



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
July 14, 2010 2:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**JULY 14, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Brian Judson, Chair  
Reed Engle  
Linda Ramsay  
Ned Gay  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Richard Law, Sr.  
W. James Overton  
Ebony Simpson

**HDRB Members Not Present:** Sidney Johnson, Vice Chair  
Gene Hutchinson  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

**MPC Staff Present:** Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director  
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**

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. [Approval of June 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [06-09-2010 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval.

- PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ned Gay  
Second: Linda Ramsay  
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

2. [Approval of June 16, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [06-16-2010 Minutes.pdf](#)

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

**IV. SIGN POSTING**

**V. CONTINUED AGENDA**

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

3. [Petition of Doug Bean for Brasserie 529 - H-10-4273-2 - 529 East Liberty Street - Principal Use Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the projecting principal use sign as submitted. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ned Gay  
Second: Linda Ramsay  
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

## VII. REGULAR AGENDA

### 4. [Petition of Gretchen Callejas for Greenline Architecture - H-10-4271-2 - 611 Whitaker Street - Rehabilitation, deck addition, and fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Ward** gave the staff report.

Staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation, side deck addition, and fence with the condition that the portion of deck east of the bay be eliminated to not obstruct the historic Queen Ann bay and not to be visible from Whitaker Street.

**Dr. Henry** asked why the previous owner made the initial changes.

**Ms. Ward** answer that she was not sure. The previous property owner nor the contractor were from Savannah. They came to town on the weekend and did the work. The previous owner advised Ms. Ward that she had been studying Victorian architecture and felt that the colonial revival style columns that she put in place were more Victorian than the turned Victorian columns.

**Mr. Gay** stated that the railings should not be removed. This would be against the building code.

**Ms. Ward** reported that she was sure the previous owner intended to replace it with some other style, but she was stopped prior to doing so.

**Dr. Henry** asked what happen to the initial request.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the previous owner received a stop work order. She was taken to court and the property was repossessed by the bank. The new property owner has come forward and will restore the elements back to the building.

### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Deering** stated that they would be happy to remove the deck at the southern projecting area around the bay window and only have it in the back. He said he had drawings for the file.

**Mr. Overton** wanted to know what color would the building be painted.

**Mr. Deering** answered that it would be the same color as it is presently painted. The present owner likes the paint scheme, but does not like what was done to the building.

**Mr. Judson** asked the petitioner if he knew whether any of the items that were removed are restored on site.

**Mr. Deering** stated that they have actually seen the items. The columns have been used in different places as interior elements and the fret work above the porch has been restored. The balusters are here; many things that were removed are still here, even interior elements. They will put all this back.

**Mr. Engle** commented that this building has been a real eyesore for a couple of years. He is happy to see that it will be restored.

**Mr. Judson** said he was on this Board when they received word that the work had been done and it was frustration for them. One of their concerns at the time was where the materials had gone. He is delighted to hear today that they are still on site.

**Mr. Deering** said they have not found the casement windows. This is one of the reasons that they are opening the side porch.

**Dr. Henry** extended the Board's appreciation to Mr. Deering and the owner for the work they are proposing to do.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she, too, was on the Board when this happened initially and it was so frustrating for them because they could not get the owner to see what was done was inappropriate.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval of the petition for the rehabilitation, side deck addition, and fence with the condition that the portion of the deck east of the bay be eliminated to - PASS not obstruct the historic Queen Ann bay and to not be visible from Whitaker Street.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

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

5. [Petition of Ed Porter for Georgia Coastal Contractors - H-10-4274-2 - 521 East York Street - Fence and existing windows and doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Ed Porter** was present for the petition.

**Ms. Ward** gave the staff report.

**Ms. Ward** stated that although the iron work is not original to the property or historic, but the petitioner does intent to store it on site and try to find someway to recycle it on the property.

Staff recommends approval of the alteration to the privacy wall and the windows as submitted.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Ward if she had any inforimation why the addition was allowed in 1979.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she could not speak for the review process of 1979, but obviously it was distinguishable from the main building and was probably seen to be reversible.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Porter** explained that the owner has a privacy and safety issue and wanted to raise the wall as it is presently scaleable. He stated that when he saw this, he, too, questioned why this beautiful 1883 building on a lovely corner had a stucco contemporary addition. He believed that anything would be a benefit to this lovely building.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation** stated that their architectural review committee looked at this request and had two modest suggestions that they hope might be helpful for the petitioner's consideration. Mr. Carey said with respect to the wall, the gate is somewhat shorter than the surrounding walls. They see this as a little awkward as it appears to be an afterthought. He said the HSF was wondering if there could be another way to handle the gate. They are not trying to redesign this, but were not sure whether an arch would be put over the gate. Mr. Carey said the HSF other question concerns the casement window. He asked if a single pane casement was being suggested. Their suggestion is that it be a single pane. The casement now appears that it

will open two ways and has a diamond shape pattern.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if this is a single wide casement window or two windows.

**Ms. Simpson** believes there are two windows.

**Ms. Ramsay** said it appears that instead of being a square opening, they are vertical elements.

**Mr. Carey** said they recognize that this is the addition portion. However, they believe that the single pane with the single pivot rather than two might work better on this portion of the building. He believes this will be a more modern treatment for the modern part of the building.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Carey that in terms of the gate would it be helpful if the petitioner installed some of the wrought iron.

**Mr. Carey** said this occurred to him, but he did not want to redesign things. However, he did give thought to whether this was an interesting way to recycle the element that is already a part of this fence and gate. Mr. Carey did not know if this would achieve what the petitioner is trying to achieve in terms of the fence.

**Dr. Henry** stated that he was not trying to redesign anything either, but the Board does try to be helpful.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** stated that the window that is being replaced is not a square window, but a rectangular window. Therefore, the double casement makes more sense than the single casement. He said he looked at this building carefully. His concern is if in fact this is to be Savannah Gray brick. Every patch that he can find on the historic building is with straight portland cement which will ultimately destroy the Savannah Gray brick. While it is not in this Board's standards, it is in the Secretary Standards that portland should not be used on old brick that is softer than the cement. This is being done a lot in this town. If it is going to be modern brick that looks like Savannah Gray brick, there is no problem. If it is going to be antique Savannah Gray brick, it should not be a straight portland cement mix. Mr. Engle wanted to know what the petitioner has to say about this.

**Mr. Porter** explained that they want to use the Savannah Gray brick. He has talked with his mason who has been doing this work for 40 plus years. They will get the proper mortar mix and stay away from the portland. They have already looked into this. This is a safety issue.

**Mr. Overton** asked for an explanation about what is being said about the portland cement.

**Mr. Engle** explained that modern brick is two to three times harder than the historic brick. When they look at the old buildings in this town where bricks are falling off, it is because they have been repointed with mortar that is too hard for the brick. It is a well established fact that the Secretary Standards have proven recommendations that eight and one-half (8 1/2) percent white portland is the recommended amount in any historic mixture.

**Mr. Overton** wanted to know what would be the remaining 93 percent.

**Mr. Engle** answered sand and lime.

**Mr. Porter** said they want to try to match the color as close as possible so that it does not look like a patch. Their plan is to have everything blend together.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Porter to respond to Mr. Carey's comments about the height of the gate.

**Mr. Porter** said he never considered this, but he could check with the homeowner as there is one small section of the fencing that will be removed and it may be applicable to placing on top of this, put an archway or sometime above it to tie it in. Nevertheless, he does see the point and believes the change would make it more aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Porter said he will talk with Dr. Brock about this.

**Mr. Judson** asked the Board if they were clear about the window.

**Mr. Porter** stated that initially it was expected to be a single window, but because of the location and the way it faces the street, the single window did not look aesthetically pleasing. Therefore, it will be a double casement.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the petition for the alteration to the privacy wall and windows with the condition that the owner consider adding an element over the gate to provide consistent height between it and the wall. Any change to that affect is to be submitted to staff for final approval. - 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

## VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

### 6. Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay Architects - H-09-4121-2 - 0 Barnard Street - New Construction

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ward** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting a 12-month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction of a two-story mixed-use building (retail, restaurant, office) and partial demolition and an addition to the adjacent parking garage.

On August 12, 2009, the Historic District Board of Review approved the petition for New Construction with the condition that a sample panel with the proposed materials (including brick, stone, cast stone, red glass) be erected on site and approved by Staff prior to installation.

The staff recommends approval of the a 12-month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness as requested by the petitioner. The Certificate will expire on August 8, 2011.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

### **Board Action:**

Approval for a 12-month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness for partial demolition and addition to the parking garage and for new construction of a two-story mixed-use building with the condition that a sample panel with the proposed materials (including brick, stone, cast stone, red glass) be erected on site and approved by Staff prior to installation. The Certificate will expire on August 8, 2011. - PASS

### **Vote Results**

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

## IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

7. [Petition of Bloomquist Construction - H- 10-4242\(S\)-2 - 612 Howard Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4242\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4242\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

8. [Petition of Kevin Grenier and Michelle Evala - H-10-4265-2 - 5 West Broughton Street - Unit A, Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4265-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

9. [Petition of Scotty Snipes for Snipes Properties, LLC - H-10-4266\(S\)-2 - 532 E. Harris Street - Existing Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4266\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

10. [Petition of Daniel Bowen for Security Finance - H-10-4267\(S\)-2 - 513 E. Oglethorpe Avenue - Relocate An Existing Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4267\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4267\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

11. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects - H-10-4268\(S\)-2 - 508 West Jones Street - Reinstate 12' Wide Opening](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4268\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4268\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

12. [Petition of Dana Saxton - H- 10-4269\(S\)-2 - 603 Whitaker Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4269\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4269\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

13. [Petition of Justin Tran - H-10-4270\(S\)-2 - 1 East Broughton Street, Unit A - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4270\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

14. [Petition of Coastal Canvas - H- 10-4272\(S\)-2 - 321 West Broughton Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4272\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4272\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

15. [Petition of Marie Booker - H-10-4275\(S\)-2 - 505 Tattnell Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4275\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4275\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

16. [Petition of Martin Smith for SCAD - H-10-4276\(S\)-2 - 26 West Harris Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4276\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

## X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

## XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### Notices

17. [Historic District Board of Review - Annual Retreat - August 6, 2010 from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. - MPC, 112 E. State Street, Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room](#)

Attachment: [HBR Retreat - Tentative Agenda.pdf](#)

**Mr. Judson** reminded the Board that their Annual Retreat will be held on August 6, 2010 from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Board Member Reed Engle will give a presentation on the Secretary's Standards. There has been and will continue to be many questions about scope of authority and procedural items. Ms. Ward will address these issues at the retreat. He advised the Board that if they have specific items or questions, to email Ms. Ward so that the items may be clarified.

## XII. OTHER BUSINESS

### Unfinished Business

18. [Petition of Ronald Erickson - H-07-3836-2 - 314-318 W. Taylor Street - New Construction](#)

**Ms. Ward** stated that this item will be on the Board's regular agenda at the August 11 meeting. Therefore, no action is required by the Board today. The Board received a copy of the memo that was sent to the Building Department.

**Ms. Ward** explained that currently she is not a part of the final inspection process. The staff is heavily involved on approval and reviews plans down to minute details to looking at models, look at paint colors, materials and design. But when it gets to the end, staff relies heavily on the City's Development Services to ensure that the plans are executed to match the Historic Review

Board. She said that they would like to help do this and be a part of the process. She reported that the City asked her to go out and look at the new construction project on Taylor Street. It is a row of three townhomes. They back up to Montgomery Street. There has been an issue with this project. Ms. Ward said she does not know whether it was executed properly or drawn incorrectly, but there is a huge problem. They were approved for townhomes and do not back up to a lane. Therefore, the garages are on the front. The garages on the front always present a problem because of the curb cut and driveway right on the pedestrian street. These townhomes are more problematic because there is a stair that comes down to the slope. The slope is very steep and a vehicle cannot be driven onto this. The City is trying to work with the petitioner on how to possibly resolve this.

**Ms. Ward** said staff has suggested that the petitioner get a parking variance, fill it in and put the on street parking back. The on street parking was eliminated when they put in the driveway. The curb cut took away the on street parking. Now, nobody can park on this block. This project was approved prior to the Site Plan Review policy that was adopted in 2007. If there had been a site plan review at that time, this would have been detected.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked where would the guests park.

**Ms. Ward** said currently there is no place for anyone to park.

**Ms. Simpson** asked if a garage was in the original design.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Ms. Simpson** wanted to know why was it changed.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she does not know where the responsibility lies.

**Dr. Henry** believes that the old rules state that a garage can only go out to a lane.

**Ms. Ward** stated that there is no lane here. When there is no lane access, you have a problem. People are required to have a parking space. She believes this is a good situation where a parking variance would have been warranted. This could have been justified. Maybe the units would not be as valuable because they would not have secure parking. However, now the problem is compounded because of the slope into the garage. This was not even technically a Historic Review Board item, but when the staff was asked to go out and look at the site for a final inspection, she was happy to do so and hopeful she will be asked to do this again.

There were a number of other items that were identified that are inconsistent with the plans submitted to the Review Board. This memo was also given to the applicant so the items could be brought forward to the Board either as after-the-fact amendments or they could correct them. She stated that after speaking

with the petitioner today, the plan is to bring it forward to the Board as after-the-fact amendments.

Ms. Ward said she indicated to the petitioner that she had strong concerns with the railing. She said the drawing that they submitted, she would use as a good example and show people to draw it this way; the built product that they have on site is something that she would show as what not to do. There is no way that she can support this. The petitioner is working to find a solution to resolve this. They realize that this will not be supported by staff. She said she also told the petitioner that she would talk with the Board today about how they hope to resolve this to keep the project moving.

The petitioner is looking to get their Certificate of Occupancy, but in her letter to Development Services she asked them to defer the Certificate until these items are resolved. Ms. Ward said the Development Services department felt this was a little heavy handed and obviously, the petitioner felt so too. One solution they talked about, but has not been agreed upon, is that the project get bonded for the amount of the cost of the improvements to bring this up to be consistent with the approved plans and the work actually be carried out by the City or the contractor following the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy so that they can go ahead and sell their properties and get them leased. But, the money would be set aside to improve the railings. Therefore, she believes this is an agreement that they all are willing to accept because the result will be consistent with what was approved.

**Mr. Overton** asked if this is new construction and who is the developer.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the architect, Ron Erickson, applied for this and was actually commended at the meeting for having a wonderful set of plans that were full of details and easy to read. She explained that the developer at that time was Nick Applegate and Cole Holiday. However, she is unsure of the partnership's name at that time. She believes that Mr. Applegate and Mr. Holiday are still involved with this project, but does not know if they are still the owners of the project or simply the contractor.

**Mr. Overton** asked who is the contractor.

**Ms. Ward** stated at one point Mr. Applegate and Mr. Holiday were the owners and contractor, but she believes now that they are only the contractor.

**Mr. Engle** asked how could a Certificate of Occupancy be given when the garage does not meet the code requirements.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the City is working on this. As far as it goes with the Review Board's aspect, the bond was one way to handle this. The City still has some concerns and she has been told that they don't want to issue the Certificate of Occupancy with the slope like it is; however, it meets all the code requirements. However, one thing that is not being met now is the required landing at the base of the stairs with a certain flatness. The petitioner cannot do this now because the slope intersects it as it

comes down and this has to be resolved. But, this is not an issue of the Review Board.

**Mr. Overton** asked if accepting a bond is within the Historic Review Board's purview.

**Ms. Ward** answered no; this would be an agreement with the City of Savannah.

**Mr. Overton** stated that he would not recommend accepting a bond, but an intermediate meeting be held to judicate the issues. He does not believe they want to deal with a bonding company. If it's not the Review Board's purview, then its okay.

**Ms. Ward** stated that this would not be the Review Board, but the City of Savannah. One solution that they like is that when they sign the bond agreement, they actually sign an agreement that gives them access to enter the property so that they can go in and make the repairs themselves and take the money from the bond. Therefore, this assures that it gets done and is consistent with the plans that were submitted and approved. Ms. Ward said, therefore, technically the Board would still approve the plans that are submitted, but it is just how do they make the owner comply with the plans that were submitted and approved by the Historic Review Board. This is the procedural matter that the staff is trying to develop solutions that they all can agree on.

**Mr. Overton** said this has been built flagrantly in his opinion against what was approved. What is the motivation of this Board to approve this? Is it because it has been built?

**Ms. Ward** said the Board would have before them an application with requested changes amendments to a plan. Therefore, the Board would be required to take action on this. If the Board decides to deny the changes, there needs to be a good reason. It cannot be denied just because it is after-the-fact. If the changes are consistent with the guidelines, standards and the ordinance or consistent with the compatibility factors, she feels that they are compelled to approve them.

**Mr. Overton** asked Ms. Ward if she will advise the Board on these issues.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the Board will receive the Staff Report where each item will be covered which will explain whether or not the Board can support it.

**Mr. Engle** said with the slope, there is no way that this is consistent with the guidelines.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked what was the petitioner's reasoning behind eliminating the shutters.

**Ms. Ward** stated that these will be matters that the petitioner will be

responsible for answering. But, when she went into the field to do her inspection, the contractor was there. She said she thought she had the wrong set of plans. However, the two of them had the same set of plans; there were just some changes made in the field. Ms. Ward believes the shutters were eliminated because of cost.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Ward if she would be submitting the discussions to the Board on the changes.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the petitioner will submit an amendment for after-the-fact approval for the changes and anything else that they want to change in the future. The Board would need to take action on this. The Board will be given the Staff Report and she will make a recommendation for approval, denial or something else.

### **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

19. [Next Meeting - Wednesday August 11, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward  
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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