



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
January 13, 2010 - 2:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

JANUARY 13, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

MPC Staff Present: 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. [Order and Welcome](#)

Mr. Judson called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. He welcomed the two new Board members, Dr. Robin Williams and Ms. Ebony Simpson.

2. [Election of Officers: Nominating Committee recommends Sidney J. Johnson for Vice-Chairman](#)

Board Action:

Approval of Sidney J. Johnson for Vice-Chairman. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3. [December 9, 2009 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [Minutes 12-09-09.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve December 9, 2009 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

4. [Continued Petition of BWBF, Incorporated - Richard Guerard - H-09-4118-2 - 342 Drayton Street -](#)

New Construction Part II - Design Details

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

5. Continued Petition of Phillip R. McCorkle - H-09-4179-2 - 319 Tattnall Street - New Construction Part I - Height and Mass - Continue to February 10, 2010 at request of Petitioner

Board Action:

Continue to February 10, 2010 at the request of the Petitioner. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

6. Petition of Martin Smith for Savannah College of Art and Design - H-09-4194-2 - 439 East Broad Street - Sign

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Gene Hutchinson and Dr. Robin Williams recused themselves from participating in the hearing, consideration, determination and voting on this item.

Board Action:

Approval of a freestanding principal use sign. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

7. [Petition of Martin Smith for Savannah College of Art and Design - H-09-4195-2 - 227 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. - Principal Use Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Gene Hutchinson and Dr. Robin Williams recused themselves from participating in the hearing, consideration, determination and voting on this item.

Board Action:

Approval of a fascia principal use sign. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

8. [Continued Petition of Doug Bean Signs for Ronen Navon - H-09-4168-2 - 111 West Congress Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was Mr. Doug Bean.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that he has not had the opportunity to meet with the applicant, but if the Board does not reach a decision today, he would be happy to meet with Mr. Bean. The HSF does not get deeply involved in the signage area as their principal concern is with buildings. However, their architectural review committee looked at the application and offers the following comments and suggestions. A question arose concerning the size of the sign and the addition of "coffee and soft drinks" at the bottom. Eliminating the copy might reduce the sign's imprint on the streetscape. Also, fewer colors might be used. He believes presently there are four different colors. They suggested that may be the ice cream portion be outlined in white and keep the cone yellow and use white around the directional arrow in lieu of the teal. Also, they question if the white banding is necessary.

Mr. Kenny Smith was curious as to whether the sign is actually 22 square feet. If so, it is very large.

Ms. Ward stated that the sign is approximately 40 inches x 51 inches for an additional bump up for the cone. This dimension includes the base which is attached to the wall.

Mr. Bean asked if the sign was too bright or had too many words. He said he would dismiss the words as the Board has no jurisdiction over what a sign says. This is a non-historic building and will be an ice cream shop, but certainly it is in an historic area. However, it is a small sign, 22 square feet including the cone. The ordinance allows 30 square feet at this location. The sign will be as bright as can be, but they are not using that much neon. He guessed that was why the staff recommended approval. The sign will have just a little border lighting that will cast a nice glow behind the raised dimensional letters.

Mr. Judson stated the staff report describes the light as externally lighted. He asked if the external lighting comes from the presence of neon.

Mr. Bean stated there is no other lighting. His customer wants the ice cream cone to be recognized.

Ms. Ramsay noticed that the pink in the photograph is noticeably pinker than what is shown.

Mr. Bean said the staff has the actual pink color. The color of pink neon is impossible to portray on paper.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Bean if he would have any objections getting with the HSF concerning the sign.

Mr. Bean answered that he would love to think about this, but his initial response is that he has worked with the Historic Preservation Office for years. Now, would he have to consider going to some other body and make them happy, too. He said he

always endeavors to satisfy Ms. Reiter and Ms. Ward with what he is doing. Mr. Bean said that he respectfully opposes Dr. Henry's suggestion.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Bean what is his objection.

Mr. Bean stated that he is trying to make a living; he sells signs. He is very intune with what signs can go where. Maybe the suggestion is only for this particular instance, but he could see where this could open up a can of worms that he believes would be unduly burdensome for him or anybody in his business.

Mr. Engle said he does not have an objection to the neon, but what bothered him and the Board the last time was that they are taking a principal elevation and putting a neon sign on it for a business that does not exist in this building since the owner will not allow the sign to go on the building where the actual business is located. The front elevation of the building where the sign is going to be mounted is essentially pristine and now they are going to add a sign that has nothing to do with the elevation. Why could the sign not be moved to the corner so that it projects diagonally and would not intrude as much on the front elevation. This is what the Board recommended for Leoci's restaurant. They moved the sign to the corner so that it did not have the full front emblem. Mr. Engle asked if there is any reason that this could not be done.

Mr. Bean said the shop under the awning on Congress Street actually opens onto the courtyard that is shared by the ice cream shop. The ice cream shop is set back 25 feet; however, it is the same building and same owner.

Mr. Engle asked why the sign could not go on the building where the ice cream shop is located.

Mr. Bean said his customer wants the Board to know that the sign would not be seen from Congress Street. As he has stated, it is a 25 foot setback. A small courtyard is here, but also a large building is located here. A case could be made that projecting from the wall above the entrance to the ice cream would be almost useless as far back as the entrance is setback.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams stated that it appears that the block already has a precedent for signs that come out straight from the street wall on a corner building that was not designed for it. He wanted to know what is the central issue for the Board. Is it the angle of the sign, scale of the sign, color of the sign relative to the Sorry Charlie's sign? One of the concerns that was raised is the four different colors. Sorry Charlie's apparently has two colors.

Mr. Engle stated that the ordinance does not specify anything regarding colors. Therefore, the color is irrelevant. This means that the sign ordinance needs to be clarified.

Dr. Henry said even though you may not agree with someone, it would not hurt to touch base with them regarding an important factor in the community. Therefore, this leads to some hesitancy on his part to vote favorably for this item.

Mr. Judson clarified that procedurally the Board has purview to make the decisions. They always welcome the comments of the HSF at their meetings. He knew that behind the scenes, HSF frequently meets with petitioners and there is a lot of give and take. However, it is certainly not a requirement to the procedure that they defer their decision in lieu of. Mr. Judson said the staff has recommended approval. The item is before the Board for consideration.

Board Action:

Approval of a neon projecting principal use sign. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Gene Hutchinson

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

9. [Petition of Mark and Kathleen Bemis - H-09-4185-2 - 113 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photos 113 E. Oglethorpe.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Pier Photos 2.pdf](#)

Present for the Petition was Ms. Kathleen Bemis.

Ms. Reiter gave the staff report.

Ramsay asked how would the piers be differentiated from the CMU if it is stucco.

Ms. Reiter answered that they were not visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Engle responded that the side elevation is visible from a public right-of-way although the Fire Department has been using it as a parking lot; but it is a dedicated street and sidewalk. Technically, this is a corner property. From the sidewalk, you can see the stucco column. This is why at the last meeting the Board questioned that the last foot was

still not stucco and wanted to know if it would be. The porch is visible from three sides.

Dr. Henry asked if the Board was suggesting that the concrete block columns not be stucco.

Ms. Ramsay said if the columns are going to be stucco, then how does this differentiate them from the existing stucco columns.

Dr. Williams wanted to know what is the material of the existing historic piers.

Ms. Reiter answered that the material is stucco.

Ms. Bemis said they were trying to match the existing structure which is approximately 190 years old. They purchased the house one and one-half (1 1/2) years ago; they only wanted more outdoor living space. Therefore, in order to make it a second story covered porch, they had to add some type of support. There were actually original stucco supports. A gourmet kitchen and a master bath were added approximately 7 years ago prior to their buying it. This structure is supported by stucco columns. If you came inside the gated courtyard and you can see through the brick wall that these are stucco columns. She believes these stucco columns were built because they match the existing stucco columns that are visible to the public from Floyd Street and Oglethorpe Avenue. Therefore, they followed what was here with the stucco columns. She said she has provided pictures that shows the columns were stucco.

Dr. Williams stated that in looking at the east side elevations his concern is the spacing of the columns on the porch. The drawings show three bay spaces between the columns of unequal proportions. He is curious of the location of the northernmost column as it appears not to be in line.

Ms. Bemis realized that the center spacing is wider, but does not know why.

Mr. Engle believes that a stairwell is here, but the plans do not show it too well.

Dr. Williams said he was wondering why whoever designed the porch's addition did not put the column in the middle space. Ms. Bemis believes that with the original structure when the roof line was installed that they were using some beams and that they followed some beams, but she is not an architect.

Dr. Williams wanted to know if all of this was new construction.

Ms. Bemis answered that she was talking about the existing house, the two-story renovation that was done 7 years ago, she was assuming that there is some type of line that was being followed.

Dr. Henry stated that if the work had not already been done, they would not have a problem with deciding to leave it where it is or do something else. Now, the Board feels more inclined to just let it go strictly because it is already here.

Ms. Bemis apologized for this and said being new to Savannah she was under the

impression that if they were doing an enclosed addition, then they would need permission. They have been working on their house for one and one-half years (1 1/2) and they have already completed the inside.

Mr. Engle said this is under the old ordinance which states that new additions to historic structures should be differentiated from the old historic materials, but Ms. Bemis has stated that she had actually copied the original purchase. This is not what the ordinance calls for.

Ms. Bemis stated she did not know that there is a new or old ordinance.

Mr. Engle said if they knocked off the stucco, then they could tell what is original and what is not; but this is not what the ordinance is all about. It's that a viewer can look at a building and will know that there is a later addition. The way this is done is by a slight subtle modification to the baluster and column type. The fact that the balusters were already on site is fine, but the fact is that the Board has turned down in the last year people who have gone out and bought columns and did not get the Board's approval prior to doing so. He said he has problems with it as he believes it is too long and to extend it out just to bring a stair down is too much as the porch could be stopped at the edge of the house and it would be more sympathetic than what has been done. He believes it is over done and are not enough differences.

Ms. Bemis stated that she would have to argue this, too, as she truly believes that the addition that was done seven (7) years ago (she was not sure where the approval came from as she has not been able to unearth any type of approvals), but it is somewhat an eye sore. She believes that what they have done softens the big white addition that was very apparent from Oglethorpe Avenue, Floyd Street and the lane behind the house. Therefore, they believed that in following the covered porches that it was a nice, soft subtle addition.

Mr. Engle said the last drawings the Board received shows a bead-board ceiling. He wanted to know if the boards would be in panels or actual boards.

Ms. Bemis answered that it's the actual same bead-boards that is on the ceiling of the original covered porch and they are going in the same direction. When they initially met with staff, they recommended that they meet with the Savannah Historic Foundation and they met with them and got their input.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Bemis if they used HSF's suggestions and **Ms. Bemis** answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation wanted to clarify a couple of things. As he stated at the last meeting, the petitioner did meet with one of their interns who made some comments and suggestions. However, he was not a part of that meeting. However, HSF's concerns have been and remain the differentiation issue between old and new. He believes that more than anything, he would like to be satisfied that they are not backing into allowing it "as is" with what they consider to be too similar of a design because there is the claim of materials onsite that were purchased, he guessed, as a part of the construction process, but before a permit was issued. Mr. Carey said he could

understand an honest mistake, but it is also important for the Historic Review Board to make good decisions based on information that is presented at the time. He believes further that to say it is differentiated enough based on what has been said is a weak argument. They would suggest subtle, but slightly more differentiation especially with the balusters. The a symmetry of the addition might be an argument for differentiation. Mr. Carey stated again that HSF is still concerned that it is too similar and wanted to clarify that the petitioner met with one of their assistant/intern. They did not formally meet with the architectural review committee or with him.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Carey if he contacted the petitioner about his concerns after she met with the intern.

Mr. Carey said on two occasions he talked with the Historic Preservation Officer about their concerns and he assumed that their concerns would be conveyed.

Dr. Henry stated there appears to be a breakdown in communication.

Mr. Carey said that HSF responds to inquires from staff. Therefore, when staff presented questions to them, they certainly responded and heard nothing else from the petitioner. Therefore, to a degree, it is probably a communication problem. He said obviously HSF is not the voice in this, but they encourage everyone to check-in with them. He did not believe that it is incumbent upon HSF to get in touch with each petitioner.

Dr. Henry stated that if HSF had concerns about the initial communication with the petitioner, then he believes that would be a special case.

Mr. Carey said this was on record at the December meeting. He was hopeful that the petitioner would have read the report and take the initiative to contact HSF.

Ms. Bemis stated that she sent Mr. Carey and his associate, Stephanie, an email. When they received information from the Presevation Director, Ms. Reiter, it was a few days before Thanksgiving and they had a 48 hour turnaround to get renderings. She asked Stephanie if they could meet with them and Stephanie said she could, but Mr. Carey was not available. Ms. Bemis said she told Stephanie that they would talk with anybody as they had a deadline to get back with the MPC staff to make the December 9th, 2009 deadline. But, when Ms. Reiter told them that they needed to note the bead-board and a few other things on the drawings, they met with a person who was doing the drawings and they have provided the drawings for today's meeting. She apologized for not being at the last meeting, but she and her husband were not aware that it was required that they be present. They both work and were out of town, but they made sure that one of them would be present at this meeting today.

Javonie, a SCAD student, had a general question since he heard the word "differentiated" used a lot, he asked if the additions should differ from the original structure or should they seamlessly appear as the original?

Mr. Engle said the phrase in the ordinance says "contemporary compatible." He explained that what this means is that you should be able to look at a building and see its history. Certainly, it would not be compatible if stainless steel or chrome columns were used. The

point is, you should be able to look at it without using a hammer and do physical fabric research to find out whether the piers are original. This can be done very subtle. It just might be a different style of balusters - same height, same spacing and different fluting. Or it might be a subtle molding differentiation on the columns, but they should go together. But on the other hand, they don't want a visitor on a house tour to say the porch is 155 years old. Now, it would not be 155 years old as it would be new. The porch's addition could look compatible, but not identical.

Dr. Williams stated that with following Mr. Engle's comment about distinguishable by compatible, the columns are the same design, but they are shorter. He said the floors seemingly line up, but the balusters on the addition appear taller. Dr. Williams asked Ms. Bemis if the balusters are taller and whether the floors are the same height. He said from the elevation, it is hard to tell how they align.

Dr. Henry stated that from the picture, it appears that they are a half foot higher.

Dr. Williams stated that if it is the case that the floor is roughly six inches higher, the balusters are the same, the columns are shorter and the ceiling is shorter; this means that they have a shorter space difference proportioning that Mr. Carey mentioned between the columns, but compatibility issues in terms of the same design columns and it sounds like the element that is mostly identical is the baluster design. He asked if this is the material that is on site already.

Mr. Judson answered that is his understanding.

Ms. Reiter stated that she was informed that these are the original materials from somewhere else on the site that were not bought.

Ms. Bemis stated that they did not buy the balusters, they just reused the balusters somewhere else as their understanding was that the Board wanted something that replicated the original house.

Dr. Williams asked where was the original porch.

Ms. Bemis answered that it was by the french doors.

Mr. Engle asked how could it be an original if it is connected to an addition.

Ms. Bemis believes it was built 7 years ago.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, the balusters are 7 years old and not 190 years old.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Bemis because the addition is larger than the 7 year old porch, would she have to purchase additional balusters?

Ms. Bemis answered yes.

Mr. Engle suggested that maybe the Board should ask Ms. Bemis to request a continuance and probably get with the HSF and come up with something that the Board could live with.

Mr. Judson clarified that in Ms. Bemis's absence at the last meeting, the Board moved for a continuance. However, since she is present today and it appears that the Board still has some concerns about the project, procedurally the Board does not have the authority to ask for a continuance, but she may ask for a continuance so the details could be worked out. To further clarify the SCAD student's question, the goal is not to make it look seamless nor appear to be an original portion of the house. The goal is to make it compatible, yet distinguishable from the original house.

Ms. Bemis wanted to know the process if they do not ask for a continuance and the Board does not approve this. Ms. Reiter explained that if the petition is denied, the petitioner could make a new petition at the next meeting, but it would have to be a changed design.

Mr. Judson said he had not gotten a motion as of yet from the Board, but Ms. Bemis certainly can allow the Board to make a motion to either approve or disapprove the project. What he is hearing from the Board is that their concerns address the general design and overall impact of the project as opposed to just the specificity of the bead-board or the other materials. He directed Ms. Bemis's attention to the comments that have been focused on the stucco supports because in terms of trying to substantiate a differentiation in the design once she replicates the other supports around the building it will further diminish that distinction.

Dr. Henry stated he believes the big issue is differentiation. He believed this could be resolved to his satisfaction if Ms. Bemis touches base with the HSF.

Dr. Williams asked for clarification on the bead-boards being identical to the original porch and the railings, but there is no issue with the HSF regarding the identical bead-board while they do have an issue with identical railings.

Mr. Judson explained that what occurred about the bead-boards at their last meeting was the Board was presented with press board and the Board had questions about the ceiling materials.

Ms. Bemis stated that they wanted to use exposed beams, but when the Board asked for something else, they decided to replicate the bead-boards. Therefore, they are now going back and forth on differentiating. They are experiencing the same with the columns. She asked for a continuance and said she will meet with Mr. Carey.

Mr. Judson stated that the Board considers the HSF to be an incredible resource and in expediting the clarification, he encouraged Ms. Bemis to meet with the staff.

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Sidney J. Johnson

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

10. Continued Petition of Neil Dawson - H-09-4188-2 - 212 West Taylor Street - Elevator Addition

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Mr. Neil Dawson and Mr. Martin Smith were present for the petition.

Mr. Gene Hutchinson and Dr. Robin Williams recused themselves from participating in the hearing, consideration, determination and voting on this item.

The staff report was given by Ms. Ward.

Ms. Ramsay asked what are the colors. **Ms. Ward** answered that the color of the stucco is to match the existing exterior wall. Ms. Ramsay wanted to know whether the color of the recess that was shown in a dark color would be included also to match the exterior wall. Ms. Ward believed so, but stated that the petitioner is present and he would be able to answer Ms. Ramsay's question about the color of the recess.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that the flat part of the recess is intended to be painted the dark gray that is on the existing trim and cornice. They chose to do the recess this way because of the way the doors are oriented in the building. The recess is only about eight inches, therefore, it is not enough to cast a decent shadow line so they felt that by painting the one flat surface a darker color would help make the distinction that the Board was striving for. Some of the other comments at the last meeting was the suggestion that they look at a glass connector; however, the distance between the building and elevator shaft is just a sliver so it did not make a lot of sense, plus they wanted to differentiate, but did not want to make a grand design statement for the elevator shaft. This is why they chose to leave the recess flat in appearance. He said that they have also simplified the banding so that it creates a relationship with a one-story flat roof addition. In bringing the storefront forward, he believes it makes the addition look more like it is a part of the more recent addition rather than a part of the historic structure. Mr. Dawson stated that the comments from the Board at the last meeting were helpful and helped them get the solution that is much more aesthetically pleasing and appropriately in accordance with the ordinance.

Mr. Engle asked what is the scoring.

Mr. Dawson replied that their previous submittal had the scoring matching up with the scorelines in the original building. But, they felt to be consistent with the theme of differentiating that they would do scorelines that were more distinguishable with the floor and ceiling structure lines of the building. Now, they did hold the belt course striations into it and also the cornice lines striation into the control joints. They tried to create large patterns that are more indicative of contemporary stucco materials.

Mr. Engle wanted to know if these would be the same color and not gray.

Mr. Dawson said they are almost invisible.

Mr. Smith stated that they received contacts from some community members. He had a conversation today with a lady who was concerned about construction in the area regarding the last renovation on the building. Mr. Smith wanted to let the Board know that it is SCAD's intention to work with the community; he exchanged contact information with the lady. He said SCAD will work with the community during the construction and they want to be good neighbors.

Mr. Judson stated the Board appreciates SCAD's willingness to work with the community.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation asked Mr. Dawson to explain the height that was suggested as he chose masonry versus glass.

Mr. Dawson explained that the distance between the main mass of the building and the elevator shaft is barely one foot-six inches. He said by the time they put in some separation of storefront glass, they end up with a piece of glass that is literally 12 inches or less. They felt the glass would be of very little benefit. Therefore, they felt it would be better to let it remain and use stucco.

Mr. Carey asked whether the elevator shaft would be extended beyond the eave which is approximately 3/6. He said this might accomplish something good or something bad, but it would be a true distance separation of maybe three and one-half feet (3 1/2 ft) that would probably warrant glass since it is wide enough, but he believed the problem is that it would extend so far to start blocking the other portion of the building and then make the elevator shaft the focal point from Barnard Street. He reconsidered this, but just wanted to put this out there for discussion or consideration. Mr. Carey stated that he thought this might be a suggestion, but he will leave it as a comment. He believes that with the scoring, a part of the trick here is that the building looks as if it is clabbered with the way it is drawn; however, he knew that this is a challenge. Mr. Carey believes they are walking a very fine line between the differentiation and the respect issue. He believes further that scoring along the existing banding lines makes sense. In this case it will not be too hard to determine that this is an addition. Therefore, he did not know if they need to go overboard on making a distinction. They might be as subtle as they can be with the scoring.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes SCAD has done a good job. At one time the Board was

not too happy with the fact that it was too much like the original. But, now they see a good definition of contemporary compatible. No one will think that this is an original elevator shaft. Elevator shafts can be a mess as it sticks out, but the way that they have worked this elevator in helps it significantly.

Board Action:

Approval of the elevator and storefront additions as amended to include the connector and flat roof. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ned Gay

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

11. [Petition of John Meyer - H-09-4193-2 - 508 East Gordon Street - Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was **Mr. John Meyer**.

Ms. Reiter made the staff report.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Reiter to clarify her statement regarding fences in the Historic District in the 1800s. Ms. Reiter explained that in the 1880s and 1890s frequently the buildings were setback in what she calls a door yard garden that was separated from the sidewalk by a low iron fence pickett or a wooden pickett fence. She said some of these fences are on Gaston Street.

Dr. Williams asked if the dark shaded area was the sidewalk.

Ms. Reiter said it appears that the sidewalk goes up to the step.

Dr. Williams wanted to know if the property line is where the fence is to be erected.

Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner could answer this question more correctly;

however she believes a portion of it is actually the sidewalk, but the part that comes up to the stairs and beyond is the owner's private property. The petitioner intends to open this up and put a garden here.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Meyer said there is a slab of concrete between the sidewalk and the front porch. Ms. Parker has owned the property for approximately four years and does not know why it is there. She believes, however, that a parking area might have been here at one time. She wants to remove the paving and put some type of pavers from the front porch to the sidewalk, but the property line is within one foot of the existing sidewalk.

Dr. Williams asked the height of the fence.

Mr. Meyer answered 48 inches which is the same height of the fence at the King Tisdell cottage.

Dr. Williams wanted to know how many feet back from the sidewalk is the fence at the King Tisdell cottage. He believes the requested fence if laid down would hit the house.

Mr. Meyer said the property line is approximately six feet to the porch.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes that the sidewalk is extending a couple of feet on the owner's property.

Mr. Meyer reported that he had a surveyor from the City's Development Services come out and put a flag on the corner of the property which is only a few inches from the sidewalk.

Dr. Williams said he believes the issue is the scale of the fence relative to the space that it is framing.

Mr. Meyer believes that 42 inches would be the next acceptable height for a fence and he was sure Ms. Parker would be amiable to this.

Dr. Williams said again that his concern would be the fence's scale relative to the house and the space it is framing.

Mr. Judson told Dr. Williams that because he is a new board member, he wanted to inform him that a concern such as his could be stipulated in the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Dr. Henry said he did not have an objection to the fence, but there should be some proportionality.

Mr. Engle said that a height lower than 42 inches would be short and would serve no practical point.

Mr. Judson said that based on the information from the petitioner, 42 inches is an available standard height and this could be stipulated in the motion.

Ms. Ramsay said she would be comfortable with staff to check out the height rather than stipulating 42 inches as the height.

Mr. Johnson wanted clarification on the sidewalk and the slab.

Mr. Judson stated that the petitioner stated the slab would be enclosed and is on the owner's private property and would become garden space or pavers to the porch and there will be no encroachment on the public sidewalk. He believes the project specified a three foot gate. He asked if the gate would be centered or line up on the stairs.

Mr. Meyer stated that the gate will be centered on the stairs and it will be three feet.

Board Action:

Approval of the fence with the condition that the height of the fence be resubmitted to staff for final - PASS approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

NOTE: The Board took a 7 minute break.

12. [Petition of Richard O. Mitchell - H-09-4196-2 - 625 Tattnell Street - Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Richard Mitchell was present for the petition.

Ms. Reiter gave the staff report.

Dr. Henry said that Ms. Reiter stated that this is not a historic unit, but is in the Historic District.

Ms. Reiter said this is new construction built in the 1970s or 1980s.

Dr. Henry said he understood that the Board approved the fence in 2006. The petitioner did not build the fence then, but built it later. Ms. Reiter said the fence was built approximately one month ago.

Dr. Henry asked if the approval in 2006 was followed. Ms. Ward said the front portion facing Tattall Street was built, but they did not finish the wall along Hall and Jefferson Streets. The new property owner decided to finish the wall, but he did not follow the same specifications that were originally approved in 2006. Therefore, the petitioner is now trying to do both, meet the old specifications so that the wooden fence will have the finished cap and the routed molded piece. However, it will be lower in height than what was previously approved and have a wooden gate on the side.

Ms. Ramsay asked if there are other wooden fences such as this in the Historic District fronting on major streets. She said this seems to be a long expansion of just pure 1 x 6.

Ms. Reiter stated that she would have to do research to Ms. Ramsay's question.

Mr. Judson said the long dimension of the fence is along Hall Street between Jefferson and Tattall.

Dr. Williams asked if it was fair to assume that the northern edge of the sidewalk is the property line.

Ms. Reiter believes that the petitioner has said that it is 12 inches off of the property line.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Mitchell stated that there is approximately a 20 foot greenspace area. It is a wide area; therefore, there is plenty of space. One reason he wanted to put the fence up is obviously because of privacy, but some large pampas grass is on the inside of the fence and some people started camping in there. He lost his last tenant because they got tired of calling the police about this.

Mr. Engle asked about the original fence line.

Mr. Mitchell said that was the fence that was built when the properties were put in.

Mr. Engle said the original fence line was setback approximately six feet from the sidewalk. But, now the fence is moved up to the sidewalk.

Mr. Mitchell explained that he will move the concrete piers because they were not put on a good foundation and, therefore, they are not secured. However, he just came off the

fence where it was originally approved by the City and the Board. He came off the edge and followed the exact same line that was approved before.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board was still bound by the previous approval.

Ms. Ramsay said they are not bound by that approval unless the petitioner came here and renewed it every year.

Ms. Ward explained that the previous owner had an easement with the City in order to build the fence in what is considered the right-of-way. She believed that the new owner would also need to obtain an easement or verify that they still have it when they go for their permit. Nevertheless, this was noted in the previous approval that they had an easement to put up the fence.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward if she was saying that the existing fence is built on the City's right-of-way. Ms. Ward stated that she has not seen a survey of the property, but she was told this when the original approval was made by the Board years ago. This means that the City could have it torn down at anytime if they need to.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Savannah Historic Foundation said that once the setback issues are determined, he was wondering if some thought was given to breaking up the long horizontal stretch. Maybe a pier could be put between the sections.

Mr. Mitchell said his plan is to plant confederate jasmine on the fence.

Mr. Engle said this fence is not on line with the adjacent properties and the standards state that fences, trellises and walls should not extend beyond the facade of the front elevation. This fence is placed over to the sidewalk and there should be a planting area in front of it. This could be everywhere; it is unfriendly and he does not believe it meets the design standards.

Dr. Henry asked if the easement was no longer valid because of the lapse in time.

Ms. Ward answered that she did not know; this would be something that they would need to provide to Development Services and Permitting.

Mr. Overton said this is okay, but this has been here by the previous owner. This apparently fit in with what they planned to do initially. Now, with the new structure, not only do they need to get the Board's approval, but also will probably need to talk with the City.

Dr. Henry believes that this needs to be clarified and in 2006 the Board approved a different design that was not quite followed. He was looking at the procedural perspective and they need to revisit this.

Dr. Williams asked what does the ordinance specify as the limited height of a fence on front property.

Ms. Reiter believes that in the Historic District the fence can be 11 feet or higher if there is a higher precedence near to what you are abutting.

Ms. Ramsay believes the fence does not meet the visual compatibility standard.

Ms. Reiter reported that the fence was approved taller along the front line several years ago.

Dr. Williams stated that his question is what is the height limit when the fence is on the front of the property versus being on the side of the property.

Ms. Reiter stated that the fence should not come out 11 feet in front of the property but at the face of the house it could be 11 feet.

Mr. Judson said the easement is not the purview of this Board should it be determined that the easement is not granted is null and void, then that is between the builder and the City of Savannah. This is not part of the Board's consideration either from design nor is it within their purview to block it in lieu of a pending easement.

Mr. Judson explained to Mr. Mitchell that he may ask for a continuance so that the design details can be worked out.

Mr. Mitchell stated he would ask for a continuance because when he met with staff he told them that he would work with them in any way he could.

Mr. Judson clarified that this is not just an issue with City easement, there is an issue with the visual compatibility of its encroachments at the property line. As it is articulated in architectural standards for buildings that a span of this length needs to have some differentiation whether it be a shadowbox or an interval of some setback. He advised Mr. Mitchell that as he works with the staff on design to keep these ideas in mind. **Mr. Judson** believes that the greatest objection among the Board is the fence has a long span of less than attractive lines.

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

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

13. [Petition of John Clegg - Barnard Architects - H-09-4197-2 - 421 Abercorn Street - Demolition of rear addition and construction of new addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. John Clegg was present for the petition.

Ms. Reiter gave the staff report.

Dr. Henry asked what is the width of the glass separator. Ms. Reiter said the architect will have to address this question. **Mr. Gay** stated that if the glass is to differentiate the new from the old, he believes it has been done in the design of what they are proposing to build.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS

Mr. John Clegg of Barnard Architects stated that they have met with City Attorney Blackburn and are continuing to meet with him. The mansard shingles can be a different size, profile and slightly different shade of color. The width of the glass is 18 inches. This highlights where the existing stops and the new begins. Mr. Clegg said they met with Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation and the drawings are a part of their result. A comment was made about the stucco on the upper floor that may be it should be a slightly different shade of color. Presently, the stucco on the 2nd and 3rd floors would be a light beige and there were discussions about this probably being a darker shade. He reported that they certainly are agreeable to this. The idea is to create a base, shaft and capital for the building.

Mr. Engle said initially he thought the high vertical object was a window, but as he is reading this, it shows that they are shutters. He asked if the shutters would be plastic.

Mr. Clegg answered that they are using a composite material that that has been approved in the past and will be durable.

Mr. Engle asked if the ordinance states that shutters should be wood.

Ms. Reiter answered that the Board can approve other materials and has been approving the composites.

Mr. Engle questioned the curve of the canopy.

Mr. Clegg explained that the curve adds a unique element and helps distinguish it as new. He said previously approved was a new canopy which was curved with metal supports and the idea is to unite the two buildings with a common element using similar materials and

profile.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated for a point of clarification that was presented as L shaped glass between the main block and the addition was not for differentiation, but they were trying to soften a very heavy corner. There is a solid joint where the two buildings will meet each other. He believes the petitioner recognized this and volunarily made the improvement. When they considered the total of the area that abuts where the shutters will be introduced, they found this to be excessively heavy and thought it would help to separate and lessen the density of the corner. Mr. Carey said they had the same question as Mr. Engle on the curverlinear canopy. They did not recognize any curve lines in the building and he believes that they have done enough to suggest that it is different. He realizes that it picks up from a previously approved curverlinear canopy across the street on the church building. He said he probably would have objected to that as they believe that a direct linear canopy would be more consistent with the rest of the building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams stated it appears that anytime someone wants to put in a new addition beside an old building however wide, they can use a sliver of glass. This not only from the point of view of the performance of the building as opposed to just a solid wall, the long term durability of the buildings, but he worries that this could set a precedence that will introduce a new kind of pattern. Sometimes this might be warranted, but he was wondering in its place if there are other design strategies that could be looked at. In looking at the images, he also is worried about design solutions such as shafts of glass between two masonry buildings which, to him, lessens the spirit of the Historic District in achieving the goal of visual compatibility, but distinctiveness. He asked what is the current status of the slates.

Mr. Clegg answered that current slate shingles are approximately 9 inches wide, with about 5 inches rectangular. There is a wide variety and he brought some samples with him. They can be 12 inches wide and a couple of shades lighter than the existing shingles.

Dr. Williams believes that the shade should be kept the same because of visual compatibility. With so many other things happening on the building, they don't want something that looks like cheap tile or that they could not find a match, or the shingles are faded. **Mr. Clegg** informed the Board that they will be willing to work with them on this.

Mr. Judson told Dr. Williams that he believes that the reference that has come up with the glass transition piece is that many of them were referencing the treatment of the new proposed SCAD museum. With the stipulation of colors and roof, if the Board approves a project they can certainly stipulate that the petitioner come back to staff with those considerations for final approval.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she was troubled about the retention of the mansard roof as opposed to the curvilinear awning. It appears that they have go far one way and then they have come back to distinguish it by putting the awning on it. This makes it busier than what

she believes it should be.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Clegg if the approved curvilinear awning on the main church building has been constructed. **Mr. Clegg** replied that it has not been constructed.

Mr. Engle said he believes that the elevation with the green walls is incredibly busy. If the chimneys are being reduced to two inches of varying thickness and they are 18 inches thick now, why are they keeping them at all? What purpose do they serve? What purpose does the green wall serve? What does it have to do with the other building? He said he found the entire elevation confusing.

Mr. Judson stated that it was his understanding in terms of the reduction of size from the elevation looking at it from Drayton Street will still have the same profile and will be just as wide with the green wall constructed around it.

Mr. Engle said the three stories of closed shutters is major. Why are they having a three story shutter?

Mr. Gay stated that possibly since the structure will face on Wayne Street and typical this will be porches that will be shuttered. Therefore, he believes the petitioner is trying to break up the side facing on Drayton Street.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Reiter if they have gotten away from Part I height and mass approval.

Ms. Reiter answered that on additions they don't consider them Part I and Part II until they exceed 50% of the size of the building to which they are attached.

Ms. White asked if the green wall would be painted green. **Mr. Clegg** stated that it would actually be plant material. The intention is to deal with a wall that was never intended to be left exposed. There were a row of townhouses and the chimneys were never meant to be exposed in this matter; therefore, they are trying to make it more than just a big blank concrete wall. They thought that the plant materials would soften it. But, they certainly would entertain a motion that would remove it from the table. The shutters at the 2nd and 3rd floors, would actually have true blades in the sense that light could come through them. This would not be an opaque wall.

Dr. Williams asked if a circulation space was behind the shutters. **Mr. Clegg** answered that a hallway is behind the shutters.

Dr. Henry believes that the petitioner has done a great job; he likes the green walls and believes they need to keep the chimneys although they are somewhat problematic, but couldn't these kinds of things be worked out with the staff?

Mr. Judson said he asked about separating the height and mass of the project from the design elements was just to speak to that point. In this particular case, a motion to approve the project could have stipulations with specific design issues on it.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Clegg if he had any objections of looking at redesigning the awnings. Mr. Clegg said they prefer not to redesign the awnings. They like the arch and

know that the uniqueness ties the two buildings together. If there was a way to tweak the theme along with Ms. Reiter and staff they would love this opportunity.

NOTE: Mr. Hutchinson left at this point to attend a meeting in Florida.

Board Action:

Approval of demolition and new addition with the condition that the applicant meet with staff to address the Board's comments on the curved canopy and corner glass connector alternate. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

14. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay Architects - H-09-4200-2 - 28 Abercorn Street - Rehabilitation, Addition, and Parking Improvements](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Revised Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Patrick Shay was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. A recombination subdivision plat will need to be issued and approved prior to the building permit. The petitioner intends to replace the non-historic doors on the side of the property facing St. Julian Street with aluminum framed doors and windows. The plans that were submitted to the Board showed a shed roof, but the petitioner has altered the plans to show a hip roof. The parking lot has been separated from this decision because there appears to be some things that still need to be continued. A revised site plan has been submitted which is attached to the Board's report. The staff is supportive of the changes. Parking is not required in the B-C-1 district. The parking that is shown on the plan is for the employees and is accessed from Lincoln Street. **Ms. Ward** stated that one question the staff has is that it seems odd to have a patch of concrete pavers in one area. She believes they are making improvements to the sidewalk, but staff suggests

that the petitioner be consistent throughout even if it is all concrete. They would rather that it be brick, but the petitioner made a comment that cars would be going over the brick regularly. The staff is requesting that the petitioner look at the materials of the sidewalk.

Dr. Williams asked what is the purpose of the canopy. **Ms. Ward** stated that there will be a drive-through. This is the office for the Georgia Power headquarters facilities. Their executive offices will be here and the citizens can pay their electric bills here. This office will replace the facility they currently have on Broughton Street.

Dr. Williams said the bricks could be alternated with concrete. Therefore, this would be a slight pattern change. **Ms. Ward** said the standard is new and there has not been any variations from the standard and no precedents have been set. However, there may be a precedent in the existing district for configuration. She hesitated to recommend a variation from the standard without further researching it.

Dr. Henry wanted to know if the Board has any authority with the sidewalk. **Ms. Ward** stated that she did not believe they have any authority, but they do have the authority that where the sidewalk is intersected by a driveway, there is a standard that requires that materials, height and configuration be consistent.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Shay stated the building that is proposed to be renovated is for the Georgia Power Regional headquarters. They have an existing building on Bay Street and their pay station is on Broughton Street. The building will have the pay center and a community auditorium as they want to continue to provide space for community groups. The upper floor will be their corporate headquarters. They have decided to purchase the lot behind the building in an effort to further enhance customer service so that they have the ability for people to pay their electric bills at a drive-through location. There will be parking on the back that is not necessarily for employees as much as it is for VIP parking for special guests that will be coming to the facility. In addition to trying to renovate the building in a way that is consistent with preservation standards, they are also deeply committed to making this LEED certified project. This provides the opportunity to retain the corporate leadership for Georgia Power in the downtown area which is significantly important as most of their facilities are located outside of the downtown area. This will enable a building to be preserved which will be able to obtain another 100 years of life and also do so in an energy conservative way. **Mr. Shay** explained the pavers are being used to assist the persons who come here for the first time find their way to the corporate entrance which will serve the 2nd floor and the other entrance serves the ground floor where the customer service lobby will be located. They originally envisioned that this area would be the same material as in the front of the building. They have received comments from the City of Savannah's Traffic Engineer who recommended concrete instead of brick because of its durability.

Ms. Ramsay asked that the elevation that is shown in green in the crosswalk and canopy will all of it be prismatic or is there another color. **Mr. Shay** answered that the idea is that the prismatic will be white.

Mr. Johnson asked **Mr. Shay** if he will be putting bricks around the sidewalk. **Mr. Shay**

said the City's Engineering department has commented to them that they prefer that the sidewalk be concrete, but they will continue advocating with Engineering on the idea of the real brick. However, the final decision rests with Engineering.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Savannah Historic Foundation stated that he had a very productive meeting with the petitioner. He said SHF's architectural committee met yesterday on this petition. They made comments to the petitioner and he believes his comments will be added. He asked what is the proposed color for the building. **Mr. Shay** said they have submitted a golden wheat color. **Mr. Carey** asked what would be the glass elevation on the main facade and will it be possible to locate the dropbox on the rear of the building which is serving as a drive-through anyway. He believes this would be more convenient to the drive-up traffic. He believes further that the corporate sign could be relocated to the rear. They question whether two signs are needed; they are only about four feet apart. Their main concern is with the canopy to the rear. He believes it should be rectilinear perhaps with a parapet and a little heavier support. Some of the other buildings around town do have canopies such as the Standard Oil building on Drayton Street and Parker's. These canopies are little heavier and more in sync with the main block of the building. They believe this will be great improvement to what is proposed. **Mr. Shay** explained regarding the dropbox if you are paying your bill, it is very likely that you will visit the bill paying center. This is the reason they have a sign near the door. The part of the dropbox that is exposed is no bigger than a letter slot. Nothing that will be protruding. The Georgia Power has a very rigorous design standards. He said that the rear canopy is rectilinear. They originally presented something that was flat, but they decided against this. They have tried to get something that is less intrusive.

Dr. Williams asked if the four lights on the parapet are there now or if they are being proposed. **Mr. Shay** explained that what is here now are little lights that were added to the parapet 20 years ago. They are proposing to be consistent with the lighting that will be in front of the building on street lamps.

Board Action:

Approved petition for rehabilitation and parking area as amended in the revised plans submitted January 12, 2010. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: W James Overton
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Gene Hutchinson - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Brian Judson - Abstain

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

15. [Petition of Brian Robin - H-09-4201-2 - 313-317 West Broughton Street - Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Brian Robin was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. This historic commercial structure, located at 313-317 West Broughton Street, was constructed in 1917 and is a contributing building to the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. Modifications over time have altered the original storefront entry designs within all bays of the building. The proposed design is based on the historic development pattern of storefronts on Broughton Street.

Dr. Henry asked about the Broughton Street Revitalization. Ms. Ward stated that the Savannah Development and Renewal Authority (SDRA) was contacted and she believes that the Executive Director is okay with the request.

Mr. Engle asked why is hardi-board being proposed. Why not bronze, wood or masonry tile? He questioned the recess and entrance.

Dr. Williams stated that the storefronts have cast iron. He asked if the drawings show what they will look like. **Ms. Ward** answered yes.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Robin stated that hardi-board is a masonry product and is durable. The historic brick columns dividing the bays will be restored and the glazed storefront will be recessed behind piers. They will put in new cornice which will be painted Charleston green.

Dr. Henry asked if there will be more than one tenant. Mr. Robin stated that 315 and 317 will have one tenant.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Savannah Historic Foundation stated that this is a vast improvement. However, he picks up on Mr. Engle's question concerning recess and entrance, etc.

Dr. Henry asked why other materials were not being used. Mr. Robin stated that the reused plank would be wood or hardi-plank.

Board Action:

Approval of the rehabilitation of the storefront. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: W James Overton

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Nay

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Reed Engle - Nay

Linda Ramsay - Nay

Ebony Simpson - Nay

Robin Williams - Aye

16. [Petition of Abraham Scott - H-09-4202-2 - 319 Lorch Street - Demolition of rear structure](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Reiter stated that Abraham Scott was present initially for the petition, but due to the lateness of the meeting, he left to go home to take his medication, but asked that the Board hear his petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. This building is not designated historic on the Historic Building Map. The roof, flooring and all interior and exterior historic fabric were removed without a Certificate of Appropriateness in August 2008 with the exception of the framing and the central chimney. A stop work order was issued in August 2008 and no work has occurred on the property since that time.

Mr. Engle asked if archaeology information has been gotten on this structure. Ms. Ward started she did not know.

Mr. Gay said let the City of Savannah handle this.

Ms. Ward said that there will be more demolition requests coming before the Board. The property Maintenance Department has cited the owner, stating that the building needs to be demolished.

Board Action:

Approval of demolition of the non-historic lane structure. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

17. [Petition of Bill Stubbs for Stubbs Oil Company - H-091123-4189\(S\)-2 - 502 W. Bay Street-Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [staff Decision.pdf](#)

18. [Petition of Melody Rodriguez for Rancho Alegre Cuban Restaurant - H-091124-4190\(S\)-2 - 402 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

19. [Petition of Jim Morehouse for Coastal Canvas for Laundrateria H-091210-4191\(S\)-2 - 346 Whitaker Street - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

20. [Petition of Liberty Street West Condo Association - H-091211-4192\(S\)-2 - 116 W. Liberty Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

21. [Petition of Jim Morehouse for Coastal Canvas Products - H-091223-4198\(S\)-2 - 402 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

22. [Petition of Peter Kusek - H-091223-4199\(S\)-2 - 522 East Charlton Lane - Roof Repair](#)

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

23. [Petition of Eugene M. Maria for Hansen Architects, P.C. - H-080619-4012\(S\)-2 Amended - 210 Whitaker Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision.pdf](#)

24. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay Architects - H-090219-4114\(S\)-2 Amended - 23 Montgomery Street - Door](#)

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

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

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

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

Board Action:

Deferred to the February 10, 2010 meeting. -

Vote Results

Motion:
Second:

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

26. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic Board of Review, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter
Preservation Director

BR:mem

NOTE: Minutes not official until signed

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