



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
January 12, 2011 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

JANUARY 12, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Members Not Present: Sidney Johnson, Vice Chair
Gene Hutchinson
Richard Law, Sr.
Ebony Simpson

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

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve December 8, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [12-08-2010 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve December 8, 2010 Meeting Minutes - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

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

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

Board Action:

Approval to withdraw the application. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

4. [Petition of Alexis Aubuchon for Coastal Heritage Society - H-10-4355-2 - 601 W. Harris Street/315 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. - Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the fence as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

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

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

Mr. Matthew Deacon was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Judson explained that the petitioners are applying for both parts I and II. This means that today the HBR will consider the height and mass of the project as well as the details of the design element. He explained that frequently on large projects they break this into two different presentations over different months.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioners are requesting approval for new construction (Part I and II) of a row of three two-story frame townhomes. Each parcel is deeded two parking spaces in the parking lot immediately south fronting Huntingdon Lane. The project site is located within Stephens Ward which maintains a diverse building typology and wide range of architectural periods, styles and materials.

Ms. Ward explained that the General Development Plan will be resubmitted to the City for approval. The proposed construction is in an R-I-P-A zone. There is a lot coverage

requirement of 75 percent. Each parcel is 20 feet wide by 61.89 feet deep. Each townhouse is 20 feet wide built to the property line. During staff's calculation of the initial lot coverage, it was revealed that the stoops encroached into the right-of-way. When the petitioners resubmitted the plan they verified that they met the lot coverage requirement. Staff's calculation is 76 percent, but the petitioners are testifying that it is 75 percent. This is a zoning issue and is left to the discretion of the City's Zoning Administrator to verify whether the petitioners meet this standard. Ms. Ward said staff does not support a variance and the petitioners have not requested a variance.

Ms. Ward stated that following staff's release of the packets, they received some comments. She believed that members of the public are present to speak on this petition. One of the comments staff received was regarding the service area utility standards. Ms. Ward wanted to ensure that this was included in the recommendation to the HBR, which is the petitioner has indicated that where the trash receptacles will be located and because they don't necessarily have ownership of the parcels to the rear, she is a little concerned about them going on Huntingdon Street and not have any kind of screening. Ms. Ward wants the petitioner to address this also when they come forward.

Ms. Ward reported that staff is recommending approval for new construction Part I and II provided the lot coverage requirement is met and that the trash enclosures will be screened from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Judson asked if zoning determines that the lot coverage is 76 percent or greater how does this renders the HBR's decision. Would the petitioners need to come back with new plans and start over?

Ms. Ward answered that she would like for the petitioners to address the lot coverage question. She believes the variable is decimal points; it is fractional that they might be over, the extreme is 76 percent, their number might show 75.4 percent. Therefore, she believes that the petitioners could redesign this to come into compliance with the standard. It may require an adjustment. Therefore, if the HBR feels that it needs to come back to them, they may request this. However, she believes it would be minimal enough that if the HBR is comfortable with it, she could approve this at staff level as long as there are no major changes in the design.

Mr. Engle said he was a little confused as to what happens with lot one.

Ms. Ward stated that she does not believe lot one is the petitioners' parcel. However, the developer and lot owner are present and they can answer this question.

Dr. Henry asked what is the primary materials.

Ms. Ward answered that it could be cementitious such as hardi plank.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward to clarify her statement concerning the front porches, stairs and lot lines. The neighboring property clearly projects further forward towards the street.

Ms. Ward explained that if you go to the site, you will notice that the sidewalk which is very wide is not obstructed. There is really no projection. The site plan is showing that the bays come out over the sidewalk and even if they do, they are not ground supported over the

sidewalk. This is new construction and staff recommends that they do not build to the new construction, but maintain the wall continuity that is established by the historic buildings on this street. This building is actually setback quite a bit. This is a section in the City that has great variation and texture within the setback, the building facade and so forth. The building is setback further, but it does maintain a low brick coping wall that is at the sidewalk edge. Therefore, staff asked the petitioners to set the project back so this would be continued.

Mr. Judson asked when was the new construction completed or approved.

Ms. Ward stated that she could not give a definite answer, but believes it has been here for some time.

Dr. Williams stated it appears to have been here since the 1980s.

PETITIONERS COMMENTS

Mr. Matt Deacon stated they appreciate the staff's comprehensive review and they agree with the findings. He wanted to clear up a couple of things that surfaced during the discussion. There are two parking spaces in the rear parking lot deeded to each parcel. Therefore, each unit will have two spaces as well; there is a trash yard on East Huntingdon Lane that is deeded to the units. Trash cans will go to the rear on the lane where the other trash cans are located. Mr. Deacon said with regards to the lot coverage, there is probably margin of error in their findings. They found that it was 75.4 percent lot coverage; however, they do not deny that it possibly could be 76 percent, but in the event Zoning finds that it is 76 percent, they will amend their project. They will squeeze the amount they need to out of the project. Mr. Deacon stated that he does not believe it would have a profound effect on the overall appearance of the project. They will probably just make it a couple of inches shorter and, therefore, would meet the standards. He stated that he had with him the legal exhibit of the parking deeds should the HBR wants to look at it.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Deacon to please comment on lot one. They all are a part of the same subdivision.

Mr. Reed Brennan, the developer and the representative for the owner, said that lot one is owned by the property owner to the east. They use this lot to do their gardening. Some shrubberies are located on this lot also.

Dr. Henry wanted to know what were the units modeled after. Somewhere he picked up that they are modeled on the Beech Institute neighborhood.

Mr. Brennan explained that Stephens Ward has a wide range type of topology. They chose to stay on lesser details with the simpler typology within this range. But, they do feel that their design is within the standards and is appropriate for the neighborhood.

Dr. Henry replied that he is not an expert, but when looking across the street, he sees that there are some very ornate houses. As a matter of the fact, the entire block is ornate houses. Therefore, to him, the proposed units just do not seem to fit in this block. It really looks more like a warehouse instead of a townhouse.

Mr. Brennan agreed that some of the most ornate buildings are on this block, but to the east along Lincoln Street, there are some very simple buildings on the block. They are not necessarily facing this project, but within the ward, there is a wide range of buildings.

Dr. Williams stated that the architectural character of Lincoln Street, north and south, is distinct such as Price Street. But, East Huntingdon Street is one of the grandeur streets. Therefore, to take the character from Price or Lincoln Streets and apply it to East Huntingdon Street is not appropriate. Dr. Williams said he believes that what Dr. Henry is saying is that these wards are very large. Therefore, to justify the design simply on the basis of inclusion in the ward might not be good enough.

Mr. Brennan said that Dr. Williams was referring to Price Street.

Dr. Williams stated that on Price or Lincoln Streets there are rows of hundreds of feet of very simple, what would have been worker housing, two-story. He said maybe articulating the massing of the building with some bays such as the buildings to the east or it could be a simple matter of including bay windows or something to that effect.

Mr. Brennan said they looked at the building on the east and noted the difference between that building and the buildings on the other side of the street that face the south. He said given certain development requirements that they were faced with, they went with a simple rectangular plan. They felt that to attempt to match the level of detail and the ornateness of the buildings across the street may not be the most appropriate thing. Mr. Brennan agreed that maybe it is a little overly simple, but at the same time he believes that to go to the other end of the spectrum and attempt to compete would not be successful.

Dr. Williams stated that he did not believe the suggestion was to go to the other end of the spectrum. At least what he would see is something incremental. If they are at one end of the spectrum and many houses are on the end of the other, they are not saying that he has to be at that end. In fact, to match the level of Victorian detail on a 21st Century house might be seen as inappropriate.

Dr. Henry said on the other side of the street he guesses is a 1930s house, but it is very ornate. Even the new house that was probably built in the 1980s is more ornate than what Mr. Brennan is speaking of. He said this is a radical departure from the style of Huntingdon Street. Dr. Henry wanted to know what constraints the petitioners were under in having to build this style.

Mr. Brennan said they were attempting to maximize lot coverage. Bay windows would have taken away square footage.

Dr. Henry asked if the constraints were purely economics and not aesthetics.

Mr. Deacon said they were set by the owner and developer.

Mr. Engle asked if there is a reason they have no fenestration on the east elevation. One thing that bothers him is the entire blank wall even where there is no adjacent building.

Mr. Deacon said the proximity to the property line was their reason.

Mr. Engle said this is the most repreensible thing. It is not the lack of detail. They have a 60 foot long blank wall that is entirely visible along the entire street. People will be sitting in their gardens and look at this mass. Maybe they should have set it 30 inches over so they could have put in windows. He believes it is totally uncharacteristic of the block and does not belong here. Maybe they should have done two bigger units.

Mr. Judson asked the HBR to ask specific questions of the petitioner. He feels they are somewhat crossing the line. He welcomes some give and take, but he also does not want the petitioner to be badgered with what would end up being HBR comments. The HBR can certainly make the comments to each other in terms of why they might or might not support the project during the Board discussion. Consequently, he wanted to limit the floor to specific questions asked of the petitioners to assist the HBR in clarifying their questions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Patrick Phelps stated that he was appearing as a homeowner and resident of this area. He owns 308 East Hall Street, which is directly behind the property that is being requesting to be developed. He said he made some comments on the staff's recommendation; he gave his recommendations to the members of the HBR. Mr. Phelps realized that parking is not the purview of the HBR, but wanted to speak on this issue as he has a concern that there are an existing up to 23 spaces. He believes that 14 of the spaces are being used by current tenants in the two buildings that are adjacent to the parking lot. If the petitioners are deeded the additional spaces, he agrees that they would be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance, but it may jeopardize the compliance of the units next door.

Mr. Gay asked that once they provide parking, if the parking is not perpetual, what would be done if the parking is lost?

Mr. Phelps said he does not know how the spaces are deeded to the two existing buildings. He agrees with staff that the lot coverage is over the 75 percent. Mr. Phelps stated that he understands that there are a lot of building typologies within the ward. However, the concentration seems to be placed within the ward, but not within the area. All of the structures on the block are three-story raised porch townhomes, except two. The allowance of two-story buildings would greatly change the historic precedents set within the block. The proposed low stoops are incongruent with the block which is comprised of mostly raised porches. He believes that this property has been before the HBR with other applications and has been approved for three story with the raised stoop. He understood that they can not force this on the developer, but the three-story is certainly something that can be considered.

Mr. Phelps reported that pertaining to **Part II Design Standards** - the continuous single gable is not reflective of the historic context set on the block which consist of roof lines articulated with pediments, dormers, and cupolas to delineate separation of row homes and to add rhythmic pattern to the streetscape elevation. The proposed low stoops are incongruent with the block which is comprised of mostly raised porches. He believes that if the approved, this would be the first and only buildings in Stephens Ward with cementicious siding (Hardi-Plank). The proposed 6 inches exposure and 1/4 inches reveal proposed is not in keeping with a typical 4 inches exposure and 1/2 inches revealed

provided by wood siding. Mr. Phelps said, therefore, he does not feel that this material is appropriate for the ward. He questioned the decision for the Hardi-Plank. The compressors are proposed to be located on the rear porch; but it is questionable whether the units will fit on the porch since typical units require a minimum of 18 inches clearance on all sides. No area has been provided for the housing of trash and recycling bins.

Ms. Mary Ellen Orellana stated that along with her husband they own the property at 318 East Huntingdon Street. While they always appreciate that someone wants to make an investment, they do have some concerns about the character of the proposed buildings.

Ms. Orellana said she spoke to some of the owners of Bed and Breakfast Inns and neighbors and their concerns are with the windows. She asked if the developer on the windows could make them more neighborly by installing shutters or transoms. As has been stated, it would be good if the building could be setback more. Huntingdon Street is very beautiful; tourists ride and walk here everyday; beautiful houses are here and it is a social street. The neighbors would like it very much that new buildings coming into their area would be as beautiful as the ones here now.

Mr. Tim Coy resides at 315 East Huntingdon Street, directly east of the property that is under consideration. He owns 313 East Huntingdon Street which is the vacant lot. His wife and he are the president and vice-president of the Huntingdon Square Homeowners Association which owns the parking lot. Mr. Coy said he could attest to the fact that there are two spaces in the lot for each unit. Six spaces will be available to the residents of the new buildings; therefore this is not a problem. However, he does see that the trash cans will be a problem. Huntingdon Lane is overcrowded with garbage cans. There will be six regular garbage cans plus six recycle garbage cans. This amounts to 12 more garbage cans.

Mr. Deacon injected that it will be three garbage cans and three recycle cans; totaling six cans.

Mr. Coy stated he thought it was down and upstairs. The six garbage cans somewhat eases the problem, but it is still an issue. He would be much happier if the garbage cans could be put some where other than in the lane. His concern also is with the sidewalk. Presently, there is only dirt in front of the property. However, all the way down the sidewalk to Lincoln Street is brick. It would be appreciated if the developers would consider doing their sidewalk in brick.

Mr. Judson informed Mr. Coy that what he stated is noted by staff, but the general plan is not a part of the HBR's purview. The HBR's purview is the architectural details and height and mass.

Mr. Coy stated that he does not agree that the total design is incompatible. He agrees that it would be nice to have some bay windows and a few other design elements would be a little more Victorian. He is much happier with this design than with one that was approved earlier by different persons on the HBR. At that time, he believed the design was very much out of scale and much too ornate. Therefore, he was not objecting to this present design.

Mr. Jim Moss resides at 306 East Huntingdon Street. Mr. Moss stated that the only thing lacking in this design is the curb appeal.

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that Mr. Phelps met and shared his comments with HSF and their Architectural Review Committee. Mr. Carey said the HSF endorses all of Mr. Phelps comments. They reviewed the comments yesterday in their monthly meeting. They regret that the Architectural Review Committee did not have prior access to this project. They did not have any contact with the petitioners. Mr. Carey said the HSF offers meeting with the petitioners at any point. If this petition moves forward and comes back for further review, the HSF would certainly be pleased to work with the applicant and provide some constructive comments. He does not believe that this project hits the mark with visual compatibility in height, mass, details or any number of areas. The HSF has concerns about the Hardi-Plank not because they are opposed to it as they understand that it is allowed for new construction, but because of the reasons that Mr. Phelps articulated, their concerns are how it would hang, how it will read on the building and its propensity to be wavy, slip and just take on dimensions that are not appropriate for buildings. He stated further, that there are three units and at some point they may be painted different colors or have different ownership. Therefore, with no division between the three units, this could lead to problems. However, this is just a small comment towards the larger comment, which really is to have a building that does not fit in with its immediate surroundings. Mr. Carey stated that he understood the argument that it may work within the ward as a whole. Nevertheless, thinking in concentric circles, the most immediate street and the area ought to be the primary concern when they are talking about whether this works individually or compatibly. The HSF does not think this does.

Mr. Carey said the fenestration pattern is alright vertically speaking, but horizontally speaking it is somewhat off a little. If they consider each unit from left to right, the two windows in the first unit to the left have a greater distance to the third window over the door to keep the vertical line in tact. But, this sort of destroys the left horizontal line. He believes that there are spaces here which could be brought in line where the entire thing could work as it should. But, he did not want to get too lost in fine-tuning something that they are not in favor of. A number of persons have made comments to the HSF and the Architectural Review Committee that they are in opposition of the design, height and mass. The summary statement of the HSF is that this petition should come back to the HBR for more review, input and be something that is more keeping with the street and the immediate area.

Mr. Judson stated that listening to Mr. Carey's and Ms. Orellana's comments, he feels compelled to say that when someone is present they are speaking for themselves or representing their agency if they are president/chair, but if neighbors wish to make comments and are unable to attend the meeting, the person might want to ask the individual to put their comments in writing to be presented to the staff. The HBR does not require that all public comments be here in person, but he feels as if they are bordering hearsay or gossip if they are reporting that other neighbors, homeowners, etc. have said whatever. Mr. Judson feels that it is only fair that when someone speak, they need to do so for themselves.

Mr. Peter Hand stated that his company owns 306 East Huntingdon Street. He is also an architect. Mr. Hand said that the MPC has done a good job of approving a colonial-style building in a Victorian and Italianate street. The detailing and the general proportions all fits in several parts of Savannah. Mr. Hand was sure that they could find on Price Street or

any number of places where this actually occurs. However, this building has nothing to do with the street that it is being proposed to be built on. He believes it is a travesty to assume that you can just drop this building into this location.

Mr. Judson explained that before the HBR moves into the Board Discussion, he wanted to clarify one point with staff. They are considering both Part I Height and Mass and Part II Design Detail. The HVAC units come under Part II. He asked staff if the screening of the garbage cans come under the height and mass approval or is it considered a part of the design details.

Ms. Ward answered that they usually look at this under Part II - Design Detail.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry stated that the units for the air conditioning were brought up as a problem. He asked the developer if he considered multi-split HVAC.

Mr. Brennan stated this is a possibility. They have not looked at it for this project. These units would fit.

Dr. Henry stated he knew that multi-split units were recently installed at the the Espy House. It costs a little more to do, but is much more efficient.

Mr. Brennan said they will certainly look into this. It was not looked at and then disregarded because of price. They just never looked into the multi-split for this project. It might be a better benefit than not having a unit on the back porch for the occupant. He said regarding the trash, there is an allocated spot that is a part of a warranty deed for trash pick up. While he agrees with the adjacent property owners' comments, legally there is a trash spot back there. However, he does believe that it needs to be addressed to get the area cleaned up. Mr. Brennan said, originally, the design did have some separation detail that if there was multi-owners and one owner wanted to paint a different color, to provide that separation. He said they are not opposed to this. They certainly are not opposed to potentially a bay window for additional detail as long as it does not protrude into the setback. He believes that with the stoop, this is not an issue. Mr. Brennan said he was just making a few comments based on some of the issues that were brought up. They are not opposed to making some modifications to the design.

Mr. Engle said that the staff has detailed quite well as to how this meets the standards of the City Ordinance, but what concerns him is he does not see this meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards. You can find anything in Savannah and make something compatible with Drayton Towers, but it would not be appropriate to put it in this block. Because they are trying to meet zero property line setbacks, there are no cornices or any substance on these buildings. The roof is totally undistinguished when every other house on this block has roof lines. If this was along Price Street, it might work fine, but it does not work right on Huntingdon Street in this block. It is not contemporary, but compatible for new construction. This does not meet the Secretary Standards and, therefore, he does not see any notation at all in staff review that deals with the Secretary Standards and normally they see this. Mr. Engle stated, therefore, he does not believe that this works at all. He believes that it does not work because they tried to cramp every single square foot that they could. This could only work if there were two units on this block. Mr. Engle said he could

not support this.

Dr. Williams stated that looking at Price Street which terminates the view is one of the rare situations in Savannah where you have a street that turns into another street and actually terminates the view. If you look up Huntingdon Street and actually Price Street fronting, there is actually a row of red brick buildings and all have bays. Therefore, even on Price Street in this section, there is an articulation of bays. It is sort of like a big urban room defined in almost all sides by either bays or by substantial porches. Consequently, he believes that the points the HBR have made actually carry further than they might have thought from the photos they are seeing in the Historic Savannah book. Dr. Williams said he agrees completely with Mr. Engle's comments regarding the cornices. This is predominantly an Italianate neighborhood and the defining characteristics are projecting bays and substantial cornices that projects out and are supported by bracketing. He was pleased to hear that the petitioners are open to the possibility of modifying the design. Dr. Williams stated that he believes this really needs to work a little harder to become compatible.

Dr. Henry stated that he agrees with the comments that have been made. It is certainly important for the Historic District to have viable investments and bring more people into the area, which they do. But, it is equally economically important not to put in something that is incompatible with the neighborhood as this will eventually deteriorate the tourist base. He, therefore, believes that an economic argument as well as an aesthetic argument exists to show that this is not a good project.

Dr. Williams asked that if this is built up to the zero lot line and the stoops now cover more than half of the front space between the building wall and the lot line, if a bay was added and they were forced to rotate the the stairs such as the building on the corner, would it be the purview of the HBR or Zoning to allow stairs to angle out into the right-of-way?

Ms. Ward said the stairs are not calculated in the lot coverage, only anything with a roof. If there is a bay and a stoop such as on the corner, then both would probably exceed it.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward that when she speaks of zero lot line is she saying the building wall or the front edge of the stoop.

Ms. Ward answered the front edge of the stoop is at the zero lot line.

Dr. Williams asked if the bay was pushed into the area where the stairs are and then the stairs angled out into the right-of-way, would this not be factured into the lot coverage.

Ms. Ward stated the bay would be factured in, but not the stairs.

Ms. Ramsay stated she agrees with the comments that have been made. She does not know if they adequately addressed Mr. Phelps's comments about the air conditioning units. This needs to be addressed. She said in looking at the detailing on this project, the pilasters would be an important addition.

Mr. James Waldner (last name maybe spelled incorrectly) resides at 306 East

Huntingdon Street. There is a fountain in front of his house, a little walkway and his neighbors as well as people off the street come and enjoy this. They have gatherings in his neighborhood which makes him feel that he is a part of the neighborhood. The project needs to be broken down to give it an appeal of being more neighborly.

Mr. Judson stated that many design details have been addressed. but he does not get the sense that it is just a matter of design details. In fact if they break this up into two parts, he does not believe they would have approval for Part I height and mass.

Dr. Williams asked wouldn't height and mass need to be approved before they moved on to design details.

Mr. Judson stated yes and the majority of the HBR members have voiced their comments and all have been negative. He said either the HBR should make a motion or give the petitioners a chance to ask for a continuance. He appreciates the flexibility of some of the design details and the bay windows, but he does not believe that they are here to do a design consortium on this building, particularly when he believes there are issues with the principal Part I approval.

Mr. Deacon stated that in regards to Mr. Phelps's comments regarding the three-story verses two-story; high stoop versus low stoop, there are two examples of the low stoop on this block adjacent to this building. He was wondering if the HBR would be opposed to them coming back with something more compatible, but still be within a low stoop configuration for height and mass.

Mr. Judson said he goes back to some of Dr. Williams's first comments. They are not asking the petitioners to replicate the most ornate houses on the block. But, the sense is this falls too short. But, there is room here for the petitioners to come back with a design that is not out of character with the block.

Dr. Williams stated that the building at the corner is the closest in height to the project. The building in between is in some ways is the least characteristic of the block being front gabled, stick style. Since his building comes close to what is already on the corner with the low stoop, the inclusion of a bay, taking a cue from this would probably be the best.

Mr. Engle said the stoop is not the only issue; the fact is there are no cornices at all.

Dr. Williams stated that Mr. Brennan is asking should he raise the lower story to get a full height stoop running back on the same block there is a precedent, an Italianate house that matches this height off the ground. This is compatible with the building at the end of the corner. The cornice issue, the bay, the window, the fenestration rhythm, and the lack of division between the units are all issues that he recommends be addressed

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Deacon if his question was answered.

Mr. Deacon confirmed that his question was answered and asked for a continuance. They will meet with the owner and developer and reassess their requirements to see what they can do to bring their design to be more in keeping with the context of the neighborhood.

Mr. Judson reminded Mr. Deacon that the HSF is available to him as a resource.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of February 9, 2011 at petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

6. [Petition of Sara Portman - H-10-4356-2 - 612 Abercorn Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Sara Portman 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 projecting principal use sign for Canine Palace at 612 Abercorn Street. Staff recommends approval with the condition that the sign be elevated one foot to meet the vertical clearance standard.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Portman said she will raise the bracket one foot as requested by the staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gay said the sign does not appear to have a lot of design. He would have loved to see more design than just a square with a dog in the middle and great big letters.

Dr. Williams questioned if the sign design is within the HBR's purview.

Mr. Judson stated that the sign design is not within the HBR's purview.

Board Action:

Approval with the condition that the sign be elevated one foot to meet the minimum vertical clearance standard. The Chairman requested that this action be completed within 60 days since the sign is already installed. This approval does not preclude any encroachment agreement that may be required to project over the public right-of-way. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Linda Ramsay

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

7. [Petition of Patrick L. Phelps - H-10-4357-2 - 308 East Hall Street - Fence and Door Replacement](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Patrick Phelps was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for fencing and a garage door replacement to the rear of the property.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the fence as amended to screen the trash bins and approval of the garage door with the condition that the petitioner resubmit the replacement garage door to staff for final approval.

Dr. Henry stated that the requirement stipulates two separate doors.

Ms. Ward explained that the requirement is that a garage door opening not exceed 12 feet in width. The petitioner has this garage opening already on the property that exceeds the 12 feet. Therefore, they are entitled to use it. The petitioner only wants to replace the wooden doors and they want to now install a new overhead door. She stated that her recommendation is that the staff be allowed to work with the petitioner to come up with a

door that appears more as two doors to help break up the span.

Dr. Henry said he remembers that the last person who asked for double door was not approved.

Mr. Judson explained that this is not new construction. The petitioner is only installing a new door on an existing garage.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Phelps stated that he will be happy to work with staff. He will see if he can locate a manufacturer that creates a 6 foot garage door that looks like it is divided. The trash condition is a problem; he did not know if there is an open solution for it. His original thought was that if he could put his trash cans on his property near the lane that nobody else in the neighborhood would hopefully place theirs there. Mr. Phelps said he was fearful that if he just put up more fencing, more trash cans will surface. Currently, they have 60 to 70 trash cans that accommodations need to be made for in this lane.

Mr. Phelps urged staff and the HBR to work with the City and Sanitation Department to possibly come up with a solution.

Mr. Judson stated that unfortunately they could go case-by-case. The HBR appreciates Mr. Phelps's willingness to do his part with his trash cans. He hopes that the Sanitation Department knows they are back there.

Dr. Williams stated that the photo on page two shows approximately six trash cans in front of what he believes may be Mr. Phelps's garage. He asked if the trash cans were there because the doors do not open.

Mr. Phelps said that is his garage, but the trash cans are not his.

Dr. Williams stated that is the question. He explained that if Mr. Phelps put in an operable door

Mr. Phelps injected that he would have to relocate the trash cans to his neighbor's property where they are supposed to be.

Mr. Gay said hopefully the neighbors would keep their trash cans in their backyards until the day of their trash collection and then roll them out to the lane.

Mr. Phelps said there is no design within those structures to accommodate this. They are either garages or open parking lots. He said another problem is that the Sanitation Department, themselves, collect the trash cans from the lane, dump them and then just return them to the quickest spot possible.

Mr. Judson said unfortunately the trash bins are not an issue for the HBR's consideration other than the design detail of the fence on Mr. Phelps's property.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE.

Board Action:

Approval of the fence and garage alterations with the replacement door to appear as two doors to mitigate the 16 foot wide span and be resubmitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

8. [Petition of Merrill A. Levy, Architect - H-10-4359-2 - 3 West Liberty Street - Exterior Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Merrill A. Levy was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the eastern elevation of the Knights of Columbus property. During a conversation with the petitioner, she was informed that due to some code requirements for safety, he will have to remove the metal gate. The petitioner plans to keep the gate on site and actually incorporate it into the site, if they can, but they cannot have the gate where it is now. She said the petitioner could explain to the HBR why he can not keep it there.

Dr. Williams asked why the gate is not grandfathered in.

Mr. Gay stated he did not understand as the gate is already there.

Ms. Ward said she believes because the petitioner is upgrading the stairway. Presently, it is a lattice entryway, but now the petitioner will be installing some fire safety devices such as a door and are adding an elevator. The petitioner could better answer this question.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the exterior alterations to the entry and railing as amended by the petitioner.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Levy said the door is not a replacement. Originally, it was a porch and there is no door. But, now it is a part of a fire code renovation of the interior of the building which requires two exits. Therefore, in order to get the exit, the decorative rail has to be removed because it would not meet the fire code. The removal of the gate left the porch open. Therefore, he had to put a door here. This is a special made door; it is four feet wide and has many side bars. It will be fabricated by a historically adequate shop. Mr. Levy said a question came up about muntins, but he cannot answer this as they don't detail with muntins. He will submit the shop drawings to the staff for review.

He said the HBR will see that a rail is running along the top, but it is a mistake. The draftsman put it there, but they are not replacing the pipe rail. The level of the deck is almost level with the windows on the second floor. People cannot come off the sidewalk and go up to the top of this because they could easily break into the building. All the work is interior and code conforming for safety reasons.

Mr. Gay asked if the door will be replacing the ornamental ironwork.

Mr. Levy said it will replace the rail.

Mr. Gay asked if it would be set back further.

Mr. Levy said the rail is in front of the steps. They cannot put push bars there according to the Fire Marshall. He said regarding the pipe rail that was mentioned, the comment is that there are two definitions. One is a handrail, which is two feet, eight to ten inches high and is normally put on the side of stairs or ramp. A guardrail, which is what will be here, is there to prevent people from falling off the level. This will be three feet, six inches high. When they discussed all of this, they decided to leave the rail as is.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Levy if he knew the age of the iron gates.

Mr. Levy answered he did not know; but knew that they have been here for a long time. Of course, they were not a part of the original building as initially this was a porch.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Levy if his work is being motivated to bring the building up to meet code requirement.

Mr. Levy stated that all work is interior except the replacement door on Liberty Street.

Dr. Williams said one of the requirements is that changes to the building not impact historic fabric. Therefore, the removal of the gates will impact the historic building fabric. He asked Mr. Levy if he has to change the door for fire egress and the path adjoining step is the only path out of the door. He also asked if the gates open inward or outward.

Mr. Mike Carbon of Knights of Columbus said the gates open outward towards Bull

Street.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Carbon why the gates cannot remain if they already open outward.

Mr. Levy said the Fire Marshall and he discussed this thoroughly. The gates are not to open at all. They cannot have something that they can lock. It would have to have push bars. If it opened, it would open over the downward steps.

Dr. Williams asked about moving the gate to the bottom of the stairs.

Mr. Carbon said he believes if the gate was moved to the bottom of the stairs, they would block traffic.

Mr. Levy said the gate would open onto the sidewalk.

Mr. Carbon said presently the gates just mainly open and close. There are no locks. They physically chained the gate because they have to. If it is unchained, the hall will be wide open.

Mr. Engle said he visited this building and looked at it very carefully. There is no reason the gates could not be permanently bolted open. All they would need to do is put lags on the sidewalls and permanently keep the gates open and in place.

Dr. Williams said this way, the petitioner would be retaining the historic building fabric.

Mr. Levy said the gate was added many years later.

Mr. Engle said the gate has been here for at least 100 years.

Mr. Judson explained that the historic fabric is not defined by it being a part of the original building, but the gate has been there long enough to be defined as historic.

Dr. Williams said the gate is here now and is a part of the building character.

Mr. Levy asked who will take the responsibility of the gate opening onto the sidewalk.

Dr. Henry said bolt the gate to the wall so that it will never be closed again.

Mr. Carbon stated that he understood what the HBR is saying and they have no issues with it.

Dr. Williams said if in the future the situation changes, it could be returned to functional order. But in the meantime to meet fire code, they are preserving the fabric and the egress.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

At the end of the meeting **Dr. Williams** said insofar as Mr. Levy evidently had some problems hearing and if he was the representative who met with the Fire Marshall, he had some concerns. He asked if someone from the MPC staff could talk with the Fire Marshall to get a better understanding of what they proposed for 3 West Liberty Street. Dr. Williams said there is a possibility they might just find that the Fire Marshall said as long as the gates swing outward they are fine with it.

Mr. Gay said in essence, the gate was kept locked and this is not good. Also it does not sit at the top of the stairs, but some steps down.

Dr. Williams said may be someone could inquire of the Fire Marshall and let him know what they proposed.

Mr. Gay said he thought the HBR's solution was fine.

Dr. Williams said it might be an extreme solution and there is a possibility that the gates could be shut, not fixed, but could swing outward so that all one has to do is push the gates open.

Ms. Ward stated she has worked with the Fire Marshall in the past and she will inquire about this. She informed the HBR that she was unaware about the removal of the gates until the meeting today. This was never indicated on their application. She received a letter from the petitioner this morning.

Mr. Gay said Mr. Carbon had no problem with opening gates. Therefore, why can't they just keep them there so if in the future they want to open them, they will be able to.

Board Action:

Approval for the exterior alterations to the entry and railing with the condition that the iron gate within the stair remain insitu and final shop drawings for the door to be resubmitted to staff. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of Sign Mart, Inc. - H-10-4360-2 - 8 Barnard Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Bill Norton of Sign Mart, Inc. was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for an internally illuminated principal use sign for Heiwa's Japanese Restaurant at 8 Barnard Street.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the projecting sign as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Norton stated that he did not have anything to add to the staff report.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE.

Board Action:

Approval of the projecting principal use sign as submitted. This approval does not preclude any encroachment agreement that may be required from the City to project over the public right-of-way. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

10. [Petition of John Clegg for Barnard Architects - H-09-4197-2 - 421 Abercorn Street - Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Addendum 1-29-2010.pdf](#)

Ms. Sarah Ward explained that petitioner is requesting approval for a 12-month extension for new construction of a four-story addition to the Wesley Monumental Medodist Church campus, specifically the rear of what is known as the Espy Building at 421 Abercorn Street. The building will not have frontage on Abercorn Street, but on the neighboring side street. There have been no changes to the proposal or to the site conditions.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the 12 month extension that will be valid 12 months from today. The extension will expire January 12, 2012.

Board Action:

Approval of the 12-month extension for new construction of a four-story addition as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

11. [Petition of Joseph Dwyer - H-10-4348\(S\)-2 - 208 East Jones Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4348\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4348\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

12. [Petition of Kayne Lanahan - H-10-4349\(S\)-2 - 140 Price Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4349\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4349\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

13. [Petition of Anthony Koncul - H-10-4350\(S\)-2 - 33 East Broad Street - Color Change, Stucco Repair/Repointing, Existing Windows, Doors, Other](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4350\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4350\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

14. [Petition of Daniel G. Carey for Historic Savannah Foundation - H-10-4351\(S\)-2 - 321 East York St. - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4351\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4351\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

15. [Petition of Ken Zap - H-10-4352\(S\)-2 - 218 W. Huntingdon St. - Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4352\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4352\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

16. [Petition of Kerry O'Connor - H-10-4353\(S\)-2 - 42 Abercorn Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4353\(S\)2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4353\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

17. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products - H-10-4354\(S\)-2 - 422 Whitaker St. - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4354\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4354\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

18. [Petition of Ashley Hubbard - H-10-4358\(S\)-2 - 530 E. Jones Street - Roof Repair, Existing Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4358\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4358\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

19. [Petition of Merrill A. Levy - H-10-4359\(S\)-2 - 3 West Liberty St. - Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4359\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4359\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

20. [Reapply for Appointment to HBR](#)

Mr. Judson stated that Ms. Ward sent an e-mail to the HBR members who need to reapply for membership on the Historic District Board of Review that they may do so now or at least by the cut-off date in February. He encouraged the members to get their applications to the City Clerk's office well in advance of the cut-off date. They have an excellent Board and he would hate to lose any members because of a procedural technicality.

Mr. Overton said Ms. Ward sent the HBR an e-mail regarding 22 Barnard Street - GSA Building. He asked Ms. Ward to please give an update on this issue.

Ms. Ward said because the GSA is a federal agency and are leasing space from a building, they had to go through Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires a review by the State Historic Preservation Office to determine if there were any impacts to historic properties. Since this building is located in the heart of the Landmark District, they did a review and actually found that the new construction project would have an adverse effect on the Historic District.

Ms. Ward stated we received a copy of the letter as we are the Preservation Office for the City. She is working with the petitioner to show that there have been alternatives. Usually, the Preservation Office will request that the agency show alternatives to mitigate their findings of adverse effect which mostly related to the height of the buildings. We suggested that there have been alternatives proposed through the course of the project to help mitigate the

height and make it compatible with the surrounding context. We also reminded the Preservation Office that they reviewed our ordinance and chose not to comment. Since no comment was made regarding the ordinance, we suggested that this was considered a recommendation for approval of the ordinance which provides for the compatibility of new construction. She said, therefore, our concern was largely, "so are you are telling us that our standards for new construction are adversely affecting the district." Since that time, they have retracted the finding and generated a new letter last week of a finding of no adverse effect. Therefore, the project will be moving forward.

The petitioner may actually be resubmitting to the HBR next month for some design details that they would like to bring forward.

Mr. Overton asked, therefore, did the state misrepresent its findings.

Ms. Ward said personally she does not agree with the Preservation Office's opinion of adverse effect on the district. She believes that the HBR really deliberated over this project and held three public hearings to provide opportunity for public input. This a lot more than what they did in their office. She believes that the HBR's judgment, decision, and its impact to the district in this specific case holds a lot more weight for compatibility than theirs.

Mr. Overton asked if the Preservation Office stated that they made a mistake or did they say that their decision was withdrawn.

Mr. Judson stated that the Preservation Office noted the points that Mr. Thomson made in his letter to them.

Mr. Thomson stated that his opinion from hearing what Ms. Ward found out is that it was Christmas time processing and that not enough eyes were on it. Certainly, they did not talk with us. However, they should have. He said that Ms. Ward deserves a lot of kudos of representing the HBR's position on this. He signed the letter, but it was written by Ms. Ward and passed onto Mr. Holder, who used it to argue with SHPO and GSA pertaining to how they went through the local process. Mr. Thomson said he was not happy with the Preservation Office decision, not because they cited something, but because it was done in a vacuum.

Mr. Gay said it was not done properly as this office was not consulted to find out what was the situation.

Dr. Williams said he believes it was wise to review it from their decision to the implication of an indictment of the zoning which had a very deliberate process over a very long time. As Ms. Ward stated, the Preservation Office had every opportunity to comment on this too. If they approved the zoning, then how could they say that it meets the zoning, which we did not oppose, but we oppose this.

Mr. Overton thanked Ms. Ward for representing the HBR well.

Mr. Thomson informed the HBR that the CAT Transfer Center is continuing to be developed. The Greyhound Bus Depot building was put on the Historic Map that was approved December 30, 2010 by the City. They went through the required process, the environmental assessment process approximately two years ago and they got a "finding of no significance impact." In this finding, a memorandum of agreement was delivered he guessed with SHPO. At the time, they were told that all they needed to do was document the building adequately according to the standards. They believed the sign was the most significant aspect to preserve. As time went by, the project changed. It is a smaller project than it was in this earlier effort. Therefore, the environmental assessment needs to be reevaluated and go through another negotiation with SHPO and another local process. He believes the issue is the people did not know the building was being put on the Historic Building Map. It was a concern to them because of the history on this project of the historic review on the previous location at Oglethorpe Avenue and MLK Jr. Boulevard. They are concerned that the building is on the Historic Building Map and now will have to go through a process that they would not have had to go through if it had not been done.

Mr. Thomson explained that the process they would have to go through with the HBR is the same process because it has been determined eligible for the National Register. It is exactly the same process whether it is on the local map or not as an historic structure. This has been explained to them. The process is the information needs to be given to the HBR and there is 45 days to provide comments. It is not an approval such as was done today, but comments on their proposal. The HBR will get this opportunity, but he was not sure of the timing of it. Mr. Thomson explained that they are trying to get to do this in this timeframe as part of the SHPO, new memorandum of agreement and the finding of no significance impact. He said on Friday, January 14, 2011 during the County Commission meeting, during the CAT meeting, a brief presentation will be given on the status of this. He believes that more detailed information will be given at the February 11, 2011 meeting.

Ms. Ward stated that representatives will be here tomorrow at 8:00 a.m. to show the fourth alternative. Two alternatives are being proposed to save the building and two do not save it. The good thing is that the County is aware of the historic significance. She is hopeful that an alternative will be chosen that incorporates the existing building.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

21. [Savannah Civic Center Addition - City of Savannah](#)

Attachment: [Request for Comment to Civic Center Site 1-4-2011.pdf](#)

Mr. Judson stated this is an area where the HBR does not render a decision, but their input is valued.

Ms. Ward reported that the City has plans to install an addition at the Civic Center. The City has the ability to opt out of the HBR process provided they submit a set of plans and get comments from the HBR. She stated, therefore, she is prepared to draft a letter on behalf of the HBR regarding this project.

Ms. Ward said hopefully the HBR has had an opportunity to look at the information which was sent as a separate e-mail from the agenda. She explained that the City is putting in an emergency command center in the basement of the Civic Center and an elevator is needed to be installed to get out of the basement. Consequently, the City is proposing a one-story elevator shaft to go from the basement to the ground level within the portico fronting the Montgomery Street elevation closest to the Oglethorpe Avenue side of the building.

Ms. Ward reported staff supports the application. It meets all the requirements.

Board Action:

Provide comments to City of Savannah with a recommendation that the proposed elevator addition is consistent with the Historic District ordinance and to proceed as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

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

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

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

Ms. Ward reported that on March 11-12, 2011, training on Historic

Preservation Commission will be held in Carrollton, GA. Due to not enough people signing up to attend this training in November 2010, the State of Georgia is offering the training in March. We have received a letter from the Historic Preservation Division reminding us that it is a requirement that the HBR members be trained at least once in this area. The Finance Director has informed her that we can provide funding for one member to attend this training. She was hopeful that an HBR member who has not attended the training would sign up to attend.

Mr. Judson said he attended the last training session and found it incredibly beneficial.

Mr. Overton will attend the training.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

23. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the HBR, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 4:45 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.