



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
August 11, 2010 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

AUGUST 11, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Brian Judson, Chair
Reed Engle
Linda Ramsay
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Richard Law, Sr.
Gene Hutchinson
Ebony Simpson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Sidney Johnson, Vice Chair
W. James Overton

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Adrienne Miller, Historic Preservation Intern

City of Savannah Staff Present: Mike Rose, City Building Inspector
Tiras Petrea, City Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approval of July 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [07-14-2010 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve July 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Linda Ramsay
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Gene Hutchinson - Aye
Brian Judson - Abstain
Richard Law, Sr - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

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

2. [Petition of Rooker Properties, LLC - H-10-4285-2 - 455 East Oglethorpe Avenue - New Construction, Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

At the request of the petitioner, this item was withdrawn.

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

3. [Amended Petition of Gretchen Callejas for Greenline Architecture - H-09-4162\(S\)-2 - 408-416 West Gaston Street - Ramp Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the ramp addition as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Ned Gay
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of Pete Callejas for Greenline Architecture - H-10-4279-2 - 10 East Taylor Street - Fence](#)

Mr. Judson stated that a member of the public requested that this item be pulled from the consent agenda and be placed on the regular agenda in order to review this request and receive public comment.

Mr. Engle stated that he did not look at this request when he was in the field. He did not believe that any of the other members looked at it either. He wanted to know if the Board would have a full presentation on this request.

Mr. Judson explained that in the interest of an open forum he would like to honor the public's request. It may be that the Board would not have sufficient information to address the public's concerns, but it will be duly noted that not all Board members have thoroughly examined this project.

Board Action:

Approval to removed this petition from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of Doug Bean for Kayak Kafe - H-10-4287-2 - 1 East Broughton Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the projecting principal use sign as submitted. This decision does not preclude an encroachment agreement which may be required from the City of Savannah to project over the public right-of-way. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

6. Amended Petition of Bill Coggins for Applegate Industries - H-07-3836-2 - 314-318 West Taylor Street - New Construction modifications

Attachment: [Staff Report and Attachment.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. She stated as a note, Applegate Industries is no longer involved in the project. Bill Coggins is representing the owner. She explained that the petitioner is requesting after-the-fact modifications to the new construction of three row houses at 314, 316, and 318 West Taylor Street.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff is in favor of the revised handrail as built on 318 West Taylor. Staff recommends that they do the same on 314 and 316. Staff also recommends after-the-fact approval for the amendments as submitted with the modification to the handrail to include the elimination of the shutters, elevation of the raised stoops, replace the double door and awning on the rear with a single french door with no awning to be installed; eliminate the pedestrian gate from the masonry privacy wall; and install the brick rowlock above the stucco base.

Ms. Ramsay said that in the original approval, shutters were shown on the front and back.

Ms. Ward explained that Ms. Ramsay is correct. The shutters were approved for the entire building. Normally, if the petitioner had come in and shown the building on the front

facade, there is no requirement that they put shutters in. The ordinance does not mandate this, but they did show the shutters as a part of their design. She believes, therefore, that they do look at this in the details. This was more important on the Montgomery Street side as the shutters were actually serving a purpose to show the balance and symmetry on the facade.

Dr. Williams said the railings look awfully thin for handrails.

Ms. Ward stated that the new handrail is consistent with the elevation drawing and the section that was approved by the Board.

Dr. Williams said they don't appear the same in the photo. The drawings show two layers of wood such as the lower railings meets the balusters and the upper railings presumably has something on it.

Ms. Ward explained that it has a top handrail and a bottom rail.

Dr. Williams said the middle drawing shows the two-part handrail. There are two pieces of wood in the middle drawing on the top.

Ms. Ward stated this would be a discrepancy in the plan also because it does not show in the section.

Dr. Williams asked what recourse does this Board have if they have two versions of the same railing approved by a previous review board and the petitioner followed one. He guessed that the other is more historically accurate.

Ms. Ward believes the petitioner is in compliance, but she believes also that the petitioner could address this if the Board feels this makes it more compatible.

Dr. Henry said he is more interested in the driveways. As he recalls, the driveways go out to the sidewalks.

Ms. Ward believes the sidewalks are compliant. The slope of the driveway, however, is excessive.

Dr. Henry said he believes that the Hummer is the only car that will be able to get over this. He did not want the Board to overrule themselves.

Ms. Ward explained that the driveways were not a part of the Board's review. Portions of the driveways are in the public right-of-way. For example, half of the stoop is in the right-of-way and normally the Board does not review things in the right-of-way. This is done by the Engineering Department during the site plan review at the City. She believes the petitioner is still working with Engineering on this issue. However, the issue may be resolved by now.

Mr. Engle stated that the code requires that it be a level riser. One side of the step is about three inches lower than the other side. When coming down, your bottom step is onto a surface, which is approximately a 45 degree angle.

Ms. Ward believes the petitioner has had to regrade this. She said that Mike Rose of the City Development Services department is present and could speak to this issue. However, she believes that the petitioner had to remove some of the concrete to make a level pad at the base of the stairs to be compliant with the building code and the City did hold the petitioner to this.

Mr. Gay said the new post does not resemble the post shown in the picture.

Ms. Ward said they do not match.

Mr. Gay said the old post has a ball on top, but the new post does not. It appears that a presentation was not made to the Review Board. The back door is completely different, the stairs are different.

Ms. Ward stated she agrees and this is why she brought it to this Board's attention.

Mr. Gay stated that he could not imagine why the petitioner decided to make the changes himself.

Dr. Henry stated that he was puzzled why the staff is recommending that the Board approve this.

Ms. Ward explained that she feels it meets the ordinance. If the petitioner had properly come in at the time, the staff would have recommended approval for the changes. Obviously, she does not believe the staff would have recommended approval for the driveway, but this is not in the staff's purview. If the petition had been submitted with a boxy new post without the sphere on top, she believes the staff would have recommended approval for it. Consequently, staff does not have a reason not to recommend approval for it now.

Mr. Gay said there are some drastic changes to just do it.

Mr. Engle stated that he does not believe that they would have approved the Montgomery Street elevation without the second part shutters. Now, they have one single window on the second floor elevation. This Board over and over has insisted on symmetry on public elevations such as this. How much more would it cost to put two pairs of shutters in these openings? He does not agree with Ms. Ward that the Board would have approved the elevation as presented.

Ms. Ward rephrased her comment by saying staff would have recommended approval to the Board of these changes had the petitioner come in at the proper time. Now, as the Board, it is their decision to actually act on them and determine if they are visually compatible. She believes the staff's recommendation would have been the same.

Dr. Henry said if the Board does not have any authority with the driveways, why are they mentioning them in the things to approve.

Mr. Judson said the driveways are not included for the Board's approval. This is being discussed because several Board members mentioned the driveway elevation.

Ms. Ramsay said Ms. Ward cannot change the ordinance; it is as written. The Board's job is to determine the visual compatibility. The Board needs to decide whether it is visually compatible without the shutters. She agrees with Mr. Engle and would like to see the shutters on the front as she believes it would be much more compatible.

Mr. Judson explained as frustrating as the Board sometimes finds the order in the way things happen, the Board is not here to consider how the project deviated from the original plans. The Board's job is to consider the application today as though it was a new petition. It is certainly here for review and discussion, but it is not a matter of condoning or not condoning the deviations from the original plan. Therefore, this Board is to take a fresh look at what is submitted to them today. Unfortunately, procedurally this Board cannot take any weight to the fact that it is an after-the-fact approval as this Board has discussed many times.

Mr. Gay said the people can bring in what they want, then just go out and do what they please. Then come back to the Board and say they made a mistake.

Mr. Judson said this is one of the reasons that they have discussed that the Historic Review Board will have a more active part in the site inspections and this is how they have got to this point today. Ms. Ward went with the City on the July inspection.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, it is not an all or nothing proposition. The Board can approve some of the changes.

Ms. Simpson asked if the property owners would be forced to make the changes.

Ms. Ward answered yes. She believes this is their request to the City when they did the final inspection that they not issue the Certificate of Occupancy until the items are addressed. Ms. Ward said she does not believe that the City was able to do this. To her knowledge the Certificate of Occupancy was issued because a policy was not in place prior to this time. She has been trying for years to get the policy enacted. Therefore, it was not a lack of effort, but they are looking at ways to ensure that the Certificate of Appropriateness is upheld and enforced even if it ends up being done through a bond issued by the applicant either until he can finish the repairs and then he would receive the funding back or at the end of a period (six months) the City could potentially cash the bond and make the repairs themselves.

Ms. Simpson asked what are the repercussions should the Board approve some, but not all.

Ms. Ward explained that the Board has staff recommendation. The staff is recommending that after-the-fact approval for the changes that have been made with the condition that they do not support the change to the handrail as shown. The staff recommends that it go back and match the originally submitted handrail provided in the building section.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Coggins said he would entertain questions from the Board and add comments as they go forward.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Coggins to address the handrail issue.

Mr. Coggins said the handrails are two and a quarter (2 1/4) by one and a quarter (1 1/4) deep which is the WM-240 that is specified on the right-hand cut section. He said the handrail was an oversight. Their company had previously built 308 and 310 West Taylor Street and they simply copied the handrails with the exception of the handrails that were approved on 308 and 310 had a 2x6 top handrail which is now in the new building code is too wide as you cannot get a grip on it. Therefore, what they built here is a 2x4 top handrail. When he met with Ms. Ward on the job site, she showed this to him and they changed it to the detail that is shown on the right. The material is extremely thin and he believes the handrail is 13 or 14 feet long and weak. At this time he met with Mr. Mike Rose and Ms. Ward and they went across the street to 420 Montgomery Street. They noticed that a handrail is here somewhat similar (it will not meet code now), but had a post separating the middle to give some stability. Therefore, they added the post and agreed to wait until this meeting to find out where to go with the handrail.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Coggins if he knew what the handrail in the middle drawing is as it is clearly different from the right-hand drawing.

Dr. Henry stated that he is aware that the driveways are not a part of the Board's purview, but he wanted to ask the petitioner how they came up with those driveways.

Mr. Coggins stated that it is a long story. They worked very closely with the City Engineers, Building Code department, their company engineers and EMC Engineering. They have an approved ADA two percent slope four (4) foot sidewalk through this area. He explained that from there, it obviously slopes up. As he heard earlier from the Board, it was thought that they could have gone on into the garage. But Building Inspections was here and told them that there had to be a 3x3 landing at the bottom of the steps. They flattened this area and this is what gave them the steepness. He does not know if the Board as visited the site, but 308 and 310 have a gradual driveway. They do not meet the ADA standards for the sidewalks. It was agreed with the City Engineers that what they put in place would meet the ADA standards as well as the building codes with the 3x3 landing.

Mr. Judson asked the Board not to visit the issues that are not a part of their purview.

Mr. Engle said his biggest concern is Montgomery Street. The impact of this elevation on Montgomery Street is a major effort to bring it back and he does not believe that this helps the Montgomery Street corridor. The shutters are left off on the second floor even though the recesses are there. He asked Mr. Coggins if there is a rationale explanation that the shutters are not put in the recesses.

Mr. Coggins explained that the reason the shutters were left off is two part. They are directly across the street from Taylor Row; they are two different buildings. It was management's decision that their building would better blend in with what was there at Taylor Row. He believes that if they look at the Montgomery Street side, they are just brick recessed areas and no shutters. This is why they were omitted.

Mr. Engle asked if this was why they left off the canopy on the rear door. The first thing that is going to happen is that the owner will have to spend their own money to put a canopy

over the door or the entire stoop will rot. Water will come in under the back door. He said again that what concerns him is that on the Montgomery Street side they lose the balance of the elevation. On the top right-hand elevation, there should be a canopy on the left side at the back stoop that balances the roof on the little stoop in the front. This has been left off the elevation, but there was a canvas canopy here. This changes the entire Montgomery Street balance. Now, what is here is a flat wall with nothing accentuating the stoop in the back. He asked Mr. Coggins if there is a reason for this, except to save money.

Mr. Coggins said it was not due to saving money. They decided against this as there is no other canopies anywhere in the area.

Mr. Engle said it appears to him that an awfully lot of arbitrary things were done with no consultation with the Historic Review Board. These are not historic buildings and they do not have to match other historic buildings (and they don't), but what this Board is concerned with is balancing aesthetics. He believes that they have lost the balance on Montgomery Street because of the decisions made arbitrarily. Mr. Engle said he has a real problem with this. He is not as concerned with Taylor Street frankly because it is an entirely new elevation and across the street is an entirely new elevation, but Montgomery is not.

Dr. Williams asked what is across the street on Montgomery Street.

Mr. Engle answered that a cross Montgomery Street is another row of new buildings. He said that a lot of historic buildings are in this area.

Dr. Williams stated that the balance would be frontal rather than sectional. It is an end building on the end of a row. He was not sure if the canopy, although it is true that they did not include it in the original elevation of the Montgomery, would ever provide an adequate balance the way Mr. Engle is talking about with the front stoop. He asked if the original is canvas and presumably would be like a canvas awning over doors.

Mr. Engle pointed out that a picture of it is shown somewhere in the packet.

Dr. Williams said he saw an elevation drawing and he presumed that it is an angle awning.

Mr. Engle said normally it would be the same depth of the stoop and, therefore, would have a presence.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Coggins if he found the answer to the handrail question.

Mr. Coggins answered that what he was looking at the detail of A-12 is just the WM-240 and directly below it says 2x2 balusters. Even though the Board believes they are seeing two pieces of wood, and he two is seeing two pieces, it is just specifying the one WM-240 which is just an oval piece of handrail.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Coggins if this is why they have installed the oval handrail. However, it looks awfully flat in the photo.

Mr. Coggins stated that it is not egg shaped, it is somewhat flat.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Karen Jenkins, a real estate agent with Ceila Dunn Sotheby's International Realty, stated that she has shown these properties. Ms. Jenkins believes the change in the back with the lack of the canopy and the change in the porch to wood without the spiral staircase detracts the properties. The big wooden staircase takes up the entirety of the private space in the courtyard. There is a smaller patio off the door than what the plan shows.

Mr. Coggins stated the reason the spiral staircase was removed is because it is a means of egress. The four foot spiral staircase shown on the plan that was approved several years ago, is no longer allowed by building codes. This is why the spiral staircase was removed.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Rose to give acknowledgment to the statement just made by Mr. Coggins pertaining to the spiral staircase.

Mr. Rose concurred that the statement is correct concerning the spiral staircase.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry asked if it would be agreeable to raise the issues separately.

Mr. Judson stated that he sensed this is the way the Board would handle this as apparently some issues have not raised items and some have. However, he wanted it to be understood that there would not be a separate vote. The Board would need to clarify their discussion on each issue and a motion would have to specifically identify which portions have been approved and which portions have not and give the reasons. Mr. Judson explained that it can be broken out in sections however the motion maker feels, but they are not going to have four or five separate motions. There will only be one motion to approve or disapprove.

Mr. Engle said the stoop is here. The elevation of the front doors cannot be changed. This is unfortunately a moot point. There is the nine foot five stoop and nothing can be done about it. They cannot change this and to him this has to be approved. No one seems to be concerned about the french doors on the back and the circular staircases are no longer legal, then this is a moot point as well. He does not agree with the awning being eliminated and believes it should be put back in. No one mentioned the pedestrian gate or the vehicle gate. This is a simple question of security. He is surprised that no one thought about this.

Mr. Judson stated that procedurally in the recommendation Ms. Ward mentioned that the elimination of the pedestrian gate is a part of the petition. He asked Mr. Coggins to clarify for the Board if it is their intent to eliminate the vehicle gate as well.

Mr. Coggins stated that the drive-through gate as told to them by several different parties, presented a question of security issues in the neighborhood. Therefore, they did not install the gate. The gates on the Montgomery Street side were omitted for safety security reasons to stop persons from wandering through here that do not have access.

Ms. Simpson said Mr. Coggins statement was very interesting as he said they made several choices as to seeing what is across the street. There are several security gates along

Montgomery Street, specifically in the same area they are talking about now.

Mr. Coggins asked Ms. Simpson if she was speaking of drive-through gates in this area.

Ms. Simpson answered yes; if she was not mistaken, there are several drive-through gates in this area.

Mr. Coggins said the recommendation came to them from several different people about the security reasons. This is exactly why it was eliminated.

Mr. Cole Holliday stated that the gates Ms. Simpson is referring to are to single units. As far as he knows, except for the West Jones Square building as they have underground parking here, but on Montgomery Street it is open parking. If they are looking across the street going down Taylor Street on the left, there is parking in the rear of this building that has block walls, but no gates. This is somewhat why the perception of the safety issue came about.

Ms. Simpson asked them if they some how pick and choose which properties would have the drive-through gates.

Mr. Holliday said it is a shared entrance back there, whereas the ones Ms. Simpson is speaking of with the gates are only the people that are going to be in there are the ones who live here. For example, in the one unit.

Ms. Simpson said she thought Applegate properties had more gates in addition to the individuals.

Mr. Holliday stated that there is one on each side and each one has a gate because of their own parking space.

Dr. Williams asked that the doorway that was omitted is actually to one of the private yards as opposed to the parking area.

Mr. Coggins answered yes. It is the private courtyard at 318 West Taylor Street.

Mr. Judson asked staff that since the vehicle gate is not a part of this petition can it be either (a) addressed in the Board's motion to approve or not or (b) does the applicant needs to come back with a separate petition to discuss the vehicle gate as it is not a part of the petition before the Board today?

Ms. Ward answered that she believes that the Board can discuss the vehicle gate and vote on it today. She explained that things often come up in the meeting that were not a part of the design and persons often bring drawings to the Board at the meetings to try to address some of the concerns. Therefore, as she has said, she believes that the Board can address the vehicle gate and vote on it today.

Mr. Judson said for consensus let it be acknowledged, unless Mr. Coggins has an objection, that the petition is amended with the request to eliminate the vehicle gate.

Mr. Coggins stated that this is okay. He believed that the vehicle gate was already eliminated.

Ms. Ward, too, thought the vehicle gate was eliminated; this was an oversight.

Dr. Williams said the staff's recommendation does not include anything about the railing.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes the railing that the petitioner has installed is consistent with the approved railing section drawing that was submitted to the Board and approved. However, before the petitioner went ahead and replaced all three as they had already gone through two different designs, she wanted the petitioner to stop and bring it to the Board so they could see it before doing so on the other two. Therefore, if there was something that the Board wanted differently, the petitioner would be aware of it and could incorporate it in all three. The petitioner was not moving forward again without the Board's approval. Nevertheless, she believes the revised railing that was done at 318 West Taylor Street is consistent with the approved plans. Therefore, it does not need any approval.

She said a part of the Board's motion should be that the petitioner modifies the front handrail to match the drawings that were submitted and approved by the Board originally.

Dr. Williams said this should be applied to the other two. If the Board does not specify this, there is no guarantee that the petitioner will carry this out at the other two houses. He asked if the Board should say anything about the ball.

Ms. Ward said the ball was not addressed. She included this with the handrail. However, staff recommends approval of the new post as built on the site.

Mr. Gay said if a ball is put on top of this one, it would look fairly strange as opposed to the other being much slimmer.

Mr. Judson stated for clarification, the one that is modified at this point has no ball.

Ms. Ward stated this is correct.

Dr. Williams asked about the new post on the bottom of the railing.

Ms. Ward stated that this was changed.

Dr. Williams asked what were the measurements on the new post.

Ms. Ward said she did not take measurement of this; therefore, the petitioner would need to address this.

Dr. Williams asked if the original post was a 4x4 or a 5x5. The photo on the left shows hefty top and bottom rails visually with a hefty newer post. The railings were changed to what the Board sees in photo three, but the new posts are not changed. This is a hefty newer post with a very delicate balustrade.

Ms. Ward explained that the drawings dimensions were scanned and, therefore, is difficult to read. However, it shows a 6x6 chamfered post and this is what was approved.

Mr. Engle said on page three of six, it shows a 4x4.

Dr. Williams stated that it says 6x6. He asked if it is chamfered or square.

Mr. Coggins stated that it is very lightly chamfered.

Dr. Williams said theoretically, they could take the top off this and put something a little more in keeping with the proportions of the now thinner looking railing. He asked if this is one piece. He was guessing about the cap.

Mr. Coggins said the cap is a piece of two by with a base cap underneath.

Dr. Williams said it looks visually heavier than the drawing, but the dimensions are on the drawings.

Mr. Coggins believes that the intermediate post that was added was a 4x4 which is to remain more consistent with the thin wood, but gives the needed support for building codes.

Board Action:

Approve the after-the-fact amendments as requested with the following conditions: 1. Install the handrail as approved on original plans on 314 and 316 West Taylor Street to match 318 West Taylor Street; 2. Install shutters per the original approval on all exterior facades; and 3. Install awnings on rear entries to fit new opening width. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Nay
Gene Hutchinson	- Aye

7. [Petition of Pete Callejas for Greenline Architecture - H-10-4279-2 - 10 East Taylor Street - Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

As stated under the consent agenda, this item was approved to be removed from the consent agenda and be placed under the regular agenda for the public to hear the Board's review on this item.

Mr. Pete Callejas of Greenline Architecture was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting to construct a privacy wall on the side yard garden. A beautiful historic garden wall is here at the front of Taylor Street. The petitioner is keeping this and it is heavily landscaped. Thirty-four feet from the front property line, the petitioner wishes to install a second privacy wall that will be similar to the front to provide additional screening. They want to install a below ground pool in the rear. The fence will be here for added privacy. There is an existing wall at the rear of the property. Therefore, this will not be visible, but could be slightly visual from the right-of-way along Taylor Street. The wall meets all the standards in the ordinance and does not exceed the height. The ordinance requires that a masonry base be used with an iron fencing which the petitioner has done.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the privacy fence as submitted.

Mr. Judson asked what is the height of the proposed fence relative to the height of the existing fence.

Ms. Ward said this would be good question for the petitioner. She showed a photo of the site and the existing fence. She believes it is 30 feet back, but is not sure.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Callejas stated that the privacy wall is intended to mimic the wall that is between the two properties, not the one on the front as it is a lower wall, but has the same railings. The wall between the two properties is six feet high and this is exactly how high they intend to build the garden wall.

Mr. Judson asked if the wall on the street level is low enough that this wall becomes visible.

Mr. Callejas confirmed that the wall is visible. As they can see by the bottom left picture which has the rendering of the wall, there is a lot of landscaping. They do see the wall, but not a lot of it. However, beyond the fence and the landscaping, it really will not be that visible.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Karen Jenkins stated that she lives in this neighborhood and walks by this property all the time. She wanted to know how would the wall look as one walks by from Bull Street towards Drayton Street looking through the gate underneath the side porch of the house. From the illustration it is hard to visualize it.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she does not believe that it would be seen. She believes it would be a rear garden wall behind the front wall.

Ms. Jenkins asked if the end of the new wall sort of dead ends into the porch and nothing will change on the streetscape.

Board Action:

Approval of the privacy wall as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

8. [Petition of Martie Gay - H-10-4283-2 - 19 & 21 East Gordon Street - Fence and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Martie Gay was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. She stated that this is a little odd that there are two properties on one application, but she worked with the petitioner and this seemed to be the most logical thing to do because they are requesting approval for a fence that expands the rear of both properties. Therefore, she felt it should be looked at as one component. The applicant is requesting approval to modify the privacy wall at 19 East Gordon Street and construct a new privacy wall and modify the existing four-story porch at the rear of 21 East Gordon Street. These properties are owned by the same person.

Ms. Ward reported that staff is recommending approval of the privacy wall with the condition that the brick planter not extend into their right-of-way and approval of the porch modifications as submitted with the note that if changes have to be made to meet the minimum building code required height, that the change be brought back to staff.

Mr. Judson said he was probably digressing from the Board's purview, but he understood that there is one pedestrian gate for two properties and both properties are owned by the same persons. He asked Ms. Ward if a question came up regarding what happens in the future if these properties fall into individual ownership.

Ms. Ward answered that there is a carriage house on the property at 19 East Gordon Street. Therefore, she believes the property could be assessed and it has a pedestrian door.

Mr. Engle wanted to know if the petitioner plans to keep the existing post. If so, all they are doing is adding the planters, etc.

Ms. Ward answered yes. A more detailed elevation was provided by the petitioner in large format that was scanned. Ms. Ward apologized that this document was not included in the Board's submittal packet, but was sent to the Board via email yesterday.

Mr. Gay asked Ms. Ward if the wall is to be Savannah Gray brick. The wall that is presently here is not Savannah Gray brick.

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioner told her the wall will be Savannah Gray brick.

Dr. Williams stated that the elevation on page 8 shows an oculus in the pediment and the existing house on page 6 does not have this. He asked if this is a part of the application.

Ms. Ward stated that it appears that way.

Dr. Williams asked if this is listed in the petitioner's request.

Ms. Ward answered that this was not specifically spelled out in the written description, but if it is on the plans it is a part of the submittal. She was focusing on what was written in the description.

Mr. Gay asked if this means that the petitioner would have to put the oculus in.

Ms. Ward stated that it appears that the petitioner is requesting to put the oculus in.

Ms. Ramsay believes the oculus is there.

Mr. Engle believes what Ms. Ramsay sees is the vent.

Dr. Williams stated that it is not that important. He only asked for clarification.

Ms. Ward said she questions whether the gable is historic.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Gay to clarify whether an existing vent is here.

Ms. Gay answered that a vent is not here. They are proposing to put one in because of ventilation purposes. This is an old home and there was not much ventilation. They recently sprayed the house with envirofoam on the inside, but the top unit maintains about a ten (10) degree difference from the bottom unit. Therefore, they are adding a little bit of ventilation here.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Gay if this was written on their application.

Ms. Gay answered that she did not write a lot of items on the application. They just gave the picture. If the Board does not like it, she will remove it.

Ms. Ramsay said it is shown in the existing rear elevation and is shown in the improved back elevation which would lead one to believe that it is existing.

Ms. Gay said basically they just took pictures of the existing elevations.

Mr. Judson clarified that the document Ms. Ward referred to that was emailed to the Board shows this in the drawing of the existing.

Ms. Gay said the designer probably sent this to Ms. Ward. However, if this is a stickler and the Board does not want the vent there, it does not matter to them. In 2002, someone bought the building, turned it into condos and basically when they were doing so, did it the cheapest way possible. The rear of that unit looks horrible; it is not good looking. Therefore, they are trying to make it look a little better for the historic area.

She said something was mentioned about the brick. They are reusing all of the existing bricks. They dismantled the carriage house, saved and cleaned all the bricks as well as the brick fence that was here. They will reuse these bricks for the entire properties.

Mr. Judson said Ms. Ward recommended that the planter box be set off of the public right-of-way. He asked Ms. Gay if this was amenable to her.

Ms. Gay replied yes. Also the 11 foot is perfectly fine, too. They are just making the planter tie-in to the existing planters. It will not be thick and they will plant jasmine or creeping fig in the planter to grow and cover the lattice. She said the Board asked about the pedestrian gate. The carriage house has two garage doors, but the courtyard also has a front gate that goes to the front and there is another front gate. Therefore, there is three or four different ways to get into the courtyard.

Dr. Williams stated that on page 8 the pediment below the oculus shows what appears to be a dental course or something above the lower cornice. It looks very odd.

Ms. Gay explained that this is the slope.

Mr. Engle said the handwritten note that goes with this says, "we are going to beef up columns, handrails, and figures." He said if the columns will be beef up, it does not appear that they will be reused.

Ms. Gay explained that they will reuse the columns. They are just going to wrap them. The columns are not deteriorated, but have ugly knot holes. They will wrap them and then put the base and top molding on them.

Mr. Engle wanted to know if screens would be put on both sides of the porch. The drawings do not indicate this.

Ms. Gay said the screens are the shutters.

Ms. Simpson asked if the shutters are existing.

Ms. Gay answered no. They talked to the neighbors on the right because if you are standing on the porch you look right into their carriage house as well as their backyard. They showed these neighbors the pictures who were excited about the shutters.

Ms. Ramsay said the material is not identified for the lower raised panels. She asked what is the material for these panels.

Ms. Gay said the panels are wood.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it appears that the column is flush with the entablature above.

Ms. Gay stated that it is not. It is recessed just a little bit.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board does not have a floor plan, but it looks like in wrapping the existing column with azak, which she has a problem with, appears that three inches are extended from the base of the column. She does not know how wide it is at the top of the column. However, this is not what is shown in the elevation drawing.

Mr. Engle said it's moved over about five inches.

Dr. Williams said the beam has been shortened about ten inches.

Ms. Gay explained that at 19 East Gordon existing columns are here. What they wanted to do was wrap these columns with the azak similar in keeping with what's next door. It will not be exactly the same as they will not use the same sizing. She did not notice the difference where the designer placed the column designs. However, they are not moving the columns. They will put a crown piece.

Mr. Gay asked if the top cap will stick out past the roof.

Ms. Gay said it will come out some, but will not be a foot. The top will be just as what they have on Gordon Street, capped with copper flashing.

Mr. Gay stated that the drawings do not show this. One thing is shown, but the description is something completely different. It looks great, but what they are working with will end up looking different.

Ms. Gay said just because the drawing shows them moved in, they are not moving them. The capital will extend past the freeze that is here.

Ms. Ramsay said wrapping the columns will make them wider.

Dr. Williams asked if there is a measured drawing that shows the width of the proposed capitals. Will the columns be clad all the way up or only where there is detail?

Ms. Gay said they will be clad all the way.

Dr. Williams asked if the columns are currently 6x6.

Ms. Gay answered that they are either 6x6 or 8x8.

Dr. Williams asked what is the thickness that the columns will be clad with.

Ms. Gay answered that the azak is about half an inch.

Dr. Williams asked if the drawings show seven and one-half inch above the five and one-half inch.

Ms. Gay answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked if there is a dimension on the width of the capital.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it is approximately seven and one-half inch scaling from the bottom.

Dr. Williams said the photo of the house shows that the current 6x6 is almost flush with the edge of the house. It appears that they are only recessed from the outer edge of the house almost two inches. The drawing shows the columns in about one foot from the outer edge allowing these capitals to project out about six or seven inches.

Ms. Gay stated that she did not go that far into looking at the detail. She was looking at the big picture. She has a picture of the columns that are next door.

Dr. Williams stated that the Board has a picture of the columns. The problem he is having is that the drawing that is proposed is more acceptable than what Ms. Gay is verbally proposing.

Ms. Gay said if the column is removed, the freeze will have to be deeper.

Dr. Henry questioned what was meant by deeper.

Mr. Gay said not only would the petitioner have to move the column over, but also back.

Ms. Gay explained that she did not mean deeper, but thicker.

Dr. Williams asked why it would be thicker. May be a better solution would be to scale back the beefiness of the molding being added to the columns that are not quite articulated. The house on the left has a very robust sculpture quality to its cornices with vintals and projecting moldings, but this house has a more delicate quality.

Ms. Gay said this would cut down on the capital on the top.

Dr. Williams said scale everything down so that the problem would be resolved of the visual blemishes that are apparent now. They can be clad more leanly.

Ms. Gay said they have no problems with anything that the Board is suggesting.

Mr. Judson stated that he believes the concern was the potential projection that was not being accurately shown and may be this could be scaled down.

Dr. Williams said the less projection you have, the less maintenance issue one will have.

Mr. Engle said he was a little concern with the wall. The proposed spacing for the proposed lattice is awkward in conjunction with the piers of the masonry part. They are not lined up. If some day this gets covered up with vines, but it may not get covered with vines. He wished the petitioner would have vertical posts above the piers and an immediate vertical post if it is needed for structure strength. Eight foot panels are being used and he guessed prefab lattices would be used instead of custom lattice.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Gay if she would be amendable to a motion that required that the vertical support for the lattice line up with the piers.

Ms. Gay responded that they don't have a problem with this suggestion. So that they do not build something that does not look nice, she asked the Board if they noticed that next to the gate a pier is already here. Is this pier is how everything is to be set up?

Dr. Williams recommended to Ms. Gay that she follows Mr. Engle's suggestion from the left hand edge up to the pier beside the gate and then a small lattice panel the width of the gate over the gate. If nine feet and eight six are too long for the lattice panels, the alternative of having an intermediary may be even shorter. Dr. Williams explained if Ms. Gay uses intermediary, they could be a little shorter than the main post between the lattice.

Ms. Gay stated that this would not be a problem. She believes what the Board is seeing is actually the dimension line. There is nothing that extends up past that.

Dr. Williams asked the staff if 11 feet meet the code.

Mr. Judson answered yes; 11 feet is the maximum.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that he believes the Board has addressed the questions that they had which was the lining up of the column with the entablature and architrave. He asked if the posts would be aligned.

Mr. Judson answered yes.

Mr. Carey stated that the amount of detail on the capitals were some debate as well. He said the HSF wants less.

Mr. Judson said this would be a solution to the dimensional problems.

Mr. Carey said he just wanted to have all these things confirmed.

Board Action:

Approve the privacy wall with the condition that the wood lattice posts align with the brick piers below and the brick planters not extend into the public right-of-way and approval of the porch modifications with the condition that the details and column capitals be simplified and reduced in size by approximately 50%.

- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle

- Aye

Ned Gay

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Gene Hutchinson

- Aye

Brian Judson

- Abstain

Richard Law, Sr

- Aye

Linda Ramsay

- Nay

Ebony Simpson

- Aye

Robin Williams

- Aye

9. [Petition of Ray Prichett for Detailed Construction - H-10-4286-2 - 502 East Jones Street - Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Ray Prichett was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward disclosed that her family and she have worked with Mr. Prichett on a contract involving their home. The project is no longer going on, but she just wanted it to be known that she has worked with this petitioner in the past.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to remove the stucco parapet surrounding the side gable roof. The residence is one-half of a historic residential duplex and the roof overhang is proposed to match the neighboring property. This property no longer serves as a commercial tenant and is used as a residence as it was originally designed to be. Modifications overtime including the stucco facade and parapet have altered the original historic character of the building. The petitioner says that the parapet is trapping water within the roof and exterior walls.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff is recommending approval to remove the stucco parapet and restore the side gable roof.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward that at the time her family was involved with this contractor was there ever a discussion of this issue.

Ms. Ward answered no.

Dr. Williams stated that the photo does not show the roof projecting.

Ms. Ward stated correct.

Dr. Williams asked if the roof will project.

Ms. Ward answered that this has been the indication from the petitioner. She believes the roof will project if the petitioner is proposing to widen it.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, the petitioner is limited to the removal of the parapet and not the removal of the stucco, changing of the windows and corner.

Ms. Ward said she the petitioner and she spoke about this. Staff encourages them to do a full restoration. The petitioner indicated that the wood siding is here underneath the stucco and is visible. At this time the property owner is not moving forward with this, not because they don't want to, but are limited to what they can do right now.

Dr. Williams stated that he was not sure if it would necessarily require a full restoration. He asked when was the last time this building was used as a store.

Mr. Engle answered 1901.

Dr. Williams said it has been used more as a store with a physical corner entrance. He stated between 1996 and today the historic doors disappeared.

Ms. Ward stated that she does not know, but she could look into this and find out.

Dr. Williams asked if the windows are there.

Ms. Ward answered that she believes the windows have been replaced. The shutters are not there, but there is trim that has been applied to the outside. She believes that if they had done a corner cut entry in 1901, they would have done some kind of store front windows. The openings are a little small for 1901 and even 1916.

Mr. Engle said the tax assessment book lists shifting from residential to commercial as of 1901 and it was a fruit store and no longer a residential from there on.

Dr. Williams asked if the building is residential now.

Dr. Henry asked if the store front was original to this building.

Ms. Ward answered that originally it was built as a duplex with two entrances. Then it would have matched the neighboring property which has been restored. She believes the question is, was the corner store done at the turn of the century? Therefore, this portion may be original. The petitioner is not proposing to change the corner entry, they just want to restore the roof and remove the parapet.

Dr. Williams said the problem he is having is that a part of the store will be removed. The squared off parapet (as he will call it) is not in keeping with the restored neighbor's other half of the pair. He understands the water issue being a motive to modify the parapet, but it would be almost as if they are removing a defining character feature that has been here since 1901.

Ms. Ward said she agrees with this, except that she does not know if the parapet was here in 1901. Evidence is there that it was used as a commercial building, but when the changes were made overtime, they do not know. A corner cut entrance is consistent with the Victorian period. But she does not know when the stucco and the parapet were added. She does not know if is historic or not.

Dr. Williams said that 1960 would make it historic. He said he guarantees that it is older than 1960.

Ms. Ward said she had one thought that may be it was done at the same time the stucco stoop was put in was a concrete block stoop with the concrete baluster that this was the time the stucco was done and they changed the size of the openings. However, she does not have any documentation of when the changes were made.

Mr. Engle stated that the tax record card shows that it was stucco with a standing seam tin roof in the parapet area in 1935. Therefore, he has no doubt that this was done in 1901 when it ceased being residential. The building had a wood shingle roof before it was converted.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward that the pierced concrete block that she is talking about could have been added at a later date than the bottom part of the portico because even the columns are sandwiched on each side of the piers. He was not sure if they are the same material that is across the front. Are they just on the end? It appears that a piece of the end has fallen off and was repaired with a cinder block.

Ms. Ward said they could have as it looks like cinder block to her. It has been stuccoed.

Mr. Judson clarified that the Board is looking at the adjoining building.

Mr. Gay stated that the parapet has already been removed from the adjoining building.

Dr. Williams stated that the cladding has been removed also. He understood that these are companion buildings, but the character of this building's fenestration, entrance, and massing have been altered. The taking back of the roof line, the upper part of the wall and the end parapet so that it matches the massing of the neighbor, but in every respect it will remain distinct from its neighbor.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ray Pritchett stated that their main concern with removing the parapet is that approximately 50 gallons of tar have been put behind the parapet just on top of the shingles. In his opinion, this was not built originally with the house because of how everything is tied in together. Their owner has black mold on the interior walls and on the

Jones Street side water builds up about one foot when it rains. It is not shedding properly and this is why they want to remove the parapet. Mr. Pritchett stated that he has talked with the owner about going down to the natural wood siding and it is something that she is considering, but does not have the money to do so right now.

Dr. Williams asked if the main motive is water evacuation, not aesthetics.

Mr. Pritchett answered yes and that the owner wants to make it look more like residential property versus commercial and match the house next door.

Mr. Pritchett said a permit was issued for this house in 2006 and at that point, a lot of things were changed. He said if the Board looks at the Price Street side, underneath the diamond, the window is basically like that. Therefore, the stucco job to him is not something someone would have done in the early 1900s. It is somewhat debauchery the way it was done. There are a lot of openings that have been closed off that were existing. Just beyond the window, it appears that a larger window much like a double hung sash window may be five or six feet tall versus the short windows that are here. To the right side of the door, there is another opening that does not look like a door, it looks more like a window as well that has been covered up over time, too. Mr. Pritchett said a lot of patch work has been done all over the house.

Dr. Williams stated that theoretically one could retain the Price Street parapet, which is the more character defining parapet and just remove the parapet off the Jones Street front to resolve the water issue.

Mr. Pritchett said this would resolve a lot of the water issue.

Dr. Williams asked that the owner's motive is the water at this stage.

Mr. Pritchett stated that the owner wants to make the house look more like a residential property than a commercial storefront. He said to his knowledge it has not been used as a storefront for quite a while. He knows it may not sure on the records that it was used as a residence, but the woman who purchased it, purchased it from someone else that had been using it as a residence and they converted it quite some time ago. They installed a shower, raised the interior floor for plumbing, electrical and so forth. As a matter of fact, the interior has been altered many times.

Dr. Williams said the Board's purview is not with the interior. All this Board can work with is the exterior. One of the things that they are charged with is preserving the character defining features of the Historic District. The building is rather unusual and if the parapet was removed, it becomes more like 200 other buildings. But in looking at the upper photo, he could not think of five other buildings in the Historic District that look like this. Therefore, it is more unique and more unusual in its present configuration than in the proposed. In other words, not only is the owner throwing away part of the history, but a distinctive part. This sort of begs the question if she wants to live in a house that looks like a house than this might not be the house for her as opposed to transforming the historic building and make it conform to her idea as to what a house should look like.

Mr. Pritchett said to him, there is no other house in the neighborhood that has this type of architecture. Therefore, their push is to make it look more like the neighborhood.

Dr. Williams said in a sense, this would be a homogenization of history.

Dr. Henry stated that this is a situation where two structures had two distinctive uses. In terms of historic preservation, do you go to the older or newer?

Mr. Engle said this creates something that never existed. The building in history will never look the way the photo version shows it. It has a corner entrance, that's a storefront. As a residence it never had that; it only had this after 1901 when it became a fruit store. If the owner came in and said she wants to restore the building to the way it looked at some point in time, that would be a valid question. He is not sure it would be appropriate, but would be a valid question. But what is being proposed is to make it into something that never existed and it is clearly against the Secretary's Standards. Dr. Williams is correct; the gable front is unique. Mr. Engle said he does not know of any other residential scale building that has this. He believes that the problem is that when the standing seam tin roof comes off, which probably did not leak and replace it with asphalt which will not work with the gable. The answer is to reflash it appropriately; not rip off the gable. Mr. Engle said he does not see how they can say they are consistent with the Secretary's Standards.

Dr. Henry wanted to know if new flashing would correct the problem.

Mr. Pritchett said they probably could reflash the entire back side.

Dr. Williams said in the 1996 photo quite a substantial downspout collector is no longer here.

Mr. Pritchett said the other part of the parapet was removed and this is where the downspout collector was located. It was where the two houses are divided.

Dr. Williams asked if this further complicated the water issue.

Mr. Pritchett answered he believes the big problem is that people are going in there not knowing what they are doing; just placing tar over everything. Tar is a bandaid; it is not a problem solver.

Mr. Engle said reflashing it and putting in a downspout might end the problem.

Mr. Pritchett stated that he can totally repair this part. It is just that the owner wants to make the building look more like a residence instead of looking like a commercial bank. However, he understands what the Board is saying. If the owner is not going all the way, it is no point in going half the way.

Dr. Williams said frankly the biggest thing that declares that this is not a residence is the corner entrance. If the owner really wants this to look more like a house, this is where she should start. He said his advice is to do what Mr. Engle suggested and find a different solution that allows the preservation of the building's most character defining features in its present historic form.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

BOARD DECISION

Mr. Engle said the Board might want to ask the petitioner if he wants to withdraw this petition in order for him to go back and reconsider if they want to come back with another proposal may be adding a downspout.

Dr. Williams said the petitioner does not need a proposal to reflash it.

Mr. Thomson said in listening at the discussion, it is one of the things that was discussed the other day more in terms of do you make a motion to deny. In a motion to deny, the reasons need to be listed. He hears two things and it is not clear which one the Board favors. Either preserve the post 1901 format, fix the roof so that it does not leak or go back to the pre-1901, but fully restore it.

Dr. Williams and Mr. Gay along with other Board members do not believe that the pre-1901 is an option.

Mr. Thomson said he just wanted it to be made clear to the petitioner.

Mr. Judson stated that he believes at this point a motion would be to deny the petition. He informed Mr. Pritchett that procedurally at that point he would have to reapply and come back at a later time. He said the downspout is totally different. The Board is not really in an issue of it being to Mr. Pritchett's advantage of getting a continuance. Therefore, given that the Board's charge is to make timely decisions, he encouraged the Board to make a considerable motion.

Board Action:

Petition denied because it does not meet the
Historic District ordinance standard (I)(1)
**Preservation of historic structures within
the historic district.** - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Robin Williams
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Gene Hutchinson - Aye
Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Doug Bean for Primary Art Supply - H-10-4288-2 - 14 East Broughton Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Doug Bean was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace the existing fascia sign with an internally illuminated projecting principal use blade sign. The sign is to be located between the second and third floor on the main facade of the building fronting Broughton Street. The proposed sign does not penetrate any historic fabric nor obscure any character defining features. The sign actually creates a point of interest on an otherwise flat facade.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the projecting principal use sign as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Doug Bean came forward and entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Engle said they looked at this building and if you look at the front elevation showing the sign, there were windows on the second and third floors flanking the triple window. He does not agree with the statement that no historic fabric is impacted by this sign if in fact the windows are still there, the brackets on the sign will go directly through both historic windows. He believes the sign is great and glad to see that one sign of this type is coming back, but he questions if it is possible to shift the sign either to the east to where it will be 24 inches from the center window or shift it to the west. Therefore, if the historic windows are still behind the stucco veneer, they will not be punched through by the sign brackets.

The property manager stated that the old windows on either side of the central windows were cinder blocked up when the facade was done.

Dr. Williams asked if this will be aesthetic illumination or flashing lights.

Mr. Bean said the City's Sign Ordinance does not allow flashing or moving lights anywhere in the city.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the projecting principal use sign as submitted. This decision does not preclude an encroachment agreement which may be required from the City of Savannah to project over the public right-of-way. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

11. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects - H-10-4289-2 - 115 East River Street - Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Neil Dawson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace the ground supported awning with a structural canopy and modify the handrail on the second floor deck of Tubby's Tankhouse.

Ms. Ward stated that staff believes the standards have been met with regards to the awning. The building will not be altered any more than it is altered now. They will be putting it in the same location. Staff believes that the proposed canopy is a significant upgrade from what is here because it is an integrated architectural design. It is also a reversible treatment that allows the business to expand its use without damaging character defining features on the facade. Staff feels that the proposed roofing material, corrugated sheet metal, does not meet the standard.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval to replace the awning and modify the handrail with the condition that the new roof material be selected and resubmitted to staff. She cannot tell from the information on the signage whether it will be visible nor does she know what all is here on the building now. Therefore, she would like to work with the petitioner on staff level. It is small enough to where she does not think that it needs to

come back to the Board, but she just wants to ensure that it meets the Sign Ordinance for River Street. The colors for the canopy need to be provided for the canopy framing. Staff recommends approval with those conditions to be resubmitted to staff.

Mr. Engle said the way he reads the staff recommendation, the petitioner could put on an asphalt roof.

Ms. Ward stated that an asphalt roof would meet the ordinance.

Mr. Engle said it would be a major departure from what is here now and a major improvement.

Mr. Judson stated that the Board would need to be careful how they word the motion.

Ms. Ward said she believes a standing seam metal roofing should be used. She believes that a metal roof is most appropriate on a canopy to meet the ordinance.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Neil Dawson, architect for the petitioner, stated that with regards to the staff's comments, they believe it is reversible. Initially, when they talked with Ms. Ward, they talked about doing something that was a little more industrial so that it did not distract from the historic character of the River Street building. Mr. Dawson said they believed that a corrugated metal roof, although not specifically listed in the standards, is in the same family as a standing seam metal roof. He believes it is more industrial in character and certainly there are many examples throughout the city of corrugated metal roofs, particularly, in canopies and awnings. City Market has a number of these. Since this is a contemporary feature, it is reversible and they believe it is a more appropriate material than standing seam. They would not propose to do asphalt shingles, even though its allowed. Mr. Dawson said given that the ordinance allows asphalt shingles, he believes the corrugated is a much more substantial and gives better appearance.

Mr. Dawson stated that what he would like to propose with regards to this material is that they would like to put a sample up and have the Board review it at some point in the future unless the Board is set now that they will not approve the corrugated. But, as he as said, he believes the corrugated will provide an appropriate look and is right for this building. He said he talked with Mr. Carey earlier about perhaps changing the railings system. Mr. Dawson said they want something that is less obtrusive and a little more nautical in feel. Therefore, they proposed the cable railing. He guesses that one of Mr. Carey's concerns is that it created a horizontal line within the building elevation and he agrees. Therefore, what they talked about proposing, and if it is agreeable to the Board, to add a secondary steel structure 4 x 4. This will create an alignment with the window system above. Presently, it is an eight foot rhythm, but they would go to a four foot rhythm. He believes this would add a secondary level of structure and a little more verticality to it as right now is very horizontal in the current proposal.

Ms. Simpson asked if the materials would be the same as proposed.

Mr. Dawson answered yes. They would just add another level of detail which he believes is more appropriate.

Mr. Engle stated that horizontal railings on eight foot centers are relatively invisible. By throwing in steel posts every four feet instead of every eight feet makes it more visible.

Dr. Williams stated that he disagree that it will be invisible. He asked if the cables would be steel.

Mr. Dawson answered yes.

Dr. Williams said they would catch the light and behind them would be a fairly shaded and shadowed area. The horizontal lines would be prominent just as cables on the bridge stand out. He told Mr. Dawson that the whole idea of verticality is what he wanted to ask him about. He asked Mr. Dawson why remove the existing railings since they obviously carries over from the River Street Inn. The drawings show the River Street Inn; is this the same client?

Mr. Dawson answered that they are the landlord to his client. Therefore, it all was designed with the similar railing system throughout. He believes that the hotel, who is the owner of the building wants, and his client wants, a little bit of differentiation between Tubby's and the hotel. They were agreeable to change the railing system. He said frankly his client wants something that is a little more transparent. This is four inch pickets, 42 inches high right now. It is a steel fence and they felt the cable rail reflects more of an elegant kind of invisible line. Tubby's will be upgrading the restaurant to a little bit more fine dining and they felt it would be more compatible with this rather than the existing system.

Dr. Williams said the cable he guessed would be approximately the same thickness as the vertical.

Mr. Dawson answered no; nowhere close.

Dr. Williams asked if they were half inch.

Mr. Dawson answered that they are a little more than half inch pickets. He guessed they are five-eighths and four inches on center. But will be like a quarter inch cable.

Dr. Williams stated that they will be half the weight, but double the visible brightness.

Mr. Engle asked if they will be stainless or galvanized.

Mr. Dawson said they will be a coated steel. They are still looking at whether it will be stainless; they do make a coated steel which is obviously alot cheaper. But they are concerned about how it will hold up. His guess is, however, they will end up with the stainless steel.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dawson, therefore, the idea is to leave them kooking metallic so that they evoke the idea of cabling, but will not be transparent so that you could see through the railing.

Mr. Dawson stated that they want to change the top rail to an epoxy wood more substantial top rail than just the steel pipe rail. The epoxy will have a nice dark mahogany look that fits with the nautical theme.

Dr. Williams asked if there would be changes to the lower story.

Mr. Dawson said they don't have any say over the lower story.

Mr. Judson said the Board is only dealing with the second floor.

Mr. Dawson said regarding the signage, his client will engage Mr. Bean to do a more comprehensive signage submittal to staff. When they were reviewing the sign standards, they found that they are under considerably of what they can do. Therefore, they have a lot of room of what they can modify and upgrade, but they want permission to have Mr. Bean deal directly with staff on this.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if the signages are a part of this petition.

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioner has a small sign as a part of this package. However, what she is asking is that if the sign meets the standards, that the Board allow her to approve it. She cannot review it right now as she needs to see all the signage for the entire property to do the numbers.

Mr. Dawson stated that he proposes that they amend this and take it out. He would rather do it comprehensively through Doug Bean Signs. They thought it would be a good place for a sign, but they are not sign designers. Therefore, he suggested that part of the application be withdrawn.

Mr. Judson said this will be stipulated in the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Patrick Godley, downtown resident, stated that he is against the proposed cable railing. This is all one building and is really just one porch. The corrugated metal roof and the cable railing present this as a more modern, more marina looking building separate from this one building. He said this is all one porch coming together. There is also one upper porch for this entire building the way it looks to him now with the uniform railing throughout. The changes will take this a way. As the petitioner said, they are separating themselves from the River Street Inn, the metal roof and the cable railing may fit very well with the marina theme at Tubby's in Thunderbolt, but he does not believe it fits well with historic River Street.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said from past discussions, his feelings on corrugated roofing have been stated before. However, it is not in the ordinance and he does not believe that it is historically appropriate. Whether the addition is historically or not, the backdrop is an historic structure. Therefore, he believes it should be a historic roof if it is going to be put on there. A question of permanence is not for this Board to deal with. He believes it ought to be standing seam and the motion should state so. He said he is a little worried about

getting the old nautical theme. This is an historic district. He believes the continuity of the railings is nice; they can be painted a different color if they want to differentiate between the Inn and Tubby's.

Dr. Williams agreed with Ms. Ward about the condition of the existing canopy and he shares Mr. Engle's sentiments about corrugated metal. It is an industrial waterfront, but even industrial buildings would have had standing seam roofing on them. Some of the warehouses downtown have quite steeply pitched roofs, they are not all flat roofs. If his memory serves him correctly, the pitched elements have standing seams or at least you would expect it. The Board would have to ask that if this was a shed on a farm, then yes they could have a corrugated roof, but this is not that kind of circumstance. It has been dressed up with railings, but it sort of creates a mixed message that the part of the building has the older railings that are going in one direction, the nautical element with the cable interjects a very modernistic note. But, he has concerns about the orientation of the railings being horizontal rather vertical because the lines if you look in proportion to the windows and all the other railings.

Dr. Williams said he likes the idea of replacing the canopy with something he guessed more permanent. He said he is not entirely convinced that the cables are going to be more transparent because they are going to be more brightly metallic in his experience like the dark railings, although thicker vertical elements at 5/8 versus the 1/4 cabling. Bright elements tend to attract the eyes more than dark elements. Dr. Williams said, therefore, he believes that the silver metallic railing is not going to blend in as much as this railing does.

Ms. Ramsay said she shares Mr. Engle's views about the choice of the metal roofing and continuity of the railing at the bottom.

Mr. Engle asked if the new railing to meet Code would have to a foot higher. He asked what is the height.

Mr. Dawson answered 48.

Mr. Engle asked what is the height of the existing.

Mr. Dawson answered 48.

Mr. Engle asked if the new rail would remain the same thing.

Dr. Williams stated he had a question about the proposal to show the Board a sample. He said if this was the case, would this have to tabled?

Mr. Judson answered no. Motions can be made with stipulations.

Dr. Williams said he believed that under these circumstances if the Board is going to be basing the judgment on a sample, he did not want to approve something on the promise that it would look good.

Ms. Ward stated that she imagines this would be more significant and she hesitates to use

it as an example, but a similar treatment for a railing was approved on the Ryan building on the Bay Street elevation. It is for the entire row next to the new Bohemian. It is not yet fully completed as she does not believe that the wooden handrail is there, but the horizontal cables are there. The staff was looking at a more contemporary design as opposed to a nautical theme.

Dr. Williams stated that Bay Street side is a five story elevation. He said the sample is not about the railing, but what Mr. Dawson proposed about the roof sample.

Mr. Engle stated he believes that the Board knows the difference corrugated and standing seams; he did not see that the Board waiting to see a sample of corrugated would make a difference.

Dr. Henry stated that he had the same concerns about chopping up the building, which is a handsome old building with different railings, and with the horizontalness. He does not feel as strongly about the roof, but likes the idea of a roof rather than an awning.

Ms. Ramsay asked for clarification if they can just disregard the Secretary's of Interior Standards on the roofing and select a corrugated roofing.

Mr. Engle answered that it is not the Secretary's Interior Standards, but it is their own Historic Ordinance that does not approve corrugated roofing. He stated that the way this is now, he cannot support the roofing or the railing.

Mr. Gay said the Board would need to rephrase the entire thing. They would need to say that they want the roof to be standing seam, approve it this way and that the railings not be changed at all. This ought to be what they are talking about now which is the opposite of what the petitioner is proposing.

Mr. Judson said this seemingly is the Board's sentiment, but he believes it is fair to let Mr. Dawson respond to this.

Mr. Dawson stated that if he could propose a resolution, they would do a standing seam metal roof and retain the existing railing. However, it is frustrating for him as the designer that this Board has become somewhat of a design board rather than a review board. He gets his hand slapped when he does something that looks somewhat historic and when he does something contemporary, he gets his hands slapped also. Therefore, he is a bit confused coming to this Board; he does not really know what the expectation is anymore. But, they will modify as has been suggested.

Ms. Ramsay told Mr. Dawson that under corrugated roofing he might want to read the Standards.

Mr. Dawson stated that he agrees, but putting a standing seam metal roof on a new addition is trying to make it look like an old standing seam metal roof. Although it is in the ordinance, it is not something that is in the Secretary of Interior Standards. Nevertheless, he respectfully requests that they modify the standing seam and keep the existing railing.

Mr. Judson explained that the petitioner has expressed that he would be willing to follow the Board's suggestion regarding the roofing material with the approval of the awning

architectural changes and will be willing to retain the existing railing. He said withdraw this modification from the motion, if this is in fact how the Board proposes to move at this point.

Dr. Henry stated that he believes that there are two major elements. One is the roof and the other is the railing.

Mr. Gay stated that the petitioner is saying that he will change both of them. He will change the roof to a standing seam and will not change the railing.

Mr. Judson stated that he believes Mr. Dawson would prefer to proceed with the proposed railing as presented in their petition, but that if in fact it is worded in the Board's motion that they do not accept the change or do not approve the change to the railing, he is amendable to accepting this reluctantly.

Dr. Williams said he was not a part of the Board when the other railing was approved beside the Bohemian. His opinion is based on the assumption of how this would look and the drawings are not doing justice. Black lines on white paper as opposed to how the dynamics of these materials are going to work. This is a different railing and he did not know if it would be beneficial to have an opportunity to look at another railing or even see photos of that railing.

Mr. Gay asked if this railing is objectionable of what they already have.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Gay if he was speaking about the existing railing.

Mr. Gay answered yes.

Dr. Williams said evidentially the petitioner finds it worthy of replacing it, but the Board's job is to make a determination that whether what is being proposed for replacement is compatible. He does not know what the other one looks like. Some one at some point said it can be done elsewhere in the district, but he had no part of the other Board's decision. Dr. Williams said he is sensitive to a designer's frustration that how can it happen several hundred feet away.

Mr. Gay explained that it is a different setting. There are two stories versus five stories.

Mr. Engle said the other is not a historic building.

Ms. Simpson stated that she does not have an issue with the design of the rail. She has an issue with the continuity, even though the spot is not necessarily in front of tables, however a lot of folks that are there for Tubby's wait there. This space is, therefore, technically used for Tubby's.

Dr. Williams stated that in other words for the sake of continuity, in Ms. Simpson's opinion if all of it was replaced.

Ms. Simpson said she understood that there is a difference between the Inn portion versus the public.

Mr. Judson said he was looking at this from all angles. He appreciates Mr. Godley's comments regarding the continuity of the rail and it seems to have struck a note with the Board. He said that doing the modification to the railing, Mr. Dawson proposed to bring it all the way over to the stairwell. This would make it inclusive of the entire span as opposed to just differentiation.

Mr. Dawson stated this is a part of the hotel's entrance and the hotel is more concerned about maintaining the continuity on their part of the building because of the balconies. He believes that the hotel would be reluctant to modifying the rail.

Ms. Simpson asked if this was the main entrance.

Mr. Dawson stated that he would not call it the main entrance, but it is the "main entrance" from River Street to the Inn. There is also an access below and this door is used often.

Mr. Judson asked if he was correct that the span of the porch is opened so that people going to Tubby's go this way.

Mr. Dawson answered yes. This is the only way up to Tubby's.

Mr. Gay said continuity is one element of wanting to keep this. But, he likes what is there now better than what is being proposed.

Ms. Simpson said technically, it still meets the standards.

Dr. Williams stated if the current railing was historic, they could say that it should not be removed, but this is not an historic railing.

Mr. Gay stated again that the petitioner is saying he is willing to leave it there.

Mr. Dawson said at this point, he would say that he prefers to leave it that way. It is not that big of a deal to his client.

Board Action:

Approve to replace the awning with a wood frame canopy structure and install new decking with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval: 1. Install standing seam metal roof; 2. Retain the existing railing; and 3. Provide colors for canopy framing. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle

- Aye

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects - H-10-4290-2 - 532 Indian Street - Alterations and additions](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Patrick Phelps was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Judson disclosed that his wife works at SCAD in a non-management capacity. She does not discuss his decisions with him nor does he feel that his wife's position at SCAD is in any way affected by his decision on this project.

Dr. Williams is employed at SCAD and completed the Conflict of Interest form. He recused himself from participation in this matter.

Mr. Hutchinson has retired from SCAD.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and stair additions. The building is not listed as an historic structure. An encroachment agreement from the City of Savannah may be required for any projections onto the right-of-way along River Street. These projections are compatible with the existing building and help to emphasize new points of entry. A series of angled parking spaces are adjacent to the sidewalk at this location.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the exterior alterations and stair additions as proposed with the condition that they submit the storefront manufacturer to staff and if an encroachment agreement is needed, that the petitioner work with the City to get it.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps stated that he had the cut sheets for the window storefront with him that was requested by staff. He gave the cut sheets to the Board and stated that on page 2 there is a profile of standard aluminum storefront by Kawneer. The measurements are five inches deep and two and one-half inches wide. Mr. Phelps said this is typical to what has been installed on the second floor and also installed on the first level of Indian Street entrance.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Phelps if his intention is to use tinted reflective glass.

Mr. Phelps answered no. It will be clear glazing.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for alterations and additions as submitted. An encroachment agreement from the City of Savannah may be required for any projections onto the right-of-way. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Abstain

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

13. [Petition of Rhondda Netherton - H- 10- 4277\(S\)-2 324 Price Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4277\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4277\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

14. [Petition of Jeanne Fullam for Coastal Heritage Society - H- 10- 4278\(S\)-2 - 650 West Jones](#)

Street - Roof Repair (Paint Shop)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4278\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4278\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:
Second:

15. Petition of Jennifer Baughman for Coastal Canvas - H-10-4280(S)-2 - 1 East Broughton Street - Awning

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4280\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4280\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:
Second:

16. Petition of Chesapeake Construction H - 10 - 4281(S)-2 -7 E. Congress Street - Color Change to ATM

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4281\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4281\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:
Second:

17. Petition of Daniel Raskin - H-10-4282(S)-2 - 15 West York Street - Window/Door

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4282\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4282\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:
Second:

18. [Petition of Sign Mart - H-10-4284\(S\)- 202 West Bay Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4284\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:
Second:

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements

19. [Acknowledged](#)

Mr. Judson thanked the Board for their participation in the annual retreat. He especially wanted to thank Board Member Engle for his insightful presentation. He wanted to echo Mr. Engle's comments that they as students on an ongoing educational process, make every effort to avail themselves of not only of the handout that Mr. Engle passed out, but also the other publications from the Secretary of Interior Standards and their own standards. In doing this, it will ensure that they are up to date on the policies that they are adjudicating.

Ms. Ward congratulated Ms. Simpson on her upcoming addition to her family. Ms. Simpson is expecting that the baby will be born in January, 2011.

Ms. Ward reported that next week, August 19, is the deadline for projects to be heard by the Board at the September 8 meeting. At this time, she will know what the agenda will look like for that meeting. However, she spoke with Ms. Charlotte Moore, the Special Projects Coordinator for the Unified Zoning Ordinance (UZO), and she would like to be placed on the Board's agenda at the September meeting to introduce the Board to this project and talk about how the Board can get more involved with the changes that are forthcoming regarding the ordinance.

Mr. Judson reminded the Board that this item was on their Annual Retreat agenda, but time did not allow them to address it at the retreat. It is vital that they have the UZO presentation.

Ms. Ward reported that there are two upcoming training events. Unfortunately, we don't have any funding, but if the Board is interested in attending the training, she will be happy to help them coordinate this. The National Trust Conference will be held at the end of October in Austin, TX and the Georgia Alliance of Preservation Commission training will be held November 5 and 6. The location has not been selected yet, but will be held in northern Georgia. Ms. Ward said she informed the Commission that MPC used to provide funding for two people to attend the conference, but had to suspend this. They are looking at may be holding the next training event in Savannah.

Mr. Judson stated that he has been fortunate to attend one of the conferences and not only was the material presented very educational, but the chance to talk with others from other communities was very helpful.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the public is able to access the MPC site prior to the meetings to see the submittals.

Ms. Ward answered yes; the individual could have contacted her before the meeting and she would have told her how to access the agenda. This is why the agenda is posted on the website.

Mr. Engle stated he was somewhat mystified by the petitioner's comment that this Board is becoming more and more a design review team. He thought that a part of their job is to review the design.

Mr. Judson stated that he believes where it becomes that line is "visual compatibility" and this is what the Historic District Board of Review is determining. Obviously, they are not here to set policies nor consult on initial designs and concepts. He believes, however, there is always that fine line when they are addressing a project for visual compatibility. What has really come up in the past when they had continued petitions and they have had petitioners come back again, the Board needs to be consistent. The Board does not need to come back with more suggestions on a second meeting. They need to be clear and thorough on their first meeting so that they don't become some sort of designing on these project.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she believes the problem is that not all review boards in past times have been as equally concerned with the details. She believes that the petitioner may have been accustom to not having to answer as completely as now.

Mr. Thomson said it has been a problem with this Board in the past and he asked that they ask themselves this question as they make reviews in the future, "Is what is being proposed allowed from whatever perspective they are looking at?" If it is, "Are you commenting that you would prefer a different design than what the architect who is putting some time into it suggesting? Mr. Thomas stated that this is the only difference. Maybe the tin roof versus standing seam might have been a legitimate discussion. Mr. Thomson said he is not trained in

this; therefore, he does not know. This will draw a line for them - don't substitute your design for the architect's design when both are allowed.

Mr. Judson said Mr. Thomson makes a valid point, but they have another example also where they do have some responsibility to the public in their part of opening it up to the public so they can hear their comments. Mr. Judson believes at this point they become some what facilitators for those comments and addressing the petitioner in terms of their flexibilities.

Mr. Thomson stated even then is the public speaker substituting his preference. This is not a part of the purview of this Board.

Dr. Williams stated that the discussion pertaining to the railing was completely about compatibility. Granted the part of the building that the railing is situated on is a non-historic, but is going to frame a historic building. Dr. Williams said his thought is that on one hand he wants modern design in Savannah, but the question is, is it the right place. The other situation that was mentioned is different. It is a long, low horizontal building. Therefore, those of them who are involved in the framing of the zoning guidelines and went through hours and hours discussing about how one thing sits beside another was about issues of visual compatibility, scale, mass, and rhythm detailing. He said this struck a cord with him based on their discussion. It would trigger a sort of visual incompatibility issues. They must then weigh this versus condoning and being open to modern design. He wants to respect the opportunity of the architect to design, but as has been said, if it conforms. The gray area was, therefore, strictly speaking it is not a historic railing now and they are replacing it with a different design, but the standard for him is if the element affects how the Board reviews the rest of the historic fabric then it becomes a compatibility issue and is within the Board's purview. Dr. Williams asked if this was a fair interpretation of the standards.

Mr. Thomson said he was only throwing out a test for the Board to consider. People come before this Board with all sort of backgrounds and the architect has a background not necessarily in historic preservation. He just wants the Board to be aware of the overall demeanor and purpose of how they are dealing with these issues and are not changing their opinion for someone else's.

Mr. Judson believes that Mr. Thomson point is well taken. There needs to be a litmus test for each of them to hold themselves to regarding their comments and discussion. Ultimately, if something passes it passes; if it is compliant, then it's compliant.

Dr. Williams said if there was no other railings on the building; it was just a brick wall and they were coming in with a proposal to put a deck with the horizontal railing, there were not balconies and the River Street Inn railing is not already here, he would have been fine with it. But, this was creating a visual conflict. This sounds like what the member of the public believed, too.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

20. [Adjourned](#)

There being no other business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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