



Historic Preservation Commission

Virtual Meeting
May 26, 2021 3:00 PM
Meeting Minutes

MAY 26, 2021 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

A Pre-Meeting was held virtually at 2:30 PM. Items on the Agenda were presented by Staff, as time permitted, and the Commission asked questions. No testimony was received and no votes were taken.

Members Present: Virginia Mobley, Chair
Chelsea Jackson-Greene, Vice-Chair
Kendra Clark
Rebecca Fenwick
Darren Bagley-Heath
T. Jerry Lominack
J. Haley Swindle - Arrived late for the meeting
Dr. Robin Williams

Staff Present: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director
Leah Michalak, Historic Preservation Director
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner
Monica Gann, 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 and explained that staff will present each application with a recommendation; and then the petitioner will 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.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

VICTORIAN DISTRICT

[2. Petition of Ward Architecture + Preservation | 21-002636-COA | 311 West Waldburg Street | Rehabilitation and Addition](#)

[Victorian Staff Recommendation 21-002636-COA.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[rear image - oct 2014.pdf](#)

[Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the rehabilitate and construct a rear porch addition for the fire-damaged townhouse located 311 West Waldburg Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

Increase the shed roof slope for the addition to a minimum of 2:12 to meet the standard.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

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

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

3. Adopt the May 26, 2021 Agenda

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby adopt the May 26, 2021 Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Rebecca Fenwick

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

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

[4. Approval of the April 28, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 04-28-2021 minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the April 28, 2021 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Kendra Clark

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

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

[5. Petition of GM Shay Architects | 21-001270-COA | 212 East Park Avenue | Rehabilitation, Alterations, Addition, and Construction of Accessory Structure](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation commission does hereby continue the Petition of GM Shay Architects | 21-001270-COA | 212 East Park Avenue | Rehabilitation, Alterations, Additions, and Construction of Accessory Structure as requested for 90 days.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye

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

[6. Petition of Sasha Reyes | 21-001803-COA | 922 West 42nd Street | Alterations and Addition](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition of Sasha Reyes | 21-001803-COA | 922 West 42nd Street | Alterations and Additions to the June 23rd Regular Meeting as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Jerry Lominack

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

[7. Petition of GM Shay Architects | 21-001940-COA | 1700 Drayton Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass with Special Exception Request](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the Petition of GM Shay Architects | 1-001940-COA | 1700 Drayton Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass with Special Exception Request.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye

J. Haley Swindle

- Not Present

[8. Petition of Array Design, Shauna Kucera | 21-002527-COA | 520-522 East Anderson Street | New Construction, Small, Parts I & II](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continued the Petition of Array Design, Shauna Kucera | 21-002527-COA | 522 East Anderson Street | New Construction, Small, Parts I and II as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Jerry Lominack

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

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

VICTORIAN DISTRICT

[9. Petition of Sawyer Design | 21-002656-COA | 512 East Anderson Street | Addition](#)

[Victorian Staff Recommendation - 21-002656-COA - 512 E Anderson St.pdf](#)

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

[Staff Research.pdf](#)

Mr. Jonathan Leonard of Sawyer Design was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Aislinn Droski gave the report. The applicant is requesting approval for the alteration and extension of an existing rear addition for the property located at 512 East Anderson Street. The width, roof shape, and openings of the existing addition are proposed to be altered. The depth of the existing addition shall not be changed. No other alterations are proposed for the main portion of the building.

Ms. Droski reported that staff recommends approval of the alteration and extension of an existing rear addition for the property located at 512 East Anderson Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Remove the boards on all openings.
2. Submit a COA which contains the required repairs and replacements for the main historic portion of the building.
3. Ensure that no portion of the historic main building is removed in order to accommodate the reconfiguration of

the roof of the rear addition.

4. Provide the material specification for the rear addition windows.
5. Ensure that the foundation of the addition, existing and new, is finished with stucco.
6. Ensure all new wood elements are painted or stained.
7. Ensure the distance between the balusters of the exterior stair does not exceed four (4) inches on center.
8. Ensure the gable end rakes of the reconfigured roof of the rear addition overhang at least eight (8) inches.

Ms. Droski entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sawyer said he had no objections to the staff recommendations. He entertained questions from the Commission.

Mr. Lominack called attention to Sheet C-100. He said this sheet was listed as showing the rear elevation, but it is the side elevation.

Dr. Williams said that staff recommendation #8 states gable end rakes. He asked for clarification on this as "rakes" usually refer to the pitch of the roof, not an actual feature. Dr. Williams asked if this should be eaves or soffit. What part of the roof is being stated here?

Ms. Droski explained that what is stated is exactly how the Standard is written in the ordinance.

Dr. Williams asked if this would be the gable end relative to the wall it overhangs.

Ms. Droski answered yes.

Dr. Williams said rakes sound odd. Maybe the Commission needs to revisit this at some point. He explained that the eave would be on the downslope, but he has never heard this called the rake.

Ms. Mobley said the Commission will have this as a topic of discussion on a later date. She wished more windows were in this project. The old houses that have been altered tend to have lots of windows, but there is a tendency not to put in many windows in new construction.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they are happy to see that the little cottage is going to be rehabilitated. The HSF has talked with the owners numerous times and they are highly supportive of the owners rehabilitating the cottage. However, there are several things he wanted to point out to the Commission:

1. They are somewhat perplexed by the absence of the front porch in the drawings. He said they did not take this as the porch is being removed, but they believe that while executing a full rehabilitation on the entire building, that there would be some repairs made to the front porch. It has the 1960 wrought iron post and balusters that he believes could be replaced with historically appropriate wood columns.
2. The rear addition shown on 512 had a rear wing and a small porch. They all are aware that Sanborn is helpful in giving the idea of a configuration of a building such as the footprint, etc., but they are not to scale and they are not always perfectly proportionate. Mr. Arvay explained that what he believes they see here is the rear wing portion [which is the gable portion] and the flat roof portion is the enclosed porch. Their Architecture Review Committee (ARC) believes that there could be much more historic fabric than what they think. Is this original to the house? Possibly, not. Was it there by 1916? They believe it possibly was. Therefore, they want the Commission to consider this when essentially this entire back portion will be completely

demolished and rebuilt.

Mr. Arvay said if this design goes forward as submitted, the HSF agrees as Ms. Mobley stated that there is a lack of windows on the rear facade. Ultimately, though, they think this is close to what they see on the Sanborn and this should be respected.

Ms. Mobley explained that the application today is for the rear of the building. The petitioner still has to come before the Commission for the renovations and repairs to the front of the building for the existing structure. The Commission will have the opportunity to look at this.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed that while alterations had certainly taken place on the rear addition, it appeared to retain much of its historic form per the 1916-1973 Sanborn Maps. It appeared to the Commission that portion of the addition with the flat roof may be the enclosed open porch depicted in the Sanborn Maps. The Commission indicated that they would like to see more information regarding the materials that currently exist on the rear, such as the foundation, as well as photographic evidence of the integrity of the structure. The Commission was in agreement that this petition be continued to the meeting of **June 23, 2021**.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition for the alteration and extension of an existing rear addition for the property located at 512 East Anderson Street to the June 23rd HPC regular meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

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

CUYLER-BROWNVILLE DISTRICT

[10. Petition of Shirley Geiger | 21-002341-COA | 706 West 36th Street | Fences with a Special Exception Request](#)

[📎 Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation 21-002341-COA.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)

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

[📎 Submittal Packet - Special Exception Request.pdf](#)

Dr. Shirley Geiger was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Olivia Arfuso gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for the installation of fences

on the vacant lot at **706 West 36th Street**. This lot is adjacent to a lot also owned by the petitioner which contains her primary residence. An existing shed and fence encroach onto the vacant parcel.

Ms. Arfuso stated that the petitioner is, also, requesting a Special Exception from the Design Standard as follows:

Fences or walls no more than six (6) feet in height may be installed within the side or rear yards behind the front façade of the building.

To allow for the installation of 7-foot tall privacy fences in the side and rear yards, to match the pre-existing nonconforming fences at **704 West 36th Street**.

Ms. Arfuso reported that staff recommends approval for the installation of fences on the vacant lot at 706 West 36th Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that all wood is painted or stained.
2. If the front yard fence is proposed to be forward of the front façade, ensure that it is no more than 36-inches in height.

AND

Approval for the request for a Special Exception from the following Standard:

Fences or walls no more than six (6) feet in height may be installed within the side or rear yards behind the front façade of the building.

To allow for the installation of 7-foot tall privacy fences in the side and rear yards to match the pre-existing nonconforming fences at 704 West 36th Street, contingent upon the following condition:

1. The petitioner applies with the *Development Services Department* to move the property line at 706 West 36th Street so that there is no longer an existing encroachment, and both lots (704 West 36th Street and 706 West 36th Street) are conforming.

Ms. Arfuso entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Dr. Geiger explained that she spoke with Mr. Lotson who recommended that she change the lot line. She has spoken with her surveyor and requested that 1' - 3" be added to the lot for 704 West 36th Street and 706 West 36th Street will be the appropriate size.

Ms. Mobley asked if adding the 1' - 3" would allow for the proper required setbacks from the property line.

Dr. Geiger answered that she was following what Mr. Lotson suggested.

Ms. Michalak explained that it would not be 1'-3" from the house, but it would be from the fence which can be on a property line.

Mr. Lominack asked if the 7 foot wood fence between lots 32 and 33 will remain.

Dr. Geiger answered yes.

Mr. Lominack asked if the fence remains, why do they want to build more? The drawings do not show how the fence will look. He assumed that this fence will match a fence that should not have been approved. Mr. Lominack said he does not know the purpose of fence, but it appears to be a bad decision.

Ms. Mobley questioned whether the Commission previously had a discussion on a petition requesting

a solid fence across the property on Barnard Street.

Mr. Lominack explained that with this petition and the demolition petition at 631 West 38th Street, it appears that this area is going through a renaissance. A lot of buildings have been preserved and improved. He believes it would be nice to see a house developed on this lot, but to continue this wood-type barrier fence does not seem to be a friendly intrusion in this neighborhood.

Ms. Mobley stated that the existing fence and continuing this style is more of a preference versus a standard. This Commission addresses the height and she questioned whether they, under previous petitions, had comments about a 7 feet high fence across the front of the property. She was told that the Commission has discussed this. Therefore, while she prefers that the fence be lower in the front, it becomes a personal preference as long as they approve the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Lominack stated that the materials and the design are more than a personal preference. They are controlled by the ordinance. If this was not the case, somebody could build a fence out of whatever material they want to. Consequently, he feels that the Commission has control over the materials and the quality of the construction.

Ms. Mobley asked what the Cuyler-Brownville Ordinance stipulates about fence material.

Ms. Arfuso answered that the ordinance states that the *permitted materials are wood, iron, brick, stucco over concrete block, smooth fiber cement or extruded aluminum.*

Ms. Mobley stated, therefore, the wood is an allowable fence. As they can see, the configuration addresses the height and they have been asked to give a special exception to be continuous of the existing fence. She asked if the five foot spacing between fence and building fit into the measurements that the Commission has been given.

Ms. Michalak answered that the new fence that is being proposed is not within five feet of the building.

Ms. Arfuso replied that the west side is proposed to be five feet from the neighbor's building at 708 West 36th Street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said they did not want to make any comments on fence placement or encroachment. The HSF's comments strictly pertains to the fence on the 36th Street facade, the portion fronting 36th Street. He believes that Mr. Lominack spoke to this; the current fence that is being matched is nonconforming; therefore, they do not see a good reason to perpetuate more of this. Mr. Arvay said he was wondering if the fence along the 36th Street frontage could be made six feet or whatever the conforming height is.

Dr. Geiger, in response to public comments, said she would be happy to try to do this for the front.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission concurred that a 7-foot-tall privacy fence along the front yard is not visually compatible with the character of the neighborhood. They felt that it would be more appropriate if the front yard fence adhered to the *Design Standards* for "Fences and Walls," and was no more than six (6) feet in height.

Ms. Fenwick made a motion to include this as a condition in the final decision. The Commission voted in favor of adding a 3rd condition to staff's recommendation, that the petitioner must work with staff to reduce the height of the fence along the front yard.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for the installation of fences on the vacant lot at 706 West 36th Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

- 1.Ensure that all wood is painted or stained.
- 2.If the front yard fence is proposed to be forward of the front façade, ensure that it is no more than 36-inches in height.
- 3.The petitioner must work with Staff to reduce the height of the fence along the front yard.

AND

Approves the request for a Special Exception from the following Standard:

Fences or walls no more than six (6) feet in height may be installed within the side or rear yards behind the front façade of the building.

To allow for the installation of 7-foot tall privacy fences in the side and rear yards to match the pre-existing nonconforming fences at 704 West 36th Street, contingent upon the following condition:

1. The petitioner applies with the Development Services Department to move the property line at 706 West 36th Street so that there is no longer an existing encroachment, and both lots (704 West 36th Street and 706 West 36th Street) are conforming.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Chelsea Jackson-Greene

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Nay
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Virginia Mobley	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

[11. Petition of City of Savannah Code Compliance | 21-002481-COA | 631 West 38th Street | Demolition of a Contributing Building](#)

[Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation 21-002481-COA.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet - Application.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet - Signed Court Order.pdf](#)

[HSF Letter of Intent - 631 W. 38th Street.pdf](#)

[Staff Research.pdf](#)

Officer Joshua Downs of the City of Savannah's Code Compliance Department was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Olivia Arfuso gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for the demolition of a contributing building in the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District located at **631 West 38th Street**. The City's Inspection Worksheet notes that a fire occurred within the building, and states that there is currently, "extensive interior fire damage, roof collapse, partial wall collapse." The inspector recommends demolition. The demolition of the building was ordered in Recorder's Court on **April 21, 2021**.

Ms. Arfuso gave the following background information on the structure: This historic building was constructed in **1925** and is a contributing resource within the National Register Cuyler-Brownville Historic District and the local Cuyler-Brownville Historic District. **631 West 38th Street** is an example of a shotgun-form house. On **April 6, 2021**, Michael Rose from the City of Savannah inspected the property and recommended demolition. On **April 8, 2021**, the property owners were notified that the Building Official of the City of Savannah had deemed the property to be unsafe, due to the 15 Code Violations listed in the Inspection Report. Therefore, the building was declared condemned. On **April 21, 2021**, the case was heard in the Recorder's Court of Chatham County. The Defendants (Derrick and Eric Brantley) were found to be "...in violation of several sections of the *Property Maintenance Ordinance of the City of Savannah*, as well as **Section 8-1037 (e)** of the *Code of Ordinances of the City of Savannah*."

Ms. Arfuso explained that **631 West 38th Street** was considered, "...dilapidated; structurally unsound; unsafe; unsanitary; is dangerous to humane life; is a public nuisance; and constitutes a hazard to safety and health by reason of inadequate maintenance, dilapidation, obsolescence and abandonment." The Defendants agreed to the demolition of the building. On **May 19, 2021**, Staff received a letter of interest from the *Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)* showing their overall concern and consideration to save the contributing building that is proposed to be demolished. They have begun the process to reach out to the owners with the intent of purchasing the building.

Ms. Arfuso reported that staff recommends continue the petition for the demolition of the contributing building at 631 West 38th Street to the June 23rd HPC Regular Meeting so that the *Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)* is given adequate time to contact all necessary parties, and further discuss the purchase of the property.

Ms. Arfuso entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Officer Downs stated that Code Compliance is the petitioner for this petition. He said as Ms. Arfuso reported, they went through the process with the building officials as well as going through the Recorder's Court. They actually had an open case on this property and were working on this prior to the fire. The intention was for them to work with a contractor to rehabilitate the property. However, when they initially started the process, they were asked by the owners if they could demolish the property. Officer Downs said he explained to the owners that this was not possible and that it is a lengthy process which would likely not be approved. He said the demolish question came up prior to the fire. Consequently, the owners started working on the property and then the fire took place.

Officer Downs explained that a lot of criminal and vagrant type activities go on in this block. Heavy drug activities and prostitution go on in the vacant houses in this area; especially in the lane behind this house. Therefore, there could have been numerous causes for the fire. But, Code Compliance feels it is more for the health and safety of the community that the damaged building be removed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] stated they are looking for a small amount of time to see if they can save this structure. This little "shotgun house" is the only true shotgun that exists in all of Savannah. It is not a super prominent form in Savannah and a house of this scale and size would never be able to be built back on this lot as it once was due to the current code and setbacks. This house could never be replicated.

Mr. Arvay said the HSF makes no false pretense about the severity of the damages. He said while Officer Downs's concerns are completely valid and they see him as only doing his job, they do not

believe that the demolition of contributing structures that might be able to be saved is a prudent way to preserve buildings that provide for affordable housing. This house is a perfect scale for what is called naturally occurring affordable housing which is something that HSF has a lot of interest in. The HSF has reached out to the owners via email and a phone voice mail; they are waiting on a return call from the owners.

Mr. Arvay said recently a property was on Victory Drive that HSF was trying to save; even though the City was very intent on tearing the structure down, but through the action of the HSF, they were able to get the structure back onto the market. Someone purchased the structure and the HPC has recently approved the rehabilitation plans for the house. This process does work if it is allowed to run its course. All the HSF is asking is that this be continued to the next regular meeting of the HPC so they can try to save this structure.

Ms. Jackson-Greene told Mr. Arvay that she is aware that the HSF has saved houses that have been condemned, but she wanted to know if they have done badly condemned projects such as this property? Have you had a chance to look inside this structure? Ms. Jackson-Greene said she has looked at Officer Downs's report on this property and it looks to be in a very bad state. Do you believe what is in there is viable?

Mr. Arvay stated that the structure is in bad shape and is on the more extreme end of the scale in terms of condition. He said "yes" HSF has saved homes with fire damages. He explained that there is another property that HSF saved after it caught a disastrous fire. They had been fighting for a year and a half to save the building. The building had changed hands a couple of times, it is a big project, but this house is about to be sold again with rehabilitation plans in place. The new owner has the full intention to rehabilitate this house.

Mr. Arvay said in an answer to Ms. Jackson-Greene's question, while this house will largely be a reconstruction, especially in the rear, it is the HSF's hope that they can at least save the envelope and maintain the historical appearance of the current house. He said that if it comes down to just the dirt lot, you will never be able to build a house like the one that was there. But, if they can save the majority of the exterior walls, then they can construct basically a new house on the inside and, therefore, they would have successfully saved the form. He said this is the HSF's intention, but he wanted to be clear to the Commission that this is their intent. They have not had a lot of time to explore this and, therefore, there are a lot of contingencies here.

Ms. Jackson-Greene asked Mr. Arvay if he felt that they would have done enough due diligence to give the Commission an answer as to whether the structure could be saved.

Mr. Arvay answered yes. They believe this is a worthy request given not only the HSF's mission, but also the City's mission of providing more affordable housing. Cuyler-Brownville does not need any more empty lots.

Ms. Jackson-Greene asked Mr. Arvay if they have gotten in touch with the Housing Task Force Committee.

Mr. Arvay said the HSF's Director is involved in this. They are aware of it and try to be involved. He said he did not know whether the task force would have any bearings on this, but they are aware of this task force and their work.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Arvay if he said they have left voicemails and sent emails to the owners. Have you heard anything from the owners?

Mr. Arvay answered that they have not heard from the owners, but they called the owners recently. They are looking forward to hear from the owners soon.

Mr. Lominack said a lot of nice things have been happening in a positive way in this neighborhood. It would be nice to see this continue here. Certainly, saving this building will be good.

Attorney Lester Johnson, Assistant City Attorney for the City of Savannah said he had a question for Mr. Arvay. Attorney Johnson told Mr. Arvay that one question they have from the City's

perspective is as they all know that the public schools ended last Friday and some of the other schools will end this week. There will be a lot of traffic in this area from pedestrians. If the Commission grants the continuance, does the Historic Savannah Foundation have any plans to try to secure this building so that children and others will not be attracted to try to go in this building?

Mr. Arvay stated that this is a good and valid question. But, since the HSF is not the owner, he does not believe that they have any authority to board up someone else's house. If they could reach the owner and come to some agreement in the near future, there could be the potential of them taking this on, but as of now, it is not the HSF's property to do any improvements, including something as minor as boarding it up. This really falls under the City's purview and responsibility and not the HSF's.

Attorney Johnson clarified that he was saying if the HSF made contact with the owners and they were willing to contemplate a sale, that they would obviously give the HSF permission to board up the house. The owners would probably not want to do so themselves as this would add to the expenses that they are already incurring at this time.

Mr. Arvay said this is something that he would be willing to talk with the owners about.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition for the demolition of the contributing building at 631 West 38th Street to the June 23rd HPC Regular Meeting so that the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) is given adequate time to contact all necessary parties, and further discuss the purchase of the property.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Darren Bagley-Heath

Second: Rebecca Fenwick

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

STREETCAR DISTRICT

[12. Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 21-002658-COA | 305 West 33rd Street | Rehabilitation, Alteration, and Rear Porch Addition](#)

- [☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-002658-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Narrative and Drawings.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Material Specifications.pdf](#)
- [☞ Staff Research.pdf](#)

Mr. Justin Bienvenu was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Olivia Arfuso gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for the rehabilitation and alterations of **305 West 33rd Street**. The alterations also include the addition of two-story rear porches. The front porch is proposed to be restored. The existing infill between columns (currently enclosing the front porch) will be removed. The areas of infill will be replaced with painted wood railings that are 36-inches in height, and new P.T. wood trim will be installed. The front porch roof will also be replaced, with a new standing seam metal roof. On the rear of the building, the existing rear portico roof, supports, landing, and stairs will be demolished. A two-story porch is proposed to be constructed at the respective levels of the existing first and second floors. The porch will extend the width of the building and will be 7'-7" in depth. Existing rear window / door openings will be altered to allow for access to the porches. Painted horizontal wood siding will be installed on the exterior walls, and new doors will be *Marvin Signature*, Ultimate, Aluminum clad wood double doors are proposed.

Ms. Arfuso explained that the porches will be constructed with P.T. wood beams, 10" x 10" box columns, and 3-foot tall wood railings. The second-story porch will be 7'-4 1/2" in height, and will have a flat TPO roof with a continuous metal gutter. The porches will be separated by wood trim that is 1' - 7 1/2" wide. The first-floor porch will be approximately 10'-1" in height and located 2'-10" above the foundation. New wood stairs / railings will provide access to the first-floor porch. Horizontal wood boards are proposed as infill between the new brick porch piers. All wood porch elements are proposed to be painted.

Ms. Arfuso reported that staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation, alterations, and rear porch addition at 305 West 33rd Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the design so the original door opening on the first floor of the western portion of the rear façade is unaltered.
2. Ensure the two-story rear porch addition is constructed in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
3. Ensure that the rear porch foundation infill material is recessed a minimum of (3) inches behind the front edge of the pier, so that the piers are clearly visible and differentiated.
4. Ensure that all original front porch elements (including the existing roof shape/configuration) remain unaltered, and that only the non-historic porch infill is removed.
5. Ensure that the distances between balusters do not exceed (4) inches on center.

Ms. Arfuso entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bienvenu thanked staff for their report. He asked staff to reconsider their recommendation #1 - "Revising the design so the original door opening on the first floor of the western portion of the rear façade is unaltered." He showed the Commission a picture from the lane. The door in question is not visible at this distance even with the chain link fence in front of it. Mr. Bienvenu said the western portion is original to the Sanborn Map. They question whether that is the actual original opening. They know that the eastern side of the rear facade was an open porch feature before, but has now been enclosed. They are not sure that the door was always here; it could have been a window opening. This is why in their design, they are proposing that this become a double door. Also, they are keeping the original window on the second story which is visible from the rear alley. They agree with all of staff's other recommendations.

Mr. Lominack said his comment centers around what Dr. Williams said earlier. In reviewing the ordinance, there are some things that need to be changed. The building code requires space between balusters not to exceed four inches. But, somehow this has gotten translated into making balusters four inches on center, which only may be the proper spacing for certain balusters. This may be too close for a lot of balusters. Mr. Lominack said he did not know what the plan is on the part of the applicant for this project. But, it also matches the building code standpoint if the placement of the guardrail is required that it be more than 30 inches above the ground level. Therefore, there are a couple of issues here. The applicant may be able to address whether they are planning to have four inches on center or some other spacing.

Ms. Mobley explained that the applicant has agreed with all of staff's recommendations with the exception of recommendation #1 which involves revising the design so the original door opening on the first floor of

the western portion of the rear façade is unaltered."

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said overall, they want to praise this project for being sensitive. They are looking forward to seeing the front porch reopened. He believed he was reading this correctly, but he wanted to be sure that the porch posts are going to remain. Mr. Arvay believed the plans state this. The porch columns look like they are tapered round columns, but he just wanted to be sure that as much historic fabric is preserved as possible. He said on the rear elevation, they agree with staff on the rear door. They believe a single door was here and they believe it should remain as such.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The commission concurred with all of staff's recommendations.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the rehabilitation, alterations, and rear porch addition at 305 West 33rd Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the design so the original door opening on the first floor of the western portion of the rear façade is unaltered.
2. Ensure the two-story rear porch addition is constructed in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
3. Ensure that the rear porch foundation infill material is recessed a minimum of (3) inches behind the front edge of the pier, so that the piers are clearly visible and differentiated.
4. Ensure that all original front porch elements (including the existing roof shape / configuration) remain unaltered, and that only the non-historic porch is removed.
5. Ensure that the distances between balusters do not exceed (4) inches on center.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: Rebecca Fenwick

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

[13. Petition of Ethos Preservation | 21-002016-COA | 2305 Price Street | Rehabilitation and Addition](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 21-002016-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

🔗 [Preservation Brief 6_ Dangers of Abrasive Cleaning to Historic Buildings.pdf](#)

🔗 [Preservation Brief 14_ New Exterior Add...pdf](#)

🔗 [Preservation Brief 38_ Removing Graffiti from Historic Masonry.pdf](#)

🔗 [Preservation Brief 1_ Assessing Cleanin...pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Rebecca Fenwick recused herself from participating in this petition. She is a Principal of Ethos Preservation.

Ms. Ellen Harris was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations and a rooftop addition for the property located at 2305 Price Street. The scope of work includes:

- Metal awnings removed.
- One of the entrance signs will be removed.
- All broken tile will be replaced in-kind.
- Broken brick will be replaced in-kind and repointed in repair areas with Type N mortar.
- Mirrored storefront glass will be replaced with clear glass in existing wood frames.
- All historic materials (including trim, storefront, tile, siding will be retained and preserved.
- Rooftop addition on the southwest corner of the building.

Ms. Michalak gave the following background information on this property. The project was first heard at the April 28, 2021 HPC Meeting. At this meeting the Commission continued the petition (for a maximum of 90 days) to allow the applicant to restudy the rooftop addition. At this meeting staff recommended to approve the following work for the property located at 2305 Price Street because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Metal awnings removed.
2. One of the entrance signs removed.
3. All broken tile replaced in-kind.
4. Broken brick replaced in-kind and repointed in repair areas with Type N mortar.
5. Mirrored storefront glass replaced with clear glass in existing wood frames.
6. All historic materials (including trim, storefront, tile, siding retained and preserved.

Ms. Michalak stated that the staff also recommended denial for the following work for the property located at 2305 Price Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards:

1. Painting the historic brick.
2. Rooftop addition.
3. Cleaning the brick (until an appropriate treatment plan can be identified and approved by the HDBR).

Ms. Michalak stated that items revised from the previous scope of work for the purposed of this review include:

- Brick painting removed.
- Size of rooftop addition reduced, and materials and design of addition revised.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for alterations and a rooftop addition for the property located at 2305 Price 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. Provide the means and methods for which the brick will be cleaned, and the graffiti and

- paint removed.
2. Ensure the rooftop addition windows are inset a minimum of 3 inches.
 3. Revise the addition eaves soffits to be perpendicular to the building wall.

Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Harris thanked the Commission for hearing their petition and thanked Ms. Michalak for her review. As Ms. Michalak stated, this is the second time that the Commission has heard this petition. She extended a "thank you" to the Commission for their helpful suggestions at the last meeting. They feel the suggestions made the project a better project and that it is more compatible and more in-keeping with the historic character. Ms. Harris said they are happy to comply with all of staff's recommendations and the three additional recommendations that they attached to their approval.

Ms. Harris entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams asked if staff's recommendation #3 - "Revise the addition eaves soffits to be perpendicular to the building wall" is the diagonal downward slope a level slope to be used as a parapet or something to disguise the slope?

Ms. Michalak answered "no." The eaves can not slope with the roof, they need to be perpendicular to the building wall. she explained that basically the roof's eaves have to be perpendicular to the wall. This is the standard in the ordinance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said they are very pleased to see that the petitioner has gone back and dramatically reduced the size of the rooftop addition. They believe that brings it into something that is more palatable. Mr. Arvay said it is the opinion of their Architecture Review Committee [ARC] that even with the dramatic reduction, they do not feel that the letter of the law is actually being met. He said as per the petitioner's renderings, it is still clearly visible on a small one-story building from several vantagepoints. If there is anything else that can be done in terms of the design, such as a slanted roof can be made a flat roof. They are aware that flat roofs are not preferable. Consequently, though, as much as their ARC was encouraged by these changes, they want to go on record by saying it is still visually incompatible as per the standards.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The commission discussed the rooftop addition. Dr. Williams stated that the slope of the addition is not matching the geometry of the buildings. The straight line slope makes it glaringly an addition that seems not to be as compatible as it could be.

Ms. Mobley asked Ms. Harris if they were willing to consider the reconfiguration of the roofline.

Ms. Harris answered that if this is the HPC's desire, they can certainly do so. However, her personal thought on this is that it will increase the height. They have made every effort to reduce the height as much as possible. Therefore, this seems a little contrary to the previous comments they have received; however, if the HPC wants to see a stepped parapet, they respectfully ask that maybe this could be a condition that the Commission would list as a condition on their approval. Then they will work with the staff to make it as minimal as possible, but still achieve a more compatible roofline with the primary facade.

Mr. Lominack stated that he respects Dr. Williams's opinion, but he feels almost that a little more dramatic roof form would be better that clearly speaks to an addition and does not intend not to be one. He said he was not saying one that gets taller, but one that has more curve, arc, or something that might work better with the form of this building. It appears that another form might be better than the present form. Mr. Lominack stated that he believes to make the high part of the sloped roof to have the soffits perpendicular to the building would increase the depth of the front fascia and make it

look awkward. He said, however, what they see today is certainly a great improvement over what they saw at the last meeting. This is a neat building.

Ms. Clark explained that she believes the petitioner has taken the Commission's recommendations under consideration. At the last meeting the Commission's concern was the height and visibility from the street. She does not want the Commission to keep changing what they are asking for. Then have the petitioner redo it; it is too tall, etc. This causes going back-and-forth. The main concern here is does it meet the ordinance.

Mr. Lominack made a motion to accept staff's recommendations #1 and #2 and not to accept staff's recommendation #3. The motion was seconded by **Dr. Williams** and **carried unanimously**.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve alterations and a rooftop addition for the property located at 2305 Price 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. Provide the means and methods for which the brick will be cleaned, and the graffiti and paint removed.
2. Ensure the rooftop addition windows are inset a minimum of 3 inches.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

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

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[14. Acknowledge Approved Staff Reviews](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby acknowledge the Approved Staff Reviews

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Rebecca Fenwick

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye

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

[15. Petition of Henry Benton | 21-002337-COA | 13 East 39th Street | Staff Approved - In-kind reconstruction of rear deck with conditions](#)

☞ [21-002337-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[16. Petition of Lance Greenhaw | 21-002238-COA | 536 East Bolton Street | Staff Approved - Porch Roof Replacement](#)

☞ [Victorian Staff SIGNED Dec - 21-002238 - 536 E Bolton St.pdf](#)

[17. Petition of Susie Bull | 21-002201-COA | 415 B East Duffy Street | Staff Approved - Rear Door Replacement](#)

☞ [Victorian SIGNED Staff Dec - 21-002201 - 415B E Duffy.pdf](#)

[18. Petition of South Shore Roofing | 21-002355-COA | 518 East 33rd Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

☞ [Staff SIGNED Decision - 518 E 33rd St - 21-002355-COA.pdf](#)

[19. Petition of South Shore Roofing | 21-002731-COA | 602 West Victory Dr | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

☞ [Staff SIGNED Decision-21-002731-602 West Victory Drive.pdf](#)

[20. Petition of Shah Architecture | 21-002590-COA | 421 East 45th Street | Staff Approved - Demolition](#)

☞ [21-002590-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[21. Petition of Cleveland Doyle | 21-002478-COA | 651 West 34th Street | Staff Approved - Relocation of existing accessory structure with conditions](#)

☞ [Cuyler-Brownville Staff SIGNED Decision 21-002478-COA.pdf](#)

[22. Petition of John Meyers | 21-002592-COA | 102 E. 39th Street | Staff Approved - Removal of fence and installation of driveway](#)

☞ [Streetcar Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-002592-COA - 102 E 39th St.pdf](#)

[23. Petition of Brittany Ruscoe | 21-002732-COA | 425 E. 31st Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

☞ [Streetcar Staff SIGNED Decision - 21-002732-COA - 425 E 31st St.pdf](#)

[24. Petition of Edvina Green | 21-003039-COA | 1102 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Repair in-kind exterior walls and porch with conditions](#)

☞ [Staff SIGNED decision 21-003039-1102 Habersham Street.pdf](#)

[25. Petition of Justin Van Hecke | 21-002946-COA | 510 East Bolton Street | Staff Approved - Roof replacement, windows, soffit and fascia and rear deck rails](#)

☞ [21-002946-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

[26. Plan 2040 Presentation - Nicholas Fazio, Advance Planning and Aislinn Droski, Historic Preservation](#)

Ms. Mobley explained that no votes will be taken on this item. It is for discussion only.

Ms. Mobley stated that a request has been submitted from one of the HPC's member to change **Article 15 of the Historic Preservation By-Laws**, which addresses the conflict of interest which states that no HPC member shall take part in the deliberation and consideration for determination of any petition in which he or she shall have real property interest or financial interest."

Ms. Mobley said that this request seeks to allow a member to present their own petition rather than recuse themselves. She opened the floor up for discussion.

Mr. Lominack said since he presented this request, he wanted to read the proposed amendment as written and not as Ms. Mobley presented it. He said the proposed Amendment to the HPC Bylaws begins by saying **DELETE ARTICLE VI, .15** in its entirety and substitute the following:

15. Conflict of Interest: No HPC member shall take part in the deliberations, consideration, or determination of any petition in which he/she shall have a Real Property interest or financial interest in an entity which has been a Real Property interest. This shall not prevent a member of the HPC presenting an application at the public hearing to the HPC and answering direct questions from the HPC which he/she serves, except when he/she has a Real Property Interest in the petition.

Mr. Lominack said in his submittal, he gave several reasons for justification:

1. This revision would bring it into conformity with Appendix A, Code of Ethics of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAAPC), which states "... should recuse themselves entirely from deliberations and decisions." He said it specifically does not include presenting a petition,
2. Additionally, Appendix B, Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form, specifically ties the conflict of interest to "Real Property Interest." He said he attached several legal definitions of "Real Property Interest" along with his submittal.
3. Law Insider has a very concise legal definition of real property interest as follows: "Real Property Interest means any legal or equitable interest in land or an option to acquire, or a leasehold interest with a term, including options to renew or extension provisions that contemplate a total period of occupancy of more than 20 years, together with all improvements.'
4. There is a special knowledge and expectation that exists between a design professional and his/her client in much the same way as between an attorney and client or patient and doctor. The requirement that a member of the Commission not represent a client or petition is a disincentive to those very people who should serve on design review boards and commissions.

Mr. Lominack explained that the above is what he presented as a proposed amendment. He said that the Commission Chair and the Historic Presentation Director have a copy of the submittal along with the real property definitions.

Ms. Mobley said as information for discussion, she wanted to add that all of the information that was presented by Mr. Lominack to the Commission was presented to the City Attorney for review. The amendment was "shot down" negatively stating that it was something that the City could not support.

Ms. Jackson-Greene said she understood why someone would want to present their own project, but she, like Mr. Lominack and other members of the Commission, work in the design community in Savannah. She did not join this Commission because of the work that she does, but because she is a concerned member of this community. Therefore, she does not believe that it is appropriate for the Commission members to be able to present the work that they do where they have financial interest. Although, they do not have a stake necessarily in the property, the work that they do, does directly affect that property. Therefore, she finds it inappropriate that they would present the work in a way that would not be bias; this is why they recuse themselves. Ms. Jackson-Greene asked if the other City boards abide by the conflict of interest clause. She believes that City Council has other necessary items on their plate then to vote on a By-Law Amendment that is already in place for a strong legal reason.

Ms. Jackson-Greene asked if the Commission will vote on this issue or will it be sent to City Council regardless of what the Commission thinks.

Ms. Mobley stated that the proposed amendment would not be sent to City Council because there won't be a vote today. The process would be [and they will not take a vote on this today] that they as the entire Commission or as a committee from this Commission look into a revision, send it to City Council; City Council would review this and vote on it. This Commission can not change its bylaws.

Ms. Melanie Wilson, MPC Executive Director, explained that she received the revisions that Mr. Lominack submitted earlier today. She knows that one of the things that was made very clear is that usually for something such as this, there are two things that need to be adhered to:

1. This Commission has been in existence less than a year.
2. The policies that this Commission had when they applied for membership to the HPC involves the Code of Ethics which were in place. The other Boards and Commissions follow the same regulations.

Ms. Wilson explained that generally as a Commission, they can say that this is not important enough to take to City Council because they are the committee. The Commission can say that while they appreciate Mr. Lominack's comments, but that they do not think it warrants moving it forward. She wanted to make it clear that they feel that there is danger in what is being proposed. Not all Commissions and Boards are made up of professional individuals; lay persons serve on these boards as well. The reason is to ensure that feedback is given. The ethics section is serious and when you start trying to amend it, change definitions, etc., this opens up a hornet's nest.

Ms. Wilson stated that at one time, this issue arose on the Historic District Board of Review [HDBR]. The HDBR decided to listen to the issue, but did not move it forward because they did not feel that the proposed amendment was appropriate.

Mr. Bagley-Heath stated that he was on the Arts Commission for a number of years. Even, though, all of the applicants for services from the City, but nonprofits, they did have members of the Commission that were on the boards of various organizations and when they put their request for proposals in to seek City funds to provide services to the City, because they were on the Commission and even though they were nonpaid members, they had to recuse themselves from the deliberations and they were not allowed to be in the room while those deliberations took place. Therefore, he believes they need to follow along this line.

Mr. Lominack explained that one thing he specifically did was to put into this proposed amendment is that the person could only make the presentation and answer direct questions from the Commission, but could not participate in the deliberations or the vote. He believes that as far as the definition of real property interest, the definition is clear. He said he does not believe that there should be any questions as to what a real property interest is. The proposed amendment is in conformity with the Code of Ethics of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. This is cited and included as an appendix in their By-Laws. He said it appears to him [and he could be wrong] but this Commission has the authority to amend its By-Laws.

Ms. Jackson-Greene said she was not interested in pursuing to change the By-Laws. She asked that if other members are interested in changing the By-Laws, to speak up; but as she has stated, she is not interested in doing so.

Ms. Fenwick asked if there are any other communities in Georgia that have Commissions operating in this fashion.

Ms. Pamela Everett, MPC Assistant Executive Director, in response to Ms. Fenwick's question, answered "no." No other Commission permits this type of matter to happen this way. Ms. Everett reminded the Commission that when they underwent the training for the Commission, this was one of the things that the trainers mentioned, that you should not do this as it is not in the best interest of the Commission.

Dr. Williams stated that he had a question regarding the current By-Laws. Do they permit a Commission member who has recused himself or herself, because they have a petition before the Commission, if there is a very specific question that comes up in the Commission discussion, under the current regulation of the By-Law, can that member of the Commission who has recused themselves be consulted and called upon?

Ms. Michalak, in response to Dr. Williams's question, explained that the person cannot take part in the discussion as they must recuse themselves entirely. The recused person leaves the room completely.

Ms. Wilson explained that no matter which board it is, if a member has something that their firm is working on, the member most of the time leaves the room. The thought is, if the firm has someone who is presenting the item, they should be able to answer all questions. There is not to be any conversation on the matter with that Commission member pertaining to the item(s) on the agenda that they will be hearing.

Ms. Clark stated that she realizes that a lot of the members do this kind of work on a daily basis, they have a lot of expertise, and they are a part of a lot of activities, but her biggest concern is that she is a believer that any kind of government function should be very transparent. There should not be an appearance of any kind of impropriety. She said even if it is the best intention or no back door talking; there is no preference given to anybody, but by having the Commission member present the item, this could present a doubt in the community minds about whether the person is being held to the same standard. This is not so apparent now as they are having their meetings virtually, but think about when they return to having their meetings in person, and they have a Commission member standup from their position of power, walk into the crowd, and then return to their position of power. Even if the Commission is not voting or being in the discussion, it is just the appearance. They need to have the community's trust regarding the decisions that they make.

Mr. Lominack stated that he wanted to make it clear that his reason for applying for membership on the Commission had nothing to do with him trying to get preferential treatment. He said his commitment to preservation in the City of Savannah is well documented. He said obviously this is not going to be approved by the Commission. But, he will weigh his position on the Commission accordingly.

Ms. Swindle told Mr. Lominack that she does not believe the Commission thinks he had ulterior motives for wanting to amend this section of their By-Laws. But, she believes that most members on the Commission are thinking about future members who might come after him with such in their minds. The Commission is supposed to be unbiased in whatever they do; especially with whatever properties and any work that they all do as preservationists. She does not believe that it would look good for any of them to be able to present if they have any interest in an item. Ms. Swindle said she believes that this is why the By-Laws were created. She said also she was told that the proposal was not approved by the Legal Department. Consequently, she was concerned about how far the Commission would go with this conservation if their lawyer has already stated no.

Ms. Mobley asked Ms. Everett to please answer Ms. Swindle's question.

Ms. Everett answered that this conversation should end as it does not seem to be the will of the Commission to change it. She believes this does not need to be discussed any further as the City Attorney does not believe that this is a good idea in that it would not follow the law in Georgia or proper board protocol.

Ms. Mobley thanked everyone for their comments. She believes they have a good overall feeling about why they are on this Commission and she is hopeful that they will continue to work successfully as they have in the past. Ms. Mobley thanked Mr. Lominack for his effort in bringing this to the Commission's discussion. However, she believes the whole Commission has spoken and this will be a part of the Commission's minutes.

PLAN 2040 PRESENTATION

Ms. Jackie Jackson, Director of Advance Planning and Special Projects gave the update on Plan

2040. The logo on the front page has nine colors and within this plan is the 2040 logo. This is the nine jurisdictions within Chatham County. Ms. Jackson explained that through this effort, they are trying to grow on the premises of regional planning and pull in all the jurisdictions. They have gone over this process this past year and have pulled in Unincorporated Chatham County and City of Savannah. They are also pulling in Garden City and the City of Pooler to this discussion as well as there is a need to include these cities. They will continue try to engage these communities and grow this effort over the upcoming year.

Ms. Jackson showed the planning team. This is an MPC wide effort throughout, but she just wanted to introduce the individuals who have been working diligently behind the scene on this project the past nine months. She explained that the Comprehensive Plan is a vision document for the community, Plan 2040 is a 20-year plan. Therefore, they are looking outward to the next 20 years. MPC has been involved in this process since the 1980s. They have done most of the updates and implementation efforts for Unincorporated Chatham County, City of Savannah, and some of the other jurisdictions as well. As they continue this effort, they have incorporated looking at land use, transportation, quality of life, economic development, natural resources, and housing. A lot has been involved with this process. This has not been an easy task or undertaking; then add in COVID-19 through the entire process as well. This really has been an intense process.

Ms. Jackson explained, however, that this process as a whole and this document as a whole is meant to be a policy guide. It is meant to look long range for the community. This will be the policy that when local officials, anyone coming up for zoning, etc., will use this document to track the implementation and look at it to see where the community wants to be in 20 years. This really is a roadmap. It lets us know where development is happening and where it will be happening in the future.

Ms. Jackson pointed out the key elements in this process. The ones highlighted in yellow are required by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. This is state mandated for jurisdiction to implement a comprehensive plan. They have to be sure to include the public in this process as well as key stake holders. Land use and transportation are required in this document, but the local community has decided to go above and beyond and really home in on the quality of life efforts. Consequently, the reason she is making the presentation today is to call out the historic and cultural resources efforts of this document. It is one that both the City of Savannah and Unincorporated Chatham County feel that is extremely important and impertinent for us to discuss in this process. They are looking at climate change with regards to each element and lastly because hopefully we will never encounter this again, but it is such an important discussion, COVID-19 has had on all of these elements in our community.

Ms. Jackson noted that this is a required document by the State of Georgia. Once it is implemented and adopted, it allows a local community to maintain and keep what is called a qualified local government [QLG] status. This enables the local community to look at the goals and strategies and make sure that they are happening. This also opens up funding opportunities for local communities. Therefore, by having the QLG status, they can get grants and other efforts to get low interest loans.

Ms. Jackson explained that this has been an ongoing process since September 2020. A lot has been going on behind the scenes. Presently, they have started entering into the draft presentation phase of the process. All the while, they have had a lot of public input and outreach. They have gained some very important comments from the general public on what they want to see in the next 20 years and what they want to accomplish in their community in the next 20 years. The final state mandated deadline is September 30. Once they complete this process, the plan will be fully approved by the State of Georgia and sent back to the local community for implementation.

Ms. Jackson reported overall, they have gone into the community safely during COVID-19. They have had outdoor events, met with City Council members, had farmer market events, etc. They recently met with faith based communities and neighborhood organizations to ensure that they did not miss anyone. She said the intent of this entire process is to get public input. The additional element that they used was a public survey. They got the information out to the public by radio, television, and utilized lots of social media outlets. They also had a public survey open to the general public for more than 80 days where they gathered input and asked questions, specifically about the bullet points that were shown on the screen. They received more than 2,500 responses. The majority of the responses came from the City of Savannah as oppose to other jurisdictions.

Ms. Jackson said they are continuing to get feedback; they are asking the people to remain involved with the process. They are now populating the website www.mpc.compplan2040.org. She said the website has all the direct links for the chapter elements as they are developed. They also have access to all the presentations they have made. A copy of this is put on the website as well to enhance that they remain extremely transparent. They have created a mapping tool for this comprehensive plan process. This is a referencing tool that can be accessed at any point within the county and put a specific item on there listing a possible issue or opportunity that a member or resident may have within the county. They have received more than 300 comments in this mapping tool.

Ms. Jackson explained the ways that the public can keep in tune with what they are doing. The website is listed at the bottom, but they have an email address: plan2040@thempc.org. When an email is sent to this address, it is received by five staff persons.

Ms. Aislinn Droski, Assistant Preservation Planner, gave the overview on the Historic and Cultural Resources Chapter as well as their seven goals. Ms. Droski explained that the first part of the plan introduces generally what is preservation work as well as the history of preservation within the City of Savannah and Chatham County. She said following the introduction, the chapters are divided into three main sections. There are seven themes and goals. They have compiled lists and maps of all districts listed locally and nationally within the City of Savannah and Unincorporated Chatham County. This is not something that they had in any previous Comp Plan. Therefore, they are excited about this.

Ms. Droski explained that there are goals that follow each section and within each goal, various objectives are identified as ways to aid them in achieving the goals.

Ms. Droski entertained questions from the Commission.

Ms. Mobley thanked Ms. Jackson and Ms. Droski for their presentation. She asked Ms. Droski if it would be possible in one of the Commission's upcoming pre-meetings if she would cover some of the aspects that may effect the Commission.

Ms. Droski, in an answer to Ms. Mobley's question, answered yes.

Ms. Fenwick stated that she left some comments on the mapping tool. She encouraged the Commission members to do the same.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[27. Next HPC Pre-Meeting: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 at 2:30pm](#)

[28. Next HPC Regular Meeting: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 at 3:00pm](#)

[29. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Ms. Mobley adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:45 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.