



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
June 9, 2010 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

JUNE 9, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Brian Judson, Chair
Sidney Johnson, Vice Chair
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Richard Law, Sr.
Robin Williams, Ph.D
Ebony Simpson

HDRB Members Not Present: Reed Engle
Linda Ramsay
Gene Hutchinson
W. James Overton

MPC Staff Present: Thomas Thomson, Executive Director
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 May 12, 2010 Minutes](#)

Attachment: [05-12-2010 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve May 12, 2010 Meeting Minutes - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay	
Second: Sidney J. Johnson	
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Not Present
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

2. [Petition of Gregory Schroeder for United Way of the Coastal Empire - H-100514-4258-2 - 428 Bull Street - Principal Use Facia Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

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

3. [Petition of Braddy Electric Co. Inc./Braddy Signs - H-100518-4260-2 - 508 West Jones Street - Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a principal use sign and supplemental identification sign as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Not Present

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

4. [Continued Petition of Daniel E. Snyder, AIA - H-10-4233-2 - 41 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. - New Construction, Part I Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Daniel E. Snyder was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for **Part I, Height and Mass of a new garden wall and ancillary support/service structures** on the north and west portions of the property at 41 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. A **finding-of-fact for visual compatibility of a 2'-6" variance for the height of the wall** is requested. If a finding-of-fact is made, the Historic District Board of Review will need to make a **recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals** for the approval of the variance request.

The petition was continued at the March 10, 2010 Historic District Board of Review meeting for the applicant to provide paper copies of the plans to better communicate the design and intent of the project. No changes have been made to the design.

Further evidence was submitted to support the forward placement of the wall along Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. was incorporated into the report. Documentation of masonry walls extending above the allowed 11' have also been submitted by the applicant and are in the submittal packet.

The site is currently comprised of three separate parcels all zoned B-C (community-

business). A General Development Plan was approved by all City infrastructure departments.

FINDINGS:

The historic building at 41 MLK, Jr. Blvd., now occupied by the Ships of the Sea Museum, was constructed in 1819 for William Scarbrough and designed by William Jay. The property is a National Historic Landmark and is a contributing structure within the Savannah Historic District. This is the only listed building within this block of Middle Oglethorpe Ward. Historic structures across MLK are of a later period in history and are more commercial in nature.

The ordinance states that the wall shall not exceed 11 feet in the Historic District. The height of the proposed masonry wall is consistent with the height of the existing historic wall in the MLK elevation. The topography changes going down West Bryan Street. The corner where Ann and Bryan Streets meet is the tallest portion of the wall at 13'-6".

Variance Criteria. The Board shall make a finding for each criterion below and submit a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals

a. Special Conditions.

- i. Special conditions and/or circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, buildings, or structures involved and which are not applicable to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district; and
- ii. The special conditions and/or circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant; and
- iii. The special conditions and/or circumstances are not purely financial in nature so as to allow the applicant to use the land, buildings or structures involved more profitably or to save money.

A special condition does exist due to the change in topography along the site from MLK to Ann Street.

b. Literal Interpretation. Literal interpretation of the provisions of the regulations would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district within the same or immediately adjacent ward under the terms of the Ordinance and would result in unreasonable hardship on the applicant.

c. Minimum Variance. The variance, if granted, shall be the minimum variance necessary to make possible the reasonable use of land, buildings, or structures.

d. Special Privilege Not Granted. The variance shall not confer on the applicant's property any special privilege that is denied by this Ordinance to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district.

e. General Consistency. The variance shall be consistent with the intent of this Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan, and shall not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or

welfare.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of Part I, Height and Mass with a finding-of-fact that the height of the wall is visually compatible. Staff also recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the 2' -6" variance for the height of the proposed garden wall because a special condition does apply to the property based on the change in elevation of the land.

Mr. Judson thanked Mr. Snyder and the Ships of the Sea Museum for their flexibility in supplying the additional information.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Snyder said they appreciate the opportunity to clarify the information for the Board. This is the site of a national historic landmark. Therefore, this is a very important site. In the 1990s, Mills B. Lane IV restored this project and established it as the Ships of the Sea Maritime Museum. This sort of makes this a great gift to the City of Savannah. As they have indicated, they are developing the parcel to the north of the Ships of the Sea Museum. An important part of this project is that they protect the Scarbrough House. Mr. Snyder said this is a part of the mission of the museum, a part of the requirements of Mr. Lane, and is one of the most important charges that has been given to them. This is the reason that the Ships of the Sea Museum bought this parcel of land so that the Scarbrough House would be protected.

Mr. Snyder explained that as a design scheme, the approach that they took was to wrap the Scarbrough House in a continuous expansion of the garden that is in the back. This means that they will put a garden around the Scarbrough House. This will prevent the encroachment of large buildings against the Scarbrough House. The garden will have a wall that will go around the site. When they look at the elevations, it becomes quite clear that the building of importance is the Scarbrough House. As Ms. Ward indicated, they have an issue of the slope as it slopes down a lot on West Bryan Street. Therefore, they are aligning their new wall with the top of the historic wall which is a Jay designed wall. He stated that by aligning the new wall around the site, they will have a 13'-6" as the height. This would be 30" over the allowed height of 11 feet. It is 13'-6" not 13'-2". They are also requesting a variance. The site section shows how they step down the space in the west end of the site. This will show "open shed" which means it is a large space. By going with the scheme of a garden and garden wall, they are concealing the large space within the garden wall. The roof aligns with the top of the garden wall and the event space nor the roof will be seen from the street. The museum parking is to the south, the garden is behind the museum, and their work is along the vacant land to the north of the existing museum. Behind the museum is the beautiful garden that Mr. Lane gave to the City of Savannah. He said this is one of most beautiful spaces in the city. It is the largest private garden in the city and the admission is free. The garden was designed by Mr. John McEllen and is 13 years old. Mr. McEllen is a local renowned landscape architect who will be doing the work for the new part. Therefore, same level of craft and beauty will be in the new garden.

Mr. Snyder pointed out that the historic wall to which they are aligning is the remaining wall of what was known as the Crammer building. At one time it came out to the

corner where the chain link fence ends. But, when the Crammer building was demolished, it was cut back. Therefore, the wall now terminates about two feet behind the carriage gate. The wall and the steel structure will remain, but they do step incrementally back from the carriage gate. They will have a transverse wall that aligns with the top of the Crammer building wall.

To determine visual compatibility, the ordinance asks that special consideration be given to contributing buildings. He said they are outside the Oglethorpe plan area. As such, they have a different building type, building history and they have the issue of topography. When they look at the drawings from 1871, this area contained many residences, but to date, there is only one house remaining here and it is the Scarbrough House. In determining compatibility, the easiest thing to do is to compare like things and garden walls to garden walls. In the large area, there is no garden wall other than the Scarbrough House. Therefore, it will be a little bit harder to determine visual compatibility. The contributing buildings are across MLK as mentioned by Ms. Ward. These walls do set up a nice wall of continuity. The most important contributing building is the First Bryan Baptist Church. Mr. Snyder said because they are aligning their wall with the existing wall and the road slopes away, the height of the wall will not be experienced by these buildings, but it will be experienced at the bottom. First Bryan Baptist Church is the equivalent of a city block away. They are only talking about 30 inches over 300 feet. Therefore, this is really an insignificant difference being considered. As they go around the remaining context of the area, it will be seen that this is a very diverse area. A parking lot is in this area. There is steel construction where they get the big openings and curtain wall construction. On the southeast corner, there is a building that is more than 22 feet tall. The sum of the two walls is 78 feet without a window.

Across Ann Street, there is the Yamacraw Urban Renewal project. These buildings are lined up in formation and do not face the street. Formally, this is what will be found in the Oglethorpe Planned Area and is a completely different form of structure. On the northwest corner, there is a park which is a part of First Bryan Baptist Church. The contributing building is beyond this. There is a parking lot and then there is very large height, big mass against this huge void. Mr. Snyder stated that he did not believe a similar formal arrangement would be found in the remaining sections of the city. He asked the Board to think about 30 inches as being discernible in this context and 30 inches as it would impact the building beyond this one. He said still pertaining to MLK, the impact of the hotel, a few contributing buildings, the First African Baptist Church (unfortunate the back of the church faces them) and the parking lot.

If this context is evaluated, it would be found that there is no consistency of height or mass. Looking at the other visual compatibility requirements, there is no consistency by which compatibility could be determined. He said they chose this scheme as a house with a garden. This actually refers back to the context of the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century when this part of the town was called the "court end." The street at this time was known as West Broad Street. If one started at the top of West Bay Street, there was a house called Gibbons House and described as one of the best built houses in the city. When this house was demolished the front entry was delivered to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. Also the Stiles House was in the area. It is described as being on 50 acres of land. This was a plantation on the edge of Oglethorpe's plan. The Marshall House was located on the corner of Oglethorpe Avenue and MLK. He asked the Board to notice that the wall continued in a straight line as it left the house and

behind the house was a garden. But, what is not shown is that there was another garden in comparable size next to it. The house and garden were the equivalent of two city blocks. This is how they are approaching this project. They are making a large house with a large garden.

This is exciting for them as it is a rare opportunity to do this. This Board will not get many petitions to come before them in willingness to dedicate this much land to green space. Mr. Snyder said the other exciting thing is that this is an opportunity for them to make some reference to the 18th century rather than as usual to the 19th century.

Mr. Snyder said if they look at the height and mass over time since then Stiles is gone as well as Gibbons. The Marshall House remains; but by 1871, even the houses were being demolished and industrial and commercial buildings were being built. Consequentially, by 1871 we had two large warehouse buildings on their property and another on the adjoining property. By 1884, another was on the adjoining property. However, by the middle of 19th century, there are big blank walls because they are industrial buildings and not commercial building. When you get into the 20th century, the Crammer Building was built. By 1937, an auto supply parts was here. This was a storage building which was not a commercial building. This proves that over time, there was a precedent for big blank walls in this area.

When Oglethorpe laid out the city, he laid it on top of the bluff. They find the wall be a strong and compelling experience. They are powerful and beautiful to witness. They have shown the height of their wall to be 13'-6". The walls on Old Louisville Road are similar to the condition that they will have. The walls are a part of the area and they are a result of the topography just as they have at their site.

Mr. Snyder explained that the dimensions of their service driveway came from the City of Savannah Traffic Engineering Department. The open shed seats 300 people in a reception type setting. Three hundred people is one-half times the size of the Morris Center at Trustees Garden. The challenge for them is would be that if they were to bring this to their site, they would be putting in a building one and one-half times the size of the Morris Center in their backyard. They did not think that this would be adequately protecting the Scarbrough House. Therefore, they felt that by going with the garden wall scheme and concealing this area within the garden wall with the wall to be a little higher by 30", would be a good compromise; thereby protecting the Scarbrough House.

Mr. Snyder said their diagram shows the wall going around the site. The wall steps in and out around the site. This breaks down the mass. Their longest wall is not longer than the historic wall of the Scarbrough House. Therefore, no wall is longer than the historic precedent that was set here. However, the important thing in their diagram is there are views into the garden as you walk around the site. There is a view in the front; a view on West Bryan Street; and two views on Ann Street. This is nothing like the walls that are currently there. This is something that is attractive. The masonry wall is type one at one elevation wrapping around; wall type two is wood about 11 feet above grade wrapping around. He explained that the bottom half of the masonry wall is fig ivy, but brick will be underneath the fig ivy. However, the wall comes up and goes out, and continues up the balance of the height. This gives a clear line to terminate the fig ivy and makes a solid fig and masonry. Wall type two is approximately divided into increments and, therefore, a different massing. Wall type 3 shows a grid. But, they are not proposing that it be a grid.

It is just an abstraction for height and mass.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Snyder if the main reason they are asking for the variance is to hide the roof of the shed or to at least obscure it.

Mr. Snyder answered that is a part of it.

Dr. Henry stated that it was brought up about the possibility of stepping the height of the wall down.

Mr. Snyder stated that this diminishes the viewer's ability to interpret this as a single project. By aligning this it reads better as a unity.

Dr. Henry wanted to know why the variance is being requested. He questioned if one reason is to partially hide the roof and the other reason is that it is more aesthetically pleasing not to step it.

Mr. Snyder answered that it is more aesthetically pleasing.

Dr. Henry stated that he believes this is a very good project. He said that he made it a point to look up the old gas station at 106 West Harris Street and believes it has at least a 15 foot wall around it. Dr. Henry believes it works great.

Mr. Snyder stated that they were the architects for the 106 West Harris project. John McEllen was the landscape architect for this project. They went through the Oglethorpe Plan Area and found many walls taller than their wall. The reason they did not include it is because they do not think that the context of the Oglethorpe Plan Area applies to this area.

Ms. Simpson wanted to know why on the petitioner chose to keep the last 3'-9" on the western side of Bryan Street wall and not have a type three garden view here.

Mr. Snyder said this is sort of the sense of garden wall and project.

Ms. Simpson said on the other side, there is a view.

Mr. Snyder said it is a formal aspect. They like stepping the wall back and really like making the space for bigger vegetation. This makes the wall much more acceptable so they get the vegetation here. The step back automatically made a view into the garden.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Snyder that in his illustration where he showed several other walls outside the Oglethorpe Plan, was he making a point that the wall was 13'-6" so that beyond this, they would be looking at walls that are much higher.

Mr. Snyder answered yes. In most cases, they were over 20'.

Dr. Williams asked if the north wall comes out to the edge of the property.

Mr. Snyder stated that the wall steps back a little.

Dr. Williams asked for the measurements for the overhang belvedere.

Mr. Snyder answered it projects three feet.

Dr. Williams asked if the northernmost edge of the belvedere property is on the line or overhanging public right-of-way.

Mr. Snyder stated that it does not overhang onto the sidewalk. They are three feet back from the property line.

Dr. Williams informed Mr. Snyder that he gave an excellent presentation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Judson reminded the public that the Board's role is to discuss the architectural features. The comments, therefore, need to be limited to the petition as proposed in its architectural features as opposed to land use or any other considerations are outside the purview of the Board.

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation gave a word of support for this project. The petitioner met with the Historic Savannah Foundation architectural review committee on June 8 and they had a very thorough discussion about this project. Mr. Carey said they unanimously agreed that this is a project that the Historic Savannah Foundation can support. Based on the history of what was in this area and also keeping in mind the flexibility of this area that it is outside the Oglethorpe plan, they believe offers some room for creativity. He said for the consistency of the wall height and the structure versus stepping it, really becomes more of a structure and something to look at itself rather than simply a barrier.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry agreed with Mr. Snyder's statement that it is good periodically to experience a strong wall.

Board Action:

1. Approval for Part I, Height and Mass with a finding-of-fact that the height of the wall is visually compatible. 2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the 2'-6" variance for the height of the proposed garden wall because a special condition does apply to the property based on the change in elevation of the land. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Robin Williams
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye
W James Overton	- Not Present
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of William Coggins - H-100407-4237-2 - 313 Berrien Street - New Construction, Part II Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Johnathan Leonard was present for the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction, Part II Design Details, of a 2½ story single-family residence on the property at 313 Berrien Street.

Part I, Height and Mass was approved on May 12, 2010 with the items listed below to be addressed in the Part II submittal. All of these items have been addressed in the revised plans submitted for Part II.

1. Eliminate the solid party wall on the east elevation;
2. Restudy location of parcel lines to allow for window openings on the west elevation which allowed them to put in a parking space on the site as required; and
3. Reposition the windows on the second floor of the front façade to reduce the amount of solid above the windows or lower the height of the second floor.

The property at 313 Berrien Street is zoned RIP-B (residential, medium density). A Specific Development Plan was approved in 2008. A revised plan has been submitted to accommodate parking and to allow for windows on the west elevation. A recombination subdivision plat must be filed and recorded prior to issuance of a building permit.

Hardi-plank siding with wood and hardi trim on windows and fascia and continuous brick foundation and copper gutters and downspouts are being proposed. The ordinance requires that the Hardi-plank have a smooth finish.

Ms. Ward reported that we need specifications on the metal roofing to look at the height of the ribs and the length of the panels. The petitioner has provided a sample of the window. She did not find that this window has been approved on any prior project. It is required that a sample be provided at the meeting. The petitioner has indicated that this same window was used on the other projects that are shown on the site plan. The window is here today on display. The petitioner has also provided small samples of the materials.

Ms. Ward stated that the staff is recommending approval upon verification of the use of smooth Hardi-Plank siding, the specifications for the standing seam porch roof and

shutters, and revised railing detail to be submitted to staff for final approval.

Mr. Gay asked if the under pinning of the porch foundation will be exposed brick or brick over stucco for the stairs and around the porch.

Ms. Ward said continuous brick is what was submitted. But if there is a difference, the applicant can clarify.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Leonard said he has with him the actual window sash. They are asking to use the same exact sash and same color as the other buildings on Berrien and Taylor Streets. He said smooth finish on the Hardi-Plank is not an issue for them. They will also bring in the metal roof details to be sure their standing seam is not too high and is appropriate with the detailing. They will also bring in actual hinge samples to be sure that they are approved at the staff level. He said to clarify the front porch, a brick sample is in their submittal packet. Ms. Ward was correct in her belief that the front porch will actual be brick piers with stucco inserts which will be the same color as the French vanilla.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation said that on yesterday at their architecture review committee meeting a question came up. He believes that the last Board meeting his comments were to actually try to lower the height of the area above the second floor windows. He believes this has been achieved. Yet, at the same time it created a little box. He believes they were trying to search for a little more verticality of the second floor windows in the context of the buildings to the right. Mr. Carey said he only brought this up just in case members of the Board may have the same sort of unsettling feeling about this. Otherwise, the Historic Savannah Foundation did not have any serious objections, but just more of an observation.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Leonard if portions of the windows were dictated by a prefabricated proportion measurements.

Mr. Leonard answered yes. The difference between the two buildings is that the four to the right, second floor windows are six feet tall. In their building, they went down to a five foot tall window to help make the transition between the four large buildings and also be able to keep the same height. They will be able to keep their interior dimensions the same, but, also relate back to the small window on the left. They took the windows that were about six inches lower and raised them up to help achieve a better portion.

Dr. Williams stated that it appears to be different proportions from both the smaller windows to the left and the taller windows to the right, both have more vertical proportions. He asked why.

Mr. Leonard stated the reason could be the two different drawing styles between the designers. It is the same exact window and they all are the same exact width. The only difference between the two, second floor on the new building is a five foot versus the ones on the right are six feet; but they are the same width.

Mr. Judson believes that they all agree that it is somewhat transitional between the other existing buildings on the block.

Mr. Leonard stated that if they have to go back to the six feet window is not a problem. However, from the last meeting, they thought it would actually be better to stick with the five foot window in helping to bring the two together.

Dr. Williams stated that he was wondering if the same manufacturer has a window that is five feet tall, but slightly narrower, but the same portion. He asked Mr. Leonard if the window is 3:5.

Mr. Leonard answered yes; they have two versions. They can go down to 2:8 versus five or they can go down to the next, which will be a 2:6 or a 30 inch up to a five. Therefore, they do have some flexibility dealing with the width.

Dr. Williams stated that if the issues of proportions were a consideration, slightly narrower windows could possibly be used.

Ms. Ward reported that there is a requirement in the ordinance that a minimum of 3:5 be maintained. Therefore, the petitioner can not go any narrower.

Board Action:

Approve the petition upon verification of the use of smooth Hardi-Plank siding, the specifications for the standing seam porch roof and shutters, and revised railing detail to be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

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

6. [Continued Petition of Kathleen Dupuis - H-100422-4245-2 - 217 E. Gaston Street - After-the-fact approval for rear addition](#)

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

Mr. Daniel Brown was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval to construct a one-story rear addition on the building at 217 East Gaston Street as follows:

Location: Rear of the building beneath the ground floor of the rear porch.

Size: The addition encloses the ground floor of the porch area and extends an additional 6' into the rear yard. It is 14'-4" wide and 8'-9" tall.

Materials: Exterior walls are concrete block to be surfaced in stucco with a 6' wide opening for a double French door. The low slope shed roof (3:12) is surfaced with a standing seam metal roof.

Colors: Colors will match the existing trim and body of the main building.

This item was continued from the May 12, 2010 meeting for the applicant to provide a floor plan and wall section of the addition. This information has been provided by the petitioner and can be found on pages two and three of the submittal packet.

The historic building at 217 East Gaston Street was constructed in 1877 as part of row and is a rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density) and is currently occupied by the Old Savannah Inn. The addition was constructed to provide another guest room for the Inn, according to the owner.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff feels that the standards have been met for additions to be subordinate and compatible. It is minimally visible from the rear and cannot be seen from the front. Therefore, the staff recommends after-the-fact approval for the addition as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Brown was representing Ms. Kathleen Dupuis. Mr. Brown said the low slope shed roof (3:12) is surfaced with a standing seam metal roof. The exterior walls appear to be concrete block, but they are scored stucco to show a differentiation between the existing and new stucco. He said if the Board wishes this to be a smooth finish, they will do so.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Brown to what degree would the lights be reduced.

Mr. Brown answered to whatever the staff recommends for the french doors. Presently, they have 27 lights and they can reduce it equivalent to the above existing door.

Mr. Judson explained for a point of clarification that this was not the staff's recommendation, but that the Historic Savannah Foundation suggested this as a design detail.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Brown if he knew the reason why the addition was done before-the-fact in getting approval from the Board.

Mr. Brown stated that Ms. Dupuis came to him after the construction had begun. She told him that she was not from Savannah and did not know about getting prior approval.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Brown if he is a lawyer. Is this his role?

Mr. Brown answered no. Ms. Dupuis hired him after the fact and he came and spoke with the staff. He is an architect.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Judson explained that at the last meeting a significant amount of comments were heard regarding the impact of the construction site on the lane and other factors that are really not a part of the Board purview. If the public is going to comment on the project, Mr. Judson asked them to limit their comments to the design changes and architectural details of the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gay asked if there is a penalty or fine imposed upon an individual that does not get prior approval before starting their work.

Mr. Judson believes this was covered in their last meeting. He said in terms of the permitting process, there is some duplication of fees. This Board has absolutely no power to fine anyone. He knew this is frustration that the staff and the Board deal with. Mr. Judson the staff may want to shed some light on this.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff is meeting with the city tomorrow to discuss additional fees that could be applied.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward to report to the city on behalf of the Board that this is a serious concern. They are not trying to be punitive or vindictive, but the Board has seen a common problem with projects moving forward without proper procedure. The Board is making every effort to make the citizens aware of the process and in all cases, ignorance of the law is not an excuse. The Board would like to see a little more burden placed upon the petitioner in the future.

Dr. Henry wanted to know the ramifications about him possibly abstaining in protest to the after-the-fact approval.

Ms. Ward stated that if Dr. Henry abstains, it should be because he has a financial interest or a conflict of interest. Otherwise, he could recommend denial.

Mr. Judson explained that typical as they define reasons for abstaining, a procedural objection is not one of the reasons.

Ms. Ward stated that Dr. Henry could request that his "NO" vote be recorded in the

decision.

Dr. Henry did not feel that a NO vote would be proper if the petitioner met all the criteria. However, he does have concerns.

Mr. Thomson explained that Ms. Ward was saying that the Board members should vote "yes" or "no." A member can only abstain if they have a financial or conflict interest. However, the member may ask that their "NO" vote be recorded with a statement that you voted no because you did not believe it was appropriate that the work was begun prior to obtaining approval.

Mr. Judson asked that regarding the process, the reasons Mr. Thomson just gave for a Board member to abstain should actually be a reason to ask to be recused prior to the vote in the hearing. Therefore, it would not come down to point where the member would abstain. They should have recused themselves before the discussion.

Dr. Henry explained that he would vote for this as he believes it would be improper to vote against it if the petitioner meets all the criteria.

Board Action:

Approve the after-the-fact petition for the rear addition as amended. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Not Present

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

7. Continued Petition of Cogdell & Mendrala Architects, P.C. - H-100422-4246-2 - 16 Price Street - Rear addition

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. John Mendrala was present for the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for a two-story rear addition on the building at 16

Price Street (northeast corner of Price and East Bryan) as provided below. Changes were made from the previous meeting on May 12, 2010 to address the Board's comments and are indicated in **bold** text.

Location: The majority of the two-story addition is on the northern half of the rear of the property. A second story is also proposed over a portion of the existing one-story rear porch.

Size: Two-story addition, **reduced from the previous submittal, 22'-11" deep** by 14'-4" wide. **The height has been reduced from 21' to 20' to appear subordinate to the primary structure.** A bathroom addition is also proposed over the existing one-story porch.

Materials: The **additions are clad in Hardi-plank siding** and will be painted to match the primary structure. **The bay window has been reduced in size and brackets have been added at the base.** It will feature a copper standing seam roof with copper flashing. **Aluminum clad windows are placed within punched and paired openings with operable louvered shutters. Louvered foundation vents are located within the solid brick foundation. A brick chimney is exposed through the roof.**

Colors: Siding, trim, and shutters to match the main house.

The building at 16 Price Street (aka 18 Price Street) is listed as a rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. The building, however, is not historic and was constructed in the 1960s by John LeBey possibly as a replica of another structure elsewhere in the district. Mary Morrison's *Historic Savannah* states that it is a replica built in 1968. As such, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards do not apply.

The Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps depict a Victorian-type apartment building on the site in 1916. A photograph of this building is provided on Sheet HRB2.7 in the submittal packet.

The property is zoned RIP-A. The addition will not be visible from the front façade (Price Street) but will be visible from East Bryan Street. An existing seven foot tall wooden privacy fence is located along the property line at Bryan Street. There is no lane at the rear of the property.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff is supportive of the wood siding and feels it is compatible with the building. However, the flat roof on the wood siding of the portion of the addition is a little awkward. Staff recommends that the roof shape be restudied to be consistent with the proposed second story addition over the existing porch. Flat roofs can be used on wood frame buildings or additions, but they are typically much smaller. This has been requested on elevator shafts such as things that are seven or ten feet deep. Historically, they had some flat, very low pitched buildings that are wood frame and immediately next door they have this, but they had wide eaves and brackets to minimize the harshness of the wood clapboard going all the way up to just the band board. Staff is recommending that the petitioner look at this again. The petitioner has done a bracketed bay window with punched openings on the rear facade. The standard in the ordinance says that paired windows may be used; however, the individual sashes have to have a vertical or horizontal ratio of 5:3. This is required whether it is on the street or not for the paired group windows. The staff is recommending that this be restudied or widened to meet the standards. This would also

help to better align with the window opening above if it was a little wider. The Marvin windows have previously been approved and met all the standards of the ordinance. The proposed shutters on the paired opening are somewhat out of scale with the rest of the building. Actually, they are almost the size of one of windows on the main building. Therefore, the staff is recommending that a bi-fold shutter be used if a shutter is needed. Ms. Ward summarized that the staff is recommending approval of the addition with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Restudy of the roof on the two-story addition to be consistent with the pitched roof on the second story porch addition or incorporate a projecting eave;
2. Restudy the window sash width on the ground floor south elevation to meet the minimum 5:3 ratio of height to width; and
3. Eliminate the full window sized shutters.

Ms. Ward reported that since the staff's report was prepared, they have met with the petitioner who has had time to look at the staff's recommendations and restudied this. They have met with staff several times. The petitioners are flexible and want to do the right thing to meet the ordinance. It is just somewhat hard to grasp the addition on a non-historic building to make it compatible. Ms. Ward believes the petitioners have restudied the addition to incorporate a pitched roof on the design. The staff was able to look at this yesterday and believes it is a much more appropriate solution. This makes it appear a little larger, but since this is not a historic building, they are not as concerned with making it look subordinate to the main building as much as they are in making it look compatible with the main building and the district.

Mr. Judson said Ms. Ward mentioned the standing seam copper roof. He asked her if she was referring only to the bay window.

Ms. Ward replied yes.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward to be more specific about what she means by a pitched roof over the addition. Which direction is the staff recommending the slope?

Ms. Ward explained that basically, she was recommending some sort of pitched roof or a projecting eave. She said she was suggesting that maybe they could do a pitched roof at the same height as their addition and unify the two additions together. However, this would cut into the bay window and she does not believe that the petitioners would choose this.

Dr. Williams asked if this abuts a building.

Ms. Ward confirmed that it does and when staff met with the petitioners to discuss this, initially they said they wanted to do a gable roof, however, it compounded the neighbor's water problem. However, she believes that the petitioners have been able to resolve this.

Dr. Williams asked if thought was given to a shed roof.

Ms. Ward believes this would be fine as she did not believe it would be perceived that it is a shed roof if you were standing on Bryan Street.

Dr. Williams asked if the staff's concern is more with the junction of the wall to the cornice and basically to the sky.

Ms. Ward stated that if it was just a small bump out, she does not believe it would be awkward, but it is much longer than what they have seen in elevator shafts. This is about two or three times that size. She said the neighboring building probably has a pitch, but what would be seen on the street is basically a flat roof. It has an overhang with a fascia.

Dr. Williams stated that in other words it needs a little more three-dimensional cornice. This would be an easier solution than probably trying to find a roof pitch that would work.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner could answer this. However, she knows it is very important to the petitioners to maintain the bay window.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Mendrala stated that in discussions with staff, they felt the flat roof was a bit awkward. They could not get enough of a slope in the front and back to make it really right and get a full two story. Therefore, they started mimicking the 1967 residential design and trying to pull those redevelopments into it to see if there was some way they could handle the water problem.

Mr. Mendrala said in their discussion with the contractor, two neighbors are trying to solve their water problem between the two buildings. He said they can basically have a low slope cricket about 12 to 18 inches between the existing parapet and/or the slope of their roof which will allow them to drain water to the back side of the building. Because one building projects farther than the other, they can adequately accommodate a sizeable downspout to carry the water away. This solved their water problem. This does bring their roof up closer to the height of the existing building, but he believes it still is more appropriate to the existing structure.

Mr. Gay asked what is the material of the roof.

Mr. Mendrala answered that he believes it is asphalt shingles.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Mendrala if they had a solution to the problem of the water shedding down onto the neighbor.

Mr. Mendrala said they will have a very low cricket. They can also modify the look of the width by bringing their flat wall slightly in. Therefore, they do have some dimensions to play with to make it look appropriate.

Dr. Williams wanted to know whether new addition that is over the rear porch, if the porch is existing.

Mr. Mendrala answered that the porch is existing single story.

Dr. Williams stated that one concern for him is that the addition now sitting above the

porch makes the originally designed physically and visually hold up a relatively small roof . They look inadequate to carry the visual load if not literally the structure load of the addition. He believes the triple window works much better than the over-scaled window with the huge shutters. Dr. Williams asked why the windows were so tall relative to the other windows.

Mr. Mendrala said he believes the thought was to make the lower windows taller than the bay. But, certainly they can be reduced by a foot. He believes they are 3:6. They surely can go to five feet.

Dr. Williams said the greater width will provide a visual base for the bay. Therefore, a 3:5 per window would work better and make it more compatible with the sill line and basically bring it in line with the other windows. The oriol window or the bay window above, it seems aesthetically ornate to a building that has a handsome severity about it. Underneath the bracket or bay, there is a very complex series of moldings that is unlike anything else in the house. He did not believe that copper is anywhere else in the house.

Mr. Mendrala answered that copper is nowhere else in the house.

Dr. Williams likes the bay, but he was wondering about the ornate. He believes that it could be simplified to be more in keeping with the line of the house. He said he is not opposed to copper, but was wondering if there was a specific rationale for the copper.

Mr. Mendrala stated that he believes the owner was going to paint the copper. Therefore, he believes they will end up with color here.

Dr. Williams asked if the roof was bell shaped or straight spokes.

Mr. Mendrala answered that it was bell shaped.

Board Action:

Continue to the Special Called meeting on June 16, 2010 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Richard Law, Sr

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

8. [Petition of Harleston Cabaniss - H-100518-4259-2 - 216 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Alteration/Partial Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Judson stated at this point that the Board did not have a quorum due to Mr. Gay leaving for another meeting. He asked the Executive Director, Mr. Thomson, to clarify the procedure for the Board. Mr. Thomson explained that due to the loss of a quorum, any actions undertaken by the Board would be counterproductive. He explained that the Board should select a date and time to have a special called meeting to/ continue the remaining items on the agenda.

The Board agreed to have the a special called meeting on Wednesday, June 16, 2010 at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Samuel Stromm stated that he was present representing Mr. Harleston Cabaniss and requested that the Board hear their petition today. They are aware that the staff has recommended denial of their petition and they were not protesting staff's recommendation.

Ms. Ward explained that she could go ahead and give the staff reports today if it is the Board's desire. However, she will have to give the reports again at the Special Called Meeting as the Board's vote would not be official and ratified and, therefore, she could not issue the Certificate of Appropriateness until a quorum has voted on all of the petitions.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish a wood frame trunk room addition on the third floor of 216 E. Oglethorpe Avenue. The exterior wall that will be exposed will be infilled and covered with stucco to match the existing wall of the building. The request is being made to eliminate any potential liability that may exist between this property and the neighbor over a leak in the roof area.

The historic building at 216 E. Oglethorpe Avenue is the western end of a row of townhouses constructed from 1872 to 1874. The building is a rated structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District.

Between 1884 and 1898 a wood frame trunk room was added to the third floor of the end of the row at 216 E. Oglethorpe Avenue. By 1898, a wood frame trunk room was constructed and appears on the map.

The room cantilevers over the open space between the end of this row and the neighboring brick double-house. This is a unique feature that is not typical of the district. This simple space is surfaced in wood siding and features an historic two-over-two double-hung sash wood frame window typical of the period of construction. No documentation of structural damage has been submitted.

The following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation apply:

2. *The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*

4. *Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends denial to remove the historic trunk room because the alteration does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and would remove a historic character defining feature of the building.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cabaniss reported that his contractors have not seen any connection with the alleged water problem as stated by his neighbor. It appears to him that his property at 216 East Oglethorpe is not responsible for the water problem. The neighbor has some problems, but they are not caused by him.

No action was taken. Continued to the June 16, 2010 Special Called meeting due to loss of quorum.

9. [Petition of Steve Day - H-100519-4261-2 - 12 Price Street - Rear Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Steve Day stated that he is aware that the Board could not vote on the petitions today, but from his perspective as a contractor, it would be beneficial to him to know whether the Board has a concern or problem with his petition. This would enable him to meet with his client and try to get it resolved before he appears again on next Wednesday. If there is a problem, he would also be able to meet with staff before next Wednesday.

Mr. Judson explained that he saw value in hearing the remaining petitions. This would move the conversations forward.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval to add a second-story over the existing rear addition on the building at 12 Price Street.

The historic residence at 12 Price Street was constructed in 1817 and is a rated structure within Savannah's National Historic Landmark District. The existing rear second story addition was approved in 1999 with conditions that it be redesigned to reduce the mass and height to not obscure the simple one-room form that is a significant characteristic of this early 19th century structure.

The property is zoned RIP-A (residential, medium density) and there is no change in footprint to the building.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be impaired.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval with the following to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Restudy the window type and lite pattern on the smaller rear windows.
2. Incorporate appropriate trim work on windows.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward if new drawings would be helpful.

Ms. Ward answered yes if the Board agrees with the staff's comments.

Dr. Henry stated that he would like to see what the finished drawing would look like.

Ms. Ward explained that basically she believes that it would just entail that there would be a drip edge and all the windows would have headers, sills and surrounds.

Dr. Williams asked if the previously approved addition was the left-hand edge. The proposal shows that this is flushed with the original wall. He wanted to know where in-between is the staff recommending.

Ms. Ward answered that the staff has not given a specific number. It will be some distance from the roof as the staff believes the roofline helps to break up the mass so that it does not appear to be so solid. There is a little overhang here and she believes that the petitioner could explain this better, but the drawings show that this will be eliminated and just have the band. She believes that if the shed roof shape is being preserved, it seems natural to preserve the overhang.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Day stated that he and Ms. Ward have had a number of discussions about the project. He said they decided to keep the exact same pitch that they have on another section. This will give them a flat edge. They do not have a problem with the staff's suggestion of maintaining the drip edge. As far as the windows are concerned, the two smaller windows are in a bathroom and a closet. His client did not want a large window here simply because they did not want the sunlight to fade their clothes. Also, the additional size of the window would eliminate space in the bathroom. Nevertheless, they will work with the staff to come up with the right size and type of windows. The shutters will be operable and built with Spanish cedar.

Dr. Williams asked if the roof flats out roughly about two feet from the back.

Mr. Day answered yes. However, his client is not happy with this. They are concerned about the possibility of a leak. But, if they do about a one-half or almost two pitch on this, they can get away with this. Therefore, this could be rubber roof whereas the rest would be shingles just as the roof is today.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Day if the owner has considered making the addition longer than the current one, but shorter than the one being proposed. He said that looking at the rear elevation of the model, it actually is substantial and seems overwhelming. This is a very delicate house and he was not here in the 1990s when the original addition was approved, but he was wondering if the owner would be agreeable to pull the wall back. This would eliminate the roof plain issue and the mass.

Mr. Day explained that this would eliminate the functionality of the bathroom which would shorten the shower to the point where they would almost not have enough room for a standard shower which at a minimum is 900 square inches.

Dr. Williams said obviously this would impact the bedroom to the left. He asked what is the function of the space on the right.

Mr. Day said it is a closet. In the other area is space for a washer and dryer and the other is a bench in the bathroom.

Dr. Williams asked if the current roof pitch is parallel to the lower roof pitch.

Mr. Day answered no. The existing roofline works well for them. Therefore, they will only be adding the flat area here. Just as Ms. Ward has stated, he believes that the drip edge will work greatly. They have a six inch wide drip line already and they will be able to carry it around and down to the rear of the house and up the other side.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Day what would have if he took the line and rather than flattening it out, kept the roofline straight.

Mr. Day said they would lose about six inches on the back line.

Dr. Williams stated that they are talking about a shower. They would lose a little head room. He asked Mr. Day if this was an option that he could explore.

Mr. Day answered that this is an option that they could explore. Or, the Board could let him raise the roofline a little.

Dr. Williams stated by having the roof straight, it would make it even more subordinate because it would be shorter. He was only looking for strategies that would diminish the mass.

Mr. Day stated that this would simply bring it down about four to six inches on the outside and lower the line of windows. He has already talked with his clients about this and they are willing to look at this.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Day if he was suggesting that he would extend the lower level.

Mr. Day explained that they could carry the six inch lip around and tie it in so that the roof would look like it is cutting through the new addition. This would give them a good definitive line that differentiates between the new and the old.

Ms. Simpson told Mr. Day that she was saddened by the major changes to such a historic and wonderful building. It now looks like a suburban/contemporary house.

Mr. Day stated that he knew what Ms. Simpson was saying as he lives in an 1851 house. The reality is, though, it is not an 1851 house. The house was built for a specific family at that specific time, but there has been many changes to it and changes will continue. They now have new kitchens that were not available at the original time, there is in-door plumbing and all the other things that were not available in 1851. Therefore, they have to accept the fact that things are going to change, but they don't want to destroy what they had in the past because they have a beautiful jewel here. He stated again that he knew what Ms. Simpson was saying, but as people become older they put elevators in the houses.

Dr. Williams asked what are the plans for the existing 1817 rear cladding on the second floor that will be impacted by the addition. He asked if the cladding where they are not punctating it with doors be encapsulated inside the new walls so that theoretically one could come back take the addition off and put it back to the state where it is now.

Mr. Day said this would be difficult. It would be nice to do, but he was not sure what value this would lend to the overall project and the overall integrity of the house.

Dr. Williams stated that it would preserve the integrity.

Mr. Day stated that it would preserve the integrity of the house, but if he started cutting it up because he has to get through the wall to install electrical and all sorts of things, he is not sure of what he has done to preserve the wall. He said that he would have new drawings for the Board on next Wednesday.

No action was taken. Continued to June 16, 2010 Special Called meeting due to loss of quorum.

10. [Petition of Alex and Robin Moore - H-100520-4262-2 - 607 Tattnell Street - Alterations and fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the building at 607 Tattnell Street as follows:

1. Remove non-historic side entry portico.
2. Replace non-historic side entry door with two-over-two double-hung wood window

- sash. Replacement sash to be obtained from rear addition.
3. Replace two historic windows with French doors to access a wooden deck to be submitted for approval at a later date. New doors are wood frame 15-lite doors by Jeld-Wen to be 36" wide by 96" long. The existing wood headers will be retained and preserved.
 4. The existing HVAC units will be relocated to the rear of the property for installation of a future deck and will be screened by a privacy fence (see below).
 5. Install a six foot tall dog-eared wooden privacy fence along the rear and north sides of the property.

The historic building at 607 Tattnall Street was constructed in 1871 and is a rated building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District.

The existing side porch and entry door were approved by the Historic Review Board in November 1997 and subsequently installed. At that time, aluminum siding was removed and aluminum windows were replaced with two-over-two double-hung wood sash windows.

A new deck is mentioned in the submittal packet, however not enough information was provided to review the proposed deck and as such, it is not being reviewed at this time. The applicant will resubmit plans for the deck as an amendment at a later date.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the following standards from the Historic District ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply. The proposed change from a window to a door is on a secondary elevation and is compatible with the overall design of the building. The wood fence must be painted or stained.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval to remove the existing side portico, replace the side entry with a two-over-two, single-pane, double-hung sash wood frame window, install French doors within the two window openings on the north elevation, and install a wood fence to be painted or stained. The color must be submitted to staff for final approval. Insufficient information was provided for the deck and was not reviewed at this time.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Moore apologized for not having the drawings for the deck today. They decided that they would be doing the deck six months to a year later. They are not seeking approval for the french doors. They will keep the windows as they are. Ms. Moore explained that they are requesting to remove the porch as the house is no longer a duplex, but a single family residence. The side entrance is no longer needed. They want to install a fence along their property line at the edge of the porch. It will be a six foot dog ear fence with a gate.

Mr. Judson said the staff's report mentioned replacing the door that is being removed with one of the sash windows.

Ms. Moore stated that they would like to replace it with a double hung window, single pane.

No action was taken. Continued to June 16, 2010 Special Call meeting due to loss of quorum.

11. Petition of Bryce Bounds for the Spriggs Group - H-100520-4264-2 - 349 W. Bryan Street - Elevator Addition

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No Action Taken. Continued to June 16, 2010 due to loss of quorum.

12. Petition of Kevin Grenier - H-100520-4265-2 - 5 W. Broughton Street - Principal Use Facia Sign

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No Action Taken. Continued to June 16, 2010 due to loss of quorum.

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

13. Petition of Becki Harness for Coastal Heritage Society -H - 10-4252(S)-2 - 601 West Harris Street - Roof Repair (Boiler Room)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4252\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4252\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

14. Petition of Becki Harness for Coastal Heritage Society -H - 10- 4253(S)-2 - 601 W. Harris Street - Roof Repair (Coach Shop)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4253\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4253\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

15. Petition of Sam Carroll - H-10- 4254(S)-2 - 414 East Taylor Street - Color Change

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4254\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4254\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

16. Petition of Kent Harrington H -10- 4255(S)-2 - 518 East Bryan Street - Color Change

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4255\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4255\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

17. Petition of Jack Largent - H-10 - 4256(S)-2- 225 West Broughton Street - Sign Face Change

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4256\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4256\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

18. Petition of Red Marsid - H-10-4257(S)-2 - 20 East Broughton Street, Install Lettering on Existing Awning

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4257\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4257\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

19. [Petition of Alex and Robin Moore - H-10-4263\(S\)-2 - 607 Tattnall Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4263\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4263\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

20. [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](#)

Mr. Judson reminded the Board that their Annual Retreat will be held on Friday, August 6, 2010 from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. An excellent lineup of speakers will be present.

Dr. Williams asked if consideration was ever given to limiting the length of time that an applicant may present his/her petition. In other words, he wanted to know if the Board could set a limit such as saying the individual has up to 15 or 30 minutes to present his case as opposed to an individual taking 45 minutes or an hour.

Mr. Thomson explained that he was unaware of what the Board's by-laws state, but the Metropolitan Planning Commission has time limits in their by-laws. He said essentially, it is left to the discretion of the chairman how long an applicant may speak, but he believes the MPC by-laws state that the time for and against an item is no longer than 30 minutes. The applicant could take up all of the time which would be 15 minutes and the remaining time would be divided equally. Then they would get a rebuttal at the end of the against item. However, the chairman sets the time limit based upon the issue, the number of speakers and number of other things.

Mr. Thomson explained that if the Board wants to address this, it could be put on the Retreat's agenda.

Mr. Judson said at the beginning of the meetings that he will inform the public that they have a number of items on the agenda and ask that each presenter use their time wisely.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

21. Next Scheduled Regular Meeting - Wednesday, July 14, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street

Mr. Judson reported that Mr. Reed Engle had surgery on yesterday. He asked the Board to keep Mr. Engle in their thoughts.

Petitions not heard or continued due to loss of quorum will be heard at the Special Called Meeting Wednesday, June 16, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah Ward
Preservation Director

SW: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.