



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
August 10, 2011 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

AUGUST 10, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: W. James Overton, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
Sidney J. Johnson
Stephen G. Merriman, Jr.
Linda Ramsay
Ebony Simpson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Brian Judson, Chair

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Brittany Paige Bryant, Preservation Planner
Shanale Booker, IS&M Technology Assistant
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approve Meeting Minutes of July 13, 2011](#)

Attachment: [07-13-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve July 13, 2011 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

W James Overton - Abstain

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

2. [Signs](#)

Ms. Ramsay said during the sign review process, she saw that some signs were posted improperly. One sign was on the ground and one was perpendicular to the street. She called and reported this to staff. The signs were then posted correctly.

Mr. Engle said he called the staff, too, about sign posting. Two signs were posted on the interior and could not be read. He kept driving by the MLK Jr. Boulevard site, but did not see the sign. The signs do not stand out; he wishes they were colorful. When you are looking at an empty lot, it is hard to find one small white sign.

Ms. Ramsay said the sign on MLK Jr. Boulevard was posted perpendicular. The sign was posted in the ground and just one central post was used. Apparently, the wind blew the sign sideways.

Mr. Overton said he believes the staff instructs the petitioners how the signs should be posted.

Ms. Ward said some improvements are being proposed for the signs as it is believed they are inadequate for public notice. This will be discussed during the Board's retreat in September, 2011.

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

3. [Petition of Kevin F. Rose for Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | H-11-4473-2 | 2 East Broad](#)

Street | Fence

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

Board Action:

Approve repairs to the existing brick walls, removal of the indicated interior section of the wall, and to rebuild a new portion of wall to match the existing on the east end of the property. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Linda Ramsay
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
W James Overton - Abstain
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

4. [Petition of S. Wesley Woolf, P.C. | H-11-4475-2 | 410 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use facia sign. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Linda Ramsay
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
W James Overton - Abstain
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

5. Amended Petition of Bill Coggins for Taylor Berrien LLC | H-07-3836-2 | 315-321 Berrien Street | New Construction modifications

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Bill Coggins was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior modifications to the new construction of four row houses at 315-321 Berrien Street. The request is to install a brick veneer on the existing concrete stoop foundations at each of the entrances fronting Berrien Street. The bricks are to match the existing exterior bricks and will be in a running bond pattern on the three visible sides and on the surface of the landing. No modification requests were submitted for the columns or porch detailing.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the modified front portico upon the installation of brick veneer on the sides and surface of the foundation with the following conditions:

1. The foundation for the principal structure be clad in brick veneer to match the material of building and porch foundation base;
2. A wood balustrade be installed on the front and one-side of each portico to create a side oriented entry consistent with historic low stoop entries and to be more consistent with the originally approved plans; and
3. Where possible, include a side entry step, typical of low entry stoops.

Dr. Williams said the staff recommended wood balustrades. But, the example in figure ten shows cast iron railings. He asked if the code requires wood balustrades or is there an option of having some other material.

Ms. Ward answered that staff is recommending wood because this is what was originally approved. She believes that the wood balustrade is more appropriate.

Mr. Engle asked, for the benefit of the two new members, that staff explain what the Board reviewed at its last meeting regarding this petition.

Ms. Ward explained that two meetings ago, the petitioner was requesting approval for the slab as constructed. The petitioner was requesting after-the-fact approval for the buildings as they were constructed. This was denied. Now, the petitioner has returned with an amended approach to clad the foundations in a brick veneer. Ms. Ward stated she believes this is a good step forward, but it still needs to go a little further to be more consistent with what was originally approved and be compatible in the district.

Mr. Merriam asked if there was a reason for the buildings being constructed as they are

instead of as approved.

Ms. Ward stated that there was a problem with the civil engineering drawings relating to the architectural drawings. Consequently, the elevations did not match with the vertical construction, both on this property and on the Taylor Street property.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Coggins stated that at the last meeting, they asked to have the buildings accepted, but the Board denied the request. They have now introduced the brick veneer; they talked about stucco as it is on all the buildings. Mr. Coggins said he needs to see where the bricks fall as far as running brick veneer on the foundation. Landscaping is on both sides of the stoop. Therefore, to put in a step-down, he would have to talk with the City (or Mike Rose might have an answer), but he believes that some type of concrete landing would have to be here. However, landscaping and irrigation are here already. Ms. Ward has the elevations. As you work your way back to Jefferson Street, there are three inches above the sidewalk. This was approved before the City stepped in and hired a contractor to do all the sidewalks and handicap ramps in this area. The handicap ramp that crosses Berrien Street runs along Montgomery Street was changed from its original elevation (initially it was not a handicap ramp) and, therefore, this is why there is a drastic drop in front of 321 Berrien Street. Mr. Coggins said to place a step off the side, you would step down lower and then step back up to the sidewalk. This to him does not make sense.

Mr. Engle asked why a three foot pad could not be put on the left hand side of the deck and then you would not have to step up to the sidewalk. The grade is sloping down to the right.

Mr. Coggins explained that a pad could be put there, but with the landscape plan they will lose approximately three or four feet of landscape. Then, too, the irrigation lines are already here. This would work fine, but on the others to create a step down pad, they would go down below the sidewalk or either level with the sidewalk.

Mr. Engle pointed out that this is a dangerous situation with an unequal riser being here anyway. It appears to him that there is a five inch riser on the left and approximately a ten inch riser on the right.

Mr. Coggins stated that this all was created by the handicap ramp that was put in.

Mr. Engle said if a railing was put on the front and people came to the left, they would not be subjected to breaking their necks when they walk on the step.

Mr. Gay said excuses are being made now, but certainly when this was being built, they had to look at the plans. Now, anything that the Board is offering to mitigate he believes the petitioner should be amenable to it as they did not build what was approved.

Mr. Coggins stated that he was not arguing, but he would like to meet with someone at the site. He has met with Ms. Ward several times and this was not discussed in their last meeting. They looked at what could be done with the brick veneer. He wants to meet with the City's code representative to see what they can do. Mr. Coggins said he is open to suggestions and does not know about a pad stepping down and then steps up.

Dr. Williams explained that the pad does not have to step back up.

Mr. Coggins asked if it could be flush with the sidewalk.

Dr. Williams explained that the petitioner's original plan did not have lateral going straight in, but had side entrances.

Mr. Coggins confirmed this was true. They went from left to right.

Dr. Williams said landscaping has been planted as well as irrigation which is in contradiction to the original plans. Therefore, using the presence of landscaping/irrigation which was not in the original plan, as a reason not to do what is being recommended strikes him as a poor argument. Secondly, if it is needed, for the sake of being compatible with the district, even if it is at grade, the nature of the entrance is to go towards the building and then turn laterally, turn and then go in with the railing on the front. The buildings are built shorter than what was intended based on the plans that were submitted. Dr. Williams did not know whether the City has any provisions for modifying the sidewalk, but given that the sidewalks have a certain level, they might end up with some very short steps. The Liberty Street picture in figure ten shows some steps that are only three or four inches tall and one brick in height.

Dr. Henry stated that sidesteps could be put on all the units by lifting everything upwards and perhaps by eliminating the transom.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Coggins if he was in agreement with the staff's recommendation in order to get an affirmative vote from the Board today.

Mr. Coggins said prior to the vote, he would ask that Ms. Ward, Mr. Shonka, he and whoever else meet on site.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Coggins if he was asking for a continuance.

Mr. Coggins answered yes. He would have already handled this if it was brought up in his last site visit. He would be happy to meet back on site with Mike Rose, Mr. Shonka or whomever. He would like to ask for a continuance so he may talk with Traffic Engineering, meet with Mr. Shonka, and Ms. Ward and go over what is involved before he agrees to do something that just might create other problems.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier, representing Historic Savannah Foundation and the architecture review committee, stated that they agree with the staff's recommendations. The foundation should be clad in brick veneer and a step should be added, if possible. They believe that side entrances are preferable over the primary front entrances.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he does not believe that a continuance should be granted. How many

times are they going to go over the same issues? The Board agreed with the original designs and at the last meeting they refused to modify the designs. Now, today, they have wasted time on this again and will come back and review it again. He is not willing to vote for a continuance, but is willing to vote "no" on this petition and let the petitioner submit the entire petition again. He stated again, how many times must they go over and over amended issues?

Dr. Henry asked staff how many times has the Board heard this petition. What is the process for negotiations?

Ms. Ward answered that the initial time was for the original approval; which was approved. The second time was two months ago and it was denied. Today, the petition has come back for a modification.

Dr. Henry stated that he understood Mr. Engle's point, but the petitioner is saying that he has not met with everyone simultaneously.

Ms. Ward explained that the building inspector, the property owner, Mr. Coggins, a couple of other representatives from the Building Department and she met on site. She stated that she must be consistent with her recommendations from meetings-to-meetings. Therefore, she does not know what another on site meeting would do. But, if there are code issues, she believes this is something that can be discussed.

Mr. Johnson wanted to know what part the City played in this matter.

Ms. Ward explained that the City met on site to ensure that if this was clad with the veneer, would it still meet the building code for the landing. They wanted to ensure that whatever was done would ultimately meet the building code and allow the building permit to be granted.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the petitioner was aware that the Board discussed the railings and side entry.

Mr. Engle stated that what the Board is dealing with is the historic character; not the zoning issues nor the construction issues. The basic question, therefore, is does this meet the historic character. The answer is it does not nor does it meet the original plan and he does not know how much more talking will change it. Unless this is altered, it will not meet historic standards.

Dr. Williams stated that the sidewalk from the Montgomery Street, rises up quickly several inches; but from the far left end, it appears to rise up from the curb. But, he does not know if the sidewalk should be regraded and lowered as it does appear to be rising up from the level of the curb. If the entire sidewalk was taken out and lowered by five or six inches, it might help to resolve the change of grade issue and allow for the cladding. Dr. Williams said one of the petitioner's concerns is that there is not enough drop from the step to the sidewalk. But, if the sidewalk was lowered, this issue might disappear and then they may arrive at where they want to be, which is for this to be historically compatible in character. The petitioner wants them to be functional.

Mr. Engle said if the sidewalk is dropped, this would eliminate the curb entirely. To the

right is the handicap ramp.

Dr. Williams explained that what he was saying is that it appears that the sidewalk runs parallel to the facades. It is probably four or five inches higher than the top of the curb. Looking at the far right end, it appears to be a quick rise to the first stoop and it continues to rise, but from the far left-end, it appears to be rising up behind the three bushes. Maybe if this was continued, it would allow for the issue of the sidewalk to be addressed. However, he does not know whether Mr. Coggins is amenable to the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Overton asked if the Board could approve this today subject to the staff's recommendation.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Overton explained this would take away the argument of what side it's on and everything else. The petitioner understands what the Board's position is rather than granting a continuance.

Mr. Gay stated this is not what the petitioner is asking.

Mr. Overton explained that he was aware of this, but if this Board passes a motion that they approve this in accordance with staff's recommendations, this would be it. Now, they could offer to the petitioner a continuance, but he believes some Board members will vote no on the continuance.

Ms. Simpson asked what if the Board voted on the continuance and it failed, what would be the next step?

Mr. Overton explained that he believes the petitioner could reapply one year later.

Mr. Engle stated that all the Taylor Street properties are still waiting a decision. This is only half of the development for the new petitioners.

Mr. Coggins said in addressing the lowering of the sidewalk, none of this can be done. David Lampson with the City Streets department was on site with them everyday regarding the sidewalks. When this plan was approved, there were existing sidewalks, handicap ramps and so forth. It all worked fine, but then he believes the City employed Ruby Collins as the contractor; he is unsure as this was two or three years ago, but they came through Montgomery Street and MLK Jr. Blvd and the sidewalks, handicap ramps and sewer covers were done differently. Mr. Coggins stated he does not believe that a handicap ramp was here, but the bottom line is this is where the rapid drop came from. They discussed the sidewalks many days with Mr. Lampson's help just trying to get them to the point where they were ADA accessible.

Dr. Williams stated that the wheelchair ramp on the far right is several inches lower than the rest of the sidewalk. The fact that the ramp is installed here, if anything, establishes a low level. He asked Mr. Coggins if he said that he has already talked with the City about the possibility of removing and lowering the sidewalk.

Mr. Coggins pointed out what he was saying is that the sidewalk was put in by the City's contractor. Therefore, to comply with the ADA requirements, they had to slope the ramp down. What was already there governed where they had to be.

Dr. Williams explained that what he was saying would actually illuminate the slope that Mr. Coggins alluded to and make it level with the ADA ramp.

Mr. Engle said the end of fourteen inches would be underground at the next block.

Dr. Williams said to him it appears to be rising.

Mr. Engle stated that it cannot be dropped at the next corner because you would be two steps down. You cannot do this.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Coggins if he felt he met with all the relevant City officials.

Mr. Coggins answered yes. However, the last meeting was scheduled to be with Mr. Pete Shonka, but he sent someone in his place. The meeting went fine. To his knowledge, may be he is mistaken and he will not get into he said/she said, but the railings were not talked about. They simply looked at the brick veneer. The reason they had the building codes there was because they wanted to put pavers here.

Dr. Henry stated that he remembers the railings. This was discussed at their last meeting.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward that if a motion is made for a continuance and it does not pass, what happens today?

Ms. Ward explained that someone could make another motion and the Board would vote on that motion. She said she believes that the petitioner has the right to withdraw the application at anytime without approval.

Dr. Williams asked what happens if this is done.

Dr. Henry asked if this would be the same as a continuance.

Ms. Ward answered no. A continuance means that it could come before the Board next month. But if the petitioner withdraws the application, it becomes a non-issue and they will still be left with a non-compliant project.

Mr. Overton stated the petitioner could come in next month with another application. He asked Mr. Coggins if he had a particular choice or did he want the Board to decide for him.

Mr. Coggins stated that if he is going to meet with City officials and look at the feasibility of doing what's being asked, that a continuance be asked for. Or, he can have the meetings and reapply. But, to him it makes sense to have the continuance as he will meet with the City officials.

Mr. Overton stated that some of the Board members are not in agreement with granting a continuance.

Mr. Coggins said based on the fact that some of the members are not interested in granting the continuance, he will meet with the City officials and then reapply.

Mr. Johnson explained to Mr. Coggins that the Board's purview is to ensure that he conforms with the code and ordinances.

Mr. Thomson stated that the Vice-Chair was conjecturing on the outcome of a motion that has not been made. Mr. Engle can make a motion as he chooses, but if the petitioner says that he wishes to continue the hearing, which he believes is a requirement for the Board to vote on it; then if the motion is made and seconded, it will be voted on. If it fails, as Ms. Ward stated, then another motion could be made.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ward what would be the benefit of meeting again onsite with the petitioner.

Ms. Ward stated that she had not gotten any indication that Mr. Coggins is willing to do the railing or the side entry stairs.

Ms. Simpson asked if the City representative was willing to comment on what Mr. Coggins stated.

Mr. Rose stated that they do not have a problem with installing the step and there is no issue with the building code for the modification.

Board Action:

Approve the modified front portico to install brick veneer on the sides and surface of the foundation with the following conditions:

1. The foundation for the principal structure be clad in brick veneer to match the material of the building and porch foundation/base;
2. A wood balustrade be installed on the front and one-side of each portico to create a side oriented - PASS entry consistent with historic low stoop entries and to be more consistent with the originally approved plans;
3. Where possible include a side entry step, typical of low entry stoops; and
4. Establish a sidewalk or landing pad at the base

of the side oriented entry in brick or concrete.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Amended Petition of Neil Dawson | H-11-4426-2 | 531-535 East Liberty Street | Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: MS. SARAH WARD RECUSED FROM PARTICIPATING IN THIS PETITION AS HER HUSBAND IS WORKING ON THIS PROJECT FOR THE PETITIONER.

Mr. Josh Ward was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the alteration of the north elevation from three entrances to one central entrance, the alteration on the west elevation to punched openings, and lowering of the screening wall to three feet.

Mr. Overton asked what is the total width of the building.

Ms. Bryant answered that the width of the building is 104 feet.

Mr. Overton asked if the proposal is for one door entrance to the building.

Ms. Bryant stated that on the north facade, the petitioner is requesting a central entrance. On the original approval, the petitioner proposed two entries.

Dr. Williams asked if it is 60 feet wide.

Mr. Overton asked if the petitioner is proposing not to subdivide this.

Ms. Bryant stated that she does not know what the petitioner plans are for the interior. This is a question for the petitioner.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ward stated with the proposed tenant interior layout, they thought the one inch entrance would be the best suitable. This could change as they learn more about who will be a tenant in the building. Mr. Ward said they might come back with three entrances along the north side. But at the present time, they are only wanting the one entrance. As far as the changes to the west elevation, at the time they initially submitted their application they were not sure they could keep the structure columns inside because of their deterioration. But upon further exploration, they learned that only two of the columns would probably have to be removed. Therefore, keeping the original columns in the storefront location did not work out with the placement. This why they they came back with these changes. The lowering of the screen wall became a concern because of traffic visibility turning off of Liberty Street and seeing the first few parking spaces and pedestrains behind the wall. They believed that five feet was too tall; therefore, they lowered it three feet to provide better visibility.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Ward if the tenants have been identified.

Mr. Ward answered no. They only have a projection, but nothing definite.

Mr. Overton asked if they were to lease to three distinct stores, he could have to come back to the Review Board.

Mr. Ward answered yes. He believes they would have to come back and seek approval for that.

Mr. Engle said he is aware that there were some concerns when this was originally presented because they were demolishing a building and were getting into a pattern of side loaded parking lots in areas that at one time were solid buildings to the street. But, they were happy that the tree lawn was going to be restored so they went along with the side loaded parking lot. However, he has a concern that now they are dropping back from five feet on the wall to three feet, which is no screen wall at all. This means that three feet of vehicles will be sticking out over top. Mr. Engle said the argument that you cannot see is just like pulling out at every lane in town and there are three-story buildings on both sides. Therefore, he does not believe that a five feet wall would block visibility. Mr. Engle asked Mr. Ward if he would consider having a four feet wall. He believes a good argument could be made for five feet in terms of security. Five feet will hide everything that goes on behind the wall and since it is a public parking lot, this may be a concern. However, four feet will screen cars.

Mr. Ward stated he believes it would provide better screening and visibility. Therefore, four feet would be okay.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gay stated it appears that the petitioners have an idea, but are not really sure how many tenants will be here. The petitioner stated that if they end up with three tenants in the future, they will have to come back and put the doors in. Why not put the doors in now?

Dr. Williams stated that the frontage is 60 feet wide.

Mr. Engle said it is 120 feet.

Dr. Williams said he was speaking of the north elevation facing Liberty Street. It is sixty feet -eight inches (60' - 8").

Ms. Bryant stated that large scale development standard is not a design standard for an existing building.

Dr. Williams asked would the standard apply to new construction.

Ms. Bryant stated that this is an existing building. Therefore, she does not know if this could be considered as new construction. The petitioner is rehabilitating an existing structure.

Mr. Engle said in looking at the front elevation, there are spaces for three door bays on both sides if they ever choose to put the doors there. Only the center space now is a door.

Ms. Bryant said if the petitioner did decide to put in the doors later, it would be a staff level approval.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the alteration of the north elevation from three entrances to one central entrance, the alteration on the west elevation to punched openings, and lowering of the screening wall on the condition that it is lowered to no less than four feet. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Chad Zittrouer for Kern-Coleman & Co. | H-11-4458-2 | 610 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | New Construction Parts I and II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial 2007.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Chad Zittrouer and **Mr. Jason Mathis** were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Parts I and II, of a commercial building at 610 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. The building footprint is 8,320 square feet and is not large-scale development. Signs and goose neck lighting are indicted on the plans, but have not been fully developed for review. They will be submitted under a separate application.

Ms. Ward advised that the petitioner has been involved in the site plan review process. The site plan the Board is reviewing today is in response to a lot of the comments. Therefore, the new comments are now being addressed. The Park & Tree Department has determined that if the building is located at the property line it would impact a significant live oak tree. Consequently, Park & Tree has requested that the building be setback eight feet in order to save the live oak tree. Traffic Engineering has made comments about the drive aisle and the ability to maneuver around the parking areas.

Ms. Ward said the staff has been working with the petitioner for several months. They originally submitted the application to be heard by the Board at the July 13, 2011 meeting, but pulled it to get their application correct. The petitioners have been great to work with; they have been amenable to all of the staff's suggestions. She believes the petitioners are working hard to comply with the ordinance.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of Part I, Height and Mass, with the condition that the eight foot front yard setback appear as an unobstructed continuum of the City sidewalk and that the following items be resubmitted for approval with Part II, Design Details:

1. Provide a base below the storefront of a contrasting material to the exterior brick walls;
2. Restudy the corbeled brick cornice. Provide a parapet wall with a base and top or cornice of contrasting material; and
3. Restudy the solid area in the center bay and increase the amount of detail within the sign band.

Ms. Ward further reported that staff recommends the following items be restudied and resubmitted for Part II, Design Details:

4. Inset the storefront four inches from the face of the building;
5. Align horizontal mullions within storefront on front facade with other storefront features (i.e. sill or base and horizontal bar in entry doors);
6. Provide samples of tinted glass;
7. Replace spandrels glass with clear glass;
8. Incorporate casement or double-hung windows in upper floor of front facade to meet ordinance;
9. Provide specifications for the roofing material;
10. Divide the awning into three separate frames over the three center storefront sections without engaging the brick pilasters;
11. Restudy of mortar color to reduce contrast with dark brick color;
12. Provide information on gates within screen walls;
13. Verify/reduce width of curb cut on MLK to not to exceed 20 feet in width; and
14. The sidewalk must serve as a continuous interrupted pathway across the drive in materials, configuration and height.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the lintels should extend beyond the window to appear as they are serving a purpose.

Ms. Ward said this is probably something that should be discussed with the petitioner. However, she would recommend approval of this.

Mr. Engle said if the tree is only on the left, was any thought given to pulling the center out. It is a three bay building. The center section could be pulled out to try to get the building near street level. As they know, the Board in the past has talked extensively about bringing buildings out to the sidewalk level on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard the way it was in the past. Now, it appears they are going back to having a front lawn. Maybe it could be a raised two or three feet high stoop.

Ms. Ward said she does not know about the design. But, the Park & Tree comment surfaced recently; therefore, staff has not discussed this aspect of the building with the petitioners.

Mr. Engle said the tree only involves the left side.

Ms. Ward stated that Park & Tree did not say how far the canopy extended over. The engineer is here and may be able to address this matter. The tree is here and she does not

know how far the petitioners would have to cut into the building.

Dr. Williams said he takes issue with Park & Tree's assessment. If the Board looks at picture ten across the street, there is an equally or larger live oak tree.

Ms. Ward explained that this probably was not there when the building was constructed. The building is historic and the tree grew there.

Dr. Williams asked what takes precedence --- trees or the architectural integrity. They have to assume that the building may out last the tree (he is aware that live oaks last a long time), but deferring the entire length of the building for one tree seems inappropriate. The restoration of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard is not just about having trees, but is about the architectural continuity of the street. Dr. Williams asked if the Park & Tree recommendation has to be honored along with the Review Board role.

Ms. Ward answered that these are separate issues. Staff tries to make the Board aware of what are their comments, but the Review Board is not bound to their comments. She believes, however, that the petitioners will not get their site plan approved with the tree being there.

Mr. Gay said in looking at the large tree across the street in front of the church, it appears that the church is set back.

Dr. Williams believes the church is on zero lot line.

Mr. Gay said no; if so, the steps would not have been able to protrude in the walkway.

Mr. Thomson stated that he has been involved in a lot of site plan processes where they have done everything possible to save specimen oak trees. When the plans were being studied for the elderly housing project since large oak trees were there, the building had to be redesigned at the City's encouragement. The old oak trees in Savannah makes it different than other cities as their oak trees are in many cases only two years old. Mr. Thomson said, therefore, regarding this case, any set back as long as it meets the conditions as outlined by Ms. Ward to make it look a part of the urban street pattern versus a front yard lawn, should be honored in the case of the experts saying that the building could damage the tree.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Zittrouer stated that they have worked with staff for quite some time on this. They have been involved with the Park & Tree Department relative to the tree. With regards to ADA, the area in the front and the transition area between the sidewalk and the front concerning the eight foot set back, they contacted the Traffic Engineering Department. Traffic Engineering ADA representative will meet with them to discuss what could be done to address this issue. Mr. Zittrouer said they are in agreement with the staff's recommendations. Last week, the staff was contacted about a property line dispute. They have reached a verbal agreement on this dispute. They do not have a signed documented resolution, but will get this done and present it to staff prior to the meeting in September, 2011. This issue will be resolved.

Mr. Engle stated that in looking at the front elevation, he does not see where the handicap ramp is shown on the drawing.

Mr. Zittrouer said they have not shown the handicap ramp in the front elevation, but have shown them in the site plan that will be added once they reach resolution. There are two things that are driving this issue. The City has a requirement that a finished floor building must be eight inches above the closest symmetry to a manhole. When they set the finish floor of the building in their grading to this elevation, they have approximately an eighteen inch difference between the curb in front of their facility and what the finished floor is required to be based on City ordinances. Based on the eighteen inch difference, twelve feet of transition will be required from the existing sidewalk. They cannot get ADA compliance going straight in. Therefore, they will ensure that this is added to the elevations. Basically, they will have a ramp about one to fifteen on each side and a step-down directly in front.

Mr. Engle stated, therefore, what the Board is looking at now is not what it will actually be.

Mr. Zittrouer said this is the way it will look once the building is reached, but as far as the sidewalk in front, the elevation does not show the sidewalk.

Mr. Engle believes at least two steps are needed up to the stoop.

Mr. Zittrouer said they are looking at having two five inch steps.

Mr. Engle said the steps should be approximately eight feet out.

Mr. Zittrouer stated yes.

Mr. Engle stated a raised platform will be here, but it is not shown. Therefore, the next time the Board will need more detailed drawings because the elevation will not look the same. They will need an elevation of eight feet out to see what it really looks like.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Zittrouer to address Mr. Engle's comment about bringing the center bay of the building towards the street.

Mr. Zittrouer stated that he would have to look at the exact dimensions, but the issue with the trees will require some pruning even where the building is laid out now. He was sure that the tree falls within one-third of the building. In his opinion, even with bringing the center out, it still gets into the significant tree line that Park & Tree refers to. Mr. Zittrouer said he could lay the building out on site and look at it and come up with a better judgment, but he believes this will be an issue.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Zittrouer if he believes that his client would be amenable to bringing the center bay out, if possible.

Mr. Zittrouer stated that if Park & Tree is agreeable to them working something out, he believes it is possible for them to do this. However, they need a commitment from Park & Tree. Mr. Zittrouer said they must get the Review Board's approval and the City

department. If there are conflicting perspectives about what they have to do, it puts them in a bind. They cannot tell the Review Board one thing and then commit to something different with the City departments.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Zittrouer if it is put in the form of a motion that he study this and get back with the Board, would he be amenable to this.

Mr. Zittrouer said they would like to get approval of the staff's recommendations with looking at the issue as well.

Mr. Engle said this would give the petitioners the potential to bring the handicap ramps to the side.

Mr. Zittrouer agreed that this does allow them the potential of bringing the handicap ramps to the side. He thought about this when Mr. Engle mentioned it. But, until he knows what the impact will have on the tree, he cannot make a commitment.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Zittrouer if the tree still remains a problem, would he be amenable to narrowing the center bay and bring it out.

Mr. Zittrouer answered that he believes it could be done; depending on how much has to be trimmed out and what can be worked out for the building to still look good and meet the requirements.

Dr. Williams wanted information regarding the windows on the west elevation as the north and south elevations do a good job of aligning the windows on the first and second floors. But, the second floor west elevation windows appear to be floating independently. Therefore, it appears that the side elevation is different from the west elevation. He believes that the side elevation window alignments are more successful.

Mr. Zittrouer said they will look into the window situation.

Dr. Henry questioned whether fenestration would be included in Part I - Height and Mass.

Ms. Ward explained that the shape of the opening is Part I. If they are talking about the alignment of muntins over each other is Part II.

Mr. Engle asked if the Board could approve Part I contingent that the center bay is brought out. This clearly is height and mass.

Ms. Ward believed that the Board could approve Part I as suggested by Mr. Engle. The Board just needs to be clear about this in their discussion and motion.

Mr. Mathis asked if they did not do anything with the building and let it remain as is, would it look drastically different than the church across the street where there is a tree. It appears that the church is set back.

Dr. Williams stated that he has checked and the church is on the lot line.

Mr. Merriman said it appears that a sidewalk of some sort is there and a tree lawn with a

tree in it.

Ms. Ramsay stated she believes the petitioner has stated that they are amenable to all of the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Zittrouer replied correct.

Mr. Howington said it appears that spandrel glass is above the ceiling level, but a second level is not shown. Would a second floor be here and used for something?

Mr. Mathis stated that he believes the purpose is that there are interior features here. If the glass is an issue, they are amenable to using glass consistent with the rest of the building.

Mr. Howington stated he believes that on the front elevation that Dr. Williams spoke of, the windows in the center bay appear to be dropped down a little.

Mr. Mathis said they will make the windows consistent. With respect to the question of bringing the front of the building out, there are trees across the front of the property other than the tree that was mentioned which is the largest tree. He believes they will encounter some problems with Park & Tree regarding the other trees as well with trying to bring the front out. He believes further that having the front facade consistent and flat across would provide a storefront appearance better if the front of the building was set out.

Mr. Howington said the mechanical area shows a flat brick wall. He believes this needs to be separated from the details of the building to show some differentiation so that it does not look like a block, but as a part of the building. He asked if a flush string course is shown between the two floors.

Mr. Mathis answered that it is flush.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF), stated that they agree with all the recommendations outlined by staff, but have some additional comments. Firstly, they feel that the storefront as proposed reads very flat. It needs to be further articulated. Therefore, HSF suggests providing more articulation not only below the storefront windows, but also above them either with a contrasting material or by adding some variation relief at the base. Ms. Meunier said they also feel that the central bay of the storefront should be broken up further by dividing the central awning into three awnings as recommended by staff. Also, that the awning should be lowered so that a row of headers is exposed and not covered up by the awnings. If there is an issue with the clearance, the pitch of the awning could be changed. They believe that the length of the facade is 104 feet. It appears that a lot of glazing is being proposed for the storefront. They are not sure whether this is something that can be restudied, but they suggest the possibility of incorporating awnings on the two outer bays as well to reduce some of the visible glass. The HSF strongly agrees with staff that the glass needs to be transparent and they also feel that the windows on the upper floor should be double hung windows to reflect a more intended residential use as would be consistent with a typical mixed structure. Ms. Meunier said they believe that restudying the cornices is a good recommendation and that a parapet wall

with a base on the top would be the best recommendation.

Mr. David Su said he was one of the other parties disputing the property line.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Su if this was a property line issue that he wishes to discuss.

Mr. Su answered yes.

Mr. Overton explained to him that the property line issue is not the purview of the Historic Review Board. This Board deals with aesthetic issues not property line issues.

Mr. Su stated that because of the property, this will affect how the facade will be extended out.

Mr. Overton explained to Mr. Su that the Board would allow him two minutes to make his case.

Mr. Su stated that a survey was done in 1993 and again in 1994 as he acquired the land behind the building. This gives him about three and one-half feet of property north of the building. According to the drawings that he has seen, it is about two feet north of this. Therefore, this is sort of encroaching on the City's property. Currently, there is no indication of a sidewalk by the City.

Mr. Engle believes this is a legal issue and not the purview of this Board.

Mr. Overton thanked Mr. Su for his comments.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he agrees with all the comments of the staff and also agrees with the Historic Savannah Foundation recommendation. He believes the building needs a little more character than it presently has. He is only suggesting this for when they come back to the Board. He believes that the string course should be projecting. The shadow lines of the courses should project as they are an architectural feature that is being covered by an awning. This does not agree with the design standards that says, "awnings should not cover architecture features." The suggestion from the Historic Savannah Foundation is correct; they should be lowered so that it will be below the belt course. The lintels project wider than the windows; if not, then they are not lintels as they would fall off.

Mr. Engle said he believes the building needs a little more refinement. The building across the street (Food Lion) has a lot of richness to it. Consequently, this building should be just as good.

Mr. Gay said as has been pointed out, the drawings do not show what is intended to be done.

Mr. Engle said the Board must see an elevation at the active sidewalk levels so they can see what is happening. If it is going up 18 inches, how do you get there? The Board needs to see an elevation so they will know the final grade level.

Dr. Henry agreed that the Board needs more details.

Dr. Williams said his main concern is with the street alignment and the importance of the continuity of the street corridor. If the walls came out to the street line, they might actually be about half the site and could possibly mitigate the problem significantly.

Mr. Engle said a rehabilitation project was done on the south end of Forysth Park on Whitaker Street. The two raised planters are approximately 18 inches tall. This is what they have to deal with at this site, which would change the grade.

Mr. Overton stated that if the Board approves Part I, the petitioners have to come back for Part II. Therefore, they will have a month delay to consider Part II. He asked would it not be better for the Board to strongly encourage the petitioners to ask for a continuance and come back next month for Parts I and II. This would not cause the petitioners any further delay, but would allow the petitioners more time to be more definitive.

Mr. Overton asked the petitioners if they would be amenable with no vote by the Board today on Part I in exchange to having Part I and II presented to the Board at the September meeting.

Mr. Mathis said they would be amendable to the suggestion, but they are a little leery of them getting to the same point next month as they are today.

Mr. Overton explained that he believes the petitioners have a general sense of what the Board is saying regarding the mass and height. There are a few tweaks that the Board wishes that the petitioners would study. If the things cannot be done, then the petitioners can come back and let the Board know the legitimate reason why they cannot be done. Hopefully, at the September meeting the Board will limit their comments to just the items that they questioned in Part I today and not reopen other issues.

Mr. Mathis said this made sense to him and asked for a continuance.

Mr. Zittrouer said they have taken notes, but he asked the Board members to give their concerns to the staff to ensure that they did not miss any of their concerns.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of September 14, 2011 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Mark Cadman | H-11-4462-2 | 405 East Gordon Street | New Construction of a Carriage House](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Note: Ms. Simpson left at 4:00 p.m. and Mr. Johnson left at 4:10 p.m.

Mr. Mark Cadman was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details, of a two-story wood frame carriage house on the rear of the property at 405 East Gordon Street. Part I, Height and Mass was approved on July 13, 2011 with the following conditions to be resubmitted to the Board for Part II:

1. Restudy the roofing product to have a flat panel between seams;
2. Simplify the light panels in the garage doors to have a more vertical orientation, removing the horizontal muntin, and meet window design standards for muntin size and profile (7/8 inch simulated putty glazed);
3. Restudy windows on east and west sides of carriage house that do not meet the fire code;
4. Verify that the 75% maximum lot coverage requirement is met;
5. Incorporate staff's recommendation that the apron must not encroach into the lane and provide material for shutters.

Ms. Ward reported that all of the above stated conditions have been addressed and submitted for review. The lot coverage has been recalculated and it is 69 percent of lot coverage. She further reported that staff recommends approval for the new construction of the two-story carriage house.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cadman was in agreement with the staff's report.

Ms. Ramsay said on the left and right sides of the false windows, some little marks appear. She questioned what is the purpose of the marks.

Mr. Cadman said the marks represent shutter dogs.

Ms. Ramsay did not see the need for the shutter dogs. She believes also that they are in the wrong location.

Mr. Cadman said they will remove the shutter dogs.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for New Construction of the two-story carriage house at 405 East Gordon Street with the condition that the shutter-dogs be removed from the false window openings on the side elevations. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. Petition of Pete Callejas for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4463-2 | 26 East Bay Street | Rehabilitation/alteration

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [MEMO Reiter Brown Factors Walk 101806.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: MR. HOWINGTON IS EMPLOYED WITH GREENLINE ARCHITECTURE. HE RECUSED FROM PARTICIPATING IN THIS PETITION.

Mr. Pete Callejas was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to reinstall the wooden platform over upper Factor's Walk immediately south of the business Vic's on the River at 26 East Bay Street. A new wood frame deck and iron railing is proposed around three sides over the existing steel beams. Two sections of the iron railing adjacent to the sidewalk will be removed for access to the deck.

Ms. Ward explained that Factor's Walk is a unique civil engineering landmark and is a contributing element of the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. A memorandum was attached to the report that was prepared by Ms. Beth Reiter in 2006 to address some of the encroachments in Factor's Walk, the historic encroachments that have been here to make this area functional. The memo highlights some of the unique features and includes some old photographs. This has been provided to the Board.

Ms. Ward stated that the request was originally submitted in June for the July meeting; however, because the platform is proposed over Factor's Walk, staff considered this a significant undertaking and asked the petitioners to go through the encroachment process in order to get comments from the City to see whether this was going to be plausible. The agreement was submitted to the City and staff has been working closely with the Real Property department to get their comments. The staff has received comments from Development Services and the Sidewalks Department. Both are in support of the encroachment on the right-of-way. They will have some conditions about ownership, maintenance, and so forth.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the wooden platform over Factor's Walk adjacent to 26 East Bay Street. An encroachment agreement will still have to be provided from the City.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Callejas entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes there are four large condenser units under the proposed deck. Presently, the units are somewhat dissipated because there is no ceiling, but the proposed request will put a ceiling here. He asked if anyone gave thought to the noise that might be generated.

Mr. Callegas answered that they need to look at the condenser units that are here now. As stated, there is nothing on top of them and by putting in the deck, will change the entire dynamics of the ventilation. There may be some requirements for them to be relocated. However, he does not know exactly where they would be relocated. But, if their petition is approved, their next step would be to start looking at some of the logistics. There is actually a light that shines up to the tree. He believes it is owned by the City and there will have to be relocation of other utilitarian aspects of the whole area. They have not looked into any of this yet, but they are aware that these things must be addressed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation reported that they agree with staff for the approval of the wooden platform over Factor's Walk adjacent to 26 East Bay Street. There is a historic precedent for it. However, they feel that projects such as this

are not always appropriate for all areas of Factor's Walk as pointed out in Ms. Reiter's memorandum. HSF recommends that the City or MPC develop a master plan for Factor's Walk so that any additions or developments can be handled in the correct manner.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he gave much thought to this request. As a matter of fact, he went to the site four times. The only concern he has is gentrification. If they look at the photographs carefully, most of the railings that existed in the time period that this is going back to were two-by-fours. They were nailed together, shoddy wood stuff. When all of this disappeared, they put up the pipe rails. Now, they are going back to fairly elegant cast iron railings which probably never existed in the historic period. One case is fine, but ten cases could be a problem. Mr. Engle believes that the comments Historic Savannah Foundation is making are very true. There needs to be a master plan or it all will end up looking like Disneyland. There is a cast iron railing next door; and in this case, it would work. But, it will not work everywhere. This has to be watched closely. They did not approve a right-of-way project not too long ago.

Mr. Overton asked if the project was in this same area.

Mr. Engle answered no. But, there are a lot of issues. The sidewalk has to remain open. Will there be seating in this area and will it block through traffic? These issues need to be dealt with.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward if the concerns could be held at the staff level.

Ms. Ward said the City is reviewing this and that the right-of-way remain open. The traffic pattern will be dealt with by the City.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward to convey to the City that the Historic Review Board is concerned that they look into these concerns.

Dr. Williams said one of the peculiar things about Factor's Walk is at grade level of Bay Street and up, the buildings are highly styled with a lot of elegant ornament. Gas lanterns are here; and historically this was very high style, although some of the photos show some raddy looking railings. If the buildings are an indication from the sidewalk up, was highly properly designed and below the street level such as the Cotton Exchange from the street level up, it is elegant, but from street level down, it is a basement. The River Street side of these buildings are all utilitarian. Both levels can be seen from Bay Street. Dr. Williams said along these lines, he would say that the railings are in the spirit with the site as it was originally developed. Even if this site historically never had such an elegant railing, obviously the building is very elegant. Dr. Williams said he shares Mr. Engle's comment that if this kind of railing was proposed anywhere else below where it is, would be out of character.

Board Action:

Approve the petition of the wooden platform over

Factor's Walk adjacent to 26 East Bay Street. An encroachment agreement from the City of Savannah will be required. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain

10. [Petition of Peter Faehnrich | H-11-4472-2 | 119 Jefferson Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Peter Faehnrich was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for an internally illuminated principal use projecting sign.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the principal use internally illuminated project sign.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Faehnrich stated that he did not have anything to add to the staff's report.

Ms. Ramsay asked the petitioner why he did not come before the Historic Review Board before he installed the sign.

Mr. Faehnrich answered, "a lack of knowledge."

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Faehnrich if he is the owner of the building.

Mr. Faehnrich answered no; he rents the building.

Ms. Ramsay asked him who made the sign.

Mr. Faehnrich answered a sign company in California.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Faehnrich if he put the sign up himself.

Mr. Faehnrich answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the principal use internally illuminated projecting sign at 119 Jefferson Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

W James Overton - Abstain

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

11. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4476-2 | 20 East Broad Street | Demolition and Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Neil Dawson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation and alterations. She stated that staff originally recommended approval with the condition that the petitioner provide metal roof specifications. Today, staff received the metal roof specifications via email which they have provided to the Board as an addendum.

Ms. Bryant further reported that staff recommends additionally that any new or relocated signage must be resubmitted to the Board for review.

Mr. Engle asked what is a speed table.

Ms. Bryant explained that the speed table will be located in the parking area. She guesses it is there to slow down traffic.

Mr. Engle said, therefore, it is somewhat like a huge speed bump.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson explained the rationale behind the speed table. His client has a lot of tour buses and older clientel. The speed table with a decrease in the width of the roadway creates an accessible access for tour buses to drop-off the guests to an accessible route into the building. The slope gently grades to a slope at 1-to-20 back to the existing brick sidewalk. The speed table really takes care of a lot of level changes, materials, and bad concrete work. This restores it more like the original Wright Street would have been. Mr. Dawson said that Ms. Bryant was helpful in providing historic photos for them to have a gauge on what the original appearance would have been.

Dr. Williams stated that often the brick walls are made using salvaged historic bricks from other buildings. He asked Mr. Dawson if he had plans for using these bricks.

Mr. Dawson stated that there are not enough bricks to allow them to execute the full project. If there are enough bricks, they would like to use them for the planters.

Dr. Williams informed Mr. Dawson that if he does not use the bricks do not throw them away, but salvage them as someone may be able to use them.

Mr. Dawson said his client plans to a comprehensive master plan to renovate the entire building. At some point, they will definitely reuse the bricks.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the exterior rehabilitation and alterations at 20 East Broad Street with the condition that the following information is resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Metal roof specifications; - PASS
2. New shutter specifications;
3. Any new stain and/or color change.

Additionally, any new or relocated signage must be resubmitted to the Board for review.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4478-2 | 502 East Broughton Street | Rehabilitation and Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Andrew Lynch was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the exterior alterations with the condition that the balcony is painted or stained and the windows are inset no less than three inches from the exterior surface.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that they will meet the conditions regarding the paint and window placement.

Mr. Engle asked the petitioner how does he propose to patch the windowsills. Windows have styroform with sprayed-on stucco, but they are all broken up. Drivit is not allowed in the Historic District. Would wood sills be put here?

Mr. Lynch explained that the portion of the wall where the windows are inset, they will just remove this portion and a brick mold detail would cover the cutout area.

Mr. Engle asked if the ones that are broken on the front would be patched.

Mr. Lynch stated that they are going to patch the areas where there are deteriorations in the drivit.

Mr. Merriman asked if the windows on the top level are original wood windows.

Mr. Lynch stated that he believes the windows are, but they really did not investigate whether they are historic or not. However, based on the pattern of the windows, he would say they are original.

Mr. Engle stated that the stairway on the side will be taken out, but they are leaving the balcony that was put in to get to the stairway and the side.

Mr. Lynch said correct.

Mr. Engle said this does not make much sense to him. He asked why not just take that off when they remove the stair. Then they would just have a balcony that would make sense.

Mr. Lynch said they can propose this to the owners. He does not know if the owners would have an issue with this other than the additional cost. Mr. Lynch stated that he believes the owners were looking for a low cost solution to at least remove the stair from the right-of-way.

Mr. Engle said now they are reconstructing a railing that does not belong here.

Ms. Ramsay asked if fencing will be put around the parking area.

Mr. Lynch answered that he believes there is a fence between the parking area and the adjacent property as shown by the picture on the northwest facade. The owners are proposing to provide a three foot vegetative buffer to screen the parking area.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that in review of this project by their Architecture Review Committee, the issue came up about the balcony wrapping around and there is no stair. They did not come up with a conclusive decision because this is existing. However, they are in support of removing it so that it is just a balcony if the petitioner would restudy this.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gay asked if removing the balcony would involve taking the roof off.

Dr. Williams asked staff if they reported that the balcony was added in the early 1990s.

Ms. Bryant said the balcony was added in 1998.

Dr. Williams asked if this was a historic precedent.

Ms. Bryant stated that historically there was a balcony on this building as indicated on the Sanborn maps.

Dr. Williams asked if the balcony wrapped around.

Ms. Bryant answered no.

Dr. Williams asked, therefore, historically it was only on the front.

Ms. Bryant replied yes.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for exterior alterations at 502 East Broughton Street with the following conditions:

1. The balcony is painted or stained to match existing trim; - PASS
2. The wrap around portion of the balcony, fronting onto Price Street is removed; and
3. The windows are inset no less than three inches from the exterior.

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4479-2 | 104 West Gaston Street | Rehabilitation and alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Andrew Lynch was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction of a second floor addition and exterior alterations on the rear and east facade of the building.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the new construction of a second floor addition and exterior alterations on the rear and east facade of the building with the condition that a section through the handrail be submitted to staff for final approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that he did not have anything to add to the staff's report. He entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation said they reviewed this petition very thoroughly with the petitioner as they hold an easement on the property. They have determined that they agree with the staff for approval of the second floor addition and exterior alterations to the far facade as it is a respectful and compatible addition.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Meunier if the HSF holds a conservation easement on this property.

Ms. Meunier answered yes.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for new construction of a second floor addition and exterior alterations on the rear and east façade of the building at 104 West Gaston Street with the condition that a section through the handrail be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

14. [Petition of Alexis AuBuchon for Coastal Heritage Society | H-10-4278\(S\)-2 | 650 W. Jones St. | One-Year Extension](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4278\(S\)-2 \(extension\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4278\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

15. [Amended Petition of Patrick L. Phelps for Hansen Architects | H-10-4290\(S\)-2| 532 Indian St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4290\(S\)-2 Amended.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4290\(S\)-2 Amended 7-26-11.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

16. [Amended Petition of Linda Ramsay for Ramsay Sherrill Architects | H-10-4307\(S\)-2 | 122 E. Taylor St. | Existing Window](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4307\(S\)-2 Amended 7-27-11.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4307\(S\)-2 Amended 7-27.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

17. [Petition of Matt Jording for Sub Dogs Hot Doggery | H-11-4464\(S\)-2 | 5 W. Broughton St. | Replace Existing Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4464\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4464\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

18. [Petition of Brannen Construction Co., Inc. | H-11-4465\(S\)-2 | 425 East York St. | Stucco Repair/Repointing](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4465 \(S\) 2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4465\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

19. [Petition of Denise German | H-11-4466\(S\)-2 | 530 E. Harris St. | Replace Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4466\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4466\(S\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. [Petition of Stephen B. Benenson and Phyllis M. Benenson | H-11-4467\(S\)-2| 536 E. Harris St. | Replace Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4467\(S\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4467\(S\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Jennifer Wood for Coastal Canvas | H-11-4468\(S\)-2 | 16 W. State St. | Existing Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4468\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4468\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa for Signs For Minds | H-11-4469\(S\)-2 | 16 W. State St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4469\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4469\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa for Signs For Minds | 11-H-4470\(S\)-2 | 411 W. Bay St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4470\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4470\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Becki Harness for Coastal Heritage Society | H-11-4474\(S\)-2 | 301-303 MLK Jr. Blvd | Replace Existing Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4474\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4474\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Alan Levin | H-11-4477\(S\)-2 | 509 Tattnall St. | Brick Repairs and Repointing](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4477\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4477\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Arend Jan deVoest | H-11-4480\(S\)-2 | 16 Price St. | Replace Existing Wood Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4480\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4480\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Ray Pritchett | H-11-4481\(S\)-2 | 423 Bull St. | Repair Existing Stucco](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4481\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4481\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Daniel Snyder, III | H-11-4482\(S\)-2 | 216 E. Gaston St. | Repair Existing Garage Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4482\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4482\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of MB3 Inc. dba Locos Grill & Pub | H-11-4483\(S\)-2 | 301 W. Broughton St. | Replace Existing Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4483\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4483\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

30. [302 East Oglethorpe Avenue, 307 East President Street, 126 E. Lower Factor's Walk, and 212-214 E. Huntingdon St.](#)

Ms. Ward stated that a rash of things have been going on without approval. One was on today's regular agenda. It was not highlighted, but a memo was included and documentation was given to the Board in their blue folder of some recent activity that has been going on. The memo updates the Board about the awning at 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue on the Lincoln Street facade. The owners are scheduled to appear in Recorder's Court on August 22, 2011.

Dr. Henry commended the staff on this aspect.

Ms. Ward informed the Board that they have made a policy not to deny items, but they had to deny 307 East President Street because of the time constraint. She explained that they are required to take action within 45 days or the application is approved. The petitioner was working with the staff for about two weeks. Then suddenly, the staff lost contact with the petitioner. Staff prefers to work with the petitioner to get a good door in there that could be approved. Staff went by the site and made a house call, but the staff still did not hear from the petitioner. Therefore, the application was denied. However, the petitioner has the ability to appeal and they were given the next deadline date to submit their application, which is August 25, or the Zoning Inspector will go to the site and cite the

petitioners with a summons to appear in court.

Ms. Ward reported that the others are working to come into compliance.

Mr. Engle asked if sandwich boards are legal signage.

Ms. Ward answered no.

Mr. Engle said item no. two has a sandwich board that they put out every afternoon for the bar traffic and it blocks the sidewalk about halfway.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

31. [New Board Member Appointments | Keith Howington and Stephen Merriman, Jr.](#)

Mr. Overton welcomed the two new Board members, Keith Howington and Stephen G. Merriman, Jr. Both members gave a brief background on their experiences.

32. [2011 HDBR Retreat | Friday, September 23, 2011 | 9:00am to 4:00pm | Boiler Room of the Central of Georgia Railroad Complex at 301 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.](#)

Ms. Ward informed the Board that the Retreat has been scheduled for Friday, September 23, 2011, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. The Retreat will be held in the Boiler Room of the Central of Georgia Railroad complex. She will work with the Parking Services Director, Sean Brandon, to be sure they can park there. Lunch will be provided. Ms. Ward believes it will be a good Retreat. They have a number of good items for discussion. The agenda will be sent to the Board members as soon as it is finalized.

Mr. Overton commended the staff on the level of their presentations pertaining to each applicant. Staff covers all the points well, all areas are carefully thought out, and it gives him, as a Board member, a lot of confidence to see the professionalism of the presentations they make at every meeting.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

33. [Next Meeting - Wednesday September 14, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Overton adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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