



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
September 8, 2010 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

SEPTEMBER 8, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Members Not Present: Sidney Johnson, Vice Chair
Gene Hutchinson

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Charlotte Moore, Director of Special Projects
Ellen Harris, Preservation Planner
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Call to Order](#)

Mr. Judson called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approval of August 11, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [08-11-2010 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve August 11, 2010 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle

- Aye

Ned Gay

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Sidney J. Johnson

- Not Present

Brian Judson

- Abstain

Richard Law, Sr

- Aye

W James Overton

- Aye

Linda Ramsay

- Aye

Ebony Simpson

- Aye

Robin Williams

- Not Present

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

3. [660 Broughton Street](#)

Mr. Engle reported that the signs at this location were on the ground yesterday when he went by at noontime. Ms. Ramsay said on Monday the signs were in the fencing.

Mr. Judson said if the Board did not have an objection, the chair would accept that the signs were posted. The petitioner is present and there could be an issue with the signs blowing over.

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

4. [Petition of Doug Bean for J. Parker Ltd. - H-10-4304-2 - 19 W. Broughton Street - Principal Use Sign - Continue to October 13, 2010 at the request of the petitioner](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Continue to October 13, 2010 at the request of the petitioner. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Reed Engle

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

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

5. [Amended Petition of Patrick Shay - H-091223-4200-2 - 28 Abercorn Street - Alteration to Canopy Addition](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the amendment for the clearance bar, roof color change and elimination of the parapet lanterns. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

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

6. [Petition of James Farmer for New Vision Revival Center - H-10-4296-2 - 615 Montgomery Street - Principal Use Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the principal use sign and to repair and reinstall the church steeple. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

7. Petition of Doug Bean for Impact Fitness - H-10-4305-2 - 1 East Broughton Street - Principal Use Sign

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the non-illuminated principal use facade sign as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

8. Petition of Doug Bean for Georgia Power - H-10-4306-2 - 28 Abercorn Street - Principal Use Signs

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the two principal use signs as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

9. [Petition of Daniel E. Snyder, AIA - H-10-4233-2 - 41 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. - New Construction, Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Dan Snyder was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The Board earlier this year approved Part I Height and Mass for the new garden wall and ancillary support/service structures. The petitioner is now requesting approval for Part II, Design Details, of a new garden wall and ancillary support/service structures on the north and west portions of the property. The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance on July 27, 2010 to allow the proposed height of the garden wall to extend 13'-6" along West Bryan and Ann Streets.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the new construction of the wall and open shed structure as submitted.

Dr. Williams asked if all the metal fencing is the dimension of the sample.

Ms. Ward said yes; however, she is not sure if the height is the same.

Ms. Simpson asked if page 15 shows an awning.

Ms. Ward explained that it is the belvedere that cantilevers out over the private property. It is a wood deck.

Dr. Williams asked that on page 15 to the left if what was seen is the wood fencing.

Ms. Ward explained that at the service drive off of Bryan Street is the petitioner's property and is to be used for the delivery trucks and service vehicles. A wood panel fence is just beyond this. There is a transition back to the masonry wall with the iron fencing.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Snyder stated that this is a big project. Their project has some conditions and with the Board's approval he wanted to take the time to carefully explain their project. He explained that the first screen was displaying Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. It goes from the existing colonnade with the steel beams above from the existing wall. The brick wall will match the existing wall. The entrance doors will be solid steel with a steel canopy and a hood. The masonry walls are typically 16 inches wide, but at the ends, they are 24 inches wide as they want to convey a sense of weight. The dumpster is hidden behind a sliding screen which is hollow metal and is painted black. A fixed panel is here and the screen slides the entire length so that the dumpster is behind it. The wall is articulated in the same fashion as the wood fence.

Mr. Snyder explained that the dash lines indicate an arbor above. The roof begins over the kiosk. The area they are calling a belvedere is where the stairs go up to a small second floor area. It cantilevers three feet. From one end of the belvedere to the other is rustication in the brick wall. Door type three is the wood gate and wood fence. The only thing they are illustrating on the second floor is the belvedere. The masonry comes up to the second floor; the bridge and cantilever are wood.

The elevation is much like what was seen in the height and mass presentation. The entrance is about the same portions as the historic carriage gate. They have extended the rods up so that they align with the top of the carriage gate and have put a steel panel over the existing steel beam. What is unique is that no one would ever need a steel beam this big to put up a fence, but it is here and they wanted to transform this and make it as elegant as possible.

With the steel beam they could put the rods in tension which would allow them to be thinner. They had quarter inch rods made; the height from grade to the bottom of the beam is about 11 feet. In talking with their structural engineer, a quarter inch rod may be used, but he knows he can do it with 3/8. It is very transparent and light, except for the existing beam.

Mr. Snyder next showed the belvedere area. He elaborated on the wood fence. They have a six inch beam that aligns with the six inch framing system of the fence. These lines are aligned with the rustication on the Scarborough House. The Orange Street elevation shows the fence beyond and the wooden gate.

He stated that the next perspective is through the gate as one can see into this. This is also the area of the blue stone which matches the existing blue stone. The garden is just beyond this. At the southwest corner of the open shed, is where the column comes out and extends over into the sidewalk area. The roof has not changed from the height and mass submission. The masonry recesses and this is where the fig ivy will grow. This is a true masonry wall.

Dr. Williams asked if the metal plate that looks like it has rivets or bolts covers over an existing metal beam.

Mr. Snyder answered yes.

Dr. Williams stated that it would have been better if the beam would have aligned with the historic gate. It is slightly lower and midway. The massing is relating to the gate. He was wondering if the petitioner made this face the same height as the architrave on the gate or something to create a better dialog between the two, even though, the alignment is not perfect. Otherwise, the petitioner is trying to create some type of reinterpretation of the gate.

Mr. Snyder said that he would rather think of this as a blank field. They looked at perhaps extending the rods higher to literally mimic this. What they are really doing is making a new figure that is much weaker than this. He believes it is better architecturally if this is just a quiet blank field that happens to have a dark line going through it.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes also that it is better not to go through the middle. He was saying that the petitioner is very conscientious about the top of the rods aligning with the top of the main part of the gate. He was suggesting if there is a way that the horizontal alignments between the face of that metal beam and the artitrave; something to think about if there is some latitude in the size of the beam. He said in the drawings, the plate appears to be off the ground.

Mr. Snyder stated that the plate is not off the ground. This is actually the slope up. It is all flush.

Dr. Williams asked if a new element is shown here or was it there before the hood.

Mr. Snyder explained that it is a new element. They did not have the designs. They just had the height and mass.

Dr. Williams said he was curious as to the purpose of the cove hood.

Mr. Snyder explained that when you have something this light and then go through something that is lower and darker, he believes would make the entrance experience much better. They could have put a flat door here, but by doing so they are engaging both an overhead and the sides.

Dr. Williams stated that by recessing the doors, this would achieve what Mr. Snyder stated, but he is is curious as to what the covering achieves. He guessed one could argue that it is picking up the curvature of the arch, but coving is peculiar and evokes association with things such as Egyptian architecture. This seems like an odd place to have it here. Coves over entrances are very unconventional. This strikes him as an odd detail in this circumstance. They want shadow to give a sense of depth and weight compared to darkness quality as shown on the screen.

Mr. Snyder said they would see more of the steel; if it is just a horizontal, they will not see as much. They have the section detail.

Mr. Engle saw the section detail sheet and stated that is the shadow.

Dr. Williams told Mr. Snyder that the shadow is working against him in the drawings. He thought this was actually a feature and not a shadow.

Mr. Snyder said it is very subtle.

Dr. Williams stated that is fine, but the shadow looks like it was dropping about two feet coming directly ahead of the door. This is what he was questioning. It looks very peculiar. He said on page 6, the belvedere overhang is shown from two views. Dr. Williams asked which view is right.

Mr. Snyder said it is three feet. He looked at this many times and did not see that. The middle drawing is correct.

Mr. Judson stated that the high beam is already a large figure. He believes that the wiring and everything else is done to alleviate its mass. If he understood Mr. Snyder correctly to make it higher and broader, he believes it would become too imposing.

Mr. Overton asked what type of architecture is being proposed for the fence. Would he call it post-modern design? He asked Mr. Snyder that if Mr. Jay was his partner, would he have designed the fence in this matter when the original house was built. In his opinion, it is a very post-modern looking design. Why was this approach chosen instead of just following the architecture of the original building?

Mr. Snyder explained that there is the approach of being background to the Scarborough House. They tried to keep this as quiet as possible. It is not overly attention grabbing. Rather than calling it post-modern, he would call it contemporary. There is a lot of philosophical issues around the word "post-modern." It could be post-modern as a return where they are picking up imagery from the past or it could be post-modern as critical or deconstruction which is charged going in many directions. Mr. Snyder reported that he does not think it is either of these. They do make some references to the past and rustication and make a sort of reference to the Scarborough House and building by aligning with components of the Scarborough House. But he would not call it post-modern.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Snyder if he did not feel that this is could be very jarring for someone to look at the fence as a boundary.

Mr. Snyder responded that he does not.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Snyder if where the three people are standing, is the fence 13'-6" high?

Mr. Snyder answered no. This fence aligns with the existing fence. It is 7'-6" tall. It continues on and the street slopes down. It gets to over 9' and continues to slope down to West Bryan Street until it terminates at 13'-6". Where the people are standing is only about 9'.

Dr. Henry asked what is the material of the wall behind the figures.

Mr. Snyder pointed out that it is the brick masonry; the fig ivy flushes out with the face of the wall.

Dr. Williams asked if the overhang provides an opportunity for view.

Mr. Snyder said it also makes a stronger element as they look down West Bryan Street. It also makes it physically lighter as it projects over the street.

Dr. Williams said a belvedere in a garden is used somewhat of like a gazebo from which you get a great view of the garden. From here you get a view of the garbage dumpster and the service drive. It appears to him that this is an odd thing to place next to the service drive.

Mr. Snyder said may be the belvedere might be a misnomer at this location. They are calling the entire thing the belvedere, but it goes up to the terminus which overlooks into the garden.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes a contemporary pattern is the best way to go. He also agrees with Dr. Williams with regards to the metal gate next to the carriage gate. He likes the concept of the rods and feels that it is compatible, but the height bothers him. Mr. Engle said he could not understand why the petitioner does not make the modern addition secondary to the historic carriage gates. He believes that if the upper rods were cut off where the upper architrave is and tuck them about a foot lower than they were, the petitioner could carry the horizontal line of the historic building over. Presently, they are not matching anything.

Dr. Williams stated that he actually likes the fact that it comes up to the height of the attic. However, there appears to be alignment lines going through the top of the rods. He asked what is this line.

Mr. Snyder explained that it is the far back wall. They will never see this. This is the deception of elevations.

Dr. Williams said that the petitioner has an intermediary bar here obviously for structural reasons. He asked if a bar could be done here that line up with the top of the architrave or the cornice where Mr. Engle spoke of.

Ms. Simpson stated that in this particular view or elevation, visually it does not appear secondary. She knows this has been talked about throughout the presentation in terms of the new construction being secondary. Ms. Simpson stated that she believes it is just as powerful as the existing.

Mr. Snyder believes that some of this is the difficulty of illustrating something this thin. The computer lines are much larger than the material. Therefore, they read much heavier. This is why they had this made and the actual rods are not even a fraction of this.

Ms. Simpson believes that the top is incomplete.

Mr. Snyder said this is a part of trying to make a blank field. As soon as they bring a line from the gate over into the area, they are now making a picture and turning it into a diminished picture of the gate. They feel the strongest approach is to make it just a blank quiet field. Yes, they have a steel beam here and it is given and is a part of the history of the site in the sense that they have a portion of the Kramer Building still here.

Dr. Henry stated that he has no problem with the height of the rods as he believes they are appropriate. What bothers him is the steel beam. He does not see where it relates to the gate at all.

Dr. Williams stated that it is covering the beam that is already here.

Mr. Judson stated that Mr. Snyder has provided the Board with a very detailed presentation of about 20 plus minutes. Historically, this has been a time limit in past years. However, at this point he wanted the Board to focus on specific questions. When they get into the Board discussions, they can go back and forth among themselves over the design suggestions, concerns or things that they feel are limiting factors in their ability to approve it. But, at this point, he wants them to focus on questions for Mr. Snyder.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Snyder to explain the steel beams again. He asked Mr. Snyder if he was putting a steel covering over an existing beam.

Mr. Snyder answered yes.

Dr. Henry asked if it is the same width of a steel beam.

Mr. Snyder answered yes. He stated that he was trying to find a photo of the existing, but the steel beam is here.

Ms. Ramsay said she was not present when the height and mass was presented. She said from the first proposal, this is certainly simplified, she believes, in a more elegant solution.

Mr. Snyder located a picture of the steel beam and showed it to the Board.

Dr. Henry wanted to know what is the purpose of the steel beam.

Mr. Snyder said it is a remnant of the building that was here and is actually holding up the wall.

Dr. Williams stated that the photo shows that the beam comes awfully close to the top of the cornice level. The petitioner's drawings show the bottom side of the metal plate coming halfway up the capital and there the bottom side of the metal beam is actually at the midpoint of the architrave. It is much higher than what the drawing is showing. Given this, Dr. Williams said he would recommend that the petitioner make some effort for alignment to create a better dialog between the two. He explained that he was not saying make it as high as Mr. Jay's architrave which is massive, but at least the top of the metal plate could align with the cornice and the bottom appears already to be aligned with the molding in the middle of the architrave.

Mr. Snyder said they would leave it at the bottom and bring it up.

Mr. Engle stated that the poles are not going to be anywhere near that tall.

Dr. Williams said the poles would come up to the top of the attic which is only about 16 or 18 inches higher than the top of the beam. Therefore, the petitioner's drawings are not doing him a service. He asked what is the length of the metal high beam from wall to post.

Mr. Snyder believes it is about 23 feet.

Dr. Williams asked what is the width of Mr. Jay's gate.

Mr. Snyder guessed that it is about 20 feet.

Dr. Williams said it looks narrower than that. The petitioner's drawings make it look like the two are the same width.

Mr. Snyder stated that all of the dimensions on the existing buildings, they got from prior drawings. The particular height alignment was done in his office with tape measures.

Ms. Simpson said it appears larger on the elevations.

Mr. Engle said this is a pivotal elevation and detail. It is highly important that they are drawn correctly. This Board does not know what the end product will look like.

Mr. Judson said he recalls going back to the east elevation and the drawing, the entrance is not flush with the end of the beam. He stated to clarify so that they all are on the same page before the Board moves to its discussion and a motion; he believes the photo illustrates the actual height alignment of the bottom of the beam at the center molding above the capital and that the actual height alignment is just below the top of the architrave. What is being suggested or might be suggested in a motion is to bring the cover face (plate) to align with the top of the architrave.

Mr. Snyder said that in his office they did not measure any of this. They got it from other drawings.

Dr. Williams stated that from his experience, builders follow drawings, not reality. If the beam is not where the drawing is, he does not want to read the paper and find out that they moved the beam to conform to the petitioner's drawings.

Mr. Snyder agreed with Dr. Williams and said everything is correct unto itself. They did not measure this in his office. He took the measurements from another set of drawings and placed on this. They will shorten the rods. He will measure all of this.

Mr. Engle said the rods will protude a foot over the top and the Board does not want this.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that the overall design is excellent. They have one question about the wood portion of the fencing; He believes some planting is being proposed to be in front of the fencing.

Mr. Snyder explained that historically this neighborhood was defined by lots of small residential buildings. Every project has a budget and wood is more affordable than clapboard masonry buildings. Therefore, he believes the wood would be consistent with the residential character from years ago. The wood will be stained very dark black/green. Consequently, all shadows will be lost. They will end up with a dark/green natural material in the location. They were of the opinion that this would be a good solution. They will plant vegetation here.

Dr. Henry suggested that any motion the Board makes should be subject to seeing a correct drawing.

Mr. Engle suggested that the Board have the correct drawing be submitted to staff.

Mr. Judson advised the Board to stipulate clearly what they expect with a stipulation that it comes to staff for confirmation that it has met the standards.

Dr. Williams asked that if the staff gets corrections via email, could the staff share it with the Board for their feedback or do they just leave it in the staff's hands?

Ms. Ward stated that the staff could send it out, but if the Board wants to provide feedback, it should be done at a public hearing. She said the more specific the Board's motion is, the better it is for the staff when the drawings are resubmitted she will know exactly what the Board wants.

Mr. Engle stated that this is an incredibly important building and project. He believes that in the future, correct measurements of historic structures need to be given. The relationship of the new to the historic structure is critical and not to have correct drawings is terrible. He is straining to vote on this without saying bring it back to the Board so they can look at it correctly. Something else might be wrong as they don't have the right elevations and this concerns him.

Mr. Judson said he understood what Mr. Engle said as this particular segment of the elevation is critical because it speaks to the old building whereas as they around the other building mistaking the overhang of the belvedere landing.

Board Action:

Approval of the new construction of the privacy wall and open shed with the following conditions:
1. Submit corrected drawings for the historic carriage gate and steel rod fence on the MLK elevation to staff; 2. Align the top of the beam on the steel rod fence on the MLK elevation with the top of the cornice on the historic carriage gate; and 3. The steel rods on the MLK elevation are not to exceed the height of the carriage gate attic. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ned Gay

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Reed Engle	- Aye
Richard Law, Sr	- Aye

W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Nay
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Kefren Arjona - H-10-4299-2 - 112 W. Broughton Street - Principal Use Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Kefren Arjona was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a non-illuminated principal use fascia sign on the building at 112 West Broughton Street. The proposed sign is a sandblasted redwood sign, cut to follow the general outside lines of the design. Therefore, the shape will not be a strict rectangle and is approximately 20 square feet. The sign was previously approved and located on the property at 19 Barnard Street. The business is locating to the Broughton Street area. A white valance with black lettering is proposed on the existing shed style awning frame.

Ms. Ward stated that normally this petition would have been put on the consent agenda, but staff had a concern with the valance. It appears that the white valance will be attached to the metal awning frame that is here and the staff feels that this is not appropriate. If the petition wants to do something here, they should recover the entire awning and resubmit it to staff for approval.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the sign with the valance to be resubmitted to staff as a part of the awning petition.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Arjona said the awning frame will be detached and removed from the building. The fascia of the building is metal and the letters will be black. Nothing has changed on the sign at 19 Barnard Street. It will be non-illuminated. The sign will be used on Broughton Street.

Mr. Engle asked if there were any drawings of the new fascia sign that is being proposed.

Mr. Arjona said it is not a new fascia. They just want to put a new fascia over the existing fascia.

Ms. Ward stated if it is determined that the petitioner is doing in-kind repairs to the fascia, then she could work with them, but the photos submitted to staff clearly shows a valance that goes over the adjacent store front. This is what she wants to be eliminated. But according to what the petitioner stated, he is not going to have the valance.

Mr. Arjona said he should have removed the valance from the photo and made this explanation. He did not realize that awnings and the other things were showing. But, in reality, the awning will be removed.

Mr. Gay asked if this was an awning.

Mr. Judson explained that an awning is shown in the photo that has been covered which is to go against the building once the awning is removed.

Dr. Williams stated that Ms. Ward made a comment about an adjacent store front. He asked her to explain this.

Ms. Ward explained that the photo shows a valance on an awning frame. A metal awning frame is presently on the this building. The photo shows that the awning covers the adjacent store front. But, the petitioner now is saying that this is not what he is going to do as he will remove the entire awning frame and do some repairs to the wood facia that is attached to the building. She has not seen anything on this, but if it ends up just being repairs to the facade she will be happy to work with the applicant on this at the staff level. What she did not want to see was a valance go up on the awning frame without proper cover for the awning.

Dr. Henry wanted to know what the Board should be voting on.

Ms. Ward stated that she stands by the staff's recommendation that the Board approve the sign and that anything pertaining to a valance or an awning be resubmitted to staff for final approval.

Dr. Williams asked if the sign is only going to serve the store on the left or is it centered over the two doors.

Mr. Arjona answered that it centers the building.

Ms. Ward stated that it is all one store.

Dr. Williams wanted to know if the sign will project or will it be flush.

Mr. Arjona said the sign will be flush with the building. It is about two inches wide.

Dr. Williams asked if the sign is now existing at a different location.

Mr. Arjona responded that presently the sign is at 19 Barnard Street.

Mr. Overton asked what material is the sign made out of.

Mr. Arjona said redwood and sandblasted.

Mr. Overton asked how would the different colors be achieved.

Mr. Arjona said the sign will be painted using acrylic paint and use a protective covering from the sun and so forth.

Mr. Overton asked what was the object behind the banner.

Mr. Arjona answered that it is an old time camera.

Mr. Judson explained that the camera takes vintage photographs. It is the old hooded camera.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the principal use sign with the address sign to be resubmitted to staff for review. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

11. Petition of Nathan Pollard for Kern-Coleman - H-10-4302-2 - 660 E. Broughton Street - Rehabilitation/Alteration

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Nathan Pollard was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the Kehoe Foundry Shed building in order to stabilize the building. The building is in a state of disrepair due to rust and degradation of the materials. Presently, the petitioner does not have a tenant. Therefore, they do anticipate coming back for Phase II for the rehabilitation. Today, they are only seeking stabilization of the building. As the Board will note, there is a little bump out here, but the staff's concerns are the views of what is visible from the public right-of-way which is the rear elevation. The interior of the property is not visible from the right-of-way. Therefore, staff is only concerned with the three elevations.

In summary, **Ms. Ward** stated that the staff recommends approval of the stabilization to the steel structure as proposed by the petitioner with the condition that the replacement siding be corrugated sheet metal to match the existing. Staff supports the translucent corrugated material in the monitor, as monitors were normally used for ventilation and light purposes; that the petitioner retains all the historic window sashes that are remaining and document their location with measured drawings. The windows should be retained or stored on site until repairs are made and then be reinstalled. The staff also recommends that if historically there was an oculus or some kind of oculus frame that it be used as a guidance for the new ventilation on the north and south elevations.

Mr. Judson asked that the siding that is being spoken of, is it going to come down to the line that is currently the top of the window openings?

Ms. Ward stated that she believes this is the case, but without before and after measured drawings it is hard to state unequivocally.

Dr. Henry wanted to know what this would be used for.

Ms. Ward stated that when this application was submitted, there was not a tenant. This is why they are only doing the Phase I stabilization.

Mr. Judson asked if the foundation or retaining wall that the Board saw in the photo showing a large concrete mass is it considered a part of the building.

Ms. Ward answered that she believes it is and serves a dual purpose, but this is a question that needs to be answered by the engineer of this project.

Dr. Williams asked what is the translucent corrugated material for the monitor?

Ms. Ward stated that in the submittal packet, the petitioner submitted a material cut-sheet.

Dr. Williams asked if it is fiberglass.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams stated that historically, they would not have had translucent fiberglass as there would be windows. Is this an interim material? Perhaps, this is a question that the petitioner needs to answer.

Ms. Ward stated that corrugated sheet metal is there now, so the fiberglass it is a different material. But, the profile is similar to what is here and this would be somewhat a color change.

Dr. Williams stated that since this building is not listed as a historic structure but exists within a historic district, does the Department of Interior Standards apply to this building?

Ms. Ward stated that the way the ordinance is written is that the Secretary of Interior Standards apply to historic buildings in the district. This building is not identified on the historic building map. She believes that it is eligible for the listing on the map. They have been trying to update the map and hope to do so within a year.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, this application is coming in at a time when it is not considered historic. He agrees with Ms. Ward that it should be considered historic, but if the Board makes recommendations or requirements that certain historic fabric be retained, is there legal grounds for this or can the applicant said that it is not historic and I don't have to conform.

Mr. Judson stated given that it is in the historic district, a part of the staff's verbiage of recommendation was that the Board apply the Secretary of Interior Standards. He said that they certainly stipulate in their approval and he believes it is a defensible decision.

Ms. Ward stated that the Board does look at alterations to existing buildings as to whether or not they will apply the standard. Even if the Board did not apply the standard, they would have to look at the alteration and see if it is compatible with the district.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Pollard stated that they are in agreement with all three of Ms. Ward's recommendations. They recommend that they would retain the windows and provide measured drawings to staff regarding the windows on Randolph Street side. He said to answer the question regarding the question about the clerestory or monitor, they recommend modern material. There is a budget and they are well-exceeding the cost and value of restoring it and removing basically the deteriorating structure that is just about ready to fall-in at this point. As for the siding, the corrugated sheet metal, they will be bringing this down to a point that would be above those windows, but low enough to protect the structural elements from wind and weather.

Mr. Judson asked if this would be a height that would not preclude replacing the windows.

Mr. Pollard answered yes, it will be well above the windows that are here now.

Dr. Williams asked if the corrugated siding would be removed or remain on the building.

Mr. Pollard answered that they will have to remove everything off the building. It will be a steel skeleton by the point of which they are repairing it. There will be no roof and no side walls. It will only be a steel metal frame.

Dr. Williams asked if the windows would be replaced.

Mr. Pollard answered no. At this point, they are not recommending it because they do not have a tenant and/or client to occupy the building.

Mr. Judson explained that the petition that is before the Board does not prelude this in the future. But, the petition that is before them is for a removal of the material to do damage control essentially and as far as they are going to take it at this point involves bringing siding just across the top rim of this. Therefore, skirts will only be here for a while until a further decision is made as to what to do. Today, they only want to stabilize the building.

Dr. Williams asked if the building could not be stabilized without removing 100% of the

skin.

Mr. Pollard answered yes. They will be sandblasting the entire steel skeleton, replacing columns, replacing steel joists, replacing and putting in bracing within the structure to meet wind requirements; steel members of the roof hurlings will be removed and replaced in certain areas. They will be repairing or replacing about 75% of the structure at this point to achieve a stable facility.

Dr. Williams asked if replacement materials will match the original material in terms of dimension and profile.

Mr. Pollard said in dimension of profile it will always be a zig zag, he did not know the actual term of the zig zag beam. Some of the columns are from the 1900s and are ribbed together. They will replace some of the bottoms of these with standard steel white plain sections of steel that are modernly available. They will also put in a concrete pier to account for wind low that is not being accounted for at this point.

Dr. Williams asked what would happen to the skin after it is removed.

Mr. Pollard said the skin will be recycled and/or discarded. A standard section is not the 1900s fabric of the building.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Pollard how did he know this.

Mr. Pollard answered that his best guess is that it is a 1940s alteration because in looking at corrugated metal siding, it does have a galvanization to it. This galvanization is post World War II and is really not from the 1900s time period.

Dr. Williams stated that the windows would be (original/from the 1900s).

Mr. Pollard said probably the windows would be. He could not say they are or aren't, but this is the early 1900s and he does not think this was a closed-in structure to begin with. He does not have documentation to this fact, but it is only his opinion.

Mr. Engle said the bottom line is what is here is here. Therefore, the integrity is what's here and not what might have been here.

Dr. Williams said actually if it is from the 1940s, this by virtue of age does qualify for the galvanized steel, theoretically, to be considered historic. As much of it is rusty, and he respects that material has to be removed in order to repair the structure and he applauds the desire to repair it rather than seeing it fall down. He worries about the wholesale of discarding or recycling; but basically the discarding of the skin. Dr. Williams gathered that the petitioner would not be keeping the windows. Theoretically, some of the siding might be salvageable. However, he does not know as he has never dealt with corrugated.

Mr. Pollard stated that it is not salvageable. He would not be able to get a contractor to replace it. They will not sign a contract to dotted line of the warranty.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Pollard that may be he will not be preserving the windows in situ, but would he document them in situ and then remove them in order to preserve the

structure and preserve the windows on site or wherever.

Mr. Pollard said they are in agreement with staff on this.

Dr. Williams asked if the roof is currently standing seam.

Mr. Pollard answered that it is a corrugated roof.

Dr. Williams asked if the roof is like the siding.

Mr. Pollard answered yes. He said to get a warranty on a roof now days he recommends the standing seam.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Pollard that once everything is removed, the windows will no longer be there.

Mr. Pollard answered that is correct.

Ms. Simpson questioned that once Phase I is completed, can the Board request that the windows be replaced?

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioner needs the Board's approval to remove them.

Ms. Simpson stated that she realizes that the staff is recommending that the petitioner store the windows, but she wants to know if the Board can request that the petitioner replace the windows.

Ms. Ward answered yes. This has to be made in the motion.

Dr. Williams said if it is the petitioner's intent to restore the steel skeleton. He asked Mr. Pollard to describe the results after they restore the steel skeleton. This is such a bizarre case. Will it be reclad in a new galvanized material?

Mr. Pollard answered only a small portion of it.

Dr. Williams asked if it would only be the upper part an a standing seam metal roof.

Mr. Pollard said a standing seam metal roof will go on the top of the monitor and on the lower section of the roof. The staff is recommending that they replace the wall with a corrugated siding that matches the existing. They will provide the corrugated metal siding to match the existing and bring it down to the bottom of what is the truss structure points; basically just covering it up so that it will not be affected by wind and weather. He said they recommend that the monitor and the translucent panels be the length of the structure; there is a budget constraint for this material. At this point, they will have painted steel posts; concrete columns which are encapsulating the existing steel structure in most cases because they are rotting and rusting below. This would go up to the point where it is stable to handle.

Dr. Williams asked if this would be a strategy to preserve the existing material.

Mr. Pollard answered yes. In some cases they have to replace a few of them and this is documented in the package. But, to go through it would exhaust everyone.

Mr. Judson said it would not only exhaust them, but getting into the interior of a building would be overstepping their purview. He clarified for Ms. Simpson that in today's motion what would be stipulated is the staff's recommendation and the petitioner has already said he is amendable which is to do the detailed drawings and save the windows on site. When it comes back for a subsequent proposal to finish the building, it would then be the Board's responsibility to mandate that the windows be replaced. If the petitioner came in with triangular windows, the Board could tell them no as they said they would keep the other windows and this is the design that the Board wants. But, this would not be a part of today's motion.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Pollard to explain why they are putting in lascolite translucent in the monitor when the building is "wide open." No light is needed in the monitor when there are no sides.

Mr. Pollard said in the future, there is a possibility that there will be sides. The light would illuminate the existing structure that is quite lovely from the inside if it is repaired.

Mr. Engle stated that what is applicable is the Secretary of Interior Standards because obviously the ordinance is not applicable here. They are taking a gritty, rough material which is corrugated. A few months ago, he was raving about the use of corrugated where it is supposed to be standing seam, but this is the exact opposite. Standing seam is a fairly elegant material. They will be replacing the roof and the siding and the gable end with a material that is ten times more elegant than the existing fabric.

Dr. Williams said the vertical sides will be corrugated.

Mr. Engle said the whole gable end will be standing seam.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Pollard if the gable end will be corrugated.

Mr. Pollard answered yes.

Mr. Engle said they still will be getting rid of corrugated and putting in standing seam which is a major part of the building. At least half of the elevation is as visible as the roof.

Mr. Overton asked what material has been on the monitor.

Mr. Pollard answered that now it is the corrugated material.

Mr. Overton asked the petitioner why are they changing to translucent.

Mr. Pollard answered that most monitors were either like that for ventilation or light or both. And in this case, they would like to retain it as being a light factor to the inside of the structure.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Pollard why would they do that now unknowing what the use of

the building will be in the future.

Mr. Pollard answered that the hope is that it will lend itself to new use in the future. This does not guarantee that their client will have a tenant that will need a monitor, but since it is here and there is a possibility that it will be an open structure, it would be advantageous at this point to put it on now as he can get it all warranted within the manufacturing and construction process.

Mr. Overton asked the petitioner if they are putting a hat on this building to protect the steel.

Mr. Pollard stated that if he could leave it as an open steel skeleton to the element, he would recommend this today. However, he has to cover it after the fact that they are replacing and repairing it.

Mr. Overton asked what would have been the clerestory material at the time the building was built.

Mr. Pollard answered probably 12-over-12 windows or 6-over-6 windows are something of this nature in the early 1900s.

Mr. Overton asked him if he would be opposed to doing this.

Mr. Pollard answered yes, they would be opposed to doing this.

Mr. Overton asked if the applicant has a right to demolish this building.

Ms. Ward answered that the applicant does not have a right to demolish the building without the Board's approval. She has concerns about the removal of the exterior walls and not putting them back.

Mr. Overton asked if the applicant came in and stated he wishes to demolish the building, does this Board have the right to say no.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Gay said could the City of Savannah dictate that if this Board does not approve whatever plans they have such as on Drayton Street.

Ms. Ward said they could appeal the Board's decision. Any building within the Historic District if there is a request for demolition has to come before this Board. The first thing that the Board has to do in evaluating the demolition is consider whether it is eligible for a listing on the Historic Building Map. She believes that it would be determined that this building is eligible for listing for the reasons she stated in the staff report.

Dr. Henry asked what are the concerns about not putting the walls back up.

Ms. Ward answered that they are removing the historic fabric and the character defining features of the building. She could not think of another case that they would ever recommend removing the exterior walls. Even for stabilization, she believes that the

petitioner should be required to put the walls back at least where they are visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Ward said removing the walls changes the character of the building.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Pollard if he said that he could not put the original skin back.

Mr. Pollard answered that in his opinion the original skin is deteriorated beyond use.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Pollard to explain what he meant by "beyond use."

Mr. Pollard stated that beyond use it is rusted.

Mr. Overton stated that Mr. Pollard has said that he is replicating the siding.

Mr. Pollard stated that he can replicate the siding with standard corrugated sections.

Dr. Williams stated that in some of the photos such as on page 17 show that the corrugated metal looks fine. He did not see any rust all the way through. Therefore, it is possible that there are parts of this building where the corrugated metal is intact and parts where it is rusted all the way through.

Dr. Williams stated that this is the preservation assessment of the building owner. Actually, the building beside the Ships of the Sea Museum had one person come in and evaluated and said the building was threatened. After it got its demolition approved, different opinions came forth to this Board and demonstrated that the building was not in danger of falling in.

Mr. Gay said one of the walls collapsed.

Dr. Williams stated that a small wall on a rear addition collapsed into the garden. However, this was not a part of the original structure. His point here is that the applicant says that the skin is beyond use. He asked if the Board is at the mercy of the applicant's opinion on this matter.

Ms. Ward stated that she does not believe that it is just their opinion; they are professionals in the field and she does not question the engineers that have worked on this who have said that the corrugated metal can not be restored. She believes that there are rust points at the joints, however, if they have to remove it, they should follow the Secretary of Interior Standards and replace it and match the existing; not just the upper portion, but all the way down.

Dr. Williams wanted to know what was the rationale for stopping at the head of the windows.

Ms. Ward responded that she believes it is to cover the structure.

Mr. Pollard said it is to cover the structure and and make up the roof.

Dr. Williams stated that the applicant is not going all the way down as the new tenants

might not want corrugated all the way down.

Mr. Gay stated that the new tenants may not want the windows.

Mr. Pollard stated that hopefully there is the possibility of some windows, no windows, similar pattern, almost the same exact thing. He does not know and can not tell the Board.

Dr. Williams said in this case it serves a moot point whether or not the windows are preserved.

Mr. Pollard stated that he did not believe so has he believes they are being held to the standard. He believes that the standard is what he is trying to provide to the Board. Mr. Pollard said, therefore, he does not understand why they are arguing over this.

Dr. Williams stated that Mr. Pollard just said that the way the building gets put back together depends on the future tenant; there may be windows or may not be windows.

Mr. Judson explained that a future tenant's request is one thing, but what the Board would approve at that point is another thing.

Mr. Engle read that page 15 states, "that the gable end will be standing seam siding not corrugated."

Ms. Ward stated that this is what the petitioner submitted. The staff is requesting that they do the corrugated.

Mr. Gay stated that the petitioner said they are willing to do the corrugated.

Dr. Henry said the roof is still standing seam.

Mr. Engle stated that the bottom line is that the Board either goes by the Secretary's Standards or they don't. The Secretary's Standards do not allow the putting back of two windows when there are eight. Either you restore or you don't. This is the stabilization project and not the rehabilitation project. It is mislabeled to start with. They are not rehabbing any thing, they are stabilizing it to keep it from falling down. Rehab will come next. But, the petitioner is skipping rehab and is doing something entirely different when you replace corrugated with standing seam on the roof.

Ms. Ramsay asked about the oculus that Ms. Ward spoke of.

Mr. Pollard stated that they are in agreement with this. They looked at replacement with a louver and/or indoor window. They will probably do so with the louver because there is a requirement for ventilation of an attic. Therefore, they will probably do the louver that matches the framing.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that he had a question pertaining to the dialog that has already been heard. However, he believes it is an important consideration. Mr. Carey asked if the siding could be sandblasted. He did not

think so because there would probably be nothing left. He asked the petitioner if he was suggesting standing sheet metal on the roof for structural purposes.

Mr. Judson explained to Mr. Carey that the Board allows him a great amount of latitude because they value his input, but his questions need to be directed to him and then if it is appropriate for Mr. Pollard to answer them, he would need to come back to the microphone so that his answers would be recorded.

Mr. Carey stated the HSF agrees with the staff recommendations. They have concerns about removing the sides and not showing the window openings. However, all of this is predicated on how one takes the building as it comes. In other words, what designation does it have. How is it treated? Do you apply the standards or not. While he would like to see certain things done, he is confused to how this building should be treated. Everybody is saying the standards need to be applied, but you have to accept the building as it is and not whether it is projected to be historic or whether it is hypothetically historic. A determination of eligibility can be obtained on this building. But, it is not designated as a historic building. Therefore, there is the question of applying the standards. They have gotten into this before where buildings are adjacent to or applying the standards to the context. Mr. Carey said he wants the Board to flush this discussion out and he wants to be privy to it. He is concerned that the Board may be varying off. Whatever the Board decides has to be defensible. While he may agree to what the Board wants to achieve, he is worrying that the Board is getting on thin ice.

Mr. Judson, for clarification regarding Mr. Carey concerns, asked him if in his comments there is a specific question that he wants the Board to ask Mr. Pollard.

Mr. Carey replied that if the first question is answered, he believes they can get to all the other questions.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Carey to be more explicit because his comments are in his opinion vague. He asked is it the opinion of the HSF that this building is historic?

Mr. Carey answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Carey that in his opinion, should the Secretary of Interior Standards apply to this building?

Mr. Carey answered yes.

Dr. Williams agreed with Mr. Carey. He believes this is a unique building in downtown Savannah and is an essential part of an industrial complex that has already lost some significant building parts such as the large circular tank that was at one time on the site. This is the last of the gritty metal buildings on the site. He asked Mr. Carey that in his opinion if the grittiness of the metal clad building is a character defining feature.

Mr. Carey answered yes. The building ought to be determined eligible; it is a procedural matter.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Pollard if he would be willing to put corrugated metal on the roof

instead of the standing seam.

Mr. Pollard answered that he would prefer not to.

Dr. Henry wanted to know why.

Mr. Pollard stated that with the standing seam he could get a 30 to 40 year warranty whereas with the corrugated he would have to apply a screw head through the metal and this would only provide approximately a ten year warranty to his client.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Pollard if he would be supportive of this building being determined historic.

Mr. Pollard refrained on answering this question as his client and he have not discussed the historic aspect of the building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Judson pointed out that it is certainly within the Board's purview and procedure to deny this petition. However, what he did not want to create, and what they have talked about many times in the past, is the situation of demolition by neglect. The Board is doing a balancing act, but he just wanted to point out that when they move forward into their discussion that no action may not be the best action.

Dr. Henry stated that this is the point he was making. He believes that in their motion they need to make it very clear that they are talking about stabilization and nothing else. Dr. Henry stated that he is somewhat undecided about the roof. He would have no objections with putting in plexiglass for the top windows as a stop gap measure to be reconsidered when this projects move further forward. He agrees with the petitioner that there is some good reasons for putting in a standing seam roof under the circumstances.

Mr. Engle stated that if this goes as is, it will not be eligible for tax benefits. The integrity will be lost on the building. If the owner wants to save money on the project, the way to do so is to get the 30% tax credit. But, they will not get the tax credit by destroying the integrity of the building.

Dr. Henry asked how would the petitioner destroy the integrity of the building.

Mr. Engle stated that it would not meet the ten standards as set forth by the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Dr. Henry stated that the metal would not be reusable.

Mr. Engle stated that it could be replaced in kind.

Dr. Henry said except for the roof.

Dr. Williams explained that this constitutes a substantial portion. There is a certain percentage of the structure that as to be preserved of the original material and he guessed in kind materials. The change of the roof might be enough to throw the percentage off.

Mr. Engle said the argument of a better warranty, the rationale is if you have an 18th century house with a wood shingle roof you could get a far better roof warranty if you use asphalt shingles. The warranty would be 40 years, but you will get a 15 year warranty with wood shingles. However, the point is integrity and it is a historic structure; this is the cost of doing it. There are ways around it. You could use a rubber membrane and then put corrugated on top of it just for visual appearance. This costs more money, but you would be preserving integrity.

Mr. Gay stated that he believes what Mr. Engle is saying is that it does not really matter whether this was original or not, but what is there now.

Mr. Engle stated that this is all the Board has to work with.

Dr. Williams said they are short of documentation that shows that the building originally had a standing seam.

Mr. Gay that in 1900, the standing seam would be more likely.

Mr. Engle stated that the standing seam would not be likely on an industrial building such as this building.

Mr. Judson said by chance this building was just a hay or brick shed.

Mr. Engle stated that during the time, the corrugated was the cheapest you could get.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward that from her historic review if she could tell that there was ever a translucent clear story in the building.

Ms. Ward stated that unfortunately this would help in a lot of ways, but they do not have any historic photos of the building. Therefore, she agrees with Mr. Engle that they have to use what is here. They can only speculate what was here before. Ms. Ward imagined that the reason they had a monitor was to let in day lighting and air and may be the windows were operable.

Mr. Overton asked if the petitioner knew if there ever was translucent material here.

Mr. Pollard answered that he does not know and assumes as Ms. Ward that there was probably some sort of wood clad lighted windows that probably were operable. But, this is only a guess.

Mr. Overton stated that his guess is if the Board allows the translucent clerestory to seal or be the cap of the building while it remains for a tenant to lease the facility, would they be setting a precedent where if they came back later and said that this is not the appropriate material as it looks like hardiplank, they would have already somewhat pre-agreed to that.

Dr. Henry stated that he believes the Board could stipulate that this is a stop gap.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board could stipulate a temporary material and not a permanent

material.

Mr. Judson explained that if the Board approves the installation of a material, the Board could not stipulate that in a future motion that it be removed and replaced with another material. He clarified for the petitioner that economic hardship whether it be the expense of the material or the warranty, are not within this Board's purview. The Board's role is to preserve the Historic District to the design standards. As empathic as the Board might be with all the other concerns. Mr. Judson also wanted to know if the petitioner understood Mr. Engle's comments regarding the tax credits, in that he and his client could perhaps consider some of the alternatives in that if they move forward and destroy the historic fabric of this building, it certainly changes the position in terms of federal tax credits. He stated that this is not in the Board's purview, but they just wanted to give him the information.

Ms. Simpson wanted the Board to keep in mind the ten standards for the rehabilitation. She said standard two states that the removal of historic materials shall be avoided and standard six says that deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. She wants the Board follow the standards. This is what this Board stands for and this is what they are defending.

Dr. Henry asked what is said about irrecovable damages.

Ms. Simpson answered that it could still be replaced.

Dr. Williams stated that the 1916 Sanborn map does not show any windows on the clerestory of the structure. Usually, Sanborn's comments about apertures for fire reasons and it just says, "iron clad on iron frame, iron post and roof tress, brick and earth floor." He said that the adjacent structure which is called the Smithy, the bump head on the bottom had windows on the north and south sides; he read that it says, "iron clad on iron framework" on the west side with the dotted lines and then there is an open face shed. Dr. Williams summarized that the long and short of this is actually that the corrugate metal on the monitor may not have ever been there. He said that the fiberglass that the petitioner is proposing could read from the outside like the corrugated metal, but would be translucent and allow light. Therefore, from a visual appearance on the outside, it actually is in keeping with the character of the building in terms that it is corrugation because of its materialology.

Dr. Henry said the similarity between fiberglass and corrugated steel is an interesting one. He did not know of other nuances that would be involved. However, he believes that if the Board made a motion that said this would be permissible as well as using corrugated steel for the roof.

Dr. Williams said it would be standing seam or does the Board want corrugated.

Dr. Henry stated that this is what it was.

Mr. Engle said it has to be modified a little even within the standards. He said he could accept corrugated translucent on the monitor if the entire building was reclad in corrugated. When it is documented and stored so they know what the locations are of the materials and windows and the entire building should be reclad in corrugated, not standing

seam.

Mr. Gay questioned the windows that are obviously here now.

Mr. Engle said when the rehabilitation time comes they will be replaced. But they need to be documented before they are removed.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Engle how he agrees with translucent.

Mr. Engle answered because it is corrugated. They see this all the time in agriculture buildings. This has been used on agriculture buildings since the 1930s. On big tractor sheds every 20 feet, there is one sheet of corrugated. It used to be plexiglass, but now it is a different material replacing the corrugated. It is the identical profile. Therefore, you have the same character, but not the same material.

Mr. Overton stated he hates to keep bringing this up, but the hardiplank has the same profile.

Mr. Engle stated that the hardiplank does not have the same profile nor the same texture. If they want to be totally 100%, then everything has to go back the way it is.

Dr. Henry believes the corrugated approach is the best approach.

Dr. Williams stated the petitioner's request is translucent fiberglass. He asked what color is it.

Mr. Pollard said the color is translucent clear; there is no hint or hue of color.

Mr. Engle stated that the translucent can be purchased in white; he has seen it on carports.

Mr. Judson said that another reality of color theory is that being surrounded by corrugated stainless, it will pick up the grey hue or silver hue.

Mr. Pollard stated that also being adjacent to a brown roof, it will pick up the brown roof hue.

Dr. Williams wanted to know the Board's feelings regarding Mr. Engle's proposal for roof.

Mr. Engle wanted to hear the opinions of the Historic Savannah Foundation regarding the roof.

Dr. Williams stated that he knew standing seam has a longer warranty. He asked Mr. Pollard if it was fair to say that corrugated metal is a cheaper material than standing seam.

Mr. Pollard answered yes.

Dr. Williams said with budget being a consideration, if a rubber membrane or something

that Mr. Engle has suggested as a way to enhance the roof with some kind of sub-lining material.

Mr. Pollard said he understood Dr. question to be a lack of cost question. But, he would have to refer this question to his client. They did not discuss this as an option.

Mr. Judson said the budget is certainly a talking point; however, it is not within the criteria of the Board's purview.

Mr. Pollard stated that if it is a question of standing seam versus corrugated, standing seam is a traditional roofing material used throughout the Historic District of Savannah. He asked if standing seam was used on the shed. He does not believe that the Sanborn map knows the answer.

Dr. Williams answered that the Sanborn map does not show the answer to that question.

Mr. Pollard stated that it is within the realm of probable or possible roofing material.

Mr. Engle said the Secretary Standards does not go by probable or possible, but by what the integrity is at the time you are making the assessment.

Dr. Henry stated that he was ready to make a motion.

Dr. Williams stated that he did not know what the mood of Board is, but Mr. Pollard might want to confer with his client and he certainly can do so. If not, then Dr. Henry could make his motion.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Pollard to respond.

Mr. Pollard said ultimately he did not know what the Board's recommendation or motion would be.

Dr. Henry explained that his motion would be for everything to be corrugated, including the windows and roof and put in the two oculus.

Mr. Pollard asked for a continuance.

Mr. Judson wanted to be sure that Mr. Pollard understand the Board's concerns regarding this project.

Mr. Pollard stated that he understood the Board's concerns to be the corrugated roof versus standing seam; the clerestory monitor is as designed on their plans which is a corrugated translucent panel; and the siding would be corrugated to replace in-kind what is here.

Mr. Judson explained to Mr. Pollard that it was not a quiz, but he just wanted to ensure that Mr. Pollard's questions were answered as the Board did not render a decision today.

Mr. Pollard stated that they still agree with Ms. Ward's recommendation to provide a

detailed elevation drawing that documents the windows. They will retain the windows on site.

Board Action:

Continue to October 13, 2010 at the request of the petitioner. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

12. [Petition of Matthew Frankel for Hansen Architects - H-10-4303\(S\)-2 - 450 Bull Street - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Paul Hansen was present for the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for three new dome awnings on the second floor terrace over a door and two windows of the south elevation of the building.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends denial of the two window awnings. If the petitioner wishes to put an awning over the door, this should be restudied and they should use a simple shed style awning that fits within the opening that does not obscure any character-defining features, and reinforces the shape of the opening.

Mr. Judson asked if the south elevation is on Gaston Street.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Engle asked staff if the Secretary Standards were noted on this.

Ms. Ward answered that she did not review the Secretary Standards pertaining to awnings for this.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes that dome awnings should not be used on historic structures unless they were historic.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Hansen stated that basically taking Ms. Ward's comments, they came in with a suggested alternate design to basically provide the shed awnings at the three locations. They will basically keep the header detail above each window exposed. The awnings will be only to the height of the door that enters from the parlor out to the porch. These will be shed awnings as Ms. Ward suggested. They will fit within the confines of the window and door openings in the masonry.

Dr. Williams asked if the lintels would still be visible.

Mr. Hansen answered yes. They have had problems with the door because of weather. This started out as doing something for the door and then it morphed into using the patio for certain events. Therefore, they thought about adding the two awnings to the two adjoining windows to the entrance door.

Dr. Williams asked what is the purpose of the awnings over the windows.

Mr. Hansen said it does give protection to the window, but it is more a decorative item.

Dr. Williams asked if the door awning is needed because of the weather.

Mr. Hansen replied yes. The door goes all the way down to the floor of the porch. Therefore, in rainy weather, water is actually deteriorating some of the sills of the window and the door.

Dr. Williams asked if the key awning is the one over the door; the other two are there simply to complement. He stated that basically if the awning could be just for the door as opposed to three awnings, would accomplish what the petitioner's client is seeking; this would have less impact on the facade. Dr. Williams believes the one awning would receive more support than three awnings.

Mr. Hansen said this is fine. If this is the purview of this Board to only treat the entrance door, they certainly would agree to this.

Mr. Judson explained that the nature of Dr. William's question was would the petitioner be amendable to the modification.

Mr. Hansen answered that they are in agreement with this.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the amended petition of the door awning for a simple shed style awning that fits within the opening, does not obscure any character-defining features, and reinforces the shape of the opening with the condition that the window awnings be eliminated. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

13. [Petition of Linda Ramsay - H-10-4307-2 - 122 East Taylor Street - Stucco Repair and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. **Sandra Sherrill** was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ramsay is employed at the firm representing this petition. She completed the Conflict of Interest form and recused herself from participation in this matter.

Ms. **Ward** gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for a porch addition on the building and to install stucco on an existing concrete/brick exterior wall to the carriage house at the rear.

Ms. **Ward** reported that the staff recommends approval of the porch addition to the main house and the installation of a true stucco finish on the west elevation of the carriage house as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Sherrill stated they are in agreement with the staff's recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the porch addition to the main house and the installation of a true stucco finish on the west elevation of the carriage house as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Aye

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

14. [Petition of Jennifer Baughman for Coastal Canvas - H-10 - 4291\(S\)-2 - 1 East Broughton Street - Awning Recover - Fruzen Twist](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4291\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4291\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

15. [Petition of Jennifer Baughman for Coastal Canvas - H-10 - 4292\(S\)-2 - 1 East Broughton Street - Awning Recover - Impact Fitness](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4292\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4292\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

16. [Petition of Jennifer Baughman for Coastal Canvas - H-10 - 4293\(S\)-2 - 5 West Broughton Street - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4293\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4293\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

17. [Petition of Gordon Hitt - H-10-4294\(S\)-2 - 10 Whitaker Street - Roof Repair/Stucco Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4294\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4294\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

18. [Petition of Stephen Brannen - H-10-4295\(S\)-2 - 111 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. - Existing Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4295\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4295\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

19. [Petition of Stephen Brannen - H-10-4295\(S\)-2 \(amended\) 111 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. - New Elevated Service Landing](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4295\(S\)-2 \(amended\).pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4295\(S\)-2 \(amended\).pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

20. [Petition of Edward Hill - H-10-4297\(S\)-2 - 2 East Taylor Street - Exterior Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4297\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4297\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:
Second:

21. [Petition of Sherwin Williams - CBD - H-10-4300\(S\)-2 - 508 West Jones Street - Exterior Paint Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4300\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4300\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:
Second:

22. [Petition of Jeff Whitlow - H-10-4301\(S\)-2 - 348 Lincoln Street - Repairs to Historic Brick Walls](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4301\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4301\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:
Second:

23. [Petition of Vicki Bashlor for Quality Inn Heart of Savannah-H- 10-4308\(S\)-2 - 300 W. Bay Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4308\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4308\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Board Action:

No Action Required. Staff Approved. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

24. [Petition of Ronald Erickson - H-07-3836-2 - 315-321 Berrien Street - New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Shonka Ward 315-321 Berrien Street 082410.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward stated that the Board received a letter regarding this property. The petitioner was approved for new construction and received their Certificate of Occupancy. The units have been sold. Staff was asked to go and do a final inspection. Staff is still working with the City of Savannah to develop a policy governing how to deal with such issues as this. Basically, what she found on this site is isolated to one thing. However, it is one very significant thing that she does not know how to recommend. She is working with the Development Services Department to come up with an appropriate solution.

A row of four townhomes is here. They were approved for low stoop entrances; but no stoop entrances were built. Again, they had a problem, she believes, when the slab was poured, they did not measure it right. **Ms. Ward** stated that the root of the problem is unknown, but instead of having an elevated brick pad with side stairs and railings, it is just a concrete pad with a single step and it is not clad. She does not know if cladding would make it any better; a brick platform does not quite do it.

Ms. Ward said she spoke with the contractor today. Therefore, he is aware that there is an issue that she is holding them to be accountable for what they have done. She welcomes suggestions or recommendations from the Board.

Mr. Judson clarified that this is not an action item. This is just for information. However, he does not believe that this Board would have approved it.

Ms. Ward replied that she does not believe that the Board would have approved it and she would not have recommended that it be approved. They would never approve a concrete slab stoop.

Dr. Henry ask **Ms. Ward** to remind the Board what power they have regarding this issue.

Ms. Ward stated that if the Certificate of Occupancy had not been released, she does not know what the appropriate solution would have been. This happened early-on in the construction.

Dr. Henry stated that they see it; but there is nothing that this Board can do? He asked if this is correct?

Ms. Ward stated that she is not ready to say that there is nothing the Board can do. She is trying to work with the City to identify what kind of solutions are possible, and work with the applicant to make him do what is necessary.

Mr. Gay stated in other words, the Board does not have the right to say what was submitted has to go there.

Ms. Ward does not know if the contractor physically can do so.

Mr. Judson said this is a huge engineering problem.

Mr. Gay stated this could have been anything.

Ms. Ward believes this is a potential to say a low stoop with one step and a balaster.

Mr. Engle stated that concrete can be removed entirely and fill a wood stoop which would accept rails on both sides. A low wood stoop would look much better than the concrete.

Dr. Henry asked why the entire thing could not be moved upward closer to the window.

Mr. Engle said that would make it step down into the house.

Dr. Henry said steps could be put in the inside of the house.

Mr. Judson did not believe that this would meet ADA codes because of all these issues.

Ms. Ward stated that she would not want to do anything that would make the proportions of the facade go into question, too. She does not want to make a recommendation that would impact another feature that would cause a problem.

Dr. Williams asked if the contractor built the units without the lower two feet of the elevation drive.

Ms. Ward stated that the entire brick stoop is not there.

Mr. Judson explained that the building sits closer to street level than shown on the drawing. He believes that it was more than a slab pouring issue, but an engineering and measuring issue before they got started. He wants the Board to be able to vent its frustration, but before this point is belabored, he wanted to point out that there is no vote to be made regarding this issue.

Mr. Overton stated that he believes the Board ought to direct the staff to seek advice from the City Attorney on getting an approval from this Board relative to what has been built compared to what was approved prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Judson explained that this is the point that Ms. Ward raised. He said when he initially became a member of the Historic Board of Review, subsequent inspections by the Preservation Officer were not considered a part of the process. But, now not only is the Preservation Director engaged in the planning stage, but now they are trying to integrate it into a point in the procedure to where the certificate of occupancy does not get rendered before a final inspection by the Preservation Officer.

Mr. Overton said he believes that he heard Ms. Ward say that she did not know what to do

about it.

Ms. Ward stated that she does not know what to recommend to them to do. Overall for clarification on the process, they have consulted with the City Attorney regarding what to do for future projects. They agree that it is an opened-ended loop that needs to be closed and that they should be on the Certificate of Occupancy checklist. She believes the ideas about the wood stoop are the kind of recommendations needed to address this problem.

Mr. Overton said what is here now is a raised foundation with a slab on grade and the contractor did not do it. The solution is to tear it down.

Mr. Engle stated that when the forms are set and the slab is poured, it should be inspected. This is the second time in two months that they have problems with buildings setbacks.

Mr. Gay stated that he likes the idea that the contractor cannot get the Certificate of Occupancy until it comes before this Board letting them know what is to be done.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Gay if he was saying to do this in the future.

Mr. Gay answered no. He means right now.

Mr. Overton said the contractor already has the Certificate of Occupancy for these units.

Mr. Gay said then it needs to be revoked.

Mr. Judson said he believes that a part of their mechanism should be to be aware of offenders of these sort of things. Nevertheless, this is not an action item for this Board today.

Dr. Williams stated that it seems that from the curb to the stoop, there is a change of grade in both of these especially the one on the right. He was wondering, although it is not public property, if the grade could be lowered on the sidewalk that it might create enough of a change. In other words, rather than razed the building, lower the ground area around.

Mr. Overton disagreed with this. He does not believe that it is in this Board's purview to say how to solve it. He believes they need to say it is not acceptable, come back and give them something that is acceptable.

Ms. Simpson asked if the Board could recommend heavy fines.

Ms. Ward stated that the staff is recommending increasing the fees. This is a little different than a fine. The building permitting does the fines, but staff is recommending that with after-the-fact approval is not the regular application fee. The fee needs to be doubled and it is based on the value of construction. Therefore, it is not just a double \$25.00 application fee. If it is a million dollar project, it will be a double one thousand dollar fee for the after-the-fact review.

Mr. Overton stated that this is not enough punitive damage.

Mr. Judson clarified that this Board does not have enforcement or punitive powers. He

explained that since this is not currently a petition before the Board, the exparte communication rules do not apply. If someone has a suggestion that would help to enable the staff to move forward either with the petitioner, with the City or any other suggestions, he encouraged input. The input does not have to be a part of this meeting. The record is showing that the Board is aghast and frustrated that this is happening. The Board wants to encourage staff, City Attorney and other city officers to do everything they can to remedy this situation and give the Board leverage in future situations.

Dr. Henry wanted to know if the Board was given a list of people who have not performed the work as approved, would this Board be legally entitled to make a decision on this basis.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes that the Board would need to base their decisions on the architecture and the designs and not the person.

Mr. Judson explained that the Board could not show prejudice based on past performance. They would have to consider each petition on a case-by-case basis.

Dr. Henry asked if it would be legal to know past performances.

Mr. Judson responded certainly.

Board Action:

No Action Required. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

25. [306 W. Upper Factor's Walk / 301 W. River Street](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Factors Walk 090210.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward stated that the Board was forwarded a letter regarding this matter. Chairs, picnic tables and umbrellas are on the right-of-way at this facility. These items were here when the tenant moved in and she believes they assumed that they could use the picnic tables that were here without approval and may be they could cook outside. She said in order to meet the health code, they had to provide a covered structure over the cooking area. Ms. Ward stated that none of these things are permitted without the proper approvals. She believes, even then, it would be hard to get approval for what the tenant is doing.

A stop work order was issued on the shed that was built over the area of West Factor's Walk. It is a wood frame shed. Staff requested that they remove the shed, but the tenant wants to see if they could still move forward and use it. They went to court on this matter and the Judge ordered that the tenant file the proper applications and go through the process to seek approval to have the structures on the site. Ms. Ward reported that she met with the applicant after the court date and advised them that she would not

recommend approval for this structure and that she did not believe that the Historic Review Board would approve the structure. She was not that concerned about the materials, but more importantly about the covering of the right-of-way.

These are precious passages of Factor's Walk and this is an important area to our Historic District, tourism and the economy. She said having chairs and doing sidewalk cafe was the more appropriate program for this area and that this would be the best application to pursue. They have until September 23, 2010 to submit an application to the Historic Review Board. The Judge has given them until October 25, 2010 following the Board's meeting to demolish it or get approval for it to remain.

Mr. Judson stated that the Board received the letter on this issue, but he wanted to know if Ms. Ward received a copy of the Judge's actual decision.

Ms. Ward answered no.

Mr. Engle asked if this is blocking the public's access on Factor's Walk.

Ms. Ward explained that there is not actually an access. This backs up to the neighboring property that obstructs Factor's Walk. Staff wants this encroachment to be removed as well. It is a parking deck and is blocked off. At the current way it is configured, there isn't a passage. It would be great if this was opened up. They don't want it to be obstructed further just because one bad thing is here. A part of the problem is that they continue to grow and block the rights-of-way. She said this why they are listed as the Landmark is because of the Oglethorpe plan.

Mr. Engle said if this was approved, then all of Factor's Walk could end up this way.

Ms. Ward said she tried to point out that they must be consistent in their decision-making. If they approve this, then they would have to consider it all along Factor's Walk and this absolutely not appropriate.

Mr. Judson said for everyone's clarification, the Judge allowed the tenant to let things remain for the time being and in addition to their petition to the Historic Review Board, there are other applications they need to file.

Ms. Ward explained that even if the Historic Review Board approved this, they would also have to get an encroachment agreement with the City of Savannah to build onto the right-of-way. They would also need to get a permit from the sidewalk cafe policy to have the tables and chairs on the right-of-way.

Mr. Overton wanted to know if this is a public restaurant.

Ms. Ward answered yes. The tenant was doing some additional cooking outside with tables and chairs.

Mr. Judson explained to the potential petitioners of this project that when they come before the Board with a petition, they will give the opportunity to speak and have public comment. He did not want the potential petitioners to feel that they were denied to speak today. However, at this point without the Board have a petition before them, they

would only be talking in vague generalities. Mr. Judson told them that he feels they got a sense of the Board's reaction and certainly got the staff's feedback on this. Nevertheless, the Board will welcome their participation in this process when the petition is received.

Board Action:

No Action Required. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

26. [Unified Zoning Ordinance](#)

Ms. Ward reported that this item was on the Board Retreat agenda that they were unable to hear. As a follow-up it is on today's agenda. She introduced Ms. Charlotte Moore, Director of Special Projects who is heading up the Unified Zoning Ordinance project, which is a significant undertaking that will be a new ordinance that will be applied countywide. Ms. Ellen Harris, Cultural Resource and Urban Planning Manager, has been focused on writing the sections for the Historic Districts within the City and the Unincorporated County.

Ms. Moore stated that the Tricentennial Plan has been completed. This plan includes the second part which is the Unified Zoning Ordinance. The Comprehensive Plan is a former policy document adopted by City Council and County Commission. It includes various elements including historic resources. It is basically a formal policy document, long-range that assists in the development of plans for 25-30 years period. They are looking at meshing these two documents together. The zoning ordinance is an implementation tool for this plan and for other plans as well.

She explained that the zoning ordinances between the city and the county are ancient. In fact, the City zoning ordinances celebrated a half century. If you have ever tried to read it, you know it is difficult and is cumbersome. There are too many zoning districts and standards that conflict each other. Therefore, they are working on correcting this situation. A zoning assessment report was created when they began this process several years ago. They basically evaluated some of the issues. It also serves as an educational tool. Therefore, if anyone is interested in knowing more about zoning and not just preservation, this

document could prove very beneficial. There is a website where the information can be retrieved.

The zoning ordinances are setup in 13 chapters. They worked with the Technical Committee for approximately three years which consisted of City staff, County staff and some private individuals such as architects and engineers. They had technical expertise that helped to develop the draft, which was followed up by many meetings and workshops. This year they had 11 community workshops, but unfortunately the attendance was not that great. She believes, however, that when this document comes out, people will definitely be more interested in what happens to their property. The process was to introduce the public to the project and make them aware of what zoning does and does not do. They had an Advisory Committee gathering this year. They met weekly and had approximately 12 meetings over a three months period. This consisted of a larger group of individuals including a large number of residents. Some downtown residents participated as well. Overall there were 78 members which included representation from different professions, City and County staff, and two elected officials from the City. The Advisory Committee reviewed the draft ordinance that was developed by the Technical Committee. A document is available on the website that contains questions about the ordinance. There is a lot of interest in preservation and in particular the Historic Review Board. The comments are listed on the website - **unifiedzoning.org**. Ms. Moore said a number of concerns came out regarding this Board regarding public notice. They are looking at improving public notices perhaps including a greater radius for notification. A great interest was in this Board's membership. What the qualifications should be; Board members should have some form of education opportunity yearly. Attendance was another issue - not for the Historic Review Board in particular, but they have had instances where some board members are not attending their meetings and some meetings have actually been cancelled due to lack of attendance. They want to see City Council and the County Commission more involved in the attendance issue.

They are reaching out to more stakeholder groups and identifying what are their needs and what issues they have had with zoning. They worked with individual boards identifying what kind of concerns they have and they are looking over the draft ordinance to identify whether they are in agreement with what is being proposed. Currently, the staff continues to work on the ordinance; they are editing, developing zoning maps, and once this is complete and it goes to the public, it will be available to the public to review. For example, an individual will be able to click on a parcel that will show what the zoning is now and show what zoning is being proposed. They will be able to identify the different uses and the different development standards. This will be available for the overlay districts as well. If someone is seeking information pertaining to this project and presentations that have been provided, they are available online. Ms. Moore said they also have a facebook page and they announce their various meetings on this page as well as on the dedicated website. The timeline is constantly changing; however, hopefully the draft will be completed in November 2010, and then the public process will begin. Hopefully, in March 2011, the preparation will start for City Council and County Commission.

Ideally, in April 2011, this will go to the Planning Commission who will make a recommendation and then it will go to City Council and the County Commission. She said hopefully in late Spring of next year a new ordinance will be in place.

Ms. Harris gave a summary on the changes that are being proposed in the Unified Zoning Ordinance that will directly affect the Historic Review Board and gave a review on some of the other historic preservation related sections. She explained that there are four sections she believes that the Historic Review Board would be interested in. The name of the district is being proposed to change. Currently, the official name is the Savannah Historic District which has been confusing to a lot of people because there are multiple historic districts within the City limits. Therefore, to add clarity and to be more descriptive, they are proposing to rename the area that includes the Landmark District, the Savannah Downtown Historic District. All of the changes actually deal with two areas: changes to the Board or changes to some procedural elements. The design standards will remain consistent. Ms. Harris was aware that this Board recently went through the process of revising the ordinance and all of the design standards are in the Unified Zoning Ordinance. She said they have recommended reducing the number of members from eleven (11) to nine (9) and to establish minimum qualifications for five (5) of the members.

Ms. Simpson asked if the recommended changes are for the Historic Review Board.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

Ms. Simpson how would the reduction changes take place.

Ms. Harris answered that presently they do not know, but it is at the discretion of City Council. One suggested idea was that as a Board member term expires that they just simply be dropped off.

Dr. Henry asked what is the logic of reducing the number of members on this Board.

Ms. Harris stated that this was one of the recommendations that came from the Technical Committee. She believes that most of the boards have nine or less members. Eleven members is the largest except for the Metropolitan Planning Commission. It may have been the opinion that this provided for longer meetings to have an increased number of members.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes this is a great part of it. She believes that it was felt that if the number of members is reduced, then the amount of discussion would be decreased, but up the qualifications because of the reduced members. Therefore, hopefully, this would enable getting a good qualified board as well as having the discussions focused on the issues.

Ms. Harris reported that they are proposing the items that can be reviewed by

staff be expanded to include minor changes to the exterior fences and non-illuminated signs. This mainly addresses items that are typically on this Board's Consent Agenda. However, there would be no staff denials. For example if there was a particularly controversial fence and staff did not feel comfortable approving it or the petitioner was not willing to make changes, then it could come to the Board. Therefore, only items that met the standards would be approved by staff and anything that did not, would come to the Board.

She explained that currently, there is a minimum qualification for one member. The text that is being proposed for the minimum qualifications is "the member shall have demonstrated a special interest in historic preservation of resources" The Historic Review Board shall include at least five(5) appointed representatives of professions which are directly related to the historic preservation such as architectural, architectural history, urban planning, archaeology, law or building construction and restoration.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the quorum would change.

Ms. Harris explained that the quorum would change. Currently this Board's quorum is seven.

Ms. Ramsay said it is seven, but this was not one of the recommended changes. The quorum is still written as seven.

Dr. Williams said the quorum would need to be reduced at least by one member.

Ms. Harris said with most of the other boards, it is 50% plus one member.

Mr. Judson said six members would be the quorum. As far as the qualifications, the Board meets this already. Dr. Williams brings his expertise; they have an architect; Ms. Simpson served with SDRA ; Mr. Johnson has building trade experience, Mr. Overton has development experience and they have other members who are qualified.

Ms. Harris said the appointments would be made by City Council. The Historic Review Board would be granted the authority to grant variances from the design standards. Currently, this has to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The Historic Review Board makes a finding fact that is presented to the ZBA and then they make the determination. Therefore, this authority would be transferred to the Historic Review Board which appears to make a smoother process.

Ms. Ward explained that Mr. Overton has questioned why this Board punts to the ZBA, but in the new process they would no longer have to do this. If this Board felt the variances were warranted, they could do so.

Mr. Overton stated that Ms. Harris mentioned no staff denials. He said he could understand why, but he has always been uncomfortable on this Board not being able to vote no.

Mr. Judson explained that the Board could deny, but it is at the staff level.

Mr. Overton said this Board never denies an applicant.

Mr. Judson explained that this Board certainly can deny an applicant. But, the point is that staff would not deny an applicant. It becomes a legal defensible position as well. If there is no public process, the applicant would be too easy to appeal at this point, therefore, it would come before the Historic Review Board.

Mr. Overton said the procedure should be streamlined. If the staff says no and the applicant says he objects, then the staff would say you may present, but if they take her denial and go back and do whatever she suggests, wouldn't this streamline the amount of congestion.

Mr. Judson said the petitioner could certainly accept the staff's suggestion and modify and get staff approval, but if they end up not agreeing, then it has to come to the Board.

Mr. Overton said he understood this. But, if the staff does not have the ability to deny anything, then the petitioner will press ahead to come before the Board.

Ms. Ward explained that she believes there are benefits to both processes. She said that, with no offense to the Board, petitioners really do not want to come before them.

Mr. Judson stated that the petitioners do not want to come before the Board with the staff's recommendation against approval.

Ms. Ward said the Board only meets once a month. She can approve the Staff Reviews in two days.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward if she could say to the applicant she will not approve it.

Ms. Ward answered yes and she does. Once a completed application is received, action has to be taken within 45 days or it is automatically approved.

Board Action:

No action required.

-

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

27. [Next Meeting - Wednesday October 13, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

28. [Adjourned.](#)

There being more further business to come before the Board, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

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.