



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
February 9, 2011 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

FEBRUARY 9, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Brian Judson, Chair
W. James Overton, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Sidney Johnson
Linda Ramsay
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Gene Hutchinson
Richard Law, Sr.
Ebony Simpson

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Brittany Paige Bryant, 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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approve January 12, 2011 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [01-12-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

Chairman Judson called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Board Action:

Approve January 12, 2011 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

2. [Sign Not Posted](#)

Ms. Ramsay reported that she did not see a sign posted at 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue, Petition H-11-4362-2.

Mr. Judson stated this item is on the Consent Agenda. The petitioner was not present. Mr. Judson informed the Board that they could admonish the petitioner and go ahead and review this under the Consent Agenda or they could place it on the Regular Agenda or they could move for a continuance based on improper sign posting.

Upon motion of **Dr. Henry**, seconded by **Mr. Johnson**, the Board voted unanimously to hear this petition under the Consent Agenda.

Staff will remind the petitioner that the work site needs to be posted until the work is completed.

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

3. [Continued Petition of Matthew and Jennifer Deacon - H-10-4347-2 - 307, 309, and 311 East Huntingdon Street - New Construction, Part I and II](#)

Board Action:

Continue to March 9, 2011 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry	
Second: W James Overton	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

4. [Petition of Jason Carbone - H-11-4362-2 - 302 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use projecting sign upon verification of the 10 foot vertical clearance requirement. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay	
Second: W James Overton	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

5. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay Architects - H-11-4366-2 - 412 West Bay Street - Exterior Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the petition of the alterations enlarging the opening, metal door, concrete ramp, and metal tube railing. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay	
Second: W James Overton	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

6. Petition of Leah G. Michalak for Robert Ericson - H-11-4369-2 - 38 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd - Sign, Lighting, and Color

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

Board Action:	
Approval of the petition for paint color change, awning removal, principal use sign, and exterior lighting with the condition that the wall sconce be placed beside the entry door.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Nicholas Henry	
Second: Sidney J. Johnson	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

7. Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects - H-11-4372-2 - 425 East River Street - Exterior Alterations

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

Board Action:	
Approval of the new opening with the following conditions: 1. The door frame be recessed a minimum of three inches from the exterior surface of the façade; 2. The proposed awning be submitted to staff for final approval.	- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Claiborne & Surmay, P.C. - H-11-4374-2 - 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: W James Overton

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

9. [Amended Petition of Timothy J. Bright for Holder Properties, Inc. and Christian Sottile for Sottile & Sottile - H-10-4323-2 - 22 Barnard Street - New Construction, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to amend the approved design for new construction of a six-story mixed use commercial, retail-office building on the vacant north east Trust Lot on Ellis Square bound by Barnard, Bryan, Whitaker and St. Julian Streets known as 22 Barnard Street. The amendments are limited to

design details on the exterior of the building and do not affect the previously approved Height and Mass or Design Details.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the proposed design details as amended with the condition that the ornament grille bronze clad doors be incorporated on the entry fronting Whitaker Street.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Valliere thanked Ms. Ward and staff for the review. They believe the amendment is an improvement. They are halfway completed on the construction document detailing. This why they are seeing a little more evolution in some of the profiles and details. The owner has approved the Whitaker Street door as recommended. This is a retail entrance.

Mr. Overton stated that he did not understand why the changes are being made.

Mr. Valliere explained that most of the changes are just enhancements. They had not gotten to the entrance door. Their plan from the onset was to use a bronze door with a lot of detailing. Some changes are due to peer reviews. Mr. Christian Sottile has been hired by the owner to review their designs and make recommendations on whether certain details needed to be enhanced or potentially removed. Some of the changes include Mr. Sottile's review.

Mr. Engle commented that it has been fun watching this building and each time it has been better. The amendments are not required, but they certainly have added richness and texture to the building. This is a very large building.

Mr. Judson said that he does not have the expertise to conceive of any of the designs, but when he sees the changes, he appreciates the improvement. Certainly, the light fixtures are more appropriate to the period of which the building speaks and the cornice changes make a dramatic change. More importantly, the Board appreciates the petitioner coming forward with the changes in the form of a petition as opposed to the Board going on site and finding that things are on the building that were not as drawn.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE.

Board Action:

Approval for the proposed design details as amended with the condition that the ornament grille bronze clad doors be incorporated on the central entry fronting Whitaker Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Ned Gay

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

10. [Petition of Haresh Bhojwani - H-11-4364-2 - 19 Barnard Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Haresh Bhojwani was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for a non-illuminated principal use fascia sign for the business known as The Corner Store at 19 Barnard Street. The petitioner indicated an interest in hanging a projecting sign on the Bryan Street facade; however, the information submitted is incomplete and as such, the request cannot be reviewed at this time.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the principal use fascia sign. The projecting sign must be resubmitted for review by the Board to include all the submittal information required in the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bhojwani indicated that he did not have anything to add to the staff's report.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE.

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use fascia sign. The projecting sign must be resubmitted for review by the Board to include all of the submittal information required in the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Nay

Robin Williams - Not Present

11. [Petition of Kevin F. Rose for Lominack Kolman Smith Architects - H-11-4365-2 - 2 East Broad Street - Rehabilitaiton and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Dr. Williams arrived at 2:51 p.m.

Mr. Kevin Rose of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for the rehabilitation of two ancillary structures including site improvements and an addition on the property at 2 East Broad Street within the Trustee's Garden.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation including site improvements and an addition with the following conditions: 1. Verification of the door frame placement within the brick walls; 2. Any brick and mortar cleaning or removal must be done with the gentlest means possible, and 3. All mortar must match the existing composition, texture, color and profile.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Rose stated that they agree with the staff's recommendation. The recessing of the doors are a part of their plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE.

Board Action:

Approval of the rehabilitation including site improvements and addition with the following conditions: 1. Any brick and mortar cleaning or removal must be done with the gentlest means possible; and 2. All mortar must match the existing in composition, texture, color and profile. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Michael Savidge - H-11-4367-2 - 510 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Rehabilitation and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Chandler Newell was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a rehabilitation and rear porch addition on the building.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval to restore the front entry stoop and the rear porch addition with the condition that the porch column capitals extend outward of the architrave, the corner-boards be retained and preserved and that the paint colors be submitted to staff for approval.

Mr. Engle said in looking at page seven, the porch appears to be much narrower than what is being proposed. He asked if this is the double stairway porch.

Ms. Ward said she believes it is the double stairway porch. She said in looking at the L-shaped porch, it appears it is the full width. She believes that the porch was moved to the side, they no longer exist. However, she is unsure as she does not have evidence to prove this. The photos of 1995 shows it was not an L-shaped porch, but more like a wooden fire escape at the back of the building. Ms. Ward believes, therefore, this is why the shadow marks are here.

Ms. Ramsay asked if the drawing of the porch railing detail dimension line for the 36 inches is correct. If so, it is incorrect.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner wants it to be a minimum of 36 inches. She confirmed, however, that Ms. Ramsay was correct.

PEITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Newell said they talked about the placement of the columns and how they are inset. He believes they can make the columns flush with the architraves. The porch will have to be inset approximately six or seven inches so the corner-board will be seen. The railing dimension is an error; the top of the balustrade is 36 inches.

Dr. Williams stated that the drawing on the corner and new post on the second floor do not align with the column below. He wanted to be sure that when things are moved, the architraves are being pulled back and columns are readjusted, that the alignments match.

Mr. Johnson said he was concerned about the back porch as it was said it was really a fire escape. Are stairs still in the back? He wanted to know what would be upstairs.

Mr. Gay stated that this is one house, not an apartment.

Mr. Newell said a porch will be upstairs that is accessible from the second floor bedroom. This is a one-family house.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval to restore the front entry stoop and for the rear porch addition with the condition that the porch column capitals extend outward of the architrave, the corner-boards be retained and preserved, the dimension detail be corrected for the railing to be 36 inches in height, and that the paint colors be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Lynda Sylvester for Sylvester & Co. - H-11-4368-2 - 205 West Broughton Street - Color and Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Addendum Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Lynda Sylvester was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a color change and new signage for the business "Sylvester & Co., Modern General." The application was amended prior to the Board meeting to address comments raised in the staff recommendation. The amended sign proposal is for after-the-fact approval on color change to gloss black enamel paint by Benjamin Moore. The projecting sign will be the principal use sign announcing the name of the business - "Sylvester & Company" and in the sign band, they will have individually mounted six inch aluminum tall letters for "Modern General." The petitioner also proposes goose-neck lighting and has provided specifications.

Ms. Ward said the staff is fine with the reversal of the projecting use sign as the principal use sign and the individually mounted letters and has approved awnings for the building. The goose-neck lights are really to shine a light on the awnings. In order to meet the vertical clearance as required by the code, the lawnings have to be installed above the transom. She is concerned that this gets a bit fussy at the top with the lighting, signs, and awnings. She is concerned that the goose neck lights may impact the visibility of the individual letters. They looked at some of the other signs that have signage in their sign band in addition to awnings and projecting signs. She showed a portion of a sign on the CVS building on Bull Street where goose neck lighting is used to light the awning. She feels this is somewhat awkward, but it has been previously approved by the Board. Ms. Ward believes the intent is to shine on the awning and then somehow bounce onto the sidewalk. She did not believe that it does so here. She showed the Clipper Trading Post sign as it closely relates to the sign program that Ms. Sylvester is proposing. Clipper Trading has the individually mounted letters in the sign band, a projecting sign and awnings and this building is next door to Clipper Trading Post.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the color change, signage within the sign band for "modern" and "general" and a projecting principal use sign for "Sylvester & Co." with the condition that the goose neck lighting be eliminated.

Mr. Gay stated that he did not see the awnings.

Ms. Ward explained that the awnings are not shown in this application. The petitioner submitted a separate application for the awnings and staff approved the two awnings.

Dr. Williams asked what color are the awnings.

Ms. Ward answered that the awnings are sand with black graphic.

Dr. Williams asked if the petitioner was proposing to repaint the iron a glossy black.

Ms. Ward stated that the entire storefront will be painted gloss black.

Ms. Ramsay asked for clarification if the lettering will be silver, the awning will be beige and the storefront will be black.

Ms. Ward replied yes and the projecting sign will be black with silver lettering.

Dr. Henry stated that the staff recommendation makes no mention to the goose neck lighting.

Ms. Ward explained that the staff recommendation refers to the submittal package that was submitted on the deadline. She met with the petitioner yesterday and based on their discussion, Ms. Sylvester submitted the goose neck light request yesterday.

Mr. Gay asked if an image will be on the awning.

Ms. Ward stated that an image will be on the awning, but no text. The graphic will be of the Oglethorpe Plan.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Sylvester stated that to the right of 205 W. Broughton Street is somewhat a dead zone. Going west is the Goodwill building and next is an empty lot. One reason she wants the goose neck lighting is because at night, it is a very dark dead zone. The other reason is that they will bounce off light as it has an animated head. The light will bounce more on the sidewalk than shown of the CVS awning. The awnings are historic document. Therefore, it appears that the original drawings of the squares are sort of a tea-stain rather than beige. It will look beautiful with the gloss black backdrop. To her the goose necks are somewhat like jewelery and will provide some lighting and illuminate the awnings.

Dr. Henry wanted to know more about the animated lamp head.

Ms. Sylvester said the head tilts, it is not fixed.

Dr. Henry said a light pointing towards the dead zone would probably be more helpful.

Ms. Sylvester stated in this regard, she believes the light would have to extend too far out. Goodwill leaves their fluorescent lights on at night, but they have no overhead lighting. The empty lot is next which depends on the street light. Her area is darker than her neighbors.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Sylvester if painting her frontage black makes it even darker.

Ms. Sylvester said obviously it makes it darker, but adds richness. It is somewhat like the gorgeous black gloss doors in Amsterdam. It is a classic traditional response to the

columns and the detailing above.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Sylvester if her changes are motivated to brightening up the streetscape.

Ms. Sylvester replied certainly at least for the business. The lighting is great during the day.

Dr. Williams asked her what would her impression be if the Board agreed with staff for the elimination of the goose neck lights. Would she see her facade still working?

Ms. Sylvester said she believes it would be great. Ms. Ward is amazing and she would not mind not doing the goose neck lighting at this time and see how it looks. Then if she needs to, she will come back to the Board later regarding the lights.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) pointed out that a street light is directly in front of the building which he was sure provides ample light for the facade as well as the street. Therefore, he agrees with staff that there is no need for the goose neck lighting.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he agrees with staff regarding eliminating the goose neck lighting. The cornice is beautiful and if more lighting is needed, a light fixture could be installed over the entrance doors or put brackets for lighting on either side of the doors which a lot of the storefronts have done, but he does not agree to bothering the cornices; it is not visually compatible. The CVS building is a classic case showing that the goose neck lighting does not work.

Board Action:

Approval of the color change, signage within the sign band for "Modern" and "General," and a projecting principal use sign for "Sylvester & Co." - PASS with the condition that goose neck lighting be eliminated.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Pete Callejas for Greenline Architecture - H-11-4370-2 - 42 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd / 411 West Congress Street - Alteration and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and additions within the open courtyard space for the new business, The Social Club.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the exterior alterations to the doorway, the canopy and the bar addition with the condition that the door frame be recessed three inches from the face of the building and that the colors for the wood panels, framing and doors be resubmitted to staff for final approval.

Mr. Engle wanted to know if the door and awning were a part of this project.

Ms. Ward confirmed that the door and awning are existing conditions and are not a part of this project.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Callejas said they will bring a color sample for staff approval no later than Monday or Tuesday of next week. The door setback which is actually reinstating the original door, the frame work is already setback three inches. They are going to match the existing side entry door.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE.

Board Action:

Approval of the exterior alterations, canopy and bar addition with the following conditions: 1. The door frame be recessed three inches from the exterior face of the building; and 2. Colors for the wood panels, framing and doors to be submitted to staff - PASS

for final approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Robin Williams - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Aye

15. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects - H-11-4373-2 - 401-403 Whitaker Street - Alteration/Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alteration which are limited to the northernmost storefront portion of the east elevation.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends denial of the proposed storefront alterations because an element will be removed of the primary facade that is a physical record of its transformation from a dairy to a multi-tenant commercial space and does not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for rehabilitation.

Mr. Engle asked if the southernmost storefront has the wedge and would remain.

Ms. Ward explained that the alteration work is limited to the storefront that was damaged by a car accident.

Mr. Engle questioned that when the southernmost area was built, were they mimicing the destroyed frontage.

Ms. Ward answered yes; the records show that this was the request.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward to clarify the extent of the damage.

Ms. Ward stated she believes that when the aluminum storefront gets bent and damaged as such, it would have to be replaced.

Mr. Johnson asked about the awnings.

Ms. Ward said the awnings are shown on the proposed elevations. She does not believe

these awnings will be removed.

Ms. Ramsay asked what leeway does the Board have when the Secretary of Interior's Standards are violated.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes some of the Secretary of Interior's Standards are met. She believes further that a decision would need to be made collectively by the Board and as a community how they want to apply the standards. Additionally, each case needs to be looked at on a case-by-case basis. She believes this is a distinctive character defining feature of the building that is worthy of preserving as it earmarks a period of history. She can not conclusively identify the date and in light of the lack of evidence to support that it is not historic, they would lean to the side of caution that it might be. We are required to meet the standards of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for rehabilitation, but whether we meet all of them or one of them is not specified.

Ms. Ward explained that staff is concerned with Secretary of Interior's Standard number three which states that, "*Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use.*" Consequently, she believes it is saying that no changes could ever be made to building. The Board would need to use its judgment and discretion and apply the standards as they see appropriate for each case.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lynch stated that they have reviewed the staff's report and have several concerns regarding the recommendation. They have spent a lot of time with the staff reviewing the project and researching the history of the storefront modifications made to the original dairy building. Unfortunately, both researches are inconclusive as to the date of the current storefront configuration; not that it was an entry at one point or there were multi-tenants; they are not disputing that it is a good commercial multi-tenant building. However, they don't have specific records that the angled storefront is original. Based on the limited information, it seems questionable whether this element should be considered historic or a defining feature.

Ms. Lynch said they would argue that based on the earliest photos and also the configuration of how the building would be accessed if it was seen today, defining historic character of the building is still streamlined facade that wraps the corner from Jones Street to Whitaker Street. If anything, the defining feature has been compromised by the interruption of the angled storefront glazing into an entry door. There has been a mismatched of storefront modifications to the building over the years; there is no consistency in its storefront and there is no evidence of any photos of anytime that the modified storefront entries were ever consistent with each other. The photo from 1998 is only ten years old and, therefore, cannot be used to justify this particular storefront. As the building is moving back to a single tenant building and the most character defining part of the building is the entire corner which is a part of the entrance. Further down Jones Street, the businesses want to consolidate it into a single tenant building on the corner. The entry is no longer used, which collects leaves and street refuse that detracts from the building. It makes sense that as the building move back to a single tenant use in this location, the secondary main entry would not be necessary. Therefore, they feel that their proposal is in keeping with both the original historic facade and its subsequent conversion to a

commercial building. They are not looking to redefining the historic character of the building, but instead enhance it or reestablish it.

Mr. Judson said to clarify the use of the building, the paper store will remain as a tenant and the other business, One Fish Two Fish, is not using this door.

Ms. Lynch said they have not used the door for quite some time. It is an unused entry and is not functional. The reason the owner is looking to modify it is because, as everyone knows, a car ran into the storefront and it needs to be replaced.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Lynch when she says that the soffit will be retained, is she saying that the ceiling of the angled storefront in her proposal will be behind the windows.

Ms. Lynch answered that if the Board feels that this would retain an element of its history, they would be perfectly happy to retain a remnant of this configuration from a certain time. You could see it from the outside and inside, but the storefront, itself, would be clad and smooth back to somewhat the original spirit of the building.

Mr. Gay stated, therefore, it would be a useless space between the angled wall and what Ms. Lynch is proposing.

Ms. Lynch said it would still be above nine feet six inches and would be a soffit inside. This will be used as the display area. Therefore whether it's smooth, angled or configured otherwise, it would still function in the same way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) knew that the staff has grappled with this petition. Most times, HSF agrees with staff, but in this case they do not. He was making a general statement, but believes it applies in this case where too much significance is sometimes applied to features of buildings that are added at later times. In this case, there is a lot of speculation about when something was done. Mr. Carey said he would not want to err on the side of assigning too much significance to something when there is an opportunity to restore the building to a degree; but, yet, they still have on the southern end of the building the recessed opening which still helps them to understand the full evolution of the building. However, to be able to return this, he think is really representing more of the core of the building and gives an opportunity to see it as it was and understand its evolution later at the southern end.

Mr. Carey believes, therefore, the proposal as submitted by the petitioner should be approved. As Ms. Ward stated, the Board can exercise its discretion and judgment in this process. He does not believe the Board would be violating the standards. The standards are here for guidelines and if the Board allows the return, he believes they will be allowing a better interpretation of the historic building which is the core.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Carey if he was saying that the proposed change would bring the building back to originally what it was.

Mr. Carey stated he was saying it would bring it back in a form of what it was.

Dr. Henry stated that Ms. Ward is saying it would violate the guidelines.

Mr. Gay said if the change to the dairy was done within the last 50 years.

Dr. Henry said they really don't know when it was done.

Mr. Judson stated that it is really a matter of interpretation. If the Board was saying they approve this, but then tell the petitioner they have to go to the last tenant and get rid of that angle door and make the entire building as it was, would be an extreme and inappropriate interpretation of it. He believes that Mr. Carey's point allows for the fact that by leaving the one angle entry where it is a separate use tenant, allows the building and facade to continue to speak to the fact that it is a mixed use building. From the wall north, it is a matter of interpretation and he does not believe there is a clear guideline.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he agrees with staff. He believes to remove the angled entry without knowing for sure they would be damaging a storefront that has gained significance in its own right. They are leaving one of the angled entries. If the owner would come in and say they want to take the entire facade back to the original fenestration pattern, he could support that on the basis of restoration. But, this is not restoration, but is rather creating something that has never existed. Consequently, he believes that the staff's analysis is correct in terms of the Secretary Interior's Standards. They should remain with it.

Dr. Williams said they do not know if the building ever existed as this. All they know is that it was glass block up to a point, and it became an angled entry at a point. But, every window on the building has been modified at least once and not one piece of the original fenestration is still here. Every sill has been lowered with the exception that it does appear that where the circular lighting is located, it still looks a bit low, that the sill of the right hand window looks potentially original. It is a little higher and a little thicker and comes closer to the original building. Dr. Williams said, therefore, this is really a problematic speculative situation as they are dealing with a building that has undergone many changes. It is not clean cut and the angled entries along Bull Street south of Forysth Park across from the Legion, there are a couple of buildings here of angled entries. Then further down Bull Street across from Sacred Heart, a building is located here with a short angled entry. Therefore, there are other angled entries.

Dr. Williams stated that he is very conflicted on this issue because he respects Mr. Engle's respective as well as staff, but on the other hand in a sense, the historic reality of the building is flux. It is not as if it went from one stage to another in one clean step. The photos of this building show that none of them are alike. He guessed a question could be posed, what is being truest to the spirit of the building. Is it justifying the flush facade? If he supports this proposal it would not be this basis, but on the fact that the nature of this building has been changing fenestration and this is a part of its historic reality. This is a continuation of that reality. The other aspect that they need to think about is the petitioner has mentioned that this is no longer a usable entry and in other situations where they permitted the McDonald's to cut a window in the wall actually entered into the historic fabric. The usefulness of that building could be enhancing perpetuated. He is sensitive to the petitioner's concerns that this is an area that collects trash and as an entry door, it would

help with the legibility of this as one contiguous interior from an architectural point of view.

Dr. Henry said this is almost a "no win" situation. He is persuaded by the idea of the phrase "in the spirit of the building." However, he has a lot of respect of Mr. Engle's opinion and also of staff, but there is so much speculation that he has to go along with the spirit of the building.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she agrees with Mr. Engle's opinion and the staff's report. They do not know when the character defining feature occurred which tells the story of the building. She believes this is what the Secretary of Interior's Standards want the buildings to do. The spirit changes.

Dr. Williams asked if they could argue that the story continues.

Mr. Engle stated that the story continues, but a part of the story is a car ran into the entrance and it is replaced. However, by this rationale they could say, for example the Owens Thomas House, the history still continues and they are going to put in glass doors. At some point, it is a significant structure and this is when they start judging it by the Secretary of Interior's Standards. These two diagonal storefronts are significant. If you take one out and make it a flush storefront, then next year the owner can say they want to get 18 extra square feet so we are going to remove the other storefront, too, and since it is only ten years old, why not. Then what do they have left? Ms. Ward has carefully reviewed the standards and the overwhelming ones say this does not meet the standards. The ordinance says they will be consistent with the standards and when a majority of them are not being met, they are not following the ordinance.

Dr. Williams stated he believes Ms. Ward said one standard was not being met.

Mr. Engle stated that Ms. Ward has approximately five standards; the majority are not being met and two are not applicable.

Ms. Ward said she mentioned that one of the standards is problematic to her for all interpretation which is number three. However, staff found that five are not met and two do not apply.

Mr. Engle said, therefore, the majority of the standards were not met. He does not believe that the Board has the flexibility to decide when they will apply the standards and when they will not.

Dr. Henry stated he believes the Board has the right to have some flexibility. In principle, there are variables that he believes the Board can consider besides the standards. There is no set of standards that will cover every situation.

Dr. Williams stated that if this was a clean cut historic feature as the doors on the Owens Thomas House, he would not be making any cases for the glass doors. In fact, he would resolve for the petitioner to propose the Art Moderne handrails for the doors. They know it is a character defining feature to a point. Is it a charactering defining feature that is contributing? There are charactering defining features, but not every change to a building makes a positive contribution. He agrees that a part defines the character, but a part of the

character of this building isn't lost in one phase. They are looking at three to four fenestration changes. Therefore, what he sees is that continued change is a part of the historic character of this building.

Mr. Judson stated the petitioner wanted to make a comment. This is a slight departure from procedure, but he will allow the petitioner to readdress the Board as presently, there is not a motion on the floor.

Ms. Lynch said they are not arguing that angled entrances are not significant in the history of commercial buildings in Savannah, but given that this is a single use case if it is actual historic it is the only place on this building that an angled entrance was used. She is not arguing the 1998 photo because it is not actually historic. An entry was not even here in the historic time period they are discussing. Therefore, they can argue that it is significant to that bay, but they are arguing that it is not necessarily a defining character of the building as a whole. There are six entries into the building now and they all are different. Therefore, it is not if five or six angled entrances on the building and they just want to flatten it out because it is inconvenient for them, but they feel that it is not specifically the character defining element of the building and it wouldn't be compromising the building to alter it at this time. Ms. Lynch said she agrees this is really where they were coming from in that it could be argued that the character defining quality of the building in its commercial life has changed; it is flux because clearly each one of the entries was either changed over time or was added at a different time. It is not cohesive and if anything, what they are trying to do is give it a little more consistent look which is not restoring the building with glass block per se, but trying to reintroduce the streamline wrap around facade. This what they meant by the spirit of the building, they are not saying they are restoring the building. They are not trying to deny this entry as it will still be a visual entry into the building and will still be storefront.

Board Action:

Approval of the petition as submitted because it meets the Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards as set forth in the Historic District Zoning Ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Robin Williams
Reed Engle - Nay
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Brian Judson - Abstain
W James Overton - Not Present
Linda Ramsay - Nay

Robin Williams

- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

16. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc. - H-11-4361\(S\)-2 - 414 Whitaker Street - Color Change, Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4361\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4361\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

17. [Petition of Brannen Construction Company - H-11-4363\(S\)-2 - 516 East State Street - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4363\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4363\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

18. [Petition of Bloomquist Construction - H-11-4375\(S\)-2 - 15 West York St. - Color Change, Existing Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4375\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4375\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

19. [3 West Liberty Street](#)

Mr. Judson explained that this is a new item on the Board's agenda. This category will be used when the Board resubmits items to staff such as for color change, etc. This is the point where the staff will give the Board an update on the progress.

Ms. Ward reported typically the staff will have a written report that will be attached, but since this has just been introduced about two days ago, she wanted she wanted to give the Board an updated report from the last meeting. She said she was asked to consult with the Fire Marshall about 3 West Liberty Street, the Knights of Columbus building. During the meeting on January 12, 2011, the Board required that the iron gate be preserved. The Fire Marshall has been on vacation, but his staff recollection is that the gate had to be open and not necessarily removed in its entirety. The swing may need to be changed or it will have

to remain open. The Fire Marshal will be working with her on this to ensure that the iron gate is preserved.

Ms. Ward also reported that the Food Lion building on MLK, the Board required that glazing be put on the Morris Brown side, the left side of the building, to meet the ordinance standards. However, Food Lion is doing somewhat similar to what CVS did; they are putting drywall behind this with the historic images of MLK and some of the other landmark buildings that are along this corridor. Some of those pictures are being put together now.

Mr. Johnson asked if this would be interior.

Ms. Ward answered yes; it is on the interior.

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

20. [2011 Statewide Preservation Conference - March 31-April 1, 2011 - Macon, Georgia](#)

Attachment: [2011 Statewide Preservation Conference.pdf](#)

Mr. Judson reminded the Board of the Statewide Preservation Conference. He explained that at the conference a review will be done on the information the Board received entitled "Good News and Tough Times." This report concerns the economic impact of preservation in Georgia's economy. This is a two day conference.

Mr. Thomson stated MPC could sponsor a couple of Board members to this conference.

21. [Good News in Tough Times: Historic Preservation and the Georgia Economy](#)

Attachment: [Good News In Tough Times.pdf](#)

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

22. [Historic Preservation Commission Training, March 11-12, 2011 in Carrollton, Georgia](#)

Attachment: [Historic Preservation Commission Training March 2011.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward reported that Mr. Overton volunteered to attend this training, but he cannot do so. Therefore, another Board member is needed to replace him. This might be the preferred conference as it is actually training.

Mr. Thomson said MPC could cover the cost for one Board member to attend this training.

Mr. Judson asked the Board to coordinate this with Ms. Ward as the training is very beneficial to the Historic Board of Review members. He said if the Board members wanted to go to the training in Macon, it might be if the staff can cover the entry fee for a few members, the drive is not bad to go to Macon and if they did not want to stay over night, they possibly could return home after the first day training and then drive back to the training the next morning. Mr. Judson asked the Board to email Ms. Ward if they had questions regarding the training and coordinate with her who would be attending.

23. [Reapply for Appointment to HBR through February 11, 2011](#)

Mr. Judson stated that Mr. Law, Ms. Ramsay and he need to submit their applications to the City for reappointment to the Historic Board of Review. The Clerk's office will be accepting applications up to February 11, 2011.

Dr. Henry said he does not believe that the voting by computers is working too well. He did not understand why the Board could not do voice vote or raised hands. He believes it would be much more efficient.

Mr. Thomson said some problems surfaced today that do not usually happen. They went through a period with the Planning Commission where one member was fooling around with the computer while they were listening to the reports. The person was not on the page or pushed the button and caused a problem. He said they need to see if there is a problem on the Board's side. It should be easy, once the motion is made, it takes a couple of seconds for the secretary to initiate the voting and they are individually looking at the motion. They should then click on vote button, it opens up, you vote and then submit. This process should take about three seconds.

Dr. Henry said he hit something and the entire thing just went black, but he was not voting. He just hit the wrong button at some point. The technician had to come and look at it. He believes the show of hands would be faster.

Mr. Judson said subsequent to that, the secretary has to go in and record it so that it is a part of the permanent record. In an ideal world, the electronic voting should be quicker.

Ms. Ward said if some members feel they need more training with the computer processing, it is available.

Dr. Henry asked if the staff is aware that work has restarted on the Leopold's building at 722 Habersham Street.

Ms. Ward answered yes. To her knowledge they have stopped all work on Leopold's and will most likely have to get a new permit. They will have to look at the entire scope of the work and it may have to come back to the Historic Review Board because Leopold's old Certificate of Appropriateness was issued in 2009 and, therefore, is no longer valid. If they have completed all the work that was on that COA, then they might be okay, but if they have not, they need a new building permit.

Dr. Henry said they do not know if the hardi-plank or wood was on the building.

Ms. Ward stated that some wood siding was there; it was a combination of different widths, materials, and siding. The petitioner's plan for the project at this point was to take it down, fix it, put the wood siding back and put the vinyl back.

Mr. Judson said the original approval was for vinyl. He said the staff is aware and has been on site.

Mr. Thomson said this will come back to the Board when staff knows what the petitioner is wanting to do. It was hard to tell if some of the wood could be preserved as it was removed before the staff got a chance to look at it. Mr. Thomson said he stopped the site one morning and some siding was there.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

24. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
February 9, 2011 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

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.