



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM
NOVEMBER 10, 2010 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

NOVEMBER 10, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Member Not Present: Ned Gay

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Tiras Petrea, City Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Chairman Judson called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approval of October 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [10-13-2010 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

-

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle

-

Nicholas Henry

-

Gene Hutchinson

-

Sidney J. Johnson

- Not Present

Brian Judson

- Abstain

Richard Law, Sr

-

W James Overton

-

Linda Ramsay

-

Ebony Simpson

-

Robin Williams

- Not Present

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

3. [Petition of Jean Holland, Jr. - H-10-4330-2 - 136 Bull Street - Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the alteration on the storefront with the condition that the wooden frame of the historic not be damaged, removed, fastened to, or altered - PASS and that the installation of the ATM and surround be reversible.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Gene Hutchinson

- Aye

Sidney J. Johnson

- Aye

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

4. [Petition of Joel Levine - H-10-4331-2 - 301 East Factor's Walk - Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams
Second: Gene Hutchinson

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

5. [Petition of Benjamin Mattern - H-10-4334-2 - 10 West Liberty Street - Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for the freestanding principal use sign, hung from the existing sign post, as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams
Second: Gene Hutchinson

Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye

W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

6. [Petition of Christian Sottile, Joe Greco, and Neil Dawson for Savannah College of Art and Design - H-08-4068-2 - 301 Martin Luther King Jr., Blvd. - Alteration/New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Christian Sottile was present on behalf of the petition.

Dr. Robin Williams is an employee of SCAD and recused himself from the discussion of this petition.

Mr. Judson disclosed that his wife works for SCAD in a staff position. He has no vested interest in SCAD's physical developments and he does not vote in HBR decisions.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner requested approval to amend the approved design to the front portico entry for the SCAD Meseum at the north shed of the Central of Georgia Railroad Building at 601 Turner Boulevard (formerly 233 and 301 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard).

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the amendment to the portico as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Christian Sottile thanked the staff for working with them as they went through the process of making the amendment. Mr. Sottile entertained questions from the HBR.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the amendment to the portico as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

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

7. [Amended Petition of David Bloomquist - H-10-4279-2 - 10 East Taylor Street - Stucco Wall](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner requested approval for alterations to an existing brick garden/privacy wall along Taylor Lane at 10 East Taylor Street. The petitioner requested to stucco the garden side (south facade) of the lane wall. The proposed stucco is a lime-based cement applied in two coats of a natural color.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommended denial of the petition because as submitted, covering the wall in stucco is not recommended by the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines and, therefore, does not comply with the Historic District Ordinance Section 8-3030(I)(1).

Dr. Williams asked that in photo three (3) where the wall meets the building, is the building stucco?

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams wanted to know if this is the building that is being discussed or is this a neighboring building?

Ms. Ward stated the building is a neighbor's property.

Dr. Henry asked what areas the petitioner wishes to stucco.

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioner wishes to stucco the interior wall.

Dr. Williams stated that if he understood the staff's basis for their assessments, it is not opposed in principle, but basically the absence of supporting data.

Ms. Ward answered correct.

Dr. Henry stated that he is aware that the staff is technically and legally correct in their decision, but the law does not seem sensible in this instance when all the indications are

that at one time it was stucco.

Ms. Ward answered that this is ultimately the HBR's decision, but the staff does not believe that the guideline has been met due to the lack of physical evidence being provided by the petitioner.

Dr. Williams stated that he would agree that if there was no stucco on the wall, but the staff has almost built the argument for undermining their own position. There are two good compelling pieces of circumstantial evidence. One is the stucco on the top. A stucco cap on a brick wall is not common and secondly, the brick work is a stucco-grade brick.

Ms. Ward stated she believes they could theorize about it and ultimately the decision is the HBR.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

The petitioner was not present.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he does not agree with the assessment. He believes the cap is portland cement. He believes also that it protects the wall and was done probably because of water intrusion on the top of the wall and the bricks were falling off. This is done all over town. They only slap a parge coat on top of a wall to get water from penetrating a wall. But, it does not mean that the entire wall was originally stucco. The wall is pointed on the interior; generally, when you are going to stucco a wall, you don't point it. The joints are left open so that the stucco adhere. If it was originally stucco, it was not intended to last very long because there is nothing to mount it to when you have pointing. This is all conjecture and they should not be dealing with conjecture. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards are explicit. You don't put coating on walls that did not have coatings. If it was totally invisible from the street, it would be a different situation, but this isn't. This is the problem.

Mr. Judson said the pointing proposes an alternate view.

Dr. Williams stated that this could be that it was repointed.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Engle if he is convinced that the stucco cap came later.

Mr. Engle answered that this is portland cement and is probably a 1920 cap. He was not saying that the brick under it came later, but he can show dozens of these all over the Historic District where they came along and parged the cap on top of a brick wall to keep water out.

Dr. Williams said he just noticed that the brick bond suggested that this probably was not covered in that every fifth or sixth soldier course as opposed to the running length of the

brick. Perhaps, this is further evidence that it was not covered.

Board Action:

Denial of the petition because covering the wall in stucco is not recommended by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines and therefore, - PASS does not comply with the Historic District Ordinance Section 8-3030(1)(1).

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: W James Overton

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

8. [Petition of Timothy J. Bright for Holder Properties, Inc. - H-10-4323-2 - 22 Barnard Street - New Construction, Part II, Design Details, Phase A](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present on behalf of the petition were: Mr. John Holder of Holder Properties; Mr. Tim Bright of Holder Properties, Mr. Huntley Gordon of New South Construction; Mr. Jay Andrews of Palmer and Cay Properties; Mr. Joe Stryker and Mark Valliere of Small, Reynolds, Stewart and Stewart; and Mr. Christian Sottile, Design Consultant.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner requested approval for New Construction, Part II Design Details, Phase A, of a six-story mixed use commercial, retail-office building on the vacant north east Trust Lot on Ellis Square bounded by Barnard, Bryan, Whitaker and St. Julian Streets. The property at 22 Barnard Street is currently used for surface parking with three levels of public underground parking below grade.

The project is proposed to provide offices for the U.S. Attorneys and will be leased by the General Services Administration (GSA) of the Federal Government and other tenants.

The petitioner has gone through the General Development Plan Review and are now undergoing the Specific Development Plan Review with the City. Ms. Ward stated that a

number of comments have been made, but none of the comments affect the design of the building.

Ms. Ward said that due to the size and significance of the this project, the staff recommended that the HBR review the design details in two phases. It was recommended that the HBR review Phase A, which is comprised of the design and architectural elements including window, cornices, pilasters and articulation of the exterior facades. Phase B will consist of the materials, texture, colors and the applied elements such as lighting and awnings. Therefore, today, the HBR can focus on the design details, the actual design and architecture. Then at a later meeting, they will consider the color and materials. Ms. Ward believes this would result in a less confusing process and give both the Review Board the ability to seriously consider the design elements without getting caught up in the colors and materials, which should be considered very carefully on a project of this size. The model is on display today for the HBR to review and examine.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommended approval of Part II, Design Details, Phase A with the following conditions to be resubmitted in Phase B: 1. Verify height of limestone base at storefronts; 2. Restudy the Palladian windows to reduce the vertical orientation; 3. Eliminate the vertical window mullions within windows in the central bay to reduce the vertical orientation and reinforce the 3:5 ratio; 4. Recess all window frames four inches from the facade in upper floors; 5. Further articulate the brick parapet on all four elevations; 6. Restudy and eliminate the piers and balustrade above the cornices; 6. Reduce the vertical orientation and put a top on the building; 7. Enlarge column piers at main entry; and 8. Restudy the location of the loading bay on St. Julian Street.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Ward if she was comfortable with the use of face brick as opposed to actual brick.

Ms. Ward answered that she believes the petitioner should use actual brick. It can be a veneer and does not need to be a true brick wall, but they should use a brick. There are sections that reveal a one inch that backs up to a concrete wall. She believes this would be obvious.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she asked this question as it was not a part of the staff's recommendation.

Ms. Ward replied that this would be a part of Phase B consideration. It is noted in the staff's report that the petitioner is using the face brick and the staff does not support this.

Dr. Henry wanted to know if the petitioner has lowered the building.

Ms. Ward reported that the petitioner has indicated that it has been lowered eight inches. However, there is a change in grade that was not reviewed or considered during Part I. Because the engineering drawings are continuing to be developed through this process, they now know there is a foot and one-half difference between Barnard and Whitaker Streets.

Dr. Henry assumed that the project is the higher one.

Ms. Ward answered that the project fronts on both sides. One side is lower and on side is

about six inches to a foot taller. It was proposed at 87 feet and six inches. But, now it is 88 feet and four inches on the Barnard Street side and 86 feet and ten inches on the Whitaker Street side.

Dr. Henry asked if the 86 feet lower than the corresponding building, the building closest to it. He believes they talked about trying to get this building the same height as the other buildings.

Ms. Ward answered that she believes this was considered during Part I review of the project. She can pull the file on it. She asked Dr. Henry if he was talking about the historic building, the new hotel or the Palmer and Cay building.

Dr. Henry stated if at all possible with the height restrictions, is it consistent with the guidelines concerning height?

Ms. Ward responded that the HBR's decision was that it is compatible.

Dr. Williams stated that he had two questions. He said Ms. Ward mentioned the columns and the arch; he asked is it on page 16.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward what is her recommendation.

Ms. Ward answered that the pedestal of the column be enlarged.

Dr. Williams said the staff needs to ensure that the petitioner is enlarging the right part of the architecture. The columns look appropriate. He stated that a lot of Ms. Ward's comments were predicated on reducing verticality. He asked if this is to diminish the appearance of height in lieu of actually lowering the building.

Ms. Ward stated that the design of the building, itself, and the repetition of the pilasters and bays create a strong vertical orientation. She believes this is okay for a tall building, but all of the additional architecture features exaggerate it even further. She believes that they should provide a more horizontal orientation to help balance the building. But, the repetition of the pilasters and the alignment of the vertical windows and the bays on the corners are okay.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward to give the basis for the criticism of the Palladian windows as she mentioned that many buildings historically in Savannah do have an elaboration on their top floors to serve the tall buildings formula that top flooring gets a more elaborate treatment. He asked Ms. Ward if there was anything particularly about the Palladian windows that is objectionable or is it a tripod form and, therefore, the verticals are contributing as all the other windows.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes the tripod is okay because it is aligning from the window type below. She believes this is fine, but the arch in the center continues to point up and lead the eye upward. They should start at the top of the building and add more horizontal lines to show that it is the end of the building and not continue.

Dr. Williams stated that putting arches on the top of buildings is a classic turn of the century tall building device. Therefore, in some ways, it could be argued that this helps to provide a motif so that arches are not just at the bottom.

Ms. Ward said she is recommending that the petitioner use a more squared-off window to be consistent with the others. However, this is a decision for the HBR.

Mr. Engle wanted to look at photo 9. He asked if staff gave any consideration to the center bay top floor being cast stone to emphasize horizontality. The biggest vertical thrust that seems to be the staff's concern is the massive red brick. If it had a white stripe it would tend to emphasize horizontality.

Ms. Ward stated that she agrees with Mr. Engle's statement. She tried to limit her comments on the materiality of the building, but she has some suggestions and, therefore, believes this is a good comment to make. The staff is recommending that the petitioner change the vertical pilasters to be consistent with the brick pilasters that they have on the sides. It appears that at least on the east and west elevations that when there is a change of plain or change in material, the petitioner is alternating materials from the bottom to the center and to the corners. She believes that more consistency is needed. She has not considered cast stone, but believes it would also help cap the building. However, she believes that some projection here would help and also minimize the additional height of the mechanical portion.

Mr. Judson reminded the HBR that they broke this up as Phase A and Phase B. Therefore, the actual materials and colors will be discussed in their future consideration.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Holder thanked Ms. Ward for her help in assisting them with trying to solve some of their sticky issues. He said on many occasions it has been stated that this is a GSA building. But, he wanted to clarify that this is not a GSA building. It is a building where GSA will be a tenant. They will occupy about 65% of the building. However, GSA will be have a lease. The property is privately owned. The decisions, therefore, are not being driven by the GSA, but by the persons that are present today.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Holder if he read the article in the Savannah Morning News this morning.

Mr. Holder answered yes.

Dr. Henry said he read that the GSA vetoed making accommodations concerning the height.

Mr. Holder stated that they talked with the GSA about their space and the ceiling height.

Dr. Henry said that the article stated that the GSA objected to reducing the height between the floors.

Mr. Holder said that they did not talk with GSA specifically about this.

Mr. Judson asked the HBR to keep their conversation today to the approval of the design details.

Mr. Valliere came forward and thanked Ms. Ward for separating this into two parts. They are still looking at the materials and will probably do a lot more markups and work before they finalize the materials. However, they wanted the HBR to see the materials so they could get their thoughts so that when they return next month, they will be able to share with the HBR their final materials and that they would be happy with the selection.

He wanted to address some of the comments that Ms. Ward brought up. One comment was about the full brick verses the face brick. At one time, they were considering the project to be predominately precast with a brick tile. However, they are not doing this, but will go to a full brick at the middle floor. They are still considering precast for the two-story base of the building and probably will either precast or cast stone on all the light trim including the upper floor. This is still being worked out; it is a budget issue, but, nevertheless, the details they submitted to the HBR are all actually based on the cast stone and brick. Therefore, if the project is completely cast stone and brick, they are in good shape and none of the details will change. If they do the precast at the base as he mentioned in their previous meeting, they will bring the bonding pattern in the two-by-three just as shown in the drawings. Consequently, it will look like large stone laid up.

Next, **Mr. Valliere** commented on the Palladian window. This is a new addition and Dr. Williams somewhat addressed it. This is definitely an embellishment; they are trying to add a little more to the project. He said in the middle windows, there is a divided light which has a functional reason. The building is on a ten foot module for the partitions that their tenants will have. The piers are actually ten feet on center, but they have an option to shift the ten feet to one-half increments which would put the partitions in the center of the window. The center of the windows is actually half the distance between the piers. You have to cut through this to maximize the flexibility of a tenant in doing their partitioning layouts. The module for the building is five feet; the typical partition is ten feet; the larger partitions or offices for the executives are usually 15 feet. They are typically located in the corners of the buildings, but they could be located in the middle. They are working this out now with the tenant. He said it would be hard to build a partition up to a window. You would need a muntin or frame to terminate the wall.

They will have to consider glazing; the clear glass is for the retail. As has been pointed out, the retail is now moved to St. Julian Street. They want to typically use as much clear glass into retail because of the visibility and the retail tenants want this. It is not always a good energy issue, but, nevertheless, in this case a good retail somewhat trumps this. The other glasses are not tinted. Both of the glasses are low e-coating as there is no tint. They are still analyzing this based on the amount of windows they have, how much shading coefficient they need in the glass? This is a clear glass, but is a little darker in the low e-coating. To meet the energy code, he suspects that this is what they will have. The last glass panel is a spandrel. They have conditions in the building where there is glass above the ceiling height and this is actual a spandrel glass. This means that it is clear light on the outside, but has a ceramic or solid coating inside.

Mr. Valliere stated that Ms. Ward commented about adding the cornices along the middle. He said they are open to this. He stated that initially why they did not do so is in

response to the zoning in an effort to try to break the building down so that it would not look like one solid building; especially over the long 187 feet length. They may have gone a little too far under zoning. This goes even into the comment about maybe taking the middle six floor and actually changing this to cast stone. They are open to this, too. With regards to eliminating the balustrade at the corners, this would reduce the verticality of the building, but it would take away from enhancing what they are trying to do at the corners. Therefore, because of this, they are a little reluctant to do this, but will consider it and bring this back before the HBR in a month. Regarding the piers at the columns at the entrance is actually a Palladian column and base. But, when he looked at it initially, the podium of the column looked a little too small; therefore, they will consider increasing this also. Mr. Valliere said pertaining to the coffered arch at the entrance, he typically does not like to hang stone; this makes him nervous. He said they will supply more details with this.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Valliere to give clarification regarding his statement about the coffered ceiling.

Mr. Valliere explained that the arch comes down to the spring point. It is about four and one-half feet. This entire element will be done with stucco and there will be a precast return. It will be a nice return on the arch, but the coffer portion is stucco. They put in a lot more joints here and are very sensitive about how they paint and color it to make it look more like a stone coffer. This is done for safety purposes.

He said they are not proposing that the window frames be white. One of the vernaculars they are leading toward is a Georgian style which traditionally requires a lighter color frame to contrast with the brick color. What they are proposing is an off white; they are very sensitive to having it white because they are aware of how dirty it gets. Mr. Valliere said, however, in the end, it might be a littler darker than what is shown, but as he has said, they don't want a darker frame. They like the window pane patterns. This will actually add a little more detail and articulation to the windows. The color is more on a residential scale. The screen wall at the top will be stucco and there will be a cornice that will be stucco also; and there are some vertical joint patterning. At the last meeting they said they will pull the skins as much as possible off of the main facades, which on St. Julian Street is where the retail will be located. Mr. Valliere said they have actually pulled off six feet, but they are looking to pulling this even further, but they are waiting for the final equipment. Consequently, he did not want to show the HBR something that would get their hopes up that would show ten to twelve feet back until they know all the final equipment sizing. Some satellite dishes would be installed up there for the tenant and some other equipment.

Mr. Valliere said on Bryan Street, they are approximately three feet off and a roof is over this portion; this is the elevator, machine and equipment rooms. The cores are down below. Therefore, it is limited as how far they can get off of Bryan Street. It may be two to three feet at the most. Everything was primarily with the core, but it was flipped over. He stated that it would be a lot easier maneuvering the truck in and off of St. Julian Street, but according to zoning, Whitaker Street is considered the service street. He prefers to keep it on Whitaker Street for two reasons. This is a dominant corner for retail; it has probably the largest sidewalk area that is unobstructed by ramps or grates. Therefore, this is too valuable a retail corner to give up to servicing. They had a discussion with the City today on the servicing location and what they can do to minimize it; how they load and unload.

This is an ongoing discussion. However, he would like to keep it where it is shown as he believes it is more beneficial from the interior and the retail experience. They have a large grate and they are discussing with the City on how to deal with this.

He said that the limestone height is at the base. There is a grade change of 18 inches which somewhat caused some confusion on the height of the building. The floor-to-floor on Whitaker Street is the high point of the site. It is 14 feet, six inches. Therefore, they have actually dropped it below the 15 feet, four inches that they had at the last meeting. According to zoning, this is the minimum that they can go. But as the grade drops down towards Barnard Street, they gain 18 inches. Therefore, this ends up being over the 15 feet, four inches. The nominal height is 15 feet, four inches if you take it from the mid part of the site. This why the drawings were showing 15 feet, four inches. They were still working on the survey. They are considering a stone base. The elevation of it is going to be maintained as the grade drops. Whitaker Street will be the shallow section, two feet, six inches. At Barnard Street, which is the main entrance goes to four feet in height. When the elevations are submitted for the next review, they will actually see the grade change.

Dr. Williams stated that he would be curious to see the precedence for the pedestal. May be there is some pattern book that has it.

Mr. Valliere said he does not have it with him.

Dr. Williams stated that anything could be justified with some historical precedence. But, generally speaking, pedestals are wider than the base and the pedestal has a cornice. He said the point is that the pedestal is the width of the shaft of the column and this is not normal.

Mr. Valliere agreed with Dr. Williams and said he had to actually look this up. However, he believes they were actually trying to slenderize it. However, he is fine with the pedestal size.

Dr. Williams stated that the thermal window that is in the arch, the petitioner has three major vertical elements. One is in the middle under the keystone and the two others. From a design point-of-view, it seems awkwardly integrated in the sense that the two lateral verticals are not centered on the columns below them. He is not familiar with breaking up an arch with a center post right under a keystone. They typically have three verticals, and in this case they could move the two lateral verticals in and align with the columns and eliminate the center column. They would have something speaking of architectural precedence since they are obviously looking back into history with this design. Therefore, he recommends that the central element be removed because it is just the nature of arches. Dr. Williams said the petitioner has accentuated the keystone and throwing a strut underneath it which appears to be something that is holding up the keystone denies the roll of the keystone.

Mr. Valliere stated that he would be happy to do this, but what he would probably end up doing is to down play it. There will probably still be a frame here as it goes back to the state's planning. This is the office floor.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Valliere if there were any reasons why the lateral ones are not

aligned with the columns or is this their five foot intervals?

Mr. Valliere answered that he believes it has to do with the five foot module.

Dr. Williams stated that may be this is the place where the petitioner can make an exception. Up on the top floor, Palladian windows, similar issues are there with the alignment of the windows and verticals. However, there could be an error with the drawings. It appears that there are some misalignments as shown on page 10. Dr. Williams said it looks as if the Palladian windows are wider than the windows below.

Mr. Valliere answered it they are, it is subtle. They are dealing with proportions in the Palladian windows. They have to be very careful when installing Palladian windows as they all have seen bad examples of Palladian windows, even in this City. Therefore, this is a work in progress. They have provided a better detail of this.

Dr. Williams stated that if it is a question of proportions, the petitioner could reduce the size of the window and they would maintain their proportions and achieve some vertical alignment because presently it is not subtle. He asked Mr. Valliere since he likes the Palladian, has he considered channeling the base; putting in some form of rustication on the ground floor?

Mr. Valliere answered no; he has not looked at this.

Dr. Williams stated that it could be achieved. It is just a matter of how they lay the materials to achieve this.

Mr. Valliere said they will look into this.

Dr. Williams stated that he supports anything that would help to keep St. Julian more civic and less service.

Mr. Engle stated that he has a problem with the white on the first two floors. If they were looking for historical illusions, every time he looks at this building, it reminds him of the Chatham National Bank. The window frames, the mullions and everything else were bronze. They were dark and did not pop out as they were recessed. However, this will make them pop out which is not classical on any commercial structure that he knows of. Generally, they were always darker. He does not agree with staff about the mullions because he is afraid that when he looks now and see Chatham National Bank, he sees massive stretches of dark glass with no mullions. Mullions break up the reflectivity and break up the massive amount of glass. Mr. Engle said he is concerned with dark glass because no matter how much you try to make it look historical and compatible, if you are going to have massive sheets of dark glass, it will never blend in.

Mr. Valliere said that you could have a clear glass and it is actually darker as it shows the depth behind it. This is why the modern buildings have more reflective glass that looks brighter.

Mr. Engle stated that they can go look at Bank of America around the corner from Chatham National Bank that has dark tinted glass and you cannot see through that there are original windows behind. This concerns him as this is a very large building with a very

large amount of tinted glass. All the details in the world will not make up for this. Mr. Engle said he agrees with Dr. Williams that he likes the Palladian windows on the upper floors, but he is not sure why they are treating the east/west elevations and north/south elevations the same way. They have third, third, third. He said he was not sure if the sixth floor (east/west) should not be treated quite differently than the sixth floor on the north/south. It is only 60 feet wide on the east/west elevation. Therefore, he was not sure if the sixth floor has to be differentiated as much as it does on the north/south elevations.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Engle if he was saying that the central triple bay over the door, he would have a third Palladian window as opposed to the brick.

Mr. Engle stated that personally, he would have the cast stone also. He believes the rusticated stone belongs on the first two floors, but not on the sixth floor. Mr. Engle agrees with staff that the balustrade is just an add on and does not make a definite statement.

Ms. Ramsay agrees with staff about the Palladian windows. She believes the more typical solution if you want decoration would have a series of half-round top windows. She asked if this is to be a LEED Silver building?

Mr. Valliere answered no. This is not a GSA owned building. It is not required in this project.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she believes it is required in this building.

Mr. Engle stated that as of December 30th, all 10,000 square feet or greater GSA buildings leased have to be silver standard.

Mr. Valliere said that when this came out, this was not the requirement. He said he heard what the HBR is saying, but when this came out, they doubled checked with them.

Mr. Holder asked if the HBR was talking about the base building or the tenant space that will house the GSA.

Ms. Ramsay explained that her understanding is that any building that is constructed after December that leases over 10,000 square feet to GSA has to be LEED Silver.

Mr. Holder said that GSA signed the lease prior to December.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes the requirement states that any building under construction, but she was only putting this out.

Mr. Judson told Mr. Valliere that he believes it might be helpful at this point to look at Ms. Ward list and see where they agree and do not agree.

Mr. Judson believes that they are clear on the limestone base. Mr. Valliere is still advocating for the Palladian windows and there is some dissension on the HBR which will become a matter of discussion. Mr. Valliere has given the HBR his explanation on the mullions as he has stated for the interior, they are functional. Mr. Judson said he also

heard some supporting comments in terms of breaking up the visibility of the glass. Ms. Ward made several mentions in her report to the necessity to recess all windows by four inches. Mr. Judson said he was not aware that the petitioner was not doing so.

Mr. Valliere stated that there is a condition, especially at the storefront. They have a lot of trim work done in cast stone. There is the frame, caststone and then the brick. From the brick to the caststone is less than four inches; from the brick face to the actual window frame, which is setback in the caststone is actually greater than four inches. Therefore, he believes that it is just a matter of how they take the dimensions. He said they will have four inches and nothing less.

Mr. Judson said that they have discussed the historical relevance of the pedestal for the columns and he believed that Mr. Valliere was amenable to increasing this. He agreed that this will have a visual impact. The areas that he sensed some reluctance for the petitioner to accept the staff's recommendation is the balustrades on the sixth floor. Mr. Judson asked Mr. Valliere if his understanding is that he is still supportive of their design as submitted as opposed to the staff's recommendation to eliminate the further ornamentation.

Mr. Valliere confirmed that Mr. Judson's understanding was correct regarding the balustrades design on the sixth floor, but they will review this again.

Mr. Judson told Mr. Valliere that the HBR will decide on this today. Obviously, there may be a few minor points, but the HBR will be happy for him to go back to staff with a fairly major design element of the building. However, the HBR will leave today with some resolution on this. Mr. Judson said this is not the HBR's purview, but he believes that the petitioner is correct in dealing with the City that Whitaker is the service street. It is his understanding that the petitioner does not wish to move the loading area on St. Julian Street to accommodate the retail area. Mr. Judson said that he believes also that the petitioner will have the support of City Traffic Engineering in this as Whitaker Street is considered to be the service street. Mr. Judson stated that he was only summarizing the points.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ward if there was one more issue that she added to her list of recommendations to the HBR.

Ms. Ward stated that there was one additional recommendation that she failed to put in her recommendations to the HBR. She explained that the staff wanted a projecting cornice over the center bays so that it gives a top. She forgot to add that the staff recommends elimination of the balustrade in order to strengthen the top of the building.

Mr. Judson said there is one more item that they discussed which is the coffered ceiling. This may become a part of the materials decision.

Mr. Valliere stated that he agrees on extending the cornice across the middle, even on the front.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Valliere what was his justification of the lighter color of the window frames and does only the ground floor has the lighter window frames.

Mr. Valliere said the window frames are two to two one-half inches. This will be done in

an off white. The precast is a buff color. He said that most of the windows, including storefronts when you look at the details, there is a lot of caststone or precast with heavy details to it. Except for the two middle one, it is a part of the window frame. But the actual overall frame of the window is actually done in a precast or cast stone.

Dr. Williams asked if the metal parts of the windows on the first two floors is the white color.

Mr. Valliere answered yes.

Dr. Williams stated that Mr. Valliere said something about Georgian Architecture.

Mr. Valliere said he is not an expert Georgian Architect, but he has done a lot of projects that were inspired by it. He said that Palladian motifs are common in the Georgian style, but in the character of those projects back during 100 or 150 years ago, they would traditionally go to a lighter color on their window treatments.

Dr. Williams said this would be true especially with red brick buildings such as many plantation houses in Virginia where red brick played in detail. He said white trim Georgian style was the norm, but this is not a residential plantation house. Dr. Williams stated that he believes that Mr. Engle's comments are born out of the petitioner resulting to a Palladian form which is the inspiration for most early 20th century commercial architecture. He has been googling early 20th century commercial architecture images and he has not found one. However, he was only trying to verify what Mr. Engle's and his instincts are telling them especially with the light stone. He asked Mr. Valliere if they were considering to use granite on the base.

Mr. Valliere answered yes. Originally, they were considering using granite on the base and this is not unusual.

Dr. Williams said his point is that most commercial buildings that had a lighter stone base such as the petitioner has done is common, but almost it would have bronze, dark green brown or some kind of darker tone. However, Mr. Valliere said the frames on the windows in the red brick area are actually the stone. Then on the inside, would be the metal. He said the white up higher might work, but on the lower levels he was not sure as the first two stories.

Mr. Valliere said he knew traditionally that retailers come in and paint their storefronts. But, it appears to him that authentically, you would want to carry the same color down.

Dr. Williams agreed and said that darker was more the norm; darker up.

Mr. Judson said he wanted to allow everyone to give their input, this is not something they will be voting on today. If there is any pertinent communication, that it be done through staff.

Dr. Williams stated the petitioner calls the transoms spandrels. He said that spandrels are not glass, but terracotta. He asked Mr. Valliere if they have considered having inset panels instead of glass transoms. Dr. Williams stated that Mr. Valliere said they

are nonfunctional; they are opaque and blocking service elements.

Mr. Valliere said the previous images are wrong.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes Mr. Engle was talking about the black glass on the transoms.

Mr. Valliere said he thought Dr. Williams was talking about the spandrels at the floors.

Dr. Williams believed that Mr. Valliere called the transoms spandrels.

Mr. Vallere confirmed that he did call the transoms spandrels.

Dr. Williams asked if the upper part of the windows would be the black glass.

Mr. Valliere said they will do their best to match the glass throughout. He told Mr. Engle that on the vision light he will do his best to lighten up the samples as much as possible. Ultimately, it will depend on how much room they have next to the energy code. He does not believe that it could get darker, but may get lighter. They still have to do the analysis.

Mr. Engle stated that the HBR has to see the actual thing next month. He told Mr. Valliere if he goes and looks at the Chatham National Bank, he will see the exact same situation where they dropped the ceilings for heating belts and now they have these dark blank things.

Mr. Judson asked if they were talking about a space that will be blocked from the inside; and therefore, the option is for this not to be glass?

Dr. Williams said theoretically, they could lower the window frames and have bigger spandrels pedestals all the way around on every floor.

Mr. Engle wanted to see sheet 11 (the drawings).

Mr. Judson stated he believes that this becomes a design details which the HBR will make a decision today. Before, they leave today, they need to be clear as to whether or not they are talking about this being solid material or glass.

Mr. Engle said if the HBR looks at the left-hand side, it is essentially a transom; it is a nonoperable transom. Historically, there were tons of these all over Savannah. But, as Dr. Williams has said, they could become a panel.

Dr. Williams said they could become a part of the wall. Since it has been suggested that there is occupiable space and it is a window. If it is window that comes up to the ceiling, historically, you would not put glass here. You would have something solid.

Mr. Overton stated that they are dealing with a world-class architectural firm and developer. They are now getting into the minute details of how office buildings are actually constructed. The way the petitioner has this shown is exactly the way office buildings are done. He was sure that the petitioner will come back with a color scheme,

glass, and exterior color that they all will enjoy. Mr. Overton understood that they are not talking about color today. He believes also that they need not to micro-manage this design. If they talk about little details here and there, they will have an elephant designed by a committee. Mr. Overton believes they need to rely upon the class of the architectural firm that is presenting this project to them. He believes they are getting into this much more than they need to be.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Judson informed the public that this is a public hearing. The HBR encourages and welcomes public comments. He knew that partially guided were possibly some information that was in Savannah Morning News today, but he wanted to make it clear that the HBR will not talk about the height of this building today. The height was decided one month ago and it has been approved. Today, the HBR is discussing the design issues. Mr. Judson believes they have been clear on the points that the staff has made and that they have had an intelligent response from the petitioner regarding most of the recommendations. He believes further that it is clear that the HBR is delaying discussing the materials and colors until another meeting. Mr. Judson just wanted all this to be clearly understood by the public.

This project will end up being heard by the HBR in three parts. Part I was approved on Height and Mass at last month's meeting. Today, their focus is on the Design Details of the building.

Mr. Bill Steube of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that their architectural review committee reviewed this application. They believe that the petitioner has done a great job in breaking up the massing both vertically and along the streets horizontally. In regards to the Part II Design Details, the committee generally likes the design direction and composition in the renderings. However, equally important is the committee's finding that the materials and construction methods and vision for the project in the specifications as were submitted to HSF contained what has been submitted in the renderings a handsome building to such an extent that the building is constructed as was specified in the submissions will only be described as a cheap building.

Mr. Steube said mention was made early today of improving the quality of the materials. His comments are being made towards the comments to do so. There is a big difference between cast concrete and precast stone. He believes that it is very important as this project moves forward that higher quality materials are used. The HSF has a large number of specific issues that need to be addressed. However, it is not their intention to overwhelm the HBR with information, but simply to emphasize the need that this proposed design needs to be reexamined and resubmitted. Mr. Steube said the following specific comments, if properly addressed, could materially improve the quality and desirability of the project. He said that their suggestions follow the comments of the Preservation Director commencing on page 2 of the staff's report.

Mr. Steube distributed a handout to the HBR covering the topics that the HSF wanted to direction their attention to: **1. Large Scale Development Exterior Walls** - The building is a precast concrete structure as submitted; what appears to be a rusticated stone base is actually stamped concrete. It is not stone; real stone only comes up the building

approximately 30 inches. The remainder is such as the Bryan Street Parking Garage. They are pleased that mentioned was made that they are going to use real brick. This will provide the relief, depth and shadow lines that only real brick can do. One inch face brick will not do this. Factually, one inch face brick was being proposed for a building on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard several years ago and the use of this material was not approved by the HBR at that time; **2. Commercial Design Standards** - Kawneer aluminum framing is proposed for the storefronts. The drawings submitted indicate that the framing will be flat without any articulation. Such windows will give appearance similar to the windows used in the Hilton Garden Inn or in the bathroom tile Federal Building on Telfair Square. They are flat aluminum windows and the HSF believes they need more than this. Instead windows such as those found on the Old Savannah Bank Building on Bull Street with this kind of detailing and on Drayton and Bryan, the Realty Building, would provide the level of detail that is wanted for the building's magnitude. There has been a lot of discussion about the color of the windows, especially on the lower level, these buildings obviously used the dark color; **3. Windows and Doors**. Mr. Steube said the Palladian windows should be eliminated on the top floor as recommended by the Preservation Director. If the HBR, however, elects to keep the Palladian windows, they should be redesigned so that they conform to accepted architectural practices as shown in a drawing he had with him. The top of the arch should intersect with the architrave upon the window and the base of the arch should be parallel with the adjoining openings. As presently designed, the Palladian windows do not meet the criteria. Therefore, they are ill-proportioned as they are too small for their location on the facade, resulting in an ungainly appearance with too much space over the top of the windows. He stated that the windows on the north facade appear to be blank since space behind them is occupied by restrooms and mechanical areas. The HSF questions what the glazing will be in the windows and what the appearance will be from Bryan Street. The window openings as drawn on the floor plan on the south side of level two are the same as those shown on level four through six. However, the facade on that side of the building has a different articulation; it is not the standard window as found on the upper levels. The HSF questions what configuration will actually be utilized in the facade. Approximately two-thirds of the north elevation along Bryan Street have no public openings or windows to relieve the monotony for the pedestrian traversing the street. Something needs to be done to brighten up this side of the building. No details have been provided of the articulation of aluminum spandrels. An important element of the building's appearance is demonstrated in the Savannah Bank Building as you see fabulous spandrels between the floors. Mr. Steube said they were not suggesting something as elaborate as this, but this is what an important building should have or something as such to make it meaningful. Whatever, the details will be, they need know. The drawings as submitted do not show this detail. The plans illustrate that the building is to be recessed three to four inches as has been discussed, but he wanted to restate that it is highly important that real brick be used. If not, they will have that kind of recess. Hollow metal doors are proposed for the north facade leading into the mechanical areas are shown as flat, slabs of steel or metal. The HSF realizes that this a little detailed, but it is important because the facade is so blank, that these doors should have some character added to them; and **4. Materials Textures and Colors** - The details surrounding the aforementioned Palladian windows and the other architectural elements are Stephone GFRC (Glass Fiber Reinforced Concrete) not stone. This material is akin to foam trim used on residential structure. They believe that a better quality of material needs to be used. Many of the returns, panels and recesses, including the arch over the principle Barnard Street entrance are stucco or simply cast or elements in the concrete structural system, not cast stone. They will not have the structure, joints and details of cut or cast stone. The HSF concurs with the staff's

recommendation that the windows not be white, but rather a darker color. No details have been provided as to the dimension or type of materials used for the balustrades at the top of the building. If balustrades are to be used, they need to know what they will look like. They will be high up, but if the proportions are bad, it will be visible. There is a transition from cast concrete to brick on portions of the north and south facades. No details are given as to how this transition is handled. These kinds of details are important because they are very visible to the pedestrian.

Mr. Stuebe reported in summary, this proposed building does not live up to what the renderings promise to be a classically inspired building. A building of this size on a trust lot and celebrated restored Ellis Square should be designed in detail to be a landmark, lasting us for 100 years. The expectations are for a building that suits this context. The developer promised this much and it should be constructed of materials that last, detailed to be a contributing structure to the City scape. He said that the HSF's architectural committee urges the HBR not to be sold by the renderings, but consider all the specific details of the project. They looked before at the wall and whether or not it should be covered with stucco. This is the level of detail that needs to be thought about here. Mr. Stuebe said the HSF encourages the petitioner to ask for a one month continuance to further study the design and make appropriate changes.

Mr. Judson explained to the public that Mr. Steube was speaking for the Historic Savannah Foundation who has a well-informed, active historical review committee of their own. He said may be he allowed Mr. Steube a little extra latitude to talk about some of the design changes as the HBR values their input.

Mr. Judson invited further public participation. No one came forward.

Mr. Judson explained that in light of some of the comments made by the HSF, he asked Mr. Valliere if he wanted to address some of the comments.

Mr. Valliere stated the windows on Bryan Street that comes all the way up are actually the spandrels. Behind this is the mechanical rooms and to put windows here do not make sense. Creating blind openings that are just brick, solid wall was not appealing either. He did not want to create such a heavy impression all the way up the building. It is realistically and this is what they have here; it is a core. He explained that what they try to do when they have conditions such as this and it is the modern tradition somewhat; they put the spandrel glass in there. He said he is very sensitive about this. They try to get the correct coating behind it to create the illusion that it is actual light. When someone realizes that it is not a true vision light is at night as no light comes through it. But, in this case, he thought having the glitter of the glass interrupt the solid surfaces was better than just putting a blind opening. He said where the stairwells are, they are hidden at full line of the stairs and he could not open them up to the stairwell inside. Therefore, he did accent this as a blind opening. No glass is here and it is kind of recessed and framed.

Mr. Valliere said they have already talked about the Palladian windows. He told Mr. Steube that he appreciates the HSF's concern. They have to do the Palladian windows right. They are working on this and hopefully it will be better than what they saw originally. They are working on the details. With regards to the GFRC on the Palladian windows, there are more detailings in the windows than what is seen in the drawings. He stated that he would

traditionally do this in wood because of the ornateness of the frame that goes around the Palladian windows, but it will not last. Therefore, their next choice was metal, but metal is restricted. GFRC is a nice material and it has a nice finish and they can mold it into many different forms and get the articulation that they need. It gives him the flexibility to achieve this, but cast stone does not. Therefore, he would be limited on what he could do if he used the cast stone. This is the reason he recommended GFRC. At this height he does not believe that anybody would know that it is GFRC versus stone. It will have all the jointing as the traditional stone building would have. GFRC is a thin, has a lighter weight and is cast. It is concrete, but uses very little aggregate and has a fiberglass mesh behind it that reinforces. It is hollow, not thick; therefore, how it is attached to the building is very important.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Overton stated according to what he heard from the staff's report, the HBR is being asked today to look at the fenestration of the building, the cornice and entrance details, mullions, etc., but not the materials and colors as this will come in Phase B.

Mr. Judson stated Mr. Overton was correct. However, he allowed a lot of discussion about this so that the petitioner could get the information from staff, the public input, and the HBR so that they could arrive at some consensus of a more informed presentation next month. Nevertheless, in terms of whatever motion the HBR will eventually make today, it will not address any of the materials or colors.

Mr. Overton asked whether the HBR would be deciding on the retail, loading and unloading issues today.

Mr. Judson answered given that staff included in their recommendation the final wording of their motion today should acknowledge it whether it be that they request a change or that they are fine with it staying as is. The HBR generally refers to staff recommendation when they make a motion or to support the petitioner's position. Mr. Judson said given that these are on the list of things that have been enumerated as being in contingent, they should be a part of the motion today.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Stuebe if he would readdress the issues that are before the HBR today that are the concerns of the HSF. He was not asking the HSF's concerns about colors and materials, but their concerns about the the fenestration of the building and articulation.

Mr. Steube stated that he spoke of the spandrel glass on the north facade. He just wanted everyone to be aware that the windows would not be transparent. The Palladian window and their design he feels is a very important element. If the Palladian windows are going to be done, they must be done right. However, the HBR cannot vote on this today as it does not have a final solution. When he showed the HBR the picture of the old Savannah Bank Building, he did so to show them the articulation of the window detail. Perhaps, this is a design detail, but he believes this is something the HBR needs to decide today as it is structural as what quality of extrusion will be done on the metal aluminum windows. Will it be a flat slab of aluminum or will it have some character? The hollow metal doors and the show windows are on the north facade. He believes it is extremely important to alleviate the austerity of the north facade along Bryan Street as this is a major pedestrian

walkway.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Valliere if he was showing the drawings of the second floor in his submittal or if he was showing a different floor.

Mr. Valliere stated that they brought the window from above down below. The windows have to be adjusted on the second level slightly.

Mr. Overton wanted to know which drawings are in control. Is it the exterior facade?

Mr. Valliere answered the elevation.

Mr. Overton then questioned if the petitioner would be back before the HBR saying their tenant could not fit in the space because the windows are in the wrong spot.

Dr. Williams stated this raises an issue that they spoke of earlier. He sees a window over the far left most arch, but the partition will land in the center of the window.

Mr. Valliere said that is not a window; it's the elevator. He said the windows on Bryan Street are here and will be display windows.

Ms. Ramsay said Mr. Stuebe earlier mentioned the articulation of the spandrels.

Mr. Steube concurred that he mentioned the spandrels, but he asked if this is a design detail or is it for today's discussion. However, it is important to know how the spandrels would look and how they are going to be designed.

Mr. Overton explained the way it was presented to the HBR, he believes they are going to be flat glass.

Mr. Steube said the petitioner's plans show that they are made out of aluminum.

Mr. Engle stated that this is the spandrel, not the transom. Spandrels are solid between windows.

Mr. Valliere explained that the spandrels at the storefront are metal panels and tie-in to the entire one-story, storefront framing system. But the other frames have a stone surround (shown by double lines) that is trimmed out. There is a six inch metal frame plus the two to two and one-half inch frame of the window. There is a lot of decorations along here. They are looking at doing a custom treatment in the frame to create what will look like a small capital off the verticals. This is similar to what has been proposed. Presently, however, they are only showing frame within a frame and it recesses. But, what they are talking about is doing not a heavy ornamentation, but looking at doing a little decorative element inside. This will be in cast stone or precast depending on what they end up using.

Mr. Judson said he believes these are important points as they are a part of today's consideration. Given that they don't have a final submission on the details of these, this is an item that he feel comfortable saying that those design details go back to staff so that they will be a part of the material and color submission in a month. Mr. Judson said he

believes they have highlighted the fact that they are critical design elements of the building and that they deserve some thought. He believes further that there is consensus on the HBR that there will be some meritorious thought on how good they should look and they can refer to staff on this.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes this kind of detail needs to come before the HBR.

Ms. Ramsay said the petitioner has to come back to the HBR anyway, so why not bring this also.

Mr. Stuebe said if the balustrades are going to remain at the top, they need to know how they will be designed, what are the proportions, what they will look like, etc.

Dr. Henry said it appears that the HBR needs to make a decision today on the fenestration and the balustrade of the sixth floor. They have been told that every window will be recessed four inches and display windows will be on Bryan Street. As far as the spandrels, he believes they can say that they be appropriately decorative.

Mr. Judson explained that there is some dissension on the spandrels.

Mr. Engle stated that he thought the spandrels would come back to the HBR next month.

Dr. Henry stated that he believes the only addition where a motion is needed would be the sixth floor fenestration, balustrades and the reference to the decorative spandrels.

Mr. Engle said the HBR has an entire list of recommendations from the staff that they have to incorporate.

Dr. Henry stated that he was speaking of anything in addition to the staff recommendations.

Mr. Engle said he believes that the first two floors and the sixth floor needs to be reworked. Maybe it's rustication or cast stone, but he believes the HBR has to deal with the issues that were raised on the first two floors. They agreed on the pedestal, but have not agreed with the coffered ceiling as to how this will be dealt with on the entry. He does not believe that the first two floors and the sixth floors are articulated enough.

Mr. Judson suggested that the Palladian windows be restudied as they have been a point of conversation. He has heard three things. 1) that they be eliminated, 2) they remain as shown in the drawings; and 3) that they be incorporated, but designed better.

Ms. Ramsay suggested that the Palladian windows not be a part of the motion that is made today. She believes the petitioner needs to come back to the HBR with a suggestion as to how the windows will look. The petitioner has heard the HBR's concerns.

Mr. Judson said he understood that the petitioner had a redesign in mind. Therefore, he concurred with Ms. Ramsay that it is appropriate for this to come back. But, they have to make mention of this in the motion today. He believes that Mr. Engle made a valid point about the breaking up service of the glass. He asked the HBR if they wanted to have a discussion now about the mullions.

Ms. Simpson asked if the mullions were being eliminated.

Mr. Judson answered no. The justification was shown for their existence both in a functional and some support for them aesthetically.

Dr. Williams said with the caveat that the petitioner explores the possibility over the main entrance of the second floor. He was aware that they have rental space and a template they want to conform to. He said it appears that in the side elevations, there will be arches also.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward if the staff was recommending further articulation on the cornice.

Ms. Ward answered yes. This is where she added a verbal recommendation and it is in the body of the staff report that she is recommending that the petitioner eliminate the balustrade above the corners to strengthen the cornice on the top of the building.

Mr. Engle stated that on the east and west elevations, if they eliminate the balustrade that is here, it will make the elevator shaft and all the housing stick out more than it does now. He was not sure if on the east and west elevations that the balustrades should not continue all the way across to try to hide as much of the housing as possible.

Dr. Williams asked if it would be seen. It is recessed 50 feet from the east and west. The narrow elevation is the east and west. Therefore, you would have to be in Franklin Square to be able to see the top of the central utility wall. Page 20 of the report shows some perspectives to this and mention of this was made in the petitioner's presentation.

Mr. Judson said the report shows that it is recessed substantially.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Engle if he was saying that his concern is that central portion would be easily seen.

Mr. Engle stated yes.

Dr. Williams stated again that he believes you would have to be in the next square before you saw it. It is recessed a long distance, but from the north and south it is only recessed six feet or so according to the petitioner.

Mr. Engle stated that at the last meeting, he brought it up about the cornices in the center bays. But this does not do it either. The cornices appear to be standing out there on their own and are not connected to the building.

Dr. Williams stated that there is a tradition in doing this with tall buildings to break up the massing.

Mr. Engle said the problem is it is not large-scale on the east and west. The north and south are large-scale and need to be broken up. He believes that the east and west need to be unified. He believes that they are being broken up when they should not be. The west is

the most important elevation of the building and it should have more character than the other elevations. But, presently it does not. It is being treated exactly like the other three.

Mr. Overton asked if a patio or deck is here. What is the purpose of the balustrade? Is it for decoration?

Ms. Simpson said they are for decoration.

Mr. Engle said he agrees with staff. They should be eliminated.

Dr. Williams asked if the petitioner stated that they were still considering the east and west elevation in their design review.

Mr. Judson explained that he believed there were some discussion about the north and south elevations about the color of the sixth floor.

Dr. Williams asked if this, therefore, would come back to the HBR next month.

Mr. Judson answered yes. It is a part of the materials and color.

Dr. Williams clarified that he was speaking of the design. If the petitioner is thinking of a color change, may be this would be an opportunity for them to change the elevation on the east and west.

Mr. Judson said he would prefer to see an up or down vote on the balustrade today. If in the petitioner's reconsideration of the materials, Palladian and other designs for the sixth floor, they want to come in with an amendment to the design, they certainly can and the HBR could reconsider. However, what he would like to see is a motion that tables the discussion about the Palladian for redesign consideration at next month's meeting; a summary of the HBR's findings on the five out of the seven things before them today and some kind of decision on the balustrade. Mr. Judson stated that he does not want the HBR to be a design symposium. He wants to give the petitioner a yes or no vote on this. Then if the petitioner feels like challenging it or come up with another perspective, the HBR could certainly entertain this as an amended petition either along with Phase B in one month or a later date.

Mr. Overton stated that he agreed with Mr. Judson's up or down vote, but he wanted to ask a question. What is the purpose of the balustrade?

Mr. Valliere said the building was designed to enhance the corners completely. It would enhance the verticality of the corners. The proportions at the end sets up for this nicely. To top off the corners could be a cornice or they could look at the corners versus a balustrade. In this case he was dealing with a more simplified cornice and go with a more decorative balustrade.

Mr. Overton stated that Ms. Ward has suggested that the building needs to be more horizontal and the petitioner is pushing for more vertical.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes it needs to be balanced.

Mr. Overton asked the petitioner to respond to this.

Mr. Valliere said he always look for a compromise. If the balustrade is voted down, he will look at it.

Mr. Overton asked him if he wants it to remain on the list today and have the HBR vote it up or down or does he wants to withdraw it?

Mr. Valliere said he prefers to withdraw it at this time.

Mr. Engle stated that he thought this item would be voted up or down by the HBR.

Mr. Judson explained that it is totally up to whoever put the motion on the floor.

Mr. Engle said they could be on this same issue next month for a long discussion.

Mr. Judson wanted a motion to be made that addresses the entire petition.

Board Action:

Approval of Part II, Design Details, Phase A with the following conditions, materials, and colors to be resubmitted for Part II, Design Details Phase B:
1. Verify height of limestone base at storefronts; 2. Restudy the Palladian windows to reduce the vertical orientation; 3. Recess window frames four inches from the facade in upper floors; 4. Eliminate rooftop balustrade and further articulate the parapet by incorporating a cornice around the entire building; 5. Enlarge column pedestals at main entry; 6. Further articulate service entry doors on Bryan Street; 7. Restudy the mullion pattern in thermal window above main entry; 8. Provide transition of cast concrete to brick in recessed sections on north and south facades; and 9. Provide further detail within the spandrels between windows in the corner sections. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Nay
Brian Judson	- Abstain

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

9. [Petition of Ali Akbarparsaei - H-10-4332-2 - 142 Montgomery Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Ali Akbarparasei, the petitioner, was not present.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner requested approval for a principal use fascia sign at 142 Montgomery Street for the Hookah Bar. The size of the sign is 11 square feet; non-illuminated on a plastic board with weatherproof text. It meets all the sign standards except that the staff does not feel that they are proposing to put it in a signable area of the facade. This is an iron railing and is a non-historic building; it is new construction, but the staff does not believe that the iron railing is where a sign should be placed. Unfortunately, even though this is new construction, the building does not have a good place for a fascia sign. However, staff recommends that the sign be placed on the truss work of the awning as opposed to covering the architectural element.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval that the sign be placed on the truss work of the awning.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if she said that the sign meets the sign ordinance.

Ms. Ward confirmed that it does meet the size and lighting standards.

THE PETITIONER WAS NOT PRESENT

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approved the petition with the condition that the sign be relocated from the iron railing to the signable area of the structure and resubmit to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle - Aye

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

10. [Petition of Sign-A-Rama - H-10-4333-2 - 190 West Bryan Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Jeff Groover was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner requested approval for a non-illuminated principal use fascia sign at 190 West Bryan Street, Unit A for the business AT&T. The buildings were designed for storefront, but may have anticipated a projecting sign or some other type of signage. She believes, however, that a canopy sign is really nice on these locations and she encourages the use of them.

Dr. Williams asked what is a canopy sign.

Ms. Ward explained that an existing canopy is on the building. Therefore, the sign becomes a part of the canopy. The sign is approximately 21 square feet and they are within the allowed signage for the project. It is non-illuminated, almost flat aluminum letters with a logo. The only concern of the staff is that it would be more appropriate if it was on top of the canopy. Then the canopy would serve as a base as there is a horizontal line supporting the signage instead of it being affixed. She said the staff does not have a problem if the sign fits within the frame, but the fact that it bleeds over and under looks sloppy. Therefore, the staff feels that it would look better if it placed above.

Mr. Judson said obviously if it is raised as the staff suggests and it sits on the canopy it will also bring up the horizontal element of the line below the windows and block a part of one of the windows. Therefore, they need to be clear and articulate that it may need to be moved over slightly.

Ms. Ward stated that the staff actually suggested this to the petitioner. Their entire logo is AT&T Authorized Retailer. She said the staff explained to the petitioner that they could keep Authorize Retailer as it fits within the area, then just put the logo with AT&T on top of it and center the entire thing. However, the petitioner advised the staff that this is a corporate sign standard and that they could not vary from this as it all has to work together as one.

Mr. Engle did not believe the sign would block the window. It is two to three feet up to this window from the roof.

Ms. Ward explained that the awning projects from the building a good distance.

Dr. Williams stated that even at its current location on the face of the awning, if you were in the middle or closer it would overlap the window anyway. Therefore, it depends upon where you are standing.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Groover said the AT&T layout with Authorized Retailer is a corporate identity standard. AT&T with the the globe logo cannot go over that. This is something that has to go through the entire corporate structure to approve a change for this. As far as moving the entire lettering above the awning, it is his opinion based on the signs that they have done this would look hideous. There are two way to do this. 1) They could put a wire on each letter and have a wire extending down to the top of the frame or 2) The globe logo is 30 inches. They could build a 30 inch box that runs the length of the awning and basically add on to the top of the awning. Mr. Groover said they thought in talking with priority that this would be the best option for the location of the sign. He said as far as the standard goes, he does not believe that there is anything within the standards that would prevent the letters extending above and below slightly.

Mr. Judson explained that this would be out of the question because it would be a redesign of the building and they have already approved that level of canopy. He asked Mr. Groover if he was opposed to actually have the sign sit on top of the canopy. Would there be enough clearance to hang the sign from the canopy?

Mr. Groover answered that it would probably be below the ten foot standard.

Dr. Williams asked what is the height of the underside of the canopy.

Mr. Groover stated that it is approximately 12 feet, six inches. The only reason is that the globe is 30 inches.

Mr. Overton asked what is the thickness of the AT& T letterings.

Mr. Groover answered that the letters are one-quarter inch. They are flat laser cut aluminum letters. As proposed, they would be stud-mounted into the construction adhesive, etc. onto the canopy.

Mr. Overton stated, therefore, the logo is an one-quarter inch thick piece of aluminum nailed onto the canopy, flopping around above.

Mr. Groover stated that it would not flop; depending on the HBR's approval, they already engineering drawings showing the strength, etc. to be submitted to Development Services. One quarter inch in the sign industry is standard.

Mr. Engle asked how many more spaces are there. He asked if it is four.

Mr. Groover said presently there is one which says Whitaker Street Parking Garage.

Mr. Engle stated that there are four potential things here.

Mr. Groover stated yes, at least four things.

Mr. Engle said what they would be doing now is sitting a precedence for the entire building and this is what worries him. They had enough problems approving this building. But, a part of it was the cleanness of these lines, but now they are beginning to close them up. He asked why the sign could not go on the storefront, itself, under the canopy at the top transom of the window.

Mr. Groover explained that the canopy is ten inches. The area below is less than that and as he has said, if it is below this, there would not be a ten foot clearance.

Mr. Engle stated he was saying if it is against the building, why could it not go against the windows.

Mr. Groover said there would be nothing to structurally tie it into.

Mr. Engle said there is a ten inch high clearance here above the windows.

Mr. Groover said he was sure they could attach it to a panel and then attach it to the window structure.

Mr. Judson said the letters would fall well below the ten inches. They would have to mount to something.

Mr. Engle said it could go on the stucco band.

Mr. Groover said there are ten inches or less on the stucco band.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Groover if he was saying that the Authorized Retailer would have to come up to the top height of the AT&T.

Mr. Groover said this would go against the AT&T corporate.

Mr. Engle said that McDonald's has standards too, but they are violated all the time. Historic Boards do not allow them to put in golden arches. He said he is concerned because AT&T has four or five other storefronts and they went through all the efforts to get a nice clean design of canopies and now they are going to clutter it up because once they tell them that they can violate it, then everybody will want to do so.

Mr. Judson asked the HBR to focus on questions for the petitioner. He believes the HBR has explored the options.

Dr. Williams stated that he understood the proportions, spacing and relative position of the individual elements cannot be changed. But, obviously size is negotiable with the tenant who wants the sign.

Mr. Groover stated that it is. The reason this size is proposed is basically the maximum you can have for this frontage. For visibility purposes, why have a sign that is too small.

This would defeat the purpose of the sign.

Dr. Williams said if there was clarification about the clearance underside of the canopy to the sidewalk and if it was hung in such a way that the top of the globe was on the other side and the bottom of the globe was at ten feet or higher, there would be space. Therefore, the question becomes what size would it need to be. He said if the canopy is 12 and one-half feet; if it is a 30 inch globe, this takes it down to 10 feet except for whatever space it has to hang.

Mr. Groover said essentially, it would have to be a 30 inch box.

Dr. Williams stated that there could be a bar or some kind of structural member where all the elements are and then hang it some how. He believes they are getting out of their league with sign design, but this is their purview.

Mr. Overton asked if this developer has sign criteria that has to do with the entire development of Ellis Square?

Mr. Groover replied that he is not sure. However, he wanted to say that when he did the survey for Priority, it appeared that this was a storage unit for the hotel and that making it a retail unit seems to be after-the-fact.

Mr. Overton said his point is that any development of this magnitude has criteria for sign control. Therefore, there are variances for all kind of signs.

Mr. Groover said as far as the landlord approval, they have approved this and gave to them to present.

Mr. Overton clarified that was not his question. He said he asked if they had the sign criteria.

Ms. Ward stated that when this project was originally approved, she had just begun working here. Therefore, she has limited knowledge. The petitioner came in for the Avia Hotel and the original design, as everyone knows, has a large corner canopy. The canopies were integral to the architecture of the building. The original proposal showed that the Avia sign was going to be located on top of the canopy. But, they later changed it and went with a blade sign. But she believe this was the original design intent of the architect. However, the company decided to do something later. Subsequently, as the petitioner mentioned, the only other signage on the canopies that exist currently is the Whitaker Street sign for the City, but this fits within the frame of the canopy.

Mr. Judson asked which unit is this.

Ms. Ward stated that a sign was approved for the corner of the building, but it is not the Avia hotel, it is the Studio Homes building that fronts onto Whitaker Street. However, they approved a projecting disk sign for the Pizza business last month, but it was not a flat facade sign. But to her knowledge, a sign program was not approved for the entire development.

Mr. Overton stated that it appears that the developer nor the owner of the property has a sign criteria for the property.

Mr. Groover said there is one other sign on the property to the right of the canopy sign. As stated, it is Studio Homes and is similar to this, but it is not on the canopy. It is wall mounted. No canopy is here.

Mr. Engle asked the petitioner if he considered bringing it out 90 degrees from the building, it is a hung sign. When the six-story building is built, the sign will not be seen.

Mr. Groover said this has been mentioned to the owner, but he is only the agent.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams asked that if the HBR votes this petition down, what is the timeframe for the petitioner to come back?

Mr. Judson answered one year.

Dr. Williams stated that since the HBR has raised a number of issues, only the petitioner may ask that this petition be continued. He advised Mr. Groover that if he asks for a continuance, the HBR will be able to hear this next month.

Mr. Groover stated that he understood what Dr. Williams was saying. He also asked the HBR if they had any ideas that they would approve at this point pending a motion to go back to staff with a new design based on their preliminary approval.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes a proposal to hang the sign from the edge of the canopy would be a possible solution if the petitioner is able to work this out with his client.

Mr. Judson said his concern is that when the petitioner takes it back to his client, they could say that's not an option; then the petitioner comes to staff with something that cannot be resolved. He said that Dr. Williams suggestion to the petitioner to ask for a continuance might be the best, with the understanding that the HBR's first option is to have the sign hang from the canopy. The HBR's second option is to have it sit above the canopy and their third option which they really did not talk about is to have a projecting sign.

Dr. Williams stated that the fourth option is for the petitioner to go back and talk with AT&T. Maybe there is some room in there such as Mr. Engle stated about McDonald's. Maybe AT&T has flexibility that Mr. Groover is not aware of.

Mr. Groover stated that when Ms. Ward called him, he called AT&T and was told that it is not negotiable. He asked the HBR if it would be a problem if they came up with a solution to attach the sign to the top.

Dr. Williams stated that basically every component is supported by an "L" bracket.

Mr. Groover said they would be able to see the leg coming down. The globe extends much further passed "AT&T an Authorized Retailer." He explained that what he was talking about is mimicing the ten inch canopy frame and attach it that way.

Dr. Williams stated what if the "AT&T Authorized Retailer," was basically sitting on top at the leading edge of the canopy, but that the lower corner of the globe actually encroached on the face of the canopy so that they would have everything sitting without the L-brackets being visible. He asked Mr. Groover if this might be a possible solution.

Mr. Judson stated that if the canopy is ten inches and the globe is 30 inches and you are talking about less than one-third of the height of the globe, then it would not protrude below the canopy.

Dr. Williams said approximately five inches of the globe would encroach on ten inches of the canopy.

Ms. Simpson said this is similar to what the HBR dealt with last month with the art supply sign.

Mr. Engle said every corporate wants their logo exactly the way they want it and it does not matter what the architectural is like. They went through this last month.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Groover if he had an idea regarding what would be acceptable to the HBR.

Mr. Groover said he believes it would be fine if they did something to the top or below.

Mr. Engle stated that he does not believe that they should break up the line.

Mr. Overton said he believes the petitioner should go back, study the area and then come back to the HBR with a proposal about how signs are to be put on buildings in this area. He believes that what Mr. Engle said is right. Let's get it right and if they are the first ones there on these buildings, it needs to be right so that they could use this as an example.

Mr. Groover requested a continuance to next month's meeting.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of December 8, 2010 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

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

11. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects - H-10-4335-2 - 604 Abercorn Street - Addition and Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Rebecca Lynch was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner requested a trellis addition on the deck located on the south side of the property at 604 Abercorn Street for Leoci's Trattoria.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the trellis and awning addition as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lynch stated as Ms. Ward reported they too received feedback from the Building Department, but not from the Zoning Administrator.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the trellis, awning and garden entryway - PASS
improvements as submitted.

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

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

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

12. [Petition of Beverly Elson - H-10-4327\(S\)-2 - 315 West Hall Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4327\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4327\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

13. [Petition of Kerry O'Connor - H-10-4328\(S\)-2 - 349 Abercorn Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4328\(S\)2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4328\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

14. [Petition of Coastal Canvas - H-10-4329\(S\)-2 - 17 W. Broughton Street - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4329\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4329\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

15. [Nominating Committee Report](#)

Ms. Ramsay reported that the Nominating Committee nominated Mr. Brian Judson, Chair, and Mr. W. James Overton, Vice-Chair for the year 2011.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward to remind the HBR members who need to reapply for their position to please do so. **Ms. Ward** reported that she has been in

touch with Clerk of Council twice about verifying that they are going to open the recruitment period. She was told that the month of December will be open for the Review Board nominations.

Mr. Thomson reminded the HBR members to check their appointment letter as it gives the dates when their service begins and when it ends.

Board Action:

Approval of the nominee committee report for the HBR officers for 2011; Brian Judson, Chair and James Overton, Vice Chair. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

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

16. [Historic Building Map Update, Public Meeting November 16, 2010 at 4:00 PM in the Mendonsa Hearing Room at the MPC](#)

Attachment: [Notice for Public Meeting 111610 - Neighborhoods and Media.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Notice - List of Buildings Eligible for the Historic Building Map REVISED.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward reported that they are updating the Historic Building Map. On Tuesday, November 16, 2010, a public meeting will be held at 4:00 p.m. at MPC in the Mendonsa Hearing Room. This will enable the staff to talk with the property owners whose properties have been identified as historic and answer any questions that they might have about what this means to them.

This is an informational meeting and is open to the public. The nature of updating the Historic Building map requires a text amendment to the ordinance. Therefore, staff is tentatively scheduled to appear on the MPC agenda for November 23, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. to discuss the proposed text amendment. Ms. Ward said hopefully this will be approved and then it will require adoption by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of

Savannah. There are approximately 120 buildings.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward if it would be of benefit to staff on the more complicated projects where Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) joins the staff in its staff reviews to meet with staff. Would this complicate her job or would it be better for HSF to bring their concerns in the form that was given to the HBR today? He did not know the right answer to this question.

Ms. Ward answered that a lot of the HSF comments do not always pertain to the ordinance or review. Sometimes, they talk about Part 1 when they are in Part 2. She agrees that the petitioner feels the burden of this as they have to respond to a number of different people's wants and desires. Ms. Ward said she feels as if she needs to guide the petitioners on what the HBR will do and not necessarily on what the HSF architectural review committee will say.

Mr. Judson stated that the HSF makes it clear to many petitioners that they are available for consultation. But, in his protective attitude towards the HBR, that they need to keep the distinction very clear. He said he hopes that he is always positive about the HSF comments and welcome their input. However, the HSF is not the body that is charged to adjudicate these polices, but the HBR is.

Mr. Thomson stated that he asked a similar question a few years ago when Ms. Reiter was still employed as the HSF would come in sort of at the last moment. However, the HSF's process does not allow them to give us their comments in abeyance to work with the petitioner. What the chair said is absolutely correct. The petitioner is only talking with staff and not the committee that comes later.

Mr. Overton said he believes the HSF brought in some valid points.

Mr. Judson said the HSF gets a packet the same as the HBR. They meet on Tuesdays, just prior to the HBR meeting. They might meet with a staff member, but they would not have the informed input of the architectural review board.

Mr. Overton stated that he was only trying to find a way to streamline the process, but it may not be necessary.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

17. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the HBR, Mr. Judson adjourned the

meeting at 5:40 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.