



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
February 10, 2010 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

FEBRUARY 10, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Members Not Present: Sidney Johnson, Vice-Chair

MPC Staff Present: Thomas Thomson, Executive Director
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director, AICP
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner, LEED AP
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Call to Order](#)

Mr. Judson called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [January 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [01-13-10 Minutes.pdf](#)

Upon motion of Mr. Engle, seconded by Mr. Hutchinson and carried, the minutes of the meeting of January 13, 2010 were approved with the revision of changing Ms. Simpson's last name from **White** to **Simpson**.

Board Action:

Approve January 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

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

3. [Continued Petition of Phillip R. McCorkle - H-09-4179-2 - 319 Tattnall Street - New Construction Part I - Height and Mass](#)

Board Action:

Remove item from final agenda application withdrawn by petitioner. - 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

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams

- Aye

IV. SIGN POSTING

4. Signs

Ms. Ramsay stated that she did not see a sign posted at 310 Alice Street, but the staff has informed her that the signs were posted. Mr. Gay said he did not see a sign on East Oglethorpe Avenue, but it could have been there. Mr. Engle stated that he went by 310 Alice Street twice. A sign was posted on the side near the parking lot. Ms. Reiter stated that the signs were posted and the petitioner is present. The staff has pictures that the signs were posted.

Mr. Leon Quilloin, petitioner for 310 Alice Street, stated that the signs were posted. The church held Bible study last night and the signs were posted.

Ms. Kathleen Bemis, petitioner for 113 East Oglethorpe Avenue, stated that her signs were posted. One is posted in the back towards the alley and the other is posted on Floyd Street side. They were told that the two doors to the entrance of the courtyard needed to have signage.

Ms. Ramsay believes that in both cases, the signs were not placed on the front of the building, but on the side or the back of the building. She asked if the regulations states that the signs should be posted on the front and the in the back of the building. Are the petitioners instructed to where the signs should be posted.

Ms. Reiter stated that the regulations says, "Within any traveled public right-of-way or lane." If the proposed action is visible from a lane, then a sign is posted in the lane and in this case it was also posted on the Floyd Street side. 310 Alice Street had a sign posted on the front and near the parking lot. She said the regulations state "traveled right-of-way."

Mr. Judson clarified that this means where the project is visible and not necessarily the property's address. He believes that the Bemis's property is a good example. They have two rights-of-way where the project is visible, but neither is visible from Oglethorpe Avenue side.

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

5. Petition of Richard O. Mitchell - H-09-4196-2 - 625 Tattnall Street - Fence - Continue to March 10, 2010 at petitioner's request

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of March 10, 2010 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

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

6. [Petition of Haberdashery Eco-Fashion Supply-Katie Wells and Ashley Newsome-H-10-4211-2-2 - 25 West Broughton Street-Sign and color - Continue to March 10, 2010 at petitioner's request.](#)

Attachment: [Presentation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Continue to March 10, 2010 at petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

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

7. [Petition of Stratton and Mary Leopold - H-10-4212-2 - 720-722 Habersham Street - Alteration - Continue to March 10, 2010 at petitioner's request](#)

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

Board Action:

Continue to March 10, 2010 at petitioner's request - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Robin Williams

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

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

8. [Petition of The Spriggs Group, P.C.-Kenneth Spriggs-H-10-4214-2-211 East York Street-Garage door and opening](#)

Attachment: [Elevation.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Existing photos.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval to add a garage opening and two new overhead garage doors. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Richard Law, Sr	- Not Present
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

9. [Petition of Mark and Kathleen Bemis, Amended - H-09-4185-2 - 113 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Rear Porch addition](#)

Attachment: [Revised elevations.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Recommendation Feb 10, 20102.pdf](#)

Ms. Reiter gave the staff report. The application has been amended. The applicant is requesting approval to demolish an existing rear deck built in 2003 and replace with a larger covered porch. The new porch will be 18 feet, 2.5 inches long x 13 feet, 1 and 3/16 inches wide. The porch is supported by stucco masonry piers which mostly are obscured from the public right-of-way. Some of the piers existed from the previous porch that was built in 2003. Existing balusters on site will be reused on the rear porch; they do vary slightly in design from the original balusters. The drawings have been revised to reflect this. The columns are eight inches square and the caps will be varied slightly from the original columns by the elimination of an intermediate molding. Additionally, the middle column on the south elevation will be eliminated. This is a rear covered porch and obliquely visible from Oglethorpe Avenue to a pedestrain traveling west. From Floyd Street, one can see the top of it. However, Floyd Street is rarely used except by the Fire Department. The petitioner has met twice with the Historic Savannah Foundation and arrived at the current submittal. The standards have been met and the staff recommends approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Bemis was present for the petition. She stated that she met with Mr. Carey and Mr. Dirk Hardison. They took a field trip to her house at 113 East Oglethorpe Avenue and got to view the addition. Mr. Hardison noticed that the balusters on the existing porch that was built seven (7) years ago actually differentiated from the balusters that are on the existing home. They also looked at the columns. She stated that the Board asked that the columns be differentiated; therefore, they decided to remove the intermediate molding as detailed on the pictures and they also decided to remove a column that was facing the lane to give them better visibility.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

Board Action:

Approval of rear porch addition. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Dale Echnoz, Architectural Construction Service, Inc. for Starbucks Coffee Company - H- 4207-2 - 1 East Broughton Street - Signs, Awnings and material change](#)

Attachment: [Historic District Board of Review Starbucks.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Revised plan and elevations.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation Revised.pdf](#)

Ms. Reiter gave the staff report. The applicant requests approval to cover the existing concrete ceiling over recessed corner seating area with random width white oak tongue and groove white oak planks. They are seeking approval to also install two hanging lanterns in this area with Walnut Patina Finish Basilica Outdoor Lighting by Savoy House Lighting Company. The applicant is requesting to projecting internally illuminated logo disk signs on the Broughton and Bull facades at either edge of the recessed opening. The signs will be 2 foot diameter circles projecting less than 3 feet from the building elevation; install LEED Certification plaques on outside faces of corner column; install Sunbrella black canvas awnings with White block letter "Starbuck Coffee." Ms. Reiter stated that a question needs to be asked of the petitioner whether these awnings are going to be longer than the existing awnings. There is a sign area above the existing awnings and a question is whether the awnings are going to extend up to the top of the sign area. The existing signage on the building that is in the sign area "Starbucks Coffee" will need to be removed. The petitioner is also requesting to install interior wood blinds in the storefront windows. The blinds in the Eastern-most window will be permanently closed to mask a storage room area. The closed blinds are in lieu of blackout film which is not permitted on storefront windows. Ms. Reiter said the staff recommends approval of the awnings, signage and ceiling changes.

Mr. Engle stated that he had a general question. He read on page 29 that the new code says, "Awnings shall be integrated structurally and architecturally in the design of the facade and not obscured character defining features of a historic facade." He said no matter what they may think Altmayer is still an historic facade. Now, at the moment the Altmayer building is treated as one historic facade. There are identical awnings that are coming up to a set height across the entire elevation of the building. This will change that as it will introduce two awnings that will go up to the higher cornice.

Ms. Reiter stated that this would need to be clarified by the petitioner.

Mr. Engle stated they were no longer treating the facade as a unified building, but as separate little sub-structure. He was not sure if this was the intent of the code.

Ms. Reiter said it is not a historic facade, but as Mr. Engle stated it is one building with a

unified facade.

Dr. Williams asked that if the facade is not historic, does the statement read by Mr. Engle from the new code apply.

Ms. Reiter said the building is definitely not a historic facade.

Dr. Williams wanted to know if coverings over the facade would meet the standard of significant architectural contributing details of the facade. He believes the bigger issue is the altering of the harmony of awnings.

Mr. Gay said the requested awnings are definitely different than what is presently on the building. He stated that if the awnings are going to be on Broughton and Bull Streets, then it definitely differentiates Starbuck from other tenants downstairs. Therefore, this may not be bad to have varying awnings. This is a completely different store.

Ms. Reiter said since it has been brought up, there is another question. There are piers that go up to the cross-banding where the signage is presently. But, as she sees now, the awning will cover a double window and pier. They have in the past requested that awnings be within the piers so that the verticality of the storefront shows through. Therefore, this might be another clarification that the petitioner would need to address.

Dr. Williams stated that all the awnings are the same width. The first bay where the door is located, there is no central pier just the major piers. A minor pier is covered up by the present awning.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dale Echnoz was present for the petition. He clarified that the Starbucks' design department intended to have the awnings as shown. If this is something that needs to be changed, he will take it back to the Corporate office.

Dr. Williams asked if the two new awnings are just for the two bays on the Broughton Street side.

Mr. Echnoz said the awnings will be only for Starbucks.

Dr. Williams stated, therefore, there will be a difference in other awnings down the street. He believed that Starbucks is the only visible tenant on Bull Street. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Echnoz if the requested design would have more vertical presence by going up to the belt course instead of stopping where the present awnings are placed.

Mr. Echnoz stated that he was not involved in this decision.

Mr. Engle stated that the requested awnings are significantly shallower than the existing awnings. They are only 18 inches as opposed to three or four feet.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Echnoz if he would be able to answer why this was done.

Mr. Echnoz said he could not answer why this was done.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation questioned why Starbucks is requesting two illuminated logo disk signs. Mr. Carey asked that other than advertisement, is it necessary to have two signs. He wanted to be clear on whether one sign is for Broughton Street and the other sign is for Bull Street. He said the request reads, "Install LEED Certification plaques on outside faces of corner column." Mr. Carey asked if they need more than one LEED certification plaque. He believes that it is commendable that the building would be LEED certified, but he was wondering if all the applique is necessary. It appears that a considerable amount of attention is being given to the underside of the ceiling portion in the entrance area. Currently, the concrete and cement surface where you actually enter is deplorable. It is a mixed of stained concrete and other materials. He was wondering if this would be improved. It all seems to be within the footprint of Starbucks, but he was wondering if Starbucks would spend any attention or resources on improving this when they seem to be spending a lot of time on a ceiling that he does not know if people will notice or appreciate. As you enter the area you are really walking over something that does not look pleasant. He believes that pavers would help this tremendously.

Ms. Reiter explained that the corner buildings on Broughton Street are permitted signs on both the Bull Street and Broughton Street sides. Because if the sign is on the Broughton Street side you would not see it from Bull Street and vice versa. Consequently, this is a common placement of signage. This building has two signs now.

Mr. Brice Bounds of the Spriggs Group stated in a previous firm he was faced with a similar project where they were changing awnings on a historic facade in Key West, FL and by volunteering to replace the additional awnings on the building with a similar style, they were able to win approval. He knows the additional is an increase in construction cost, but it preserves the uniform look.

Mr. Bill Steube, downtown resident, stated that, he, too, would be in favor of maintaining the uniform look of the awnings on the facade. Mr. Steube believes this is an important aspect to the overall look of the building. to break it up into the many different kinds of awnings would lead to visual chaos later.

Mr. Judson informed the petitioner that he believes he understood that there would be some willingness on his part and his client's part to consider the redesign of the awning.

Mr. Echnoz said they would reconsider the redesigning of the awning.

Mr. Judson said comments were made about the floor and entrance area. He asked Mr. Echnoz if he had any plans or comments on this.

Mr. Echnoz stated that this was not included on the plan. He will take this back to Corporate and inform them of this matter.

Mr. Engle said awnings in the past served a practical purpose and they still do if they are deep enough to keep people out of the sun and rain. But, today it appears that awnings are

just becoming an architectural hang-on that will not serve a purpose. He said an awning 18 inches will not keep you dry. Particularly, at the cafeteria area, they have a 4 foot overhang beyond the building and 18 inches will reduce it significantly. Mr. Engle asked Mr. Echnoz if there is a reason that they are going to awnings that are really no longer awnings.

Mr. Echnoz answered that he believes they were trying to mimic the Panera Bread that is directly across Bull Street. This is the same style of awning. He could not speak to what is the projection of this, but his understanding as he stated, is they were trying to get the awnings similar to Panera Bread.

Mr. Engle stated that Panera did so purposely as they did not want people standing in front of their windows.

Mr. Echnoz stated that presently their outdoor seating area extends to Broughton Street and they have a couple of tables here now. But, the new design shows what is to be presented with the old ceiling. They are not showing any tables along Broughton Street. Therefore, this could shed some light on it. They were not planning on the awnings protecting the seating area.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Echnoz to ask Corporate why they do not have more functional awnings.

Ms. Reiter commented that the Panera's awnings do not provide coverage for the pedestrian. The photos show the pedestrians standing under the bus shelter. Panera's awnings are very shallow, but they do extend below the horizontal signage area.

Dr. Henry asked the staff if it would not be for the public's betterment to have some sort of guidelines for deep awnings in the future. This would provide more shade for the people.

Ms. Reiter stated that the guidelines have a maximum, but not a minimum because it probably depends on the sidewalk width, encroachment, etc. She said the petitioner could just recover the existing awnings and it would simply be a color change on the staff level.

Dr. Henry stated that he did not know if they would need some sort of numeric minimum, but perhaps a sentence that says they favor awnings that work for the public good in terms of keeping them out of the elements.

Mr. Judson stated that Dr. Henry's point is well taken, but they need to confine their comments to the specifics of this project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he would be willing to sponsor a resolution that Starbucks recover the existing frames and approve everything else. The color is irrelevant to him; he did not believe that they are to deal with color.

Mr. Gay asked if this was done, would the round protruding sign be removed from the building. Would it be brought down.

Mr. Engle believes the petitioner would have to bring the sign down two feet.

Ms. Ramsay assumed that this is why these were flat as opposed to looking at Panera's.

Dr. Williams asked if there are any guideline preference in the past regarding interior illuminated signs versus opaque materials with traditional lights that beam onto these signs.

Mr. Judson stated that we have a complete set of sign standards for Broughton Street as opposed to the rest of the Historic District just as River Street and Factors Walk have their own sign ordinance.

Ms. Reiter stated that illuminated and neon signs are permitted on Broughton Street, it is a commercial corridor. Ms. Ramsay said if the top of the awning was low as it is now, the sign would still be visible. Ms. Ramsay stated she believes instead of getting a motion today, the petitioner probably needs to bring back answers to the questions that have been raised.

Ms. Simpson said they did not discuss the lanterns that are being proposed to be located inside the porch area. She did not know how low the lanterns would hang from the ceiling. One lantern will hang in front of the entrance.

Mr. Echnoz said the lanterns would hang seven to nine inches.

Dr. Williams wanted to know why Starbucks is removing the tables along Broughton Street side in the second bay, left-hand side, by the window. It appears to him that Starbucks would be interested in having as many outdoor tables and provide street life. With smaller awnings it would make it less functional.

Mr. Judson said Dr. Williams has a valid consideration, but this is not a part of their purview. Removable tables are not a part of architectural element.

Mr. Judson advised Mr. Echnoz that there were a lot of unanswered questions regarding the project. He could either push the HBR to make a motion to approve or disapprove the request; or they could approve it with specific stipulations. However, what he sensed is that the HBR is wondering if he would ask for a continuance and address the questions that have been raised today at a later meeting.

Mr. Echnoz asked for a continuance so he could meet with the Corporate Office and get answers to the questions that have come forth.

Mr. Judson stated that there are three elements for the Corporate Office to reconsider. They are the depth and height of the awnings; the continuity of the awnings with the rest of the building; and also Historic Savannah Foundation raised a valid point about the entrance obviously which had not been considered, but he believes it would be important for the petitioner to include in their next presentation.

Ms. Reiter stated the request that awnings on other people's businesses be changed to match Starbucks is not the purview of HBR.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of March 10, 2010 per petitioner's request. - 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

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

11. [Petition of Leon Quillion for First Tabernacle Missionary Baptist Church-H-10-4208-2-310 Alice Street-Roof Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Aerials.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Elevations and materials.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Truss system and Plan.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Ms. Reiter gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting an alteration to the roof and new roof covering for the First Tabernacle Baptist Missionary Church at 310 Alice Street. The applicant proposes to raise the roof from a flat deck to a gable that will come under the eave of the steeple and re-roof in red brick metal seam roof by Millennium Metals. The staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Reiter if she knows whether the church has always had the profile roof or if the flat part of the roof is a transformation of an earlier roof.

Ms. Reiter did not know about the roof makeup.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Leon Quillion was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Engle wanted to know if the steeple will be recovered.

Mr. Quillion answered that the steeple will be done in red as the roof.

Ms. Simpson asked if the roof has always been flat.

Mr. Quillion stated that that the roof has always been flat. The building is 101 years old and if they were not experiencing a problem with it leaking, they would not have had to request the alterations to the roof.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they were interested in knowing whether the steeple would match the roofing materials. He said it appears that it is more a prefab metal roof. The HSF recommends a standing seam sheet metal roof of a true full form architectural seam with no intermediate ribs. From the drawings it was unclear to them how this would be achieved on the long span of 80 feet. This may be the entire length of the building. They also wanted to be sure that the front elevation would retain its current look. They don't want to lose the front profile which is the small elevation underneath the steeple and be sure that wide hip roof is retained. This is a character of the defining element of the building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle, after reviewing the roof sample material the staff had on file, informed Mr. Carey that the grooves are 5-V.

Ms. Ramsay said she was concerned that the partial side elevation is not correctly drawn. The roof will come across diagonally and, therefore, the steeple will not look as it does now. It will not be the nice steeple elevation that they see now. The roof would have to curve across.

Mr. Gay stated the roof line would have to be changed, but just bring it down, they will have a little bit of a flat roof but it will have a sloop to it. Leave the top elevation as it is now.

Dr. Williams said what is here now is historic fabric. Changing the profile of the roof would be more injurious to the fabric than just piggy backing on top of it. He said he trust the profile would remain the same.

Mr. Quillion stated that the profile will remain as is.

Dr. Williams said the roof could be continued to a point. He said the roof is coming down a bevelled part of the steeple. Would this be visible from anything but an aerial view as it is behind the steeple.

Ms. Ramsay believes it will be visible from Montgomery Street.

Mr. Engle said the entire elevation will be seen from street. He said that the HBR does not have a purview with color, but the red bothers him as it will be visible. He was wishing that it would be a little bit more subtle.

Dr. Williams asked what color is the roof now.

Mr. Engle said the roof is grayish now. A light patina green would be fine.

Mr. Quillion said they don't have a problem with the color. They just want to fix the roof.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Carey if his concern about the metal roof is shown in the profile.

Mr. Carey said it is described as an "M" seam.

Dr. Williams said he did not know if Mr. Carey has looked at the company, Millennium Metal and looked at some of their other products that come close to what he was commenting on. He said that Mr. Carey made the comment that it looked industrial. There is another one shown that he believes Mr. Carey might have in mind, called the 5- V crimp.

Mr. Carey said this might just be a usage term, but the "M" sort of crimp is not as tight, strong, and standing as a true "V." Therefore, this was portrayed as an M seam panel and they are 16 inches a part. He believes that may be 12 to 15 inches might be a more traditional distance between what they call a true standing seam or V. He did not check the site to see what others might be available.

Ms. Simpson asked at this point, "Does it become a personal preference?"

Mr. Engle stated that a 22 inch panell is common, but 16 is common also. Actually, the 5-V is the same thing.

Mr. Carey stated that he believes the roof line is a major feature and there is certainly a lot of it. The church obviously wants to do what is best, what will look best and serve the building's integrity.

Board Action:

Approval to alter roof shape and re-roof with the stipulation to meet with staff on the final design detail of the v-crimp and color of the roof. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Richard Law, Sr

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams

- Aye

12. [Petition of Steve Cook - H-10-4209-2 - 540 East Gordon Street - Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for a second story addition on the rear of the building at 540 East Gaston Street. The addition is to be located above a one-story addition that is already existing on the property. There will be no change in foot print of lot coverage on the parcel. It is 12' deep and 22' wide in keeping with the existing foot print. The applicant is proposing a flat roof with a slight slope of 1/8:12 below the historic roofline on the primary portion of the building. The applicant is also proposing wood clapboard siding to match the existing in profile and color (green). The new window openings will contain one-over-one double-hung Spanish cedar sashes with single pane low-e glass. Original window pattern is six-over-six. Pine trim to match the existing trim is proposed. This is a historic residence constructed in 1884 and is rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The lot coverage requirements do not apply and the staff believes the addition is clearly differentiated from the main structure. It meets all the standards in the ordinance. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Steve Cook was present for the petition.

Dr. Williams said the petitioner will lose some head room on the second floor. He asked the petitioner if the owner thought about following the same pitch of roof line, but at a lower spot on the addition.

Mr. Cook stated that originally they looked at this, but they were not able to make it work according to the code. If they put enough pitch on the roof to make it similar the interior elevation would not meet the code.

Mr. Gay asked if the petitioner if he came with the existing roof and kept the same line, would it drop it too low.

Mr. Cook said their architect tried, but could not to anything else that would be appropriate.

Dr. Williams asked if the code required a certain interior height.

Mr. Cook answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked the petitioner why the roof is not projecting out as far as the main roof.

Mr. Cook said this is what the architect came up with. However, this will make the roof look better, it would easy for them to do.

Mr. Engle said it would be a simple overhang.

Dr. Henry said the windows upstairs are blank. He wanted to know if the windows will match what is here now.

Mr. Cook said they will be one-over-one.

Dr. Williams asked is there an as-is rear view of this property.

Ms. Ward stated that the bottom photo shows the back addition. It does not back up to a lane therefore it is not relatively visible from the right-of-way.

Dr. Williams asked if the original windows are on the second floor.

Mr. Cook answered that this is what is here now, but he did not believe that these are the original windows.

Mr. Gay asked if the windows matches the other windows in the house.

Mr. Cook answered yes.

Mr. Gay asked if the new windows would match the old windows.

Mr. Cook that this is the way it is drawn.

Dr. Williams asked why not recycle the three windows.

Mr. Engle said they don't want the windows to match.

Mr. Cook said they need to differentiate the addition.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Cook if there was a way they could retain the corky cornice from the first floor addition that protrudes. This is a characteristic feature.

Mr. Cook said they could easily provide the same overhang that is on the existing addition or something that would come closely to it.

Mr. Engle said keep what's here. This is the historic fabric. There is no reason the petitioner could not build up to second floor and keep the roof cornice. It extends out about 18 inches.

Ms. Ramsay asked how the rainwater is handled. It does not appear that gutters are here, but a downspout.

Mr. Cook stated that he does not believe there is a gutter on the house now. He believes that there is a diverter over the back door.

Dr. Henry said over time there will probably be problems with the flat roof; he has not seen one that has not leaked.

Mr. Cook said it will be a vinyl project, but they will have it pitched to the point where it will runoff in the proper direction. It is basically one piece material.

Ms. Ward recommended that further research on the rear existing addition be done to see if it is actually historic. If it is not historic it would be a lot of trouble for them to do in asking them to save it.

Mr. Overton asked if there are other flat roof houses in this area.

Ms. Ward said she did not pull an aerial view on the site as the photos the petitioner provided were more than adequate for the review.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation said the mullion between the two center windows needs a ratio, otherwise the 3.5 verticality would be lost if the mullion is not wide enough. It appears now as one wide picture window. They just wanted to be sure the ratio was maintained.

Ms. Ward stated that it is not a street fronting elevation; therefore, it was not put to that test. However, she did not think it would be visible from the right-of-way. It does not necessarily have to meet that test.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said the side elevation can be seen from the right-of-way, but he did not believe the rear elevation can be seen as there is not a lane in the back and would not be seen from any public right-of-way. Therefore, he did not believe this comes under their purview.

Board Action:

Approval of the addition as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Nay

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

13. [Petition of MKW Construction, LLC - H-10-4203\(S\)-2 - 114 West Liberty Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

14. [Petition of Michael Williamson - H-10-4205\(S\)-2 - 622 Drayton Street - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

15. [Petition of Kern Coleman - H-10-4206\(S\)-2 - 322 East Broughton Street - Secure Property](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

16. [I-16 Exit Ramp Removal Study Charrette](#)

Mr. Judson stated that public forums both education and commentary will be held on the I-16 Exit Ramp Remove Study Charrette on February, 17, 18, and 19, 2010 at the Con-Ed Building Ballroom at 714 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. February 17 is the Opening Night: Kick-off Presentation, Goals and Visions from 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 pm. The Expo hours: February 18: 9:00 am to 5:30 pm and February 19: 9:00 am to 5:30 pm. Please call Ellen Harris at 651-1482 or Lise Sundrla at 651-6973 for additional information.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

17. [Historic District Ordinance \(Section 8-3030\), Update](#)

Attachment: [Presentation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HD Ordinance 8-3030.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward gave the update on the Historic District Ordinance.

Ms. Reiter announced her intention to retire as of April 6, 2010 after 25 years with MPC and 41 years overall in preservation in Savannah. The HBR extended congratulations to Ms. Reiter and thanked her for the many years of dedicated services. She will be missed.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

18. Adjourned

There being no further business to come before the HBR, Chairman Judson adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Beth Reiter
Preservation Director

BR: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.