



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
July 13, 2011 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

JULY 13, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst
Brittany Bryant, Historic Preservation Planner
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

City of Savannah Staff Present: Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order and Welcome](#)

Chairman Judson called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. Mr. Judson reported that a delegation of the U. S. State Department's International Visitor Leadership Program were visiting today to look at cultural and heritage preservation. He welcomed the delegation and all in attendance to the meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve Minutes of June 8, 2011](#)

Attachment: [06-08-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of Minutes of June 8, 2011. - 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 - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

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

3. [Continued Petition of Kathy Ledvina | H-11-4407-2 | 323 East Jones Street | Exterior Alterations](#)

Board Action:

Continue to a future meeting date upon completion of submittal. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

4. [Petition of Ronald J. Vance | H-11-4451-2 | 14 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Board Action:

No action required. Petition withdrawn. -

Vote Results

Motion:

Second:

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

5. [Petition of Pete Callejas for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4463-2 | 26 East Bay Street | Rehabilitation/alteration](#)

Board Action:

Continue to August 10, 2011 for the City infrastructure departments to review the encroachment over Factor's Walk onto City property and provide comments for consideration. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Sidney J. Johnson

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

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

6. [Amended Petition of Sam Carroll | H-10-4346-2 | 405 East Gordon Street | Exterior alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the petition as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Amended Petition of Gonzalez Architects | H-11-4438-2 | 13 East Perry Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the petition as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

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

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

8. [Amended Petition of LukeJohn Dickson | H-11-4440-2 | 11 East Gordon Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial 2007.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. LukeJohn Dickson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. She explained that the petition is shown as amended, but this is the first time it has been presented to the Board. The petitioner submitted the petition last month, but made some amendments to the file and pulled it from the June agenda. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish the existing two-story porch at the rear of the principal structure at 108 West Gordon Street and to construct a three-story brick addition and an elevator with a wood frame porch extension in its place.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval to demolish the existing non-historic two-story porch and construct a new three-story brick addition and elevator with a wood porch extension at the rear of the property at 11 East Gordon Street with the following conditions: 1. Provide a parapet wall on the east and west elevations of the brick portion of the addition; 2. Provide brick and mortar sample on-site to show relationship to historic structures; 3. All window and door frames must be inset three (3) inches from the exterior wall surface; and 4. Clarify location of the HVAC and trash receptacles.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dickson said they are amenable to the staff's suggestions regarding the parapet wall. The impetus for the project is that the new owner wants to add an elevator shaft as she is handicap.

Mr. Engle asked staff if the railing and handrails meet the design standards. It appears to be a two-by-four. He does not know how they would grout this out and make the ballisters fit. He thought they had to be set into the rail.

Ms. Ward stated the petitioner would be able to better answer Mr. Engle's question. But, the design standards are not that specific; they say between the top and bottom rail. It does not say that they actually have to go into or dovetail into that rail.

Mr. Dickson said typically it is recessed. Often it is either custom made on site or there is material that is prefabricated and this is what is used these days. Therefore, it comes prefabricated. But, if needed, they can add a detail.

Mr. Engle stated that without a recess, the third floor could be a problem.

Mr. Dickson said this is not a problem, they can amend it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval to demolish the existing non-historic two-story porch and construct a new three-story brick addition and elevator with a wood porch extension at the rear of the property at 11 East Gordon Street with the following conditions: 1. Provide a parapet wall on the east and west elevations of the brick portion of the addition; 2. Provide brick and mortar sample on-site to show relationship to historic structures; 3. All window and door frames must be inset three (3) inches

- PASS

from the exterior wall surface; and 4. Clarify location of HVAC and trash receptacles.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of Alethia Canady for Coastal Canvas Products, Inc. | H-11-4445-2 | 552 East Taylor Street | Awnings](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Sim Harvey, homeowner, was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval on a new awning.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends denial for the awning on the principal entryway because it does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards nor the design standards as it obscures and alters the character defining features of the building.

Mr. Judson asked if the clearance under the awning is seven feet and the standards says eight feet.

Ms. Bryant answered yes; but this does not project into the public right-of-way. Therefore, in this case the standard does not apply.

Mr. Engle said the pictures show two entrances.

Ms. Bryant stated that if they look at the historic Savannah photo, they will see that it is a part of a row of townhouses. However, this unit is actually separated and connects to the one on East Broad. Therefore, it has its own individual portico entrance and the four townhouses beside it have the double entrances.

Mr. Engle said the pictures were submitted as evidence of what is here, but it is not the building they are talking about.

Ms. Bryant said the portico is shown in the historic Savannah photo that was provided.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Harvey stated that they were trying to avoid adding a new portico. The staff is greatly concerned about keeping a cohesive look in this row. He feels a new portico would further set this house a part from the row, even though, it is somewhat an individual row onto itself. The reasoning for the awning is there is an improperly constructed roof at 554 East Taylor Street which allows all the water to be shed on the front of his stoop which back splashes onto the historic fabric of the house. The door surround and sidelights were replaced and added in the 1980 renovation as well as the front slab stoop. They tried to work with Coastal Canvas to keep the awning inside the negative space that was created by the transom in order to help create and maintain the flow from structure-to-structure. Mr. Harvey said their main priority is to try to keep what is here now as the damage is greatly ongoing and causes water intrusion into the structure.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Harvey if there were any other alternatives than the awning to fix the structure.

Mr. Harvey answered that it is the neighbor's roof that is causing the problem. There is a slight hip at the southwest corner because of the overlaid of roofing material, it does not allow the neighbor's trench from their west facing firewall that the two of them share as drainage. It just shoots off at the corner of the building.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Harvey if he and his neighbor could cooperate and get the needed repairs to the roofing done.

Mr. Harvey stated that he approached the neighbor with this idea, but it is not a viable option for the neighbor at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said he was somewhat puzzled. The awning is obviously in violation of the code. Is it accurate to say that if the roof isn't repaired in some fashion that the structure is going to deteriorate?

Mr. Judson replied that based on the information that has been provided, he believes this is the conclusion that could be drawn.

Mr. Engle said if the Board remembers, they went through a situation such as this on Jones Street where the owner wanted to rip off the pediment because the roof gutter could not be fixed. If they look at the photo, they will see that there is a little three diameter pipe and they can see where scuppers were previously filled-in. He does not buy the argument because if the water is going over the roof cornices, it is running down the brick before it gets to the porch.

Mr. Judson reminded the Board to focus on the petition that is before them and whether

or not they grant after-the-fact approval for the awning. It is not their purview to re-engineer, correct the problem or suggest other alternatives although staff has been proactive in this regard.

Mr. Engle said the Board has to look at it as whether they would have approved this initially if it had come to them. He does not believe it meets the design standards.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Harvey how long has this problem existed.

Mr. Harvey said he has been in the house since September, 2010. He imagined the problem has been going on for as long as the roof at 554 Taylor Street has been in place. The property was vacant for three years before they moved in. The homeowner was incapacitated and did not live in the house.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Harvey that from his experience was the neighbor's roof incorrectly reconstructed or has it been this way since 1884.

Mr. Harvey said he has lived here for 15 years and when he moved to town it was a shell. Therefore, he would have to check to see when the Armstrongs reconstructed the shell.

Mr. Gay said photograph 10 shows the property and what was here in the beginning. It shows a porch with a roof. The only reason the porch is not here now is because evidentially it rotted and fell off.

Mr. Harvey said all the porches were removed in a 1980 renovation. All the stoops were removed and were not put back.

Mr. Engle stated that the correct response by the Secretary Standards is "restore the porch, but not rip it off and put up an awning."

Mr. Judson said the Board is not to consider what was done in 1980, but what is before them today.

Board Action:

Denial of the after-the-fact request for the awning because it does not meet the Preservation Standards or Design Standards in the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson
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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Todd Naugle, AIA for Lott+Barber | H-11-4455-2 | 222 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Exterior rehabilitation and alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Todd Naugle was present on behalf of the petition.

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

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the exterior alteration on the condition that the light fixture matches existing and the security cameras be lowered and installed on the string course. However, staff has been told that the security cameras must be installed at the proposed location as lowering them onto the string course will create blind spots and be subject to vandalism according to the Sheriff's department who will operate the cameras.

Mr. Overton asked what is the original facade made out of.

Ms. Bryant answered the facade is stucco.

Mr. Overton stated that what is being proposed in the sample is a synthetic stucco.

Ms. Bryant said this is not a historic building.

Mr. Overton stated that he was asking what was the original facade made out of.

Ms. Bryant answered that she did not know.

Mr. Naugle explained that what the Board saw in the finished samples is a finished coating that will be put over the stucco that is presently on the building. This product is common today and allows for expansion and relief of cracks. Basically, the building has previously been coated with this product and because its older age is failing. At this point, they will give the entire facade a more uniform color.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Naugle if the building was actually built as a stucco facade and subsequently recoated with the synthetic plaster.

Mr. Naugle answered that it was covered with a synthetic paint.

Mr. Overton asked if this would be a patch and repair project; and they are not replacing the entire facade.

Mr. Naugle said they are not coating the entire facade with the two colors, but there are cracks, delamination, and stucco. All of this will be repaired with portland cement stucco. What the Board is looking at now is just a coat that goes on top of the finish.

Ms. Simpson wanted to know if it is similar to paint.

Mr. Naugle answered yes.

Mr. Engle asked if the new storefront will be recessed four inches as the standards say it should be recessed four inches.

Ms. Bryant said this is a question for the petitioner as this is not indicated on the plans.

Mr. Engle said the staff did not make a recommendation on this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Naugle said they will recess the windows four inches. They will address matching the light fixtures at the new entrance on Jefferson Street with the light fixtures on Oglethorpe Avenue. The only comment they have is the security cameras. This is a county owned building and the Sheriff's Department runs the security and they have dictated the height.

Dr. Williams said a photo shows what appears to be six metal column-like fixtures on the building.

Ms. Bryant said these are downspouts.

Dr. Williams asked if the downspouts are existing.

Mr. Naugle answered that the downspouts are new and that there are four downspouts. This will drain the water from the canopy below grade to the storm system.

Mr. Overton asked if this is a county-owned building.

Mr. Naugle answered that the building is owned by the county.

Mr. Johnson wanted to know if a pitched awning will be here or will it be flat.

Mr. Naugle answered that the pitch on the canopy is essentially flat, but it has a decking material that directs the water (you will not see it) to the downspouts. It has a one foot tall fascia around the canopy, but internally it is a somewhat corrugated deck.

Mr. Gay stated that because the entryway is below ground level, this is to ensure that the water goes straight to the ground instead of having it coming off the awning and flooding the walkway.

Mr. Engle asked if the canopy is here because of the handicap ramp.

Mr. Naugle answered no; but is here as Mr. Gay said. He explained further that the reason the canopy is here is because the public will come to the building. The first floor will be a customer service center. Four county departments will be housed in this building: the Public Defender, Tax Commissioner, Board of Assessor and the Child Support Unit. Presently, these department are located in the courthouse. The canopy is the expressed entry and at the same time to cover it from rain.

Mr. Judson asked if it reads correctly that the actual entry level is below sidewalk grade.

Mr. Naugle answered correct.

Mr. Engle said it appears somewhat awkward the way it cuts off from the bay. It is being chopped off and he believes it would be better just to take it off as it will be an architectural feature just hanging from the ceiling. He asked why are they keeping it.

Mr. Naugle said they can study this. They can continue the metal ceiling underneath it and get rid of the entire decorative feature.

Mr. Judson believes the entryway will read cleaner without the additional obstruction being here.

Mr. Naugle said the public will only be able to enter through one door.

Ms. Ramsay asked what happens to entries on Oglethorpe Avenue.

Mr. Naugle said these entries are not affected other than what was the main entry will now be a secured entrance for only county staff. If the public tried to enter this way, it would be a rigid door with an access controlled simplex which is a card reader type system throughout the building. Signs will be posted directing the public to use the entrance on Jefferson Street. But, right now the Sheriff's Department wants the public to go through only one entry point.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Naugle if they considered a grade level entrance or an entrance slightly below grade from Oglethorpe Avenue rather than Jefferson Street.

Mr. Naugle answered that they did consider this, but with the stoops and their dimensions because of ADA accessibility, they cannot meet the guidelines. At the same time, they are dropping the finished floor approximately 18 inches below sidewalk elevations just to work with the whole occupied space in the garage.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Johnson wanted to know more about the awning under the bay window.

Mr. Judson explained that the petitioner said he is willing to study this or move it, if possible. This would need to be included in the motion such that the petitioner will work with staff as there could be some engineering issues.

Ms. Simpson asked if the staff spoke with the Sheriff's Department regarding the security cameras.

Ms. Bryant said the petitioner discussed the camera situation with the Sheriff's Department and forwarded the information via an email to staff.

Board Action:

Approval of the petition with the following conditions: 1. The light fixtures on the Jefferson Street facade match the current light fixtures on the Oglethorpe facade; 2. The storefront be inset a minimum of four inches from the building facade; 3. Restudy intersection of canopy over oriel window and remove oriel base if possible. - 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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

11. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4460-2 | 337 Bull Street | HVAC screening](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: THIS PROPERTY IS OWNED BY SCAD. THEREFORE, DR. WILLIAMS RECUSED FROM PARTICIPATING IN THIS PETITION.

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

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval on a new HVAC condensing unit, on the lane, at 337 Bull Street for the business Gryphon. The proposed screening is six feet tall and four feet-six inches wide, conducted of aluminum post and aluminum louver panels finished in "Beige."

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the new HVAC screening with the condition that all HVAC units on the lane be screened from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Engle said something is hanging. What is it?

Ms. Bryant replied she believes it is something for this building, but this is a question that the petitioner could answer.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Bryant if the staff was saying that all the units should be screened.

Ms. Bryant answered yes; this is the staff's recommendation.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson reported that SCAD is a tenant in this building, but it is owned by the Scottish Rite. Therefore, he does not know what spaces some of the mechanical units serve. It may be Scottish Rite space or SCAD security. However, their scope only involves the installation of one additional mechanical unit to add some supplemental cooling. Therefore, there is no other exterior repairs or modifications to the project with the exception of an intake louver which was approved by staff. They will screen the unit they are adding. Now, there is a lot of junk on the side of the building, but it is well beyond the purview of their project. They have a very limited scope. They are only trying to fix some air conditioning problems in the basement and are not trying to renovate the entire exterior.

Mr. Judson said since SCAD is a tenant, they will still use Dr. Williams' request to recuse himself from participation of this petition.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Dawson if he was saying that the units have been on the building for quite some time.

Mr. Dawson answered yes. The units that are hanging are old. One unit is hanging on a rack and all kinds of stuff have been attached to the back of this building over the years. However, as he has stated, their scope is only dealing with fixing one specific issue in the basement. Therefore, they did not deviate beyond this scope. This would be a great issue to defer to staff because they had a mechanical problem and it is 100 degrees. They had to put the mechanical unit in place before they got the screening approved. Mr. Dawson said he did not feel comfortable with doing this, but they could not delay the project for 45 to 60 days waiting on the Board's approval. He does not know procedurally how the Board works, but it seems that this is something that is well within the capability of staff. As the practioners, it certainly would help them that when they have an immediate air conditioning problem to move things along quicker rather than trying to spend 60 days waiting on the Board's report.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Ramsay asked if the Board could retroactively enforce someone screen their unit or only as new units are installed.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ramsey if she was referring to the other tenants' units. If so, he is unsure; this would be a question for staff.

Ms. Ward explained that she believes they are stretching it a little, but they would still want to push the issue. In the past, if someone put a fence at the back of the property, it was ensured that they made space for the trash receptacles. She sees this somewhat the same.

Dr. Henry wanted to know if something of this nature should be included in the Board's motion.

Mr. Judson replied no; the motion is to deal with a specific portion of the property. The Board is only addressing what is before them today and not the other things that are on the building.

Ms. Ramsay asked staff if they felt comfortable approving air conditioning screenings or would staff rather it remain as Board approval.

Ms. Ward answered that the staff is comfortable approving the air conditioning screenings. She explained that at the end of this meeting, some new changes will be discussed because of the Unified Zoning Ordinance (UZO). Under the UZO, it is being proposed that fences, screenings and so forth that meet all the ordinance requirements would be at staff level review.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the HVAC screen as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

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
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Abstain

12. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4461 | 209 West Congress Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Roof Renderings.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a rooftop addition. Since the packets were sent to the Board, the petitioner has constructed a mock-up. This has been submitted to the Board today as an addendum. The petitioner has also supplied roof renderings that show the roof schemes as they are applying for tax credits for this project. Currently, the petitioner is proposing to construct the large addition. Staff is recommending that the clerestory be eliminated which would be more compatible with the medium size addition as shown in the roof renderings that the petitioner has provided to staff.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the new rooftop addition with the condition that the clerestory be eliminated to reduce the visibility of the addition.

Mr. Judson asked staff that if the clerestory section that is being recommended for removal is above the stairwell. He asked if this is a requirement of clearance in the stairwell.

Ms. Bryant answered no. The petitioner only wanted a way to introduce light into the stairwell. It is not a requirement.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that since the submittal of their application, they have had correspondence with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding tax credits. The SHPO summation is the same as the staff. The clerestory is certainly not an initial review. Therefore, they want to modify their application to include removal of the clerestory. They mocked-up what they are calling the small addition which is essentially removing the bar. Therefore, it is only two sets of stairs and two bathrooms which is the code's minimum to make a viable outdoor space.

Mr. Dawson said their concern, and they have talked with the SHPO representative, is that virtually there is really no difference between the medium and small in terms of its visual

recognition, although you can see a sliver of it from Congress Street on the medium and none of it on the small. Therefore, they believe that the medium version that the staff is recommending without the clerestory is most appropriate. Frankly, it gives their client the utility that they need to make the project financially feasible. Mr. Dawson said it is his mistake as he suggested that the fence be painted black on the screen wall. However, he believes it should be beige so that it is more compatible with the brick and the proposed stucco. He believes that the black would cause too much attention to the mechanical screen wall. The mechanical design has not been finalized. Therefore, he does not know the exact height of the units. Their concern is to drop as much as they can; however, this is subject to some future analysis. If it gets any higher, they will bring it back to the Historic Review Board, but they believe this is the maximum height that it will be. Mr. Dawson said their details show a 42 inch guardrail that sets back six inches from the edge of the parapet so that it is not visible, but provides the required life safety requirements. They are showing this approximately four inches higher than the parapet. Mr. Dawson said depending on how their structural nozzles ends up, this probably will not have to be here that they can make the parapet 42 inches. Nevertheless, they are going to submit this. However, from any perspective he does not believe that the rail would be seen. As a matter of fact, it does not show up in the renderings at all although it is a very small element.

Mr. Judson wanted to know what is the functional difference between what is called small renderings and medium renderings.

Mr. Dawson said the intent is to actually cut off the bar on the front in order to actually meet the code. When they did so as he has stated, it did not make a visual impact in the renderings. Therefore, they believe that this one is probably the most suitable and gave them most utility.

Dr. Williams asked what happened to the original roof structure.

Mr. Dawson said the roof becomes flat. This was one of their main issues when they went to the State for historic tax credits as they felt it would remove a lot of historic fabric. He was surprised that the State was not really concerned about the roof structure as much as the visibility of the second floor addition.

Ms. Simpson asked how would the drainage occur.

Mr. Dawson answered that he said flat, but it is one-quarter inch slope; therefore, it drains just as any other commercial roof.

Mr. Engle stated that what bothers him with roof heads and this is done on Broughton Street, there are tiki torches, railings, fake palm trees, and twinkle lights wrapped around the railing. In architectural drawings this looks fine, but this is probably the reality of what is going to happen. All you will see when this is over is umbrellas on the roof, chairs on the roof and this isn't the historic character. The staff is saying that this is the traditional use, but it isn't. They had a roof and sky.

Mr. Engle said he is concerned that the railing is going right up to the pediment. If it was pulled back six feet, a lot of the stuff that will be going on up there would not be visible from the street. Once this is approved and they start putting up the twinkle lights, the Board cannot do anything. He is concerned about this and it will happen everywhere in

Savannah. The roof decks will surface everywhere with shrubberies just like the old motor company on Liberty Street. Now, hedges are being grown on the roof. This is not historically compatible. These issues must be addressed now because once it leaves here, they cannot address it and zoning isn't going to deal with it. Therefore, he would like to see the railing pulled back just as was done on Jones Street so that what happens up there would not be visible from the site lines in the street. Then they could do all the drinking and partying they want.

Mr. Dawson asked, therefore, it is not the railing itself, but what goes on next to the rail.

Mr. Engle stated the rail is visible.

Mr. Dawson said their rail is set much closer to the parapet and much tighter.

Mr. Engle stated that when Mr. Dawson walks away from the job, twinkle lights could be wrapped around it as well. How will the lighting be up there? What is going to light the rooftop deck? There is nothing here about lighting, but it will be nighttime and it will be lit up.

Mr. Dawson explained that there will be low voltage lighting. The lighting source will not be visible, but, yes, there will be lighting up there. These are actually the same issues that the SHPO raised; although, they are not in the Board's purview, but they are bothersome to the state. They have talked with their client about this and it depends really on how they manage the rooftop. Therefore, he is not in a position to tell the Board what will happen after the building is built. But he sees Mr. Engle's point.

Mr. Engle said they don't know what is going to happen in the future, but they must protect the historic character now because they will not get a chance to do so later.

Dr. Williams asked the petitioner if there is a way this could be done without removing the original roof.

Mr. Dawson answered no. The existing roof is a four-twelve pitch. There is a fairly steep hip on it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry stated that not only would a lot of the fabric be torn out with the hip roof, but as Mr. Dawson has stated from some angles you will be able to see it. The implications sound serious to him.

Dr. Williams said one of the principles this Board operates is that changes the building especially when there are changes or additions so that they can be removed so that they are unobtrusive or conflicts as little damage on the building as possible. If there was some way that this could be done and he does not know if it means raising the parapet walls. If they

had a proposed addition to rip off the back wall of an existing building and create a new back wall, they accept the additions that get tacked on beyond existing walls, but retain existing walls. They have not had a lot of rooftop proposals. The ones they have had did not propose removing roof fabric; they were just sitting on top of the roof. He asked the Board if they knew of a precedence for removing original fabric.

Dr. Henry asked if it is not visible, is it this Board's purview?

Dr. Williams stated that if an addition is put on a historic building that goes beyond an original building wall and propose to remove the wall because it will no longer be visible. Not all historic fabric is visible.

Dr. Henry said they are talking about the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Mr. Engle stated it is the City's ordinance. You can't see it, but he believes this is irrelevant. But the Secretary's Interior Standards are relevant. The roof could be leveled and keep the whole structure, but then the pediment would have to be brought up three feet. This would change the front elevation. He believes this would be a worse solution.

Mr. Gay stated this might also raise the height of the room which would make it easily seen and this would be worse also.

Mr. Engle stated that the Board has approved numerous times the ripping off original back porches and building new three-story back porches. Likewise, they have approved taking walls out on back elevations and putting on new additions.

Dr. Williams replied this is what he asked earlier. Has the Board approved the removal of a back wall without any additions being built beyond?

Mr. Engle stated that he has less problem with removing a roof because it probably has been replaced three times since the building was built.

Mr. Dawson said they had a similar project approximately five years ago with a building that had a roof deck on the back. There was an existing roof structure that was not visible from the public right-of-way. They ripped it off, put in a new steel structure and a flat roof. It is currently a roof deck.

Dr. Williams asked which building was this.

Mr. Dawson answered that it was Churchill's at 13 West Bay Street.

Mr. Engle said at the Baptist Church on Montgomery Street or MLK, they took out the flat surface and they were able to put on a gable roof. Therefore, it has been done. He does not believe you can see the roof from any street level elevation, but his bigger concern is what will happen afterward. He believes the rails should be pulled back at least six feet from the front elevation and get rid of the clerestory.

Dr. Williams stated that he was not sure if changing the railing to beige would make it less visible.

Ms. Ramsay said it is not the railing that would be beige, but the screen. She asked Mr. Dawson if he has studied how far back the 42 inch high rail would not be visible.

Mr. Dawson answered presently it is not visible. It is set back six inches and comes up four inches. Therefore, based on the perspective from the parapet, you really cannot see the little top piece of the handrail. As he has aforesaid, based on their current design layout, the parapet would not require a rail, but he put it in here because of the worse case as he does not know exactly what kind of roof thickness he might have which would vary it three or four inches. He guesses the four inches is somewhat a fluff factor depending on how the actual roof structure pans out.

Mr. Judson stated that if he understands Mr. Engle's concern it is not really the visibility of the rail. Even if there was none, it would be the parapet, itself, as to what they will hang it.

Dr. Williams stated that page two shows a parapet and then the 42 inch metal guard. He asked how far is the guardrail setback behind the parapet.

Mr. Dawson answered four inches.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Engle how far was he suggesting that it be setback.

Mr. Engle stated he believes it should be at least four or six feet. The tables and chairs will be right there. If this is not obtrusive in the historic sense, then what is?

Dr. Henry asked if it is moved back as much as Mr. Engle suggested, how much space would be left?

Mr. Dawson stated that the Board's purview isn't "visually obtrusive" in the way that it is presented; to tell them they have to move it back 12 feet or not is an arbitrary number. If you can't see the rail, you can't see the rail.

Mr. Judson said to clarify this point unfortunately someone could put a palm tree on a pitched roof if they wanted or put lights on their chimney if they wanted to do so. Really the Board's purview is the architectural permanent features of the building.

Mr. Engle said the Secretary of Interior Standards specifically address uses and historic uses. Tables and umbrellas on a hip roof are not historic uses. What he is trying to do is to come up with something that will minimize a modern use. People did not sit on roofs and drink historically in Savannah. He is trying to be consistent with the Secretary Standards and still allow the project to progress. But, this Board denied Jones Street and pushed it back not just because of the rail, but because the visual factors of how it was going to be used. This is covered by the Secretary Standards.

Dr. Williams said may be this is not the setting, but some guidelines regarding roof uses need to be established. One of the things that they have to weigh is on one hand they do this beyond roofs such as elevators, back rooms, closets and everything else that allows buildings to continue because of their viability and involve urban settings. They need to be cautious about just saying that people don't use roofs historically because they do so now.

This is a part of the evolving life of a city. The Board should come up with some standards or guidelines as he believes the reality is green roofs will becoming increasingly a reality because of the ecology factors. They will not be able to say you cannot have a green roof on a historical building because historically they don't have green roofs.

Dr. Williams said the Board will have to contend with these issues. They have had roof terraces sometimes on new construction. If this increases the viability and liveliness of the downtown economically and otherwise, he applauds this. Therefore, he believes the Board needs to weigh the historical uses against the other imperatives.

Mr. Judson stated that in close proximity to this, he was picturing City Market where he believes a bar is here called "the roof." He could not say whether this is a historical building, but he assumes that it is not as it is in City Market. But, going down the street, you see umbrellas, lights, and everything else on top of the building which is approximately 100 yards away from where this is going.

Mr. Engle said there is a difference between historic and non-historic buildings.

Mr. Gay said because a mistake is made once does not mean that you have to keep doing it three, four or five times.

Mr. Judson said that Mr. Engle's point is valid that one was a new construction while the other was not.

Mr. Engle stated that he was not saying that it could not be used, but was saying that it be modified to the extent that its impact is less.

Dr. Williams said it appears that the permanent infrastructure which is being presented is not the Board's purview and may be this is a cause for zoning or some other City department to say no umbrellas on roofs or whatever. This is not this Board's purview.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Engle to elaborate again on the Secretary of Interior Standards regarding this issue.

Mr. Engle explained that Secretary of Interior Standards says that the "character" of the property will be retained and preserved. Now, what is the character that is in front of the elevation of this building - a flat pediment and sky. It is not a flat pediment with umbrellas, palm trees and teke porches. What he is saying is let's try to push it back enough if they keep this line.

Mr. Judson said the Board needs to make some decision on a motion. He believes that Mr. Engle has voiced some valid concerns.

Mr. Gay said there has been a lot of talk concerning whether this project is financially viable without doing what is requested. But, he does not know whether it is financially viable if it is not done. If this is not done would this stop the project completely because all the stuff would not be put on the roof?

Mr. Judson said he understood Mr. Engle's interpretation of the Secretary of Interior Standards regarding roof as it affects the character of building. But, it is not this Board's

purview to consider whether Mr. Tundra is going to have diminished revenues if the rooftop is denied or modify the square footage of the rooftop addition. This is not this Board's purview to consider.

Dr. Henry said he was reading the staff's recommendation and it appears quite consistent with the recommendation to reduce the visibility of the addition.

Mr. Overton asked that Mr. Dawson, who did the perspective renderings, if the rail was moved back six feet, would it hide the umbrellas, tiki lights and the other things that might be up there.

Mr. Dawson said his purview and the purview of this Board are the permanent improvements to historic structures and not whether people drape towels over the parapet or put up tiki lights. He said that he has no control over this. He has asked Mr. Tonroe what he believes will put up here and Mr. Tonroe told him that he does not know. He asked the Board members would they want to sit up here without some kind of shade devise. How tall would the shade devise be? Will they all be the same color? How far back would they be set? Mr. Dawson said he does not know the answer to these questions. Frankly, these are movable personal items and are not permanently affixed to the structure. It is a matter of operation and not a matter of permanent improvements or renovations. Therefore, it is beyond his purview.

Mr. Thomson said as he has listened, he has a couple of observations. If the Board is talking about what potential uses go on in this building, it is really not this Board's purview. If a restaurant or bar put tables and umbrellas up there, he was not sure if it would be within the purview of this Board's design review. Mr. Thomson stated that he offered these two statements so that the Board may focus on what is their purview. He believes that staff has provided a clear recommendation. The railing is somewhat setback to begin with. Now, it could be debatable as to what extent. These are his observations and he only offers them so the Board could move forward.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Thomson how would he lodge his observation with the idea that twinkle lights would interfere with the character using the Secretary of Interior's terms of the building.

Mr. Thomson said he missed the discussion regarding the twinkle lights.

Dr. Henry said according to Secretary of Interior Standards, the key word seems to be "character." If umbrellas and various other things are put on the rooftop, it would violate the Secretary's concerns about the character of the building. He said apparently this is not the same as "use." Dr. Henry asked Mr. Engle if this was correct.

Mr. Engle replied that "use" is irrelevant. It is the character of the building.

Dr. Henry stated that the way they are using it would change the character of the building.

Mr. Judson said if they get into defining terms, there is the building and everything on top of the building. As he tries to focus in on the Board's purview, their purview is the

building. Their purview is the architectural permanent changes to the building. He said not that he isn't sympathetic to what has been said about uses and other things that may be up there, but he gets a sense that the Board is stepping outside of their purview in terms of design standards and architectural features of the building.

Mr. Thomson guessed he was confused a little because just across the street, the Board denied some structures for Zunzi's. They have tables and umbrellas up everyday. They take them in and put them out. All of City Market has tables with umbrellas and he believes that lights are strung. Now, may be these should not be here either, but he believes that the Board is outside of their purview.

Dr. Henry said he was only trying to get clarification on the rules.

Ms. Ramsay asked what if the twinkle lights were put up prior to approval of this Board. Would they have to remove them?

Dr. Williams said these are not permanent features.

Mr. Dawson said they have a similar issue downtown with sidewalk dining. The City has done an excellent job of developing design standards and criteria for what sidewalk dining has to look like. There are obviously some horrendous rooftop dining examples that exist in Savannah. He believes that rather than this Board trying to make its purview something that it is not, he believes it would be better to have a separate City department that manages and dictates things such as sidewalk dining and standards in terms of color, use, height, tiki lights, etc.

Mr. Engle said there is a problem. It is the historic character of this property, but not a bar on the roof. What they are trying to do is to accommodate it.

Dr. Henry stated that he believes Mr. Engle is confusing "character" with "use."

Mr. Judson said the positions have been expressed and he believes there is a difference of opinions. He encouraged that someone make a motion and allow their opinion to influence their vote on the motion. But there are some members who feel that these are architectural features while some members feel that they are not. Mr. Judson said he believes the arguments have been made.

Mr. Engle read from the Secretary of Interior Standards that "a property will be used as it was historically, or given a new use that requires minimal change."

Mr. Judson stated for the record, that they confer with City and Zoning use so that Mr. Engle's concerns regarding things that end up on the roof is a result of architectural changes come under the purview of the appropriate City agencies.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the rooftop addition with the condition that the clerestory be eliminated to reduce the visibility of the addition. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2007 Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Parts I and II, of a two-story wood frame carriage house on the rear of the property. This property was on the Consent Agenda as well. Also the Board has previously seen the rehabilitation of the main principal structure.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the two-story carriage house with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval: 1. The apron must not encroach into the lane; 2. Light panels in the garage doors must meet window design standards for muntin size and profile (7/8 inch simulated putty glazed); 3. and 3. Provide material for shutters.

Mr. Gay asked Ms. Ward to clarify how the lot coverage percentage was determined.

Ms. Ward explained that they take the size of the parcel (a survey is shown on page 1) with the boundary lines; calculate the footprint of the building and then the footprint of the carriage house. Anything that has a roof on it is included in the coverage. The building has open space on both sides and in the front which gives it a little more greenspace than the average townhouse lot which is usually built to the property line and encroaches over.

Mr. Gay said the only part in the back that is not going to be built on is approximately 300 square feet.

Ms. Ward stated that the courtyard is very small. This will have to be verified again by the Zoning Department.

Mr. Gay asked if the entire lot is 3000 square feet.

Ms. Ward stated that the parcel is 30 x 100 for a total of 3000 square feet. The footprint of the main house and the additions are 1,476 square feet. The carriage house is 602 square feet. They calculated a total of 69 percent lot coverage.

Mr. Gay stated earlier it was said that the little part that will not have anything on it is 300 square feet.

Ms. Ward said the open spaces would still need to be considered.

Mr. Gay said this could not be less than 15 percent of the lot. At this point they are at 300 square feet which is ten percent of the lot that is still open. If they wanted to add all the other things in here, it could not be another 15 percent of the entire lot. It doesn't seem right.

Ms. Ward stated that the staff can redo the calculations. However, she believes that if the Board is supportive of the project, they could specify in their motion that if it does not meet the lot coverage requirement that they are not supporting or condoning a variance from this standard and that they require that the 75 percent standard is met. She would not want it to exceed the coverage and the Board's approval be seen as some sort of condolence or recommendation of the lot coverage exception. Ms. Ward said the petitioner may be able to answer the question about the lot coverage, but she calculated it.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward to talk a little about the hip roof of the existing portions of the gable roof of the carriage house addition and how is this compatible within the lot lines of this development. How does it compare to the roofs of the adjacent properties? He said visually it does not make sense to him to not have a hip roof on the carriage house addition. However, he does not see it on the surrounding houses in the area.

Ms. Ward explained that they do not always make it look exactly at the same house. She remembers there was a house on East Gaston Street in the Beach Institute Neighborhood and the roof shape of the carriage house was not the same shape as the main house. Sometimes the buildings are different. But, if the Board feels this is important they can stipulate it. She said, however, she feels it is compatible because there are a number of different roof types in the area. It is not like they have a series of hip roofs all along the street. They have jerkin head roofs, hip roofs, gable roofs, gable pediments and all different types of roofs in this area. The neighboring property is a gable roof with side gable pediments.

Mr. Overton said it looks odd with only the drawings of two roofs being different. But, if there are multi-types of roof styles in the neighborhood, then he believes that it could blend in.

Ms. Ward stated that she feels the complexity of this portion of the district allows a little more expression within the architecture and more variety, but this is only the staff's

opinion.

Dr. Williams stated that he had a question regarding the metal sample that was shown to the Board. He said he was convinced that the two indentations, although granted is on the roof and has a relatively low pitch, will catch light and shade. He wanted either Ms. Ward or the petitioner to shed more light on the availability of one that is flat.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner could address this issue. She has seen the panels without the ridges. Since this is new construction, she is still recommending approval of it, but it is left to the discretion of the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cadman asked the Board if they wanted to discuss the profile of the roof.

Dr. Williams said the sample shown to the Board has two troves in the middle. He asked if there were not samples that have a flat surface.

Mr. Cadman answered that with this manufacturer, he does not believe so. This was just this particular manufacturer's lowest profile that they had to offer.

Dr. Williams stated that it is not the height of the standing seams as it is more of the indenture or whatever they are called.

Mr. Cadman said they are crimps.

Dr. Williams questioned these being crimps.

Mr. Overton stated that this is how they are made.

Dr. Williams said he is not aware of these being in the historic character of the metal roof. He advised Mr. Cadman that if he could find a sample he suggested using one that is flat. Dr. Williams also suggested that Mr. Cadman work with staff and investigate other roofing suppliers.

Mr. Cadman said if this is needed, they will work with staff to do so.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Cadman if he is the owner.

Mr. Cadman answered no.

Dr. Henry asked him what is his role.

Mr. Cadman answered that he is the designer of the project.

Ms. Ramsay explained that they have had this issue a lot of times. Windows are shown on the property line closer than three feet. These windows must be fire rated assemblies. She has never seen this work because of the cost. She asked Mr. Cadman if his intent is for the windows to be fire rated assemblies.

Mr. Cadman stated that he would have to look into this.

Ms. Ramsay was certain that the petitioner will not be allowed to have a washer/dryer opening onto a stairwell as this is the only means of egress.

Mr. Cadman said he will remove the door entranceway to this.

Ms. Ramsay said the lights in the top of the garage doors look horizontally split as horizontal lines runs through them that further divides them. She would rather that the horizontal line be eliminated so that the windows would be as vertical as possible.

Mr. Engle asked what the fire rated assemblies would look like.

Ms. Ramsay said because they are so expensive, no one has done them.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier, representing the Historic Savannah Foundation architecture review committee, reported that the committee agrees with the staff's recommendation for the approval. However, they wanted to suggest possibly reducing some of the ornamentation such as the lighting pattern on the garage door and some of the door casements to further differentiate from the main structure.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle questioned the windows and what would the Board vote on.

Ms. Ward explained that at this point, they can only vote on what has been submitted. The petitioner has submitted for a window-type which is probably not going to meet the building code. This will have to be addressed. The petitioner can come back with an alternative request to either close it or come back with a fire rated window. She does not know if there is a fire rated window that meets the standards. Potentially, there may be a shutter that encloses the opening so that there will be some sort of fenestration.

Mr. Engle said there are a lot of issues.

Dr. Henry wanted to know if an extension should be requested.

Mr. Engle said there are roofs, fire rated windows, and scale issues. He agrees with HSF that it is a little too decorative and too fussy. Maybe this should be simplified a little.

Mr. Judson said a motion could be made that the consideration of the windows come back for review by the Board; a different style of standing seam roof be found and include into the motion the different recommendations regarding the design detail.

Ms. Ward said the staff has already made its recommendation. If the Board is comfortable with Part I, they can make a motion to approve Part I only.

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
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
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

14. [Amended Petition of Alexis Aubuchon for Coastal Heritage Society | H-10-4253\(S\)-2 |601 W. Harris St. | Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4253\(S\)-2 Amended.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4253\(S\)-2 Amended.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

15. [Amended Petition of Mark Fitzpatrick for J. T. Turner Construction Co. | H-10-4307-2 | 122 East Taylor St. | Wall/Fence Replacement](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4307-2 Amended 6-23-11.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4307-2 Amended 6-23-11.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

16. [Amended Petition of Kent Harrington | H-10-4319-2 | 518 E. Bryan St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4319-2 Amended 6-23-11.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4319-2 Amended 6-23-11.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

17. [Amended Petition of Sam Brinkley for Matthew Allan | H-11-4441\(S\)-2 | 521 E. Charlton St. | Existing Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4441\(S\)-2 Amended.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet4441\(S\)-2 Amended.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

18. [Petition of Charlie Angell | H-11-4443\(S\)-2 | 23 Montgomery St. | Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4443\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4443\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

19. [Petition of Alethia Canady for Coastal Canvas Products, Inc. | H-11-4444\(S\)-2 | 28 Drayton St. | Color Change/Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4444\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4444\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. [Petition of Alethia Canady for Coastal Canvas Products, Inc. | H-11-4447\(S\)-2 | 59 Barnard St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4447\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4447\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Alethia Canady for Coastal Canvas Products. Inc. | H-11-4448\(S\)-2 | 46 Abercorn St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4448\(S\).pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4448\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Faye Anne Chaplin | H-11-4449\(S\)-2 | 534 & 536 E. Harris St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4449\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4449\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Rebecca Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4450\(S\)-2 | 409 East Liberty St. | Existing Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4450\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4450\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Chris Norman | H-11-4452\(S\)-2 | 407 E. Hall St. | Repair Existing Side Porch](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decsion 4452\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4452\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of James F. Wubbena | H-11-4454\(S\)-2 | 201 Habersham St. | Existing Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4454\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packett 4454\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Tony and Carol Chen | H-11-4456\(S\)-2 | 352 MLK Jr. Blvd | Remove Non-historic Metal Cover](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4456\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4456\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Pamela McCaslin | H-11-4457\(S\)-2 | 503 E. President St. | Repaint and New Composite Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4457\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4457\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Fulford - Swinney, LLC | H-11-4459\(S\)-2 | 522 East Bryan St. | Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4459\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4459\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

29. [Urgent Care](#)

Ms. Ramsay questioned what happened with the Urgent Care awning.

Ms. Ward explained that the City Development Services department is aware of this. Staff has taken pictures and sent them to Development Services. To her knowledge, enforcement has not been done regarding the awning. But, she has received numerous calls. The staff has tried to get clarification, but has not been successful. Ms. Ward informed the Board that she does not know what is the problem.

Mr. Judson, for the record, wanted it noted that Urgent Care on Lincoln and Oglethorpe Avenue and Taste of India Express on State Street have non-conforming awnings.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward to update the Board on the county owned building that this Board had no approval rights regarding the screening that the Board talked about approximately nine months ago.

Ms. Ward explained the building is the County Courthouse. The HVAC screening has not been done. They are still trying to come up with a solution. She has been working with Assistant County Manager Pat Monahan and Historic Savannah Foundation to come up with a screening that would be appropriate and compatible with the building. What they have now is a conceptual design for a copper louvered screen.

Mr. Overton stated, therefore, it appears that the county is working in spirit with what this Board would like for them to do.

Ms. Ward replied yes.

Mr. Overton asked if the multi-million modal bus station will be a county owned building.

Mr. Thomson answered technically it will be.

Mr. Overton asked why did this come to the Board.

Ms. Ward explained that the County wanted to bring this to the Board. However, they did not have to go through the full review, but they did.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

30. [Invitation to tour SCAD Museum | July 19, 2011 from 11-12](#)

Attachment: [Planning Commission Thomson SCAD Museum Tour 051011.pdf](#)

Mr. Judson reminded the Board that they have been invited to tour the SCAD museum building on Tuesday, July 19, 2011 from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon. They will meet at the MPC office at 10:45 and a bus will take them to the SCAD Museum.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

31. [2011 Historic District Board of Review Retreat](#)

Mr. Judson informed the Board that Ms. Ward is helping plan their Annual Retreat. They still have the agenda open for suggestions for topics. Friday, September 16, 2011 and Friday, September 23, 2011 are being discussed as possible dates for the retreat. They are hopeful that the Coastal Heritage Society will be able to make a presentation regarding some of their work. They will ask the Coastal Heritage Society if possibly they will be able to host the meeting at their facility.

Mr. Judson asked the Board that if they have ideas for content or alternate ideas for venue and/or input on the dates to please let Ms. Ward know.

Ms. Ward stated that the Coastal Heritage Society agreed to have the retreat at their facility. In the past, the retreat has only been held one-half day, but if the Board is agreeable this year, may be they could do the entire day. Last year, the retreat was cut short and the Board did not have time to have their discussion among themselves regarding some issues they wanted to talk about.

Mr. Judson asked the Board to let Ms. Ward know about their availability for the hours to hold the retreat. He said may be they could do six hours as

opposed to a full eight hour day.

Ms. Simpson suggested that the start time the Retreat is 9:00 a.m. or 10:00 a.m. She also believes that some time should be built in where the Board can do the "warm fuzzy" among themselves. Last year she was fairly new to the Board and did not know a lot of the members. They did not get the opportunity to do something that would let them get acquainted with the members.

Ms. Ward informed the Board that City Council has on their agenda for their workshop on Thursday, July 12, 2011 to appoint two new members to the Historic Review Board.

32. [Fall 2011 Historic Preservation Commission Training - Thursday, September 29, 2011 - Rome, Georgia](#)

Mr. Judson reminded the Board that State training will be held on Thursday, September 29, 2011.

Ms. Ward said this year, the State is including this training with their Downtown Conference. The Board may only attend the Historic Preservation Commission training or they may attend the entire conference. MPC will be able to pay for one Board member to attend the one day training session.

Mr. Judson said he would love to see a new member attend this training, however, he believes the individual would need to have some context about what is the purview of the Board. Also at the conference, interaction is held about what the Board does; therefore, he believes Mr. Engle or another experienced Board member should attend the training. It was the consensus that Mr. Engle will attend the training.

33. [Trees in Parking Lots](#)

Dr. Henry said he read an interesting letter that was written to the Editor regarding trees in parking lots. He asked what is the status.

Mr. Thomson said he has plans to talk with the Zoning staff about this. However, it is interesting as the person who wrote the letter to the Editor lives in Miramar, FL. This is south of the community where Mr. Thomson lived while in Florida. Instead of having tree islands in the middle of parking lots, they have tree rows which are between the heads of the cars. The tree canopies grow and meet. What they end up with is a tree covered parking

area. Mr. Thomson believes this is what the writer was referring to. The Planning Zoning Board in Florida for the commercial properties was the architecture review board and there were no rules. Therefore, it was what could be done with the applicant.

Dr. Henry said speaking as a citizen, he is hopeful that a tree ordinance could be put in for trees in the parking lots.

Mr. Judson informed the Board that the Mayor and Aldermen will have their Town Hall Meeting on tonight at 7:00 p.m. Some time will be allotted for the discussion of lighted and digital billboards.

Ms. Ward reminded the Board that the Unified Zoning Ordinance (UZO) is out now for public comments until September 30, 2011. The UZO is available online for downloading. Comments may be made online pertaining to this document. One of the proposed changes in the UZO, is to reduce the number of members on the Historic Review Board from eleven members to nine members. However, they have to do according to what is presently in place now. Therefore, she believes that City Council will fill the two vacancies on this Board. Ms. Ward said many boards will be affected. Consequently, at this time, she does not know what will be the process.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

34. [Next Meeting - Wednesday August 10, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

Mr. Judson reminded the Board that he will not be able to attend the meeting next month as he will be out of town. Vice Chair Overton will chair the August 10, 2011 meeting. He asked all the Board members to please be in attendance.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 4:50 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.