, then a larger window should be placed here. He said lastly, the petitioner has removed all the glass transoms from the top floor to the middle floor whereas the previous design just had a series of front doors which the HSF believes was much more visually compatible.

Mr. Clegg, in response to public comment, said they like the horizontal band at the top of the new addition. It creates a frieze board. They have eliminated the windows, but created a pattern to provide a terminus for the top of the addition. This is not something that existed on the historical house, but they thought some detail at the top was appropriate. They like the idea of the transom being consistent on the first and second floors. The muntins in the transom create an aesthetic for both levels. This is a subjective issue, but they like and prefer the design as submitted. They are hopeful that the Commission would vote favorable on it as submitted.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed the transoms. **Mr. Lominack** believed a strength in the treatment of the band of windows above picked up on the rhythm of the brackets of the roof of the building. He was in agreement with HSF that once these became panels, it went away. He believes they all should be treated the same way if the reason for doing them was based on the comments that were made at the previous review. The muntins in the windows do not re-enforce the pattern. He did not understand why the muntins are in the doors. **Mr. Jones** said if what the petitioner is requesting to do is in compliance, then he is in favor of the request. **Dr. Williams** stated that at their last meeting, there was a series of transoms across the top of the uppermost story was that it evoked the paneling of an Italianate building and that the paneling would only be at an Italianate house.

Mr. Clegg said he hears that the Commission is split on the windows, but in order to strike a compromise, he hates to eliminate the transoms but they seem just too divisive. Therefore, he

proposes that they be eliminated on both levels. He said the first floor doors be raised such as they were in their first submittal and all the other issues as they were resubmitted, including the balcony would remain.

Ms. Mobley asked Mr. Clegg if he was asking for the balcony to remain as on the second drawing or on the first drawing.

Mr. Clegg stated he was saying remain as shown here, a full balcony.

Ms. Mobley said some of the comments were directed to staff. She asked staff to comment.

Ms. Michalak read the section in the ordinance pertaining to windows. She explained that in the staff's current report, the standard is now met. This means that in staff's first report the standard was not met. This is why the staff's recommendation was for the petitioner to remove the windows that did not meet the ordinance. Ms. Michalak said she is not sure that petitioner was aware at that time that the so-called transoms windows were not meeting the ordinance. She said no special exception or variance, etc. was requested. To even move forward with that, the petitioner would have had to request a special exception at that time to keep them, but no special exception was requested, no posting has been done, and no fee has been paid.

Ms. Mobley explained that the petitioner has set forth three proposals; #1 the elimination of the transoms; #2 raising of the second floor doors; and #3 a full balcony as shown on the second drawings. She asked staff if the Commission can act on these now or if there needs to be a second review?

Ms. Michalak informed the Commission that they can approve the petition with the three conditions. In doing so, the Commission would list the conditions to align with the things that the petitioner has said he will do. Then the petitioner can return to the Commission or to staff.

The Commission discussed the windows. What will replace the transoms?

Mr. Clegg explained that the transoms are eliminated at the second floor. He suggested that the siding be brought up to soffit. He said the whole purpose of the paneling was to create a consistent horizontal board. But, he will eliminate these. Mr. Clegg wanted to clarify that when it is talked about raising the door heights, this was relative to the first floor doors, not the second floor doors.

Dr. Williams asked if the petitioner had given consideration to renaming the second floor windows accent windows.

Mr. Clegg answered that they will be willing to rename the windows. They will call the windows "accent windows."

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve an addition and window restoration for the property located at 211 East Gwinnett Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Remove transom windows over the folding doors at the 2nd floor of the addition and increase the height of the folding doors as designed in the August 23, 2020 HPC presentation drawings.
2. Rename horizontal windows at the 3rd floor of the addition (as designed in the August 23, 2020 HPC presentation drawings) from "transom windows" to "accent windows" to meet the window design standard AND reinstate the horizontal windows as designed in the August 23, 2020 HPC presentation drawings.
3. Remove all muntins from all horizontal accent windows.
4. Ensure that the window muntins and rails meet the design standards.
5. If more HVAC units are to be added due to the addition; ensure they are screened from view of

Gwinnett Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[12. Petition of Ray Hoover-Your Exterior Pros | 20-004019-COA | 307 W. Waldburg St. | Staff Approved- Roof Replacement](#)

[☺ 20-004019-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[13. Petition of Allegiance Roofing | 20-004043-COA | 501 East Bolton St. | Staff Approved - In-Kind Roof Replacement](#)

[☺ 20-004043-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[14. Petition of Justin Rychak | 20-004027-COA | 118-120 W. Duffy Street | Staff Approved - In-Kind Repairs and Replacements to the Roof and Exterior](#)

[☺ 20-004027-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[15. Petition of Dr Albert Burton | 20-004083-COA | 106 East 38th Street | Staff Approved- Fence Alteration](#)

[☺ 20-004083-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[16. Petition of Ryan Arvay | 20-004300-COA | 607 W. 39th Street | Staff Approved- Demolition of porch](#)

[☺ SIGNED Staff Decision 20-004300-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[17. Petition of Josh Ward | 20-004311-COA | 15 W. 37th Street | Staff Approved - installation of mini-splints and relocation of generator.](#)

[☺ 20-004311-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[18. Petition of Josephine Cooper | 20-004409-COA | 310 West 37th St. | Staff Approved installation of privacy fence w/ condition](#)

[20-004409-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

[19. Petition of Rewis Roofing, LLC | 20-004506-COA | 1318 Abercorn Street | Staff Approved installation of rear gutters and downspouts](#)

[20-004506-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

[20. Discussion Regarding Pre-Meetings](#)

Ms. Mobley explained that she is proposing if the Commission could have short pre-meetings prior to their regular meetings where they can ask the staff questions to get clarification on ordinances, any matters of concerns that they might have, etc. She entertained discussion from the Commission.

Dr. Williams asked if the pre-meetings would require a quorum.

Ms. Michalak answered yes. A quorum would need to be present. The pre-meetings are open to the public. It is a meeting, but not a public hearing. Therefore, no votes are taken in the pre-meetings. The petitioners nor the public has the opportunity to speak at the pre-meetings.

Dr. Williams stated that he asked the question because just like today, some of the Commission members may not be available at 3:00 p.m. and would arrive late at the meeting.

Ms. Mobley said she understands the situation. She was only offering this as a suggestion. If the pre-meetings do not work, they can always go back to having just the regular meeting.

It was the consensus of the Commission that they would have pre-meetings prior to their regular meetings. The pre-meeting will start at 2:30 p.m.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve to hold Pre-Meetings at 2:30 p.m. prior to their regular meetings at 3:00 p.m.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Abstain
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye

Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[21. Next Regular HPC Meeting - October 28, 2020 \(Virtual Meeting\)](#)

[22. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Ms. Mobley adjourned the meeting at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah G. Michalak
Historic Preservation Director

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.