



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

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

MARCH 9, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Members Not Present: Richard Law, Sr.

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

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Mr. Judson called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve February 9, 2011 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [02-9-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve 02-9-2011 Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

3. [Amended Petition of Patrick Shay | H-09-4200-2 | 28 Abercorn Street](#)

This site was not properly posted because no posting signs were provided.

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

4. [Petition of Douglas Farley - H-11-4379-2 - 63 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd - Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

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

5. [Petition of James Reardon - H-11-4385-2 - 125 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. - Exterior Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

6. [Amended Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay Architects - H-09-4200-2 - 28 Abercorn Street - HVAC Rooftop Screen](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Judson advised the petitioner that the Board members did not see the proper posting of signage at this location. A staff member went to the site today and did not see the signs posted.

Mr. Shay said they were not issued signs. They assumed that since this was requested by staff in order to bring something into compliance, it was not a new petition.

Mr. Judson stated unless he gets objection from the Board, he will move forward with this petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. Originally, this item was on the Consent Agenda as it is a fairly simple straightforward proposal. The property received approval from the Historic Review Board and was rehabilitated. The final inspection revealed that the HVAC units on the roof were visible from the east and north. The ordinance requires that the units be screened. Staff has been working with the petitioner for months to come up with the appropriate screening that would not draw more attention to itself, but shield the units from view. The petitioner is requesting to use a simple wire mesh screen to be coated in a black vinyl. The petitioner intends to grow fig vines up the side of it around the HVAC units.

Ms. Ward stated that in speaking with the petitioner, Georgia Power wants to install aluminum barrier bars or control gates as shown. This is actually the plan that was originally submitted to the Historic Review Board. She believes it was approved, but subsequent reviews and upon consultation with Traffic Engineering, they decided not to do the barrier arms. Therefore, this was not on their construction documents and, therefore, was not stamped. Their final approval was for two metal posts and a chain. But, now they want to go back to the aluminum barrier arms at the Lincoln Street opening for vehicular access to the property.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the petition as amended.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward to the best of her knowledge has the Traffic Department been consulted on this aspect and if so, are they in agreement?

Ms. Ward answered that according to the petitioner, Traffic is in support of what they have been shown.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay stated that the Traffic Department does not condone or support anything. However, Traffic has been apprised of the situation and has no objections. He said Georgia Power has been very cooperative from the beginning and they are prepared to move forward with the screening improvements as soon as they are approved by the Board.

Dr. Williams asked about the objects that were shown on page five. He wanted to know if the two objects were to the left of the condenser unit or the cluster on the right.

Mr. Shay answered that the cluster on the right is a building on Johnson Square.

Dr. Williams said the units are very tall. He asked if they had to be vertical or could they

be laid down to make the profile lower.

Mr. Shay answered no. These are multi-staged, multi-variable units. However, they did not anticipate that the units had to sit on a rack above the roof. They did not calculate the height of the rack and this is why they are a little taller than the parapet. The drawings that were originally submitted showed that they are obscured. From Congress Street they are visible from a distance of about two blocks, from Lincoln Street they are visible primarily because a building is not here.

Mr. Engle, from a technical interest, wanted to know how the fig ivy would get on top of the building.

Mr. Shay said the fig ivory will be taken up on the top of the building and planted in large pots. He was not sure if it would be fig ivy as it may be jasmine, but the point is it will be a vine and they will use the condensation from the units to water the vines.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Attorney Harold Yellin stated that they welcome Georgia Power into the neighborhood. He is with a firm across the street and they did not receive notification of this petition. He is also a managing member of the garage across the street and they, too, did not get a notice. They do not have an objection to the screening, but he was not aware that the units could be seen from Lincoln Street. Obviously, it is an improvement to screen the units. Attorney Yellin stated, however, with the gates that will open, he realizes it is only a visual compatibility issue, but they have a garage across the street that has three hundred cars. He does not know whether cars coming down the street would have to put in a Control Card and hold the traffic up or whether the gates are remote control. Therefore, if he had seen notification of this from the Historic Review Board, they could have had input with the City of Savannah Traffic Engineering Department. He was present for something else, but was surprised to hear about Georgia Power today. Attorney Yellin said he would like to hear more about the gates.

Mr. Judson informed Attorney Yellin that the staff could answer his concerns about the notification and Mr. Shay could clarify the gates. However, his understanding of the gates are that they will come down after hours to prevent unauthorized parking. Mr. Judson asked would the gates be operative during business hours.

Mr. Shay explained that the gates will be operative 24-hours a day. The people who are authorized to park in the lot will have a clicker similar to what is used on a residential garage door. This causes the arms to go up so that the individual could enter. The idea is to keep unauthorized persons from parking here at any time.

Mr. Judson asked if this has gone before Traffic Engineering.

Mr. Shay said their civil engineer for the project who got all the development permits has been in contact with Traffic Engineering and has notified him that Traffic Engineering had no objections.

Mr. Judson asked Attorney Yellin if this answered his question.

Attorney Yellin said he could not answer the question because if they had received prior notice, they could have anticipated a process and the result may have been different.

Mr. Judson explained that he was somewhat at a loss because the Board is looking at a design and not a function. Therefore, this falls out of the Board's purview in terms of the timing and what possible impact it might have.

Mr. Shay stated that indifference to Mr. Yellin's concerns, would it be the proper thing for him to ask for a continuance. He would be willing to do so, let his client know that they will reappear in 30 days, and he would be sure that the property is properly posted.

Mr. Judson said he did not want to dismiss a neighbor or another member of the public's input on the project. It appears that something has been circumvented at no fault of the petitioner. He said Mr. Shay could request a continuance, but he was trying to get a sense of the Board's feelings.

Mr. Engle said the Historic Review Board would not say the gates are appropriate in any case. Traffic hold up is not an issue of this Board. All they do is review this on the basis of what appears; and it appears fine. Therefore, why would they continue it?

Mr. Judson answered only in that they have several intervening bodies, including Traffic, that rather than approve it and tell the petitioner to move forward with something that could be contentious given that they have a petitioner who is willing to delay this part of the process by 30 days.

Attorney Yellin stated that he agrees with Mr. Engle. If the issue is visual compatibility, he has no issue with the Board voting on the petition today. They can always meet after this meeting and discuss this with Traffic Engineering. His intention is not to hold up the petitioner. But, it is a concern when you show up here and find your neighbor changing plans and it does have an impact.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Johnson stated this Board is responsible for the design. He understood that Mr. Shay has already contacted Traffic Engineering. He does not believe that this petition should be continued if the Board is okay with the design.

Mr. Overton stated that page three of the submittal shows an elevation of the screen. He was having difficulty reading the elevation. He asked if the screen is covering all the condensers. What is the little hump in the middle?

Ms. Ward answered that it is the condenser unit. It rises a few inches above the screen, but she believes that the petitioner has done well in screening it. She also does not believe it needs to be screened to the full height of the HVAC units because sometimes it draws attention to itself and someone would be looking up at an angle. They actually want the screening to be as minimal as possible to screen it from the right-of-way.

Dr. Williams asked if the angular view question could be posed to the petitioner. He asked if the Board was correct in their assumption that this is an at grade at the elevation

roof top.

Mr. Shay answered yes. It is roof top equipment.

Dr. Williams asked how much of the condenser is visible above the screen.

Mr. Shay said the parts of the units that are visible and have the grills that appears to be objectionable, are screened. If the Board wants the screen six inches taller, he will be glad to do so. However, he felt it was not necessary.

Mr. Judson explained he believes that what the Board is trying to clarify is at street level; standing in front of the parking garage on the other side of Lincoln Street, if a part of the condenser protrude above the screen.

Mr. Shay stated until the vines grow, you will be able to see through the screen.

Dr. Williams said it appears whether more green screening or green screening with a little bit of condenser being shown at the top. He said it also depends on the material of the condensers whether it will catch the sun and become a little beacon, than he would rather have the screening higher.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Shay about the materials. Are they painted or aluminum?

Mr. Shay said the existing compressor condenser is a power-coated metal and is painted.

Dr. Williams said the materials look metal and grayish.

Mr. Shay said they are all metal.

Dr. Williams said if the metal caps on the condensers are unpainted aluminum, they theoretically could catch the sun. Does the Board want less greenery, shorter screen with the condensers sticking their heads up or want the screens six inches higher?

Dr. Henry said he favors the latter. He does not see how they could object to six inches more screening instead of the vines. It would be better than having the condensers peeping over.

Ms. Simpson did not believe it was a big issue.

Dr. Williams said he was not making it a big issue; he believes that the petitioner is asking for one thing; but a few members of the Board believes a little higher would be good.

Ms. Simpson said she disagrees. The screen needs to be minimized as one would pay more attention to the greenery.

Mr. Judson said he does not believe that the shape of the caps would reflect at eye level. If anything, they may reflect upward. But he does not believe that they will become shimmery beacons on the top. He agrees with Ms. Simpson.

Mr. Shay said this has not been proven to be obtrusive thus far. As a matter of fact, you

have to really look for these things to see them. Mr. Yellin did not notice they were there until this meeting.

Mr. Engle said a big green cube on a roof of a building is weird. Therefore, he, too, believes it should be minimized. He does not mind if six inches of cap is shown. They see this everywhere they go in this town. This is not unusual.

Board Action:

Approval for the rooftop HVAC screen and the addendum for aluminum barrier arms. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Gene Hutchinson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

7. Amended Petition of Commonwealth Construction - H-08-4010-2 - 457-467 Montgomery Street - Exterior Painting

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Keith Woods of Commonwealth Construction was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval to amend the application for the rehabilitation of 457-467 Montgomery Street. The request is limited to the finish treatment on the exterior requesting approval to paint the fiber cement siding with USA Topcoat wall solar system. The exterior fiber cement siding of the building is not historic. The petitioner, however, should use caution to use the product properly so as not to trap in moisture that could go undetected because of the surface treatment. Also, the exterior material is not historic, it is not wood, and the proposed acrylic finish coat provides an exterior visual appearance of a product similar to latex or oil based paint.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends after-the-fact approval of the elastomeric paint with the matte finish on the nonhistoric fiber cement siding for this property. However, she stated that staff does not believe that elastomeric paints are appropriate on historic fabric as a blanket approval and should be reviewed on a case-by-case. This could be helpful to some masonry buildings and historic facades, but should be reviewed individually because not every case is identical.

Ms. Ramsay asked since this is an after-the-fact, "how did this come to the attention of the staff?" Did the petitioner request the after-the-fact approval or did someone advise the staff?

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioner reported it. Because it has an acrylic finish, she does not believe that anyone would know that elastomeric was underneath what is a typically approved paint. She stated that the contractor came to her requesting approval for this on a historic wood frame building citing these cases as examples where it was approved. When she researched what had been approved for the projects, she became concerned and wanted to be sure that there was a record of getting the elastomeric paint approved specifically for these properties, but not as a blanket approval for other properties across the board.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward, for clarification, that when she researched the properties being discussed today she realized that the paint that was used was not what the Board previously approved.

Ms. Ward answered correct.

Mr. Engle asked if this paint was used on the trim.

Ms. Ward was unsure. This is a question that could be asked of the petitioner.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Woods stated that Ameritect trim was used on the majority of the properties. Ameritect is a synthetic product similar to the fiber cement siding.

Dr. Henry stated that Mr. Woods said majority. He wanted to know if another product was used also.

Mr. Woods answered that the gables also are fiber cement siding and it is hard to say exactly what percentage. A lot of the wood was deteriorated and had to be replaced. Therefore, there could be a few pieces of wood still there, but he does not know exactly.

Mr. Engle understood Mr. Woods to be saying that there is no original fabric left in the exterior.

Dr. Williams asked about the porches.

Mr. Woods stated that new standing seam metal was used. He said Ms. Ward did an excellent job in reporting the petition. The entire process was his fault as he made an

erroneous assumption in thinking that the product was approved. Everything in the product, even the MSDS that was reported on is classified as an exterior latex. All the research that he has done online regarding latex is now a misnomer. There is "no latex" in latex paint; it is acrylic resins and water base. Latex is a term used to describe water base, but actually there is no latex in it. As he has stated, the elastomeric paint is classified in this classification and it seems to him that there was no reason to seek further approval. The assumption was that this product was consistent with most of the other products available on the market labeled as latex paint. Mr. Woods apologized for the confusion and said they appreciate the Board's consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Eli Karatassos resides at 464 Montgomery Street, which is directly across the street from these units. He has watched the dilapidated buildings be converted into beautiful buildings. On many occasions he has complimented the owner on the work that was being done. He could not speak to the technical issues about the paint, but the paint looks perfectly natural and has greatly improved their neighborhood. Even the units on Gaston Street is a great improvement. Mr. Karatassos stated that as a resident in this neighborhood, he recommends that the Board allow the units to be completed. This might generate that more people would want to build in this area.

Mr. Judson thanked Mr. Karatassos for his input as he lives in the area and has seen the quality of the finished product more than anyone. This is valuable information.

Board Action:

Approve elastomeric paint with a matte finish acrylic top coat on non-historic fiber cement siding for the property at 457-467 Montgomery Street. Elastomeric paints are not appropriate on historic fabric and should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Nay

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

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

8. [Amended Petition of Commonwealth Construction - H-09-4162-2 - 406-416 West Gaston Street - Exterior Painting](#)

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

Mr. Keith Woods of Commonwealth Construction was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. This property is the sister townhouse property to 457-467 Montgomery Street. However, only one side of 406-416 Gaston Street was painted with the elastomeric paint due to our pending concerns with the product being used. They were told to seek further approval of the Historic Review Board before proceeding.

Ms. Ward reported due to the property being nonhistoric, staff recommends after-the-fact approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Mr. Judson thanked Mr. Karatassos for coming forth and make positive comments regarding the petition for 457-467 Montgomery Street and this petition. The Board gets a lot of comments about "not in my back yard" which are valid and they all are watching out for downtown, but it is refreshing to see a neighbor take the time to come and be supportive of a project. As stated in the Board's Mission Statement, they are about the economic vitality as well as other factors; not that the Board will approve every rehabilitation and every development, but it is positive to see positive things happening particularly in this corridor.

Board Action:

Approve elastomeric paint with a matte finish acrylic top coat on non-historic fiber cement siding for the property at 408-416 West Gaston Street. Elastomeric paints are not appropriate on historic fabric and should be reviewed on a case- - PASS

by-case basis.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a row of two-story wood frame townhomes on the property at 307, 309, and 311 East Huntingdon Street. The petitioner is also requesting a finding-of-fact and a recommendation for a three percent lot coverage variance from the 75 percent of maximum requirement for the center parcel at 309 East Huntingdon Street. In the Board's meeting of January 12, 2011, the petitioner requested approval for Part I and II, but requested a continuance at the meeting to address some of the Board and public comments. Today, the petitioner only submitted an application for Part I Height and Mass.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for new construction Part I Height and Mass and recommends that the Historic Review Board recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals for approval of the three percent lot coverage variance from the 75 percent standard for the center lot at 309 East Huntingdon Street.

Dr. Henry stated he believes one of the problems at the meeting in January was with the air conditioning units.

Ms. Ward stated she did not hear a comment from the Board about the air conditioning units, but the public had concerns. The ordinance requires that the air conditioning units be screened from the public right-of-way and this requirement has been met. The air conditioning units are Part II design and today the Board is looking at Part I Height and Mass.

Mr. Engle stated that the Board could look at the air conditioning units when they review Part II Design.

Dr. Williams asked if the rules have changed regarding how staircases encroach onto public sidewalks. Throughout downtown historical buildings' staircases leading up to the first floor were out on the sidewalk. In fact, the newer buildings that are next door do this.

Ms. Ward stated that she would argue that there are no historic buildings within this block, either on the north or south side, encroach into the right-of-way. She would be objectionable to them having stairs that did so. They are supposed to look to the historic buildings to determine what is visually compatible. The district starts to transition at the Victorian district and the buildings become larger and have large surrounding spaces.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward to zoom in on the sidewalk on the monitor the historic buildings to the right. He asked if the buildings at the end of the block on the far right were historic.

Ms. Ward stated that she questions the accuracy as she does not believe they project over the sidewalk. This is a really nice ten foot wide brick sidewalk. However, this is a question that could be asked of the petitioner.

Dr. Williams asked if the buildings on the left are more modern construction that do encroach on the sidewalk.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams stated that from a massing point of view, exactly what will be read more than the steps will be the front plane of the bays and they are setting further back than anything else on the block.

Ms. Ward stated that this is actually the front porch of the building. There is a coping wall and a garden wall.

Dr. Williams said the footprint drawing is a bit misleading as the front plain of that building is the leading edge of the porch which is one-story tall not the full two-story height. Its front plane will be even further back.

Ms. Ward said the Board makes the decisions, but she believes there are a lot of texture and diversity in this block. She does not want them to encroach onto the sidewalk as she believes this would be incompatible.

Dr. Williams stated he was only trying to understand that when he sees these plans what they are looking at. He asked Ms. Ward that as far as she knows the plans may not be accurate regarding the historic buildings at the end of the block which encroach on the sidewalk.

Ms. Ward stated she was unsure. This question could be asked of the petitioner.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deacon apologized for the misleading information on the site plan. As far as the property boundaries and buildings location, they can only attest to the accuracy of their lot. He explained that the shaded areas shown are their buildings coverage. Therefore, this does indicate the extent of the roofline. He felt that the historic building on the right encroaches a nominal amount into the sidewalk. But the one directly to the left of it steps back enough that there is a lot of texture in and out on this streetscape. They chose to push their building back to have a little bit of planting area to somewhat take away a little of the harshness of the building next to it to soften the overall look of the three building unit.

Mr. Overton realized this would come up in the Design section, but the compressors are shown on the drawings.

Mr. Deacon stated that the compressors are located on the rear porch. They must have 18 inches of clearance around the compressors for them to function properly.

Mr. Overton stated that in the elevation view, the top of the units are not shown.

Mr. Deacon said the units are screened. They will have a louvered panel and the compressor unit will sit behind this.

Mr. Overton asked if these would be exposed.

Mr. Deacon said he does not have with him the exact specifications of the condensing units, but he does not believe they are tall enough to be seen from the right-of-way.

Mr. Overton asked him to check this out for inclusion in his next presentation.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Deacon, for clarification, if he was putting the air conditioning units on the front.

Mr. Deacon answered no. This is the view from the lane.

Mr. Engle thanked the team for going back and taking the Board's comments seriously. The comments he made have been addressed.

Mr. Judson thanked Mr. Deacon also. Today, this seems like this is the process that will work. He appreciates that Mr. Deacon took the comments into consideration.

Ms. Ramsay stated that when Mr. Deacon comes back she would appreciate it if he would have a section through the false shutters.

Mr. Deacon thanked the Board for the opportunity to bring the petition back. They made minor, but significant changes and he believes the changes were done for the best.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that he was aware of what Dr. Williams was saying, but this block is strange and there is no consistency within this block. The only thing that is consistent is the Victorian love of landscape. Every building with the exception of the modern building next door, has a garden plot. Mr. Engle believes it is critical that these units have it or there will be more inconsistency with the block. The fact that the steps are not going onto the sidewalk allows for a small garden plot. Mr. Engle believes this is a good compromise.

Mr. Gay said it is a nice transition from the new houses.

Mr. Judson said two issues which the Board considered 60 days ago were the simplicity of the buildings on a fairly, if not a consistent basis, then at least somewhat an elaborate block that had both Italianate and Victorian buildings and also the garden space.

Dr. Williams asked if the door placement would fall under the purview of height and mass or does it come under the design.

Mr. Judson stated that the rhythm of solids and voids are a part of height and mass.

Dr. Williams said one thing he finds peculiar about the middle house is that the entry door is in the middle of the house. This means that it cannot be a side hall plan which makes him wonder that when you enter the middle house, will you enter into a parlor. The other two houses are side hall plans. The plans do not show entire walls configurations which is not this Board's purview, but the door placement is their purview.

Mr. Deacon said the plan is somewhat wide open. The stairs are on the side and it could be called a side hall plan, but they are not wide enough to be separated into a parlor, dining, kitchen and a circulation side that goes to front/back. These are narrow lots. They struggled to get three somewhat repetitive forms. This did not work with the sites. Therefore, they compromised and went with the continuous single-story porch and the center entrance in the middle unit. He said you do walk right into the living space, but it is because of the product they were going for on the outside.

Board Action:

1. Approve Part I Height and Mass for new construction
 2. Recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals for approval of a three percent lot coverage variance from the 75 percent maximum on the center parcel (lot 3 or 309 East Huntingdon Street) based on the findings for Variance Criteria [Sec. 8-3030 (O)].
- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: W James Overton
Reed Engle - Aye

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

10. [Petition of Ricky Barrow for Mainsail Construction - H-11-4371-2 - 148 Price Street - Rehabilitation, Alteration, and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Ricky Barrow was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting rehabilitation, alterations, and an addition to the building at 148 Price Street. Ms. Ward recommended that the petitioner submit an elevation drawing of the new addition. The petitioner is not doing anything to the historic building on the south side; it is wood siding and they will only be repairing it. We need the mere elevation which they had to submit when they got their permit just to verify that it does match what is going on the other side of the building.

Mr. Engle asked if twenty risers are legal on a stairwell.

Ms. Ward stated that she cannot answer that question. However, if the petitioner did not meet the building code, the building official will not approve it. A representative is present from the Development Services Department and he is giving her a nod yes.

Ms. Ramsay stated that it cannot exceed 12 feet vertically.

Mr. Engle said that no dimensions are stated on the plans. Therefore, he could not tell anything. The stairwell looks too narrow to meet the standards.

Ms. Ward stated that she is asking as a condition of the approval that the balcony be raised to be above the band board on the storefront. She is asking for a slight change in this. The Board can request that dimensional drawings be submitted of the stairs at that time. But, if the petitioner does not meet the building code they will not be issued a permit.

Dr. Williams asked about the original entrances. Originally, these were two houses fronting Price Street. He asked Ms. Ward if her research revealed whether the two openings, especially the opening on the far right, was historic. The fenestration suggests that the houses had slightly different footprints because the distance from the corner to the outer windows are different. One has a narrow entrance. The cinder block is new, but could the entrances be historically located entrances?

Ms. Ward replied that she could not find any historical photographs of the buildings. She could speculate about them, but she does not have anything to confirm or deny this. All she knows is the entire wall was rebuilt at the ground floor. Maybe they did look at what was there before and put entrances on the other side, but she cannot confirm this.

Dr. Williams said if they knew definitively that these were where the original entrances were and their proposal is to remove the two new entrances in the middle, what would the staff's position be on this?

Ms. Ward answered that she feels the integrity of the ground floor has been compromised to such an extent that the slate has to be almost wiped clean. To install a commercial storefront, an argument could be made that maybe two storefront doors would be compatible. She believes that the petitioner's proposal is compatible with the building and speaks to the fact that they are going to have one tenant.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward that as far as she knows, this will be one store and will not be divided with a wall.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked if there will be two doors functioning as one entrance.

Ms. Ward believes it will be, but this is a question that can be asked of the petitioner.

Mr. Engle stated that page 19 shows the doorway that Dr. Williams mentioned from the inside, but it is brick. The door is in a brick wall all the way over to the concrete block.

Ms. Ward explained that this period did not show up on the Sanborn map.

Mr. Johnson said this Board's responsibility is to look at the design. As has been aforesaid, no dimensions were listed and the staircase is small.

Ms. Ward explained that the ordinances require that the residential balcony not project any further than three feet from the face of the building. They would not want it to be wider than three feet and according to the petitioner's plan, it is at three feet. The Board is correct, no vertical dimension is shown on the balcony. As a part of her approval, she is requesting that this be relocated. Therefore, whatever the dimension, it will change.

Dr. Williams stated that on the north elevation that would serve this balcony, the doorway in the petitioner's drawing shows a transom window that is level with the height of the windows, but on the original fabric, there is not a transom. One can see through the peeling siding that there is a vertical stud that presumably comes down to the header on top of the lintel. His guess is this is not an original opening. The drawing shows that the transom is added which would have an impact on the original framing and siding over the door.

Mr. Gay said the doorway does not appear to be original.

Dr. Williams said adding a transom would make the doorway taller.

Mr. Gay asked if the Board knows how tall the window is as a piece of plywood is on top of it.

Ms. Ward explained that she does not believe the petitioner will be changing any of the window openings. The windows are existing.

Mr. Gay said the window further back appears to be even with the doorway and then something is on the top of it.

Ms. Ward said at some point, the windows were shortened. At one time, they were much taller.

Mr. Engle said both of the windows have been reduced.

Ms. Ward said both windows were reduced in height and the siding above is shown. She believes the petitioner is going to take them back to their more historic appearance by reducing the boards where the windows were shortened. However, she believes these are questions that need to be answered by the petitioner.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Barrow stated that the door has been changed many times with several different modifications. There is metal at the ground floor. He does not know if the building was originally two stories. Much as been done to this building. He would have to go back and look at the pictures to see what would be revealed pertaining to the transoms. Mr. Barrow believes that it is possibly still framed with what looks like an after effect. All the windows have been reduced and he also believes the door has been reduced too for the balcony.

Dr. Williams suggested that as Mr. Barrow proceeds, if an opening wasn't there and the door stops short of the height of the windows, leave the door as is without cutting away more of the fabric and putting in a transom.

Mr. Barrow said they will not be adding anything that is not there. They will keep it the same. The only thing they will add are the windows. As the Board has seen from the pictures, the windows are boarded. They will make the windows uniform across the front. The height dimension on the balcony is 11 feet. But they are happy to move up or down according to whatever Ms. Ward recommends. Typically, their dimensions are on the actual framing and they don't put a lot of the dimensions on the exterior, but they can easily add the dimensions here. As for the columns in the back, Ms. Ward has mentioned to him about changing these to square columns and they are fine with this. The door as shown in the picture on the right, they did the selective demolition work. At one time, a bar was here. From what he remembers, much work has been done here and the second floor does not resemble anything that would show it being a separate entrance other than the door shown on the brick; of course, none of the brick is uniform. Different bricks are used throughout this building. The front blocks are completely different.

Mr. Engle stated that the framing is exposed on the interior.

Mr. Barrow said he can provide a picture of this. At one time he believes the building had aluminum windows. The main door will serve as an entrance to a wholesale antiques.

Downstairs will be the antique shop and upstairs will be used as the residence. Presently, the way this is now, you cannot get upstairs. This door has been changed many times.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Barrow if the second floor window openings would be enlarged to match where they were.

Mr. Barrow answered yes. But, they will have to use a little play to be able to fit the windows where they were, but they will be matched to previous windows.

Mr. Engle stated that the windows do not appear to be much larger than the existing in the elevation.

Mr. Barrow said the windows are actually up higher than what the Board sees.

Mr. Gay asked about the width of the balcony and the staircase will be dictated by

Mr. Barrow injected by three feet and they have to maintain the building code as well. This will be a form of egress for the homeowner.

Mr. Judson explained that the staff had a recommendation about the finish at the peak of the roof. He asked if there was an issue about the shape of the aperture.

Ms. Ramsay stated it is the added vent.

Mr. Barrow stated that the vent that is here now, the designer actually drew a triangular vent. But, they will rebuild what is here.

Mr. Overton said he was curious about how the siding on the building would be done. Will the petitioner come back and say that he cannot do what he thought he could do?

Mr. Barrow answered that they will try to save anything they can. Since 90% will have lead based paint all over it, they will save the pieces that they can. They will repair what is beyond repair with pine lap siding.

Mr. Overton questioned what if they could not find the material.

Mr. Barrow said the siding is commercially available. Guerry Lumber has the exact siding in stock. It is not uncommon and Guerry Lumber can mill their own siding as well.

Mr. Overton asked if it is uncharacteristic to do this sort of work.

Mr. Barrow answered no, but it is a lot of work. It is not uncharacteristic, the most problematic thing he saw so far was the downstairs.

Mr. Overton advised Mr. Barrow that he was speaking of replacing the siding.

Mr. Barrow said they will follow the standard procedure. The only other thing would be to go to a fiber cement, but he knew this would not be historical and they would not approach this.

Mr. Gay asked that with the flat roof in the front, does it indicate that may be this was originally a porch?

Mr. Barrow pointed out that this is a gutter. It is an inverted gutter which caused all the rot that is in the building. They will take off the existing roof shingles and repair it with a waterproof membrane and put the shingles on top.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Barrow that after he receives all of his approvals, is it his intention to proceed immediately?

Mr. Barrow said his intent once he gets all the approvals and knows which way they need to go, he will come back to Ms. Ward with the color changes and windows. They want to be sure to get the windows that match and make sure the door is done. Once Ms. Ward tells them they are approved, then they will apply for a permit to get started on the work.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Barrow, therefore, his intention is to move forward.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Barrow if his intention is to remove the lead paint from the existing boards.

Mr. Barrow said they will have to do this. They will have to do lead paint abatement on the sections that are flaking.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Johnson said this is a big task. Cinder blocks are here now. The Board needs to see the petitioner's plans. He is putting an addition onto the building.

Mr. Engle said his concern is there is no sense to review plans that do not have dimensions on it.

Mr. Barrow said he does not know if Ms. Ward presented the actual plans to the Board. This is just a copy of the plans for the house. They usually put the dimensions on the interior. They can, however, go back and add the dimensions on the plans. Everything is laid out in the plans.

Ms. Simpson said she would like to see the dimension drawings. She is aware that Mr. Barrow said it is not typical. She is further aware that the Board uses a case-by-case basis, but a previous project recently came back to this Board that was approved previously by another Board. One of the main issues with the return of the petition was that the dimensions were omitted from the drawings. Therefore, Ms. Simpson believes it is definitely imperative that the Board sees the dimensions.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward does the rule require that the dimensions are submitted to the Board.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes that the drawings need to accurately represent the project. The petitioner has dimension floor plans, site plan and building sections with dimensions. The dimensions are not there on the height of the balcony. However, she is asking the petitioner to change this anyway. The petitioner would either have to come back before the Board with the balcony dimensions. She does not know whether the Board wants the dimensions on historic building or the Board can put a condition that the petitioner provide the dimensions when they present their permit to staff for approval.

Dr. Henry stated staff seems to believe that the dimensions have been submitted while some members of the Board believe they are not adequate dimensions.

Ms. Ward agreed that some dimensions are missing from the plans. The dimensions are on the floor plans, but not on the existing structure because it is existing. The petitioner has provided the building section. Therefore, she guessed they have a more horizontal dimensions versus the vertical dimensions. The Board could request that the petitioner come back with the vertical dimensions or submit the dimensions to staff.

Mr. Gay said the vertical dimensions are set primarily by what is here now. The block will be taken away, but in doing so the wood part will still be there and what's below will be the storefront.

Mr. Engle said they have looked at three or four sheets that they have had to redo for a new storefront on Broughton Street. But, they have no details on this storefront at all. What does the moldings look like? How big are the windows? The Board has no details. He believes everyone needs to be treated consistently. He agrees further that the building is a disaster and its amazing that it has not fallen down already, but he does not think that a month's wait to provide some details is going to make a difference. This Board has been too particular about previous storefront designs to just accept this with no details at all.

Mr. Judson said he agrees strongly with Mr. Engle. He told Mr. Barrow that typically this Board is charged to render a decision. He believes that the entire Board is supportive of this project in concept and in many of the details that they can define that it is an exciting project and they would love to see it move forward, but, yet, there is certainly some reluctance to give an approval at this point. Mr. Judson does not believe that the Board has been given enough details information on the prominent street facing unless he was missing something in the packet.

Ms. Ward stated that dimensions are in the plan and a section is "to scale" through the storefront showing where the horizontal moldings are.

Mr. Gay stated he believes Mr. Engle was concern that the Board could not tell what are the details around the windows. It is just an opening and some wood will be here.

Ms. Ward stated that the building section on page 4 is clear and shows all the wood cuts.

Mr. Judson said as he was going through the pictures, he saw some things that were not presented up to this point. Therefore, they don't want to say something is not here if it is.

Mr. Engle said he sees structural framing on the storefront, but he does not see any

moldings.

Mr. Barrow said he was informed that the details should be as plain as possible. Therefore, it does not represent historical structure. They are showing a three-quarter to a one-inch scale. It shows what the dimensions will be with the sills to the raised wood panels, by the door, window sill boards and their frame court for the trim around the door.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Barrow to elaborate on what he said about the design of the storefront windows. He said Mr. Barrow made a comment about just being plain.

Mr. Barrow said he believes their original design looked more like what is downtown now. They did not want to add something that would give a false sense of historical development.

Dr. Williams asked if this was given to staff as he would have liked to have seen them.

Mr. Barrow said he had it with him and passed it around to the Board members. He said this was one of their first drawings.

Mr. Gay said the balcony goes around the entire front.

Mr. Barrow said the owner originally asked for this and they were going to try to get a variance, but they eliminated the balcony and made it where it has two separate structures.

Dr. Williams said since this is easier to read than what the Board was previously looking at, he wanted to know if the eight-by-eight post with the chamfered middle section was still present.

Mr. Barrow said yes.

Dr. Williams asked if the fixed glass transom window and moldings around those are still present.

Mr. Barrow said yes.

Dr. Williams said he is interested in knowing what is staff's concern with staggering panels.

Ms. Ward said the staff recommended that the petitioner eliminate the little brackets.

Dr. Williams asked about the panels below the windows.

Ms. Ward said the staff did not recommend that these be changed.

Dr. Williams said he was only curious as to where the decisions are being made.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner has now gone back to a simplified raised wooden panel base which she believes is compatible.

Mr. Engle asked how wide is the glass for the storefront.

Mr. Barrow answered that they are six foot panels.

Dr. Williams said one centerline to centerline on the post, the drawings show a little more than eight foot on each bay. Is the glass six feet?

Mr. Barrow said it is 80 inches by 60 inches glass rod along with an 80 inches by 16 inches panel.

Mr. Engle said the transom should be split.

Mr. Barrow stated that if the transoms are what need to be split, this is not a problem.

Dr. Williams said if the transoms are split, the petitioner might want to split the corresponding panels below the windows.

Mr. Engle said it is massively horizontal the way it reads now, but splitting the transoms and panels should help to break this up.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner did submit some storefront examples that are around town, but she believes that the standards are really clear that you are not suppose to use references from other historical properties on your properties. Therefore, they did not include those in the packet as this should stand on its own. She also believes that in 1880, this was actually a two-story residence and there was not even a commercial ground floor. The commercial ground floor did not get introduced until the 1950s. Consequently, whatever is here in order to meet the standards should be of its time.

Mr. Judson said he wanted to move forward, but this is becoming somewhat a quagmire. He wanted to get a sense in the Board's discussion is whether someone wanted to make a motion or if fundamentally the Board does not feel they have enough information, then the petitioner might want to ask for a continuance.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Barrow why they did not put the door in the center of the elevation. As he looks at this, the door is shifted to one side.

Dr. Williams stated the door is centered, but the windows are off centered. There is no real middle to the elevation. The second floor windows on the right are spaced more widely a part; the windows on the left are narrower.

Mr. Engle said the second floor is read center to window as being the center.

Dr. Williams said may be and may be not. This is a hard call. These were two separate houses.

Mr. Engle said they are not dealing with whether they are still houses.

Mr. Gay said the windows are not evenly spaced.

Mr. Barrow said to answer the Board's question, if they look at the right side and notice

that there is a six-by-six concrete block which is the structure for the corner, but on the left there is no six-by-six and this is what is existing. If they pull the measurements actually from the plans, one has the outside measurements and the other has the inside-to-inside measurements. This is why they don't look centered, but they are centered. The upstairs windows are existing in place.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Barrow if the windows upstairs dictated that he put the doors between the two middle windows and this is why it is off centered.

Mr. Engle said the doors are not centered between the windows. They are shifted to the left.

Dr. Williams asked if a firewall is to the left.

Mr. Barrow said there will actually be an interior firewall.

Dr. Williams said in order to achieve what Mr. Engle is suggesting, the window on the right would have to be narrower than the window on the left to achieve the centering of the doors between the two windows.

Mr. Barrow explained that they approached this in two different ways. 1. leaving the historical structure as is upstairs and 2. center the downstairs as it should be. They did not want one window to be shorter; therefore, this is what is shown.

Dr. Henry said the petitioner might want to ask for a continuance. He was unsure of what the Board expects from the petitioner.

Mr. Judson explained that the concerns that he has heard deals with some elaborations on the dimensions not only of the porch and balcony, but also some cross-sections on the front window design. The Board has seen and heard some discussion about the transom areas above the windows. He believes the Board needs to go through the staff's recommendation point-by-point and make sure the Board members are on the same page. If a Board member has a concern that has not been addressed, he would like to hear it now so that everything would be laid out on the table.

Mr. Judson explained further that the Board could make a motion that specifically addresses not only the staff's recommendations, but also any concerns they have going forward either that they be submitted to the Board or to the staff.

Ms. Simpson stated that her concern is with the dimensions of the balcony. She is aware that the staff mentioned this in their report.

Dr. Williams said the dimensions of the balcony are on one of the drawings.

Mr. Judson explained that this will be going before City Council who will grant the egress with the cooperation of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Engle said the Board has discussed numerous times storefronts especially on Broughton Street, but they did insist in the past on several projects that the storefront had to sit on a masonry eight-to-twelve inches tall. He asked Ms. Ward if this was a standard.

Ms. Ward believed this issue came up at one point when she was not at the meeting. She remembers that Ms. Reiter called her about this. But the standards say "*storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an eighteen to twenty-four inches tall base of the contrasting material to the lintel.*"

Mr. Judson said his recollection is that it did not specify granted masonry. There are several examples of wood both existing and approved.

NOTE: Ms. Simpson left the meeting at 4:33 p.m.

Board Action:

Approval of the rehabilitation, alterations, and additions with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval: 1. Submit a detailed section drawing of the window moldings in the storefront; 2. Retain the existing rectangular gable vents; 3. Submit door and window manufacturer and specifications; 4. Balcony to be above the storefront and feature brackets. 5. - PASS
Approval of balcony and stair projection into lane contingent upon review from Bureau Chief's through the encroachment application review process; 6. Consider using chamfered square columns on the porch addition to correspond to those in the new storefront. 7. Submit stucco finish and exterior colors to staff for final approval.

Vote Results

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

11. Petition of Greenline Architecture - H-11-4380-2 - 407, 409, 411, and 413 Alice Street - New Construction, Part I and II

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. John Deering of Greenline Architecture was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction (Part I and II) of a row of two-story wood frame townhouses on the properties at 407, 409, 411 and 412 Alice Street. A General Development Plan was submitted to the City on February 28, 2011. Comments included consideration of the drive-way with regard to future development of the lot immediately west of the subject property. Ms. Ward believes the property is owned by the same owner. A shared driveway may be more beneficial to both parcels as a double driveway would not be appropriate on Alice Street.

Ms. Ward stated that staff had a number of conditions on their recommendations, but the petitioner has addressed all the conditions in the addendum that was provided. Therefore, staff recommends approval with the condition that the petitioner study further articulation in the roof line and/or the solid areas between the base to strengthen the vertical character of the building.

Dr. Williams said the drawings show that the parking is roughly 14 feet deep. The rear elevation shows the cars parked straight in and the plan shows angles with the rear ends of the cars sticking out from the back of the building. He believes that there are no doors.

Ms. Ward said correct; there is just an opening.

Dr. Williams asked are there any requirements that a garage be large enough to accommodate an average car.

Ms. Ward stated that we don't have requirements in the Historic District ordinance, but she does not know if the City has requirements.

Dr. Williams said from the point of view of massing, it appears that the garages are unorthodox.

Mr. Engle stated that it would have to be one-way circulation also.

Ms. Ward said she believes that is their intent and this is why Traffic Engineering said they do need two curb cuts. But the plan is what the City was looking at and not the elevation. This is a more accurate representation of the garages.

Dr. Williams said all the cars will be hanging out at the back of the building. He has never seen anything like this.

Ms. Ward was hopeful that this would not be visible. The screening wall goes along MLK and a building is next. But, she does want to see the cars sticking out either.

Dr. Williams said he would ask the petitioner what size is the vehicle that is used in the

drawing since the average vehicle is 16 and something feet. How would a SUV get into one of the spaces?

Ms. Ward said they would look at the size of the openings and compatibility if they had doors.

Dr. Williams said he was wondering how ultimately functional they would be. The cars that will come in on the left of each unit will have their noses touching the staircase. He remembers the row of houses that are between Price and Habersham Streets north of the Police Station. Curb cuts are here and they were to be driveways, but no one uses them as driveways.

Ms. Ward explained that here, they need to look at the impact on the right-of-way which are the two curb cuts. There is visual compatibility and she does not believe they will be visible because a screen fence and a building obscure them from view. She believes that the opening size is not compatible unless they did have a door. However, if it is not visible, then the impact to the district is little or none. Because the parking is at the rear of the building, there will be no cars hanging out over the sidewalk.

Dr. Henry asked about the proposed fence on the right.

Ms. Ward pointed out where the proposed fence is to be located. But, the petitioner would be better able to answer this question.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Deering confirmed that this is a very unconventional approach and one of the reasons they decided to do it this way was for the very reason of the development between Price and Habersham Street. He does not like the solution and across the street from this and a little further down on Berrien Street there are some new townhouses with garage door openings that have a 45 degree angle sloped to get into the garage and you cannot do so. It looks horrible and is a terrible solution. They wanted their row houses to resemble the very simple townhouses they built in this area. He believes the townhouses are very successful and coming up with parking for the RBC-1 lot was a difficult challenge. Therefore, to design it from a street point-of-view where the front is on Alice Street and the two sides look like a two and one-half room deep small townhouse, they thought was the best solution. To carve the parking in the back is not uncommon and directly across the street, there is a conduit development where from the street you can see the cars parked under the building. Also on Howard Street, there is another row of houses that have parking that you can see from Jefferson below the structure. This was built approximately four or five years ago. Consequently, it is not that it has not been done, they just tried to be a little more successful with this because from the public right-of-way, you would not view it as the building is carved out with parking beneath it.

Mr. Gay stated that he believes the question is, "is it really feasible." Can someone actually park here?

Mr. Deering said you can actually park here. He said to get into the first parking space on left will be a five point turn if the tenant wants to live here and wants the off-street parking.

Sometimes it is a five point turn to get into a carriage house off of a typical Savannah lane and persons who live downtown knows this. This is not best solution, but it is a solution and he believes they were successful with it.

Dr. Williams said the little porch/stoops that are in the garage show two sets of stairs. He asked Mr. Deering what if they scaled them back and just had a couple of steps going up to the door and then they would gain a little more depth for the cars.

Mr. Deering said this could be a possibility, but he believes according to the code, a landing is needed outside the door. But, they can have steps in one direction and not the other.

Dr. Williams said the petitioner would need to be careful with this because if a car is there, you have to get to the door.

Mr. Deering said these were drawn with 16 foot-long or wide cars.

Dr. Williams asked if it was a lot coverage issue that prevents the depth for the building from being coming a little further south.

Mr. Deering explained it is not that; to do that angle parking you need that dimension in order to smoothly back in and out. Anyone who has used angle parking knows that a certain amount of space is needed to back out and successfully go forward. Therefore, this is why it is not pulled further south. Many of the stoops in the neighborhood were on the public right-of-way in the old row of houses and a very wide sidewalk is here about 14 feet wide.

Dr. Williams said he applauds the petitioner's desire not to have garage doors on the front of these houses. He notice that the houses in the back in this area have decks and over looking the tail ends of cars sticking out. He just wanted to know if this was a lot coverage issue.

Mr. Deering stated that it is not a lot coverage issue. They are well below the lot coverage.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Deering if in other words he was saying that if the walls were longer, than the turn could not be made.

Mr. Deering replied precisely. He said a building is being planned for the lot on the left; therefore, the screened fence will not be here forever. Mr. Deering asked Ms. Ward if the photo sheet they sent with similar rows of houses is included.

Ms. Ward answered yes. It is included in the packet sent to the Board.

Mr. Deering said they sent an amendment and challenged Ms. Ward with the vertical articulation in adding pediments or gables, etc. to the structure. There are many very simple small wooden townhouses in Savannah. Therefore, they were of the opinion that vertical articulation was needed. They intentionally kept them simple.

Mr. Engle said this is not the Board's purview, but he believes the biggest problem is there is no storage for gardening tools, bicycles, etc.

Mr. Gay said there is no gardening. Therefore, why would they need storage space for this. His concern is that the residents will not actually use the parking back there. The parking is provided, but it will be a hassle to get into the parking space and the people will park on the street.

Mr. Deering said the ceilings are ten feet tall.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve for new construction, Parts I and II. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

12. [Petition of Signstar - H-11-4381-2 - 701 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Christina Price of Signstar was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for an illuminated principal use facia sign for the Food Lion.

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

Mr. Engle said the building looks great. The trees were planted yesterday.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Price stated that the returns are white and the dove grey is traditional with the trim cap. Now, all of it is white.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the illuminated principal use facia sign. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

13. [Petition of Rudd Long for Cogdell & Mendrala Architects - H-11-4382-2 - 14 Price Street - Demolition and Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Don Cogdell of Codgell & Mendrala Architects, PC was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish a two-story addition constructed in 2008 at 14 Price Street due to improper installation of the roof which has caused severe structural damage to the addition. The east wall and a portion of the north wall of the original structure were removed when the addition was constructed. The petitioner is requesting approval to return the historic portion of the

building back to its existing form prior to the construction of the addition.

The petitioner wants to be forthcoming with the Board and let them know that they intend to come back with a new addition for this property.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the demolition of the non-historic addition and reconstruct the original building walls as submitted.

Dr. Williams asked if actual Savannah historic gray bricks were available is there a preference of reusing historic gray brick instead of replicas.

Ms. Ward answered that this is a question that the property owner could answer, but it is the staff's opinion that since the petitioner is trying to rebuild the walls, she would like for them to reuse the original bricks. Where the walls came down, they do have a large portion and will reuse them. However, the petitioner did not have enough bricks for the entire job. She believes, though, that if the opportunity arose, the petitioner would consider this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cogdell stated that they do have a quite bit of bricks, but don't know how many. Nevertheless, their intention on the north elevation is to use all the original Savannah gray bricks. If it gets to a few bricks, they will definitely get Savannah gray bricks, but they just do not have a quantity. Mr. Cogdell said they would like to lower the jack arches on the side of windows to get some relief between the cornices and the top of the jack arches. As Ms. Ward reported, there is a future addition. However, they would like to get this one to stand on its own until the future addition is resolved. They will drop them down to a pleasing position and will work with staff on this to ensure that they all are on the same page. They are excited to get started.

Mr. Engle stated that if this is to be a reconstruction, why put the arches on if they are not going to be what is here now. Ms. Ward said earlier that if this was uncovered in the future, the original opening would be there. But, this will not be the original opening because they are changing it to make it more aesthetic. He did not understand why the petitioner would not just leave the jack arches off as it will not be what was here three years or five years ago.

Mr. Cogdell said he does not know if it was there five years ago, but the jack arches are not really that important as they will not match the original construction anyway. It is not their intention to match what was here, but to replicate it.

Mr. Gay asked if the doorway on the first floor will be removed to the middle.

Mr. Cogdell answered yes.

Dr. Williams asked if the two openings above would be blind openings.

Mr. Cogdell answered yes.

Dr. Williams said if they had a photo of what was originally there and they will have two openings, the only difference is that his would go up.

Mr. Cogdell said their intention is to build them similar.

Dr. Williams asked to clarify that the petitioner would not build them as in the drawings, but as closely as possible.

Mr. Cogdell said there is a shower behind one of them now. If all of the house was completely remodeled, then the wall of the other bricks were taken down. They are only trying to bring it back compatibly.

Dr. Williams asked if a parapet is in the back of the drawing.

Mr. Cogdell answered that a parapet is on the front and rear, but not on the side.

Dr. Williams asked if the parapet they see on this photo is it on the rear.

Mr. Cogdell stated that it will be.

Dr. Williams asked if the parapet will be as tall as shown.

Mr. Cogdell answered that it is the same height as the parapet in the front.

Mr. Engle asked to see the elevation again and asked if it is on line with the bottom of the cornice.

Mr. Cogdell stated that a different house is here now (next door at 16 Price Street).

Dr. Williams said there are six courses of bricks on the original parapet. He said assuming that the petitioner's drawings are inaccurate, if he is going to be using front parapet this will be a condition of the approval.

Mr. Cogdell stated that it is not drawn exactly right. The two horizontal lines may be the courses of the brick.

Mr. Engle asked if the elevation is visible from the lane or anywhere else.

Mr. Cogdell answered no.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval to demolish the non-historic addition and reconstruct the original building walls with the

condition that the rear parapet and second floor blind windows be reconstructed to match the pre-existing condition. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Richard Law, Sr - Not Present

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

14. [Petition of Bradley Brigman - H-11-4383-2 - 720-722 Habersham Street - Rehabilitation, Alterations, and Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Bradley Brigman was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of a rehabilitation, exterior alterations and signage for the property at 720-722 Habersham Street.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed sign and neon banding as an exterior alteration to restore the building to an earlier period of significance, beginning in the 1930s, based on photo documentation submitted for review. Photo documentation and physical evidence within the building were used to develop storefront replacement, doors, and garage entry door. The garage entry door will maintain a vertical board pattern to be consistent with the period of significance. Staff also recommending approval of the change in the roof from asphalt shingles to the standing seam roof. Staff further recommends that the lighting plan be clarified; replacement windows for the second floor of the original historic portion must be replaced to match the windows that were removed, either three-over-one, true divided lights, single-pane glass, double-hung sash wood framed windows; provide a section through the wood handrail; confirm location of utilities, refuse and mechanical systems; and consider installing awnings over the storefront, consistent with the historic appearance of the building.

Mr. Engle asked if handicap ramps were shown in the gray area in front of the entrance.

Ms. Ward stated that she did not notice this until Mr. Engle asked the question. This is what it looks like, but the architect is present and could answer this question.

Mr. Overton asked if the color was shown in site 3D model.

Ms. Ward answered no; she asked the petitioner the same question. As far as she knows, the red brick will remain. They have not requested to paint it and they are proposing white siding and requested beige window sashes. The new pedestrian doors are to be a stained cherry finish.

Mr. Overton asked, therefore, none of the colors have been presented thus far.

Ms. Ward stated that the colors have not been presented in the elevations. The petitioner has used the color model, but it is not representative of what the paint will be.

Dr. Henry said he remembers that the last time this issue came before the Board, they basically denied it because they wanted to find out what was underneath the vinyl.

Ms. Ward clarified that there was an original proposal in 2008. This application to restore the building and it was going to retain the wood siding and repair the existing vinyl siding. The application today is very similar and consistent to the original application. In 2008, the petitioner received approvals and clearance to proceed. The property owner in the interim decided that he wanted to pursue using hardi-plank as a replacement siding material on the project and this is what was denied. The overall project for the rehabilitation was never denied; it was approved every time that it was presented to the Board.

Dr. Henry stated he believes that this Board's motivation for the denial, at least in part, stemmed from wanting to see what was under the vinyl.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner was requesting approval to change the material. But, today the petitioner is not requesting to change any materials. The petitioner wants to match the existing condition.

Dr. Henry stated again that he believed the motivation was to find out what was underneath the vinyl.

Mr. Engle explained that the proposal as stated was there was no wood siding under the vinyl. The Board went out and find wood siding under the vinyl. The petitioner wanted to use hardi-plank, but the Board denied the hardi-plank.

Mr. Judson stated, however, this is not the question before the Board today.

Ms. Ward stated that this is not a part of the petition today.

Dr. Henry said there is a combination of wood and vinyl presently on the building.

Ms. Ward stated correct.

Dr. Henry stated that Ms. Ward did not address the brick building on the side which is a separate structure.

Ms. Ward stated that this is an addition that is attached to the building, it is existing and

was approved by the Board which was built as approved. The petitioner has to put the roof on and the petitioner needs approval to do so; the garage door and railing have to go there also.

Dr. Henry said his understanding is the Leopold's built the brick building years ago as a residence.

Ms. Ward explained that prior to the approval in 2008, the building was vacant. After receiving approval, the petitioner built the upper story. But, she does not know what it is being used for.

Dr. Williams wanted to know if a historic building has vinyl siding within the Historic District, does the zoning guidelines allow them to replace it with inkind material.

Ms. Ward stated she believes the petitioner would be allowed to replace it as an inkind replacement of what is here. She believes that in this case, the petitioner actually had approval from the Review Board in 1983 to install vinyl siding on this building. At the time, it was not designated historic and we did not have standards for vinyl siding, but it is an inkind replacement of an approved product. This is not something the petitioner did illegally or without approval.

Dr. Williams asked that if a building doesn't have vinyl on it, then they cannot put the vinyl on it, but because the building has vinyl on it, they can do so.

Ms. Ward said that would be a change in material and requires a review and approval and she would not support it in that instance.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Brigman stated that he was aware that the Board had problems in the past with this and he thanked them for reviewing their request today. Mr. Brigman said the property owner is ready to complete the building and he has been hired to finish the project. Mr. Brigman said the Board had questions about a ramp. However, it is not a ramp. It is their model. The sidewalk is at different elevations. He said the Board had questions about the siding. He reported that the siding was deemed on the north side of the building to be rotten. Mr. Brigman said he believed the last time the Board reviewed this, they talked about removing the siding to see what was underneath. It was found that the wood was completely rotten. At that time, the owner took it upon himself to remove the rotten boards and fix it. But, the owner was told to stop the work and get approval and this is where it stopped.

He said that the building next to the brick building is original to the building from 1932. It was built as a secondary house and was torn down because of a hurricane. He was not sure of the year of the hurricane, but they have pictures showing that the hurricane damaged the signs. The addition was to rebuild the walls and the roof. The roof today only has plywood with felt paper on top. The handrails were built on top of the masonry walls and are already here as a parapet. He believes they will be 26 and three-quarter inches tall on both sides due to the parapet walls being high enough. He showed pictures as the building exists today. They are proposing that all the vinyl siding be removed; all the rotten wood be replaced and the vinyl siding be replaced with new.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Brigman why he wanted to reinstall vinyl siding back on the building if the wood exterior is being restored. If he understood what Mr. Brigman is saying, he will restore wood cladding to match in kind what is now on the building.

Mr. Brigman answered yes.

Dr. Williams told him if he does this, he would be covering up the historic cladding with vinyl. The vinyl is here now, but if the petitioner is going to all the trouble of removing the vinyl, why put new vinyl back on?

Mr. Brigman said he understood Dr. Williams' point. It is a maintenance issue. This building has been owned by the Leopold Family since 1908. The Leopold Family opened the business in 1919; the building has not changed hands and they have no intentions of it changing hands. They only wanted to use the hardi-plank in the security of the building. They understood the law and the rules and only wanted to go back to the vinyl siding because it is easy to replace and repair and they will not have to repaint the building every two to five years. Mr. Brigman said he would rather see the wood reinstalled, but because vinyl siding is here already it would be cheaper. The amount of money that the property owner has spent already to rehabilitate this building is above and beyond anybody's expectations. The interior alone has exceeded more than one-half million dollars. Therefore, he is trying to make it feasible where the property owner can complete the building.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Brigman to clarify his statement regarding the wood as it appeared that all the wood siding would be removed and then they would totally replace it.

Mr. Brigman stated that the wood is a 45 degree one-by-six and three-quarter material (sheathing). None of the clapboards on the outside of the building are the same size; a lot of it is rotten. The owner wants to pull the vinyl siding off; pull the wood siding off and then replace and repair the damaged portions of the wood. Then they will replace the vinyl siding on top of the wood.

Mr. Engle asked the petitioner if he was going to remove all of the original clapboards off.

Mr. Brigman said he was not saying they would remove all the clapboards. They have only seen what is on the north side and he believes this is the worst side. If some of the clapboards are not damaged, they will not remove it; just put new vinyl siding over it.

Dr. Henry asked if all the boards would be the same size.

Mr. Brigman explained that the building was remodeled and restored four times. The back addition has completely separate materials; different sizes and different orientations in the cladding. The building has gone through quite a few renditions of face lifts.

Dr. Henry asked if the boards would appear to be the same width when the building is completed.

Mr. Brigman said the outside would look the same. He said all he was referring to are the

structure members that they used back between the studs and the interior of the building on the outside behind the wood siding.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Brigman if he was referring to the sheathing.

Mr. Brigman said they all are 45 degree; the ones underneath the plastic on the bottom half were horizontal; and on the top half they were split.

Mr. Engle stated that the sheathing on this building was covered with something else.

Mr. Brigman said the sheathing on this building are in three different directions.

Mr. Engle stated that where there is clapboard, there is no sheathing.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Brigman what would the building look at to him when walking down the street.

Mr. Brigman showed a picture of how the building would look to someone walking down the street.

Dr. Henry asked looking at the surface, would it be varied with different boards or will it be the same boards.

Mr. Brigman asked Dr. Henry if he was speaking of the second floor.

Dr. Henry stated yes. Will all the vinyl be the same width?

Mr. Brigman answered yes.

Dr. Henry stated that he saw this building without the plastic. The two-by-two boards looked sound to him.

Mr. Brigman explained that all the boards that were removed from the north side are inside the building along with the original sign and doors. He said everything original that they were able to keep they did so. As he has said, this building has been in the Leopold Family forever and they wanted to keep it as original as possible.

Mr. Engle asked that the transoms over the doors were originally single lights; they were not divided lights. He has a photo and the transoms on Gwinnett Street side had "LEOPOLD" written on the glass. This was a very important detail and if they are restoring the 1930s, then this should go back there.

Dr. Williams stated that page 21 shows divided light transoms.

Mr. Engle said they all are divided with the exception of the ones over the doors.

Mr. Brigman said all the signs over the windows are stickers that were provided by Coca-Cola. The LEOPOLD signs over the doors were the type of signs that Coca-Cola would put on the walls. They have the pictures that are hanging in Leopold's on Broughton Street and Coca-Cola is written on both sides of the sign. They are under the impression that the

signs were supplied by Coca-Cola and is not a stained glass sign.

Mr. Engle said, however, it is a single transom. But, the petitioner is showing divided transoms.

Mr. Brigman said he is not requesting a divider over the door.

Mr. Engle said the petitioner's drawing showed a divided transom and this needs to be clarified.

Mr. Brigman stated he did not know exactly what this is; it might be something before they put the screen doors on. But, he has been working with Ms. Ward to ensure that they get this correct.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Brigman if he was going to use screen doors on the entry doors.

Mr. Brigman said the original screen doors will go back over the two cherry glass doors.

Mr. Engle said the entry doors are shown opening outward. He asked if the screen doors would be put on the inside.

Mr. Brigman stated that his understanding of the code is the doors must swing outward.

Mr. Engle stated that is correct; but how do they have screens if the inside doors open outward, they will bang into the screens.

Mr. Brigman said the frames will be constructed on site so that they will have about a two-inch lap on the outside so all the hinges will be on the outside of the screen doors. They just want to be sure that they get them installed correctly.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Brigman if he is the onsite architect for the project.

Mr. Brigman answered yes.

Mr. Engle said the petitioner could not have the inside glass door open outward when he has a screen on the outside.

Mr. Brigman said the screen doors would have to be opened before the interior doors are opened.

Dr. Williams asked if the permanent door behind the screen door opens outward too.

Mr. Brigman answered yes.

Dr. Williams said the two doors will be opening outward.

Mr. Brigman said they were only trying to bring as much of the building as possible back to its originality, but it's no problem, they don't have to put the screen doors back.

Ms. Ramsay said she is troubled with this as she was by the earlier petition submittal as there are no exterior dimensions on this. There are no trims showing around the windows and no detail sections are provided. Ms. Ramsay said she would like to see a detailed section of the eve. It appears to be just a wide piece of flat vinyl siding on the right edge of the roof.

Mr. Brigman stated that they are not changing the siding nor adding anything new, they are going back to existing. Therefore, he did not believe that a section was relevant since they are not adding anything new.

Ms. Ramsay said she was asking why it is not shown on the elevation. There is no trim around the window and the right board is just a flat piece of trim.

Mr. Brigman said the model that the Board saw and the elevation are the same.

Ms. Ramsay said she was looking at the north elevation and there is no trim shown around the windows.

Mr. Brigman said these windows do not have trim around them.

Ms. Ramsay asked if some windows have trim and some do not have trim.

Mr. Brigman answered that all the windows facing Habersham and Gwinnett Streets have trim.

Dr. Williams wanted to know which elevation is this.

Mr. Brigman stated that it is the north elevation. It faces the empty lot. The windows on the backside of the buildings have no trim and has no significant value to the street on the front nor side on Gwinnett and Habersham Streets. Therefore, he was not adding trim. He was only going back to what is existing.

Dr. Henry stated that he did not know what is the appropriate answer is on the north side, but it is certainly visible from the street.

Mr. Brigman said if the Board wishes that he add trim to it that was not original there, he does not have a problem adding the trim.

Mr. Engle said something needs to be put there to stop the vinyl.

Mr. Brigman said the vinyl will have trim around it.

Mr. Overton asked what is the color of the muntin.

Mr. Brigman answered that the brick remains the same color. Because they were trying to get the models done as quickly as possible they are not color correct. The siding will be colonial white; the brick remains the same color; the trim along the top remains the same color which is an off white; the standing seam metal roof will be sandstone and the brick that is added to the renovation on the addition remains the same.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Brigman if he would be willing to submit a color board to the staff for their review or give the staff a picture of what was here before showing the color.

Mr. Brigman said a color clarification was included in the Board's addendum, but if a color board is needed, he would be happy to supply this to the staff.

Mr. Overton said it would be helpful to give this to staff then they would not have to guess what is new or existing.

Mr. Brigman said the only color change is with the roof. He can submit a color change for the roof.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Brigman if he could submit this for clarification purposes.

Mr. Brigman answered yes.

Mr. Engle asked if any thought was given to putting the awnings back.

Mr. Brigman stated from his understanding the awnings were only on the building for eight years before a hurricane came through and destroyed the sign, the awning and roof.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation said the project appears to be evolving and improving and they are pleased, but there are a couple of recommendations that the HSF wants to make. Mr. Carey believes that on the lower left portion of the building, there is presently an arch doorway. They would be in favor of keeping the arch doorway. He wanted to reiterate Mr. Engle's point about the awning. Although it has been said that the awnings were there only for eight years, they are a very nice and appropriate feature for not only the use, but would make the building look even better. He put this in the context of what the length the owner seems to be going to of trying to restore the building as much as possible. Mr. Carey stated that he believes the awning would help as well to delineate the storefront. Therefore, any delineation with the windows and the facade in general, especially on the first floor, would improve the building.

Mr. Carey said the staff recommend approval of this project with eight conditions and this is their concern. This seems to be a lot of conditions and, therefore, a lot of things need more than clarification. Therefore, the HSF does not recommend approval of this project at this time. The project is not quite ready for prime time. The HSF encouraged the owner or the petitioner to meet with them as they welcome the opportunity to talk with them further about this.

Mr. Brigman stated that he appreciates the offer from the HSF. He said regarding the awning, there is a bus stop across the street and, therefore, he does not believe it would be safe to put up the awnings. He had no problems with retaining the arch door. It is not a historical door and has been painted many times.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Brigman if he is willing to say they will put up the awnings.

Mr. Brigman stated that he is not in a position to say this.

Mr. Eli Karatassos said he was present for another item on the agenda, but he was confused about something. He has lived here all of his life and there can only be a few structures within the Historic District that still have vinyl. The way he is hearing this is that the vinyl siding will be removed that was put over wood siding; replace the wood siding with wood siding and then reinstall the vinyl siding. Mr. Karatassos said if they can build four, five or six unit new homes with hardi-plank, he was not sure of how a wall cannot be replaced with hardi-plank. He knows the Board's rules and the availing economy. The building has had many skins; it has had wood, vinyl and a lot of different lives. Then they have to put back an arch that was there 20 years ago. He said as a citizen of Savannah, he does not understand how they could prefer a vinyl siding wall over a hardi-plank wall.

Mr. Engle explained that the Board is conceding allowing the petitioner to put vinyl siding back on. If the Board allows Mr. Leopold to strip off the wood siding and replace it with hardi-plank, this Board has no right telling anyone in Savannah with a historic structure that they cannot take off the wood.

Note: Mr. Judson left the meeting at 6:10 p.m. The Vice-Chair, Mr. Overton, chaired the meeting at this point.

Board Action:

Approval for the rehabilitation, alterations, and signage with the following conditions to be clarified and/or resubmitted to staff for final approval: 1 Provided drawings showing locations of lighting and specifications for fixtures. 2. Replacement windows for the second floor of the original window must match the original windows, i.e. three-over-one true-divided light, single-pane glass, double-hung sash wood frame windows. 3. Provide a section through the wood handrail. 4. Confirm location of utilities, refuse and mechanical systems. 5. Consider installing awnings over the storefront, consistent with the historic appearance of the building. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Ned Gay
Reed Engle
Ned Gay

- Aye
- Aye

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Not Present
Richard Law, Sr	- Not Present
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Nay
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of Dawson Architects - H-11-4384-2 - 502 East River Street - Exterior Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Dawson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations at 510 East River Street for phased renovations at the site.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the alterations, fencing, screening, trellises with the condition that the fencing along the bulkhead match existing fencing located along the River, in a simplified version, and a section drawing of the iron fencing with the front to have a masonry base be submitted to staff for final approval. She noted that if any signage is needed for the business other than awnings, it would need to come back to the Board for review if it is less than three square feet.

Mr. Engle asked if lighting is required.

Ms. Ward stated that she does not know if landscape lighting is required, but none has been submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Neil Dawson, architect for the project, stated that lighting is already on the site of the building. He explained that their concept is to market the site currently for future development to see what would make it more compatible for the district. This is a short term use of probably two to three years. They are trying to improve the nonhistoric buildings to make them more attractive.

Mr. Engle asked if the fencing would be temporary.

Mr. Dawson said they would like to continue the River Walk standard with brick sidewalks so that it ties together continuously from the Waving Girl all the way through, but they cannot afford to spend this kind of money without a viable tenant for the restaurant. Therefore, they are proposing temporary fencing just on the River Side, but on the pedestrian side, they are using lots of bricks.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated the petitioner said it would be temporary fencing. He wanted to know if the Board could stipulate a definite time limit for the temporary fencing.

Ms. Ward said they have had a number of items where the petitioners believed it would be temporary. But it is left to the petitioner how long they want to leave something up. Her only argument is whether it's compatible or not. She said temporary approval is hard for the Building Department to enforce. There are temporary construction fences, but if the Board believes that it is visually compatible, then they can approve it.

Board Action:

Approval of the exterior alterations, fencing, screening, and trellises with the conditions that fencing along the bulkhead match existing fencing located along the River, in a simplified version, and a section drawing of the iron fencing with masonry base be submitted to staff for final approval. Signage for the business must be submitted separately for review if a permit is required. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

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

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

16. [Petition of Paul and Leslie Belliveau - H-10-4344\(S\)-2 Amended - 548-552 E. Jones Street - Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4344\(S\)-2 Amended.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4344\(S\) - 2 Amended.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

17. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc. - H-11-4376\(S\)-2 - 205 W. Broughton St. - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4376\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4376\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

18. [Petition of William and Betty Hahn - H-11-4377\(S\)-2 - 110 East Harris Street - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4377\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4377\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

19. [Petition of Kevin Cohen - H-11-4378\(S\)-2 - 128 E. Broughton St. - Color Change, Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4378\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4378\(S\)-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

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

20. [Chatham Area Transit Authority Downtown Intermodal Transit Center Station - Cogdell & Mendrala for Chatham Area Transit Authority](#)

Attachment: [Memo CAT Station 030311.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Request for Comment - CAT Downtown Intermodal Transit Center Station 030111.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report - CAT Downtown Intermodal Transit Center Station 030911.pdf](#)

Ms. Martha Cogdell and Mr. Don Cogdell was present on behalf of the CAT Downtown Intermodal Transit Center Station.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. Ms. Ward stated that the Department of Transportation (DOT) and any contractors, including cities and counties, performing work funded by DOT are exempt from the requirement to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) under the Georgia Historic Preservation

Act of 1980. Local governments are also exempt provided; however, that they provide notification to the Historic District Board of Review 45 days prior to beginning any work that would require a COA and allow the HDBR an opportunity to comment. The request for comments from the Board for the Chatham Area Transit Authority Downtown Intermodal Transit Center Station was submitted on March 1, 2011.

The project consists of the rehabilitation of the Greyhound Terminal at 610 West Oglethorpe Avenue and a series of new canopy additions on site. The rehabilitation preserves the existing historic structure, a significant example of New Formalism constructed from 1964-1965 by Greer, Homquist & Chambers. A modern metal canopy will be added to the north to provide a new covered platform for the CAT buses. Additional canopies are located immediately east of the building at the corner of Oglethorpe Avenue and Ann Street for Greyhound buses. The rear canopy on the north side of the current Greyhound facility will be removed, to accommodate both transit operations, and reused to construct a trolley stop fronting onto Fahm Street.

Dr. Williams wanted to know what exterior would be demolished.

Ms. Ward explained that the new canopy will be dramatic. A portion of the rear canopy, a cantilever concrete canopy will be removed. Tee Beams will be used to construct the trolley stop.

Mr. Overton suggested that due to the lateness of the hour and since the committee has 45 days to get comments from the Board, that this item be put on the next meeting agenda.

Mr. Thomson explained that the committee does not need to get approval from this Board, but they are bringing the proposal to the Board to get their comments. The Board was informed at their last meeting that this would be forthcoming today. The committee is seeking to get a letter from the Board.

Dr. Williams asked if the letter is to come from the Board or the MPC staff.

Ms. Ward explained that the letter is to come from the Board signed by the Chair. She has tried to provide the framework for the Board as this a little different than what they normally do.

Mr. Overton said this was only submitted to the Board five days ago.

Mr. Thomson said the proposal meets the Historic District standards. It is before this Board as if they were attending a public hearing and making comments on it as a Board and not as individuals.

Dr. Henry said all the Board can do is make comments.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Cogdell said they met with staff and the Historic Savannah Foundation numerous times.

Mr. Cogdell said they are still looking at materials. The materials and color will be in keeping with the Greyhound station. They have an incredible schedule from this point forward.

Mr. Overton asked what is the schedule.

Mr. Cogdell said they must have all documents ready to go by late August.

Ms. Cogdell stated they also have a deadline for funding from FTA.

Mr. Overton asked what is the cost.

Mr. Cogdell answered the total cost is 15 million dollars including land acquisition.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes this will be great to see considering what is here now.

Ms. Ramsay believes this is an exciting project. She can imagine seeing it from the Talmadge Bridge.

Mr. Gay said it looks somewhat like an airport.

Ms. Ramsay asked committee if they will look into what Ms. Ward said about the extending canopy over the sign.

Mr. Cogdell answered they will look into this. They have several models at different locations.

Dr. Williams believes it will be a pedestrian oriented facility. The sidewalks look fine here, but on the elevation, they look a little low. He asked if decision to have the ones for CAT go straight and the other curve.

Mr. Cogdell said they wanted Greyhound to have their own. They have along ways to go with the development of this project. As they go forward a lot of things will have to be made. He can assure the Board that it will not look totally as the model. This is just the beginning.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward if she was looking to send a letter to the committee within the next week.

Ms. Ward stated she has plans to draft a letter for the Chair to sign. She believes the Board's comments are good. Ms. Ward believes further that it would be good to put in the letter that this a response to a conceptual design. The Board can only respond to the information that they have been provided.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward to send a draft copy of the letter to all the Board

members and ask them to respond within 48 hours. They need to know exactly what the committee needs approval on.

Mr. Karatassos said they are not seeking approval from the Board. They want to have a CAT transfer station, trolley, and Greyhound station. What more does the Board need to know?

Mr. Overton asked if the Historic Savannah Foundation had a comment on this project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) came forward and stated that their Architectural Review Committee and staff worked with this committee on three or four occasions and made some minor suggestions. HSF is in favor of this project. They found it not only to be appropriate in relation to the historic building, but is a contemporary and exciting design. Mr. Carey said, therefore, the HSF supports the design wholeheartedly.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry summarized he believes the Board wants lots of low vegetation; it is important that the original bus station is protected; they might consider space for the Greyhound bus shelters and they are inclined and concerned about a conceptual design.

Mr. Johnson said the letter for the Chair's signature should be written by Ms. Ward as she is more aware of this than the Board.

Dr. Williams said he was reminded of an issue on the old Chatham County Courthouse and the fencing has been pushed aside and it looks like an alien spaceship has landed on the building. It is huge and is the most miserably looking piece of machinery visible on public ground. He said he does not know how it got there; it came there recently.

Ms. Ward stated that she has not seen it, but will go and look at it. However, she can tell the Board that they will say that they are exempt from review.

Ms. Ramsay asked, "didn't the Board have the County to shield this the first time?"

Ms. Ward stated she was not aware; may be she was not here when this happened at that time.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward to research this and give the Board a report.

Dr. Williams stated that he will not be able to attend the next meeting. He

said may be if Ms. Ward will contact him, he might be able to offer an opinion that can be shared.

Ms. Ward said she will take pictures of it.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

21. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Vice-Chair Overton adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Sarah P. Ward
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.