



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
Meeting Minutes

MAY 11, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

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

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Chairman Judson called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve April 13, 2011 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [04-13-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of April 13, 2011 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

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

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

3. [Petition of Eric Richman | H-11-4418-2 | 418 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the awning removal and the installation of the principal use facia sign. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: W James Overton

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

4. [Petition of Peter A. Giusti | H-11-4422-2 | 222 East Gwinnett Street | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for the wooden fencing as requested. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

5. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4425-2 | 229 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Demolition of storage sheds](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for the demolition of the non-historic storage room additions on the north elevation of the down freight warehouse and construction of a new drip edge on the historic roof. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

6. [Continued Petition of Christina Swenson | H-11-4406-2 | 433 Tattnall Street | Repointing](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Christina Swenson, petitioner, and Mr. Dale English, owner, were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for repointing of the brick walls on the historic building. The ground floor of the north and east elevations were repointed just prior to the April meeting. The brick work was continued to the meeting today to give the Board the opportunity to go to the site and review the brick work.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the exterior repointing provided that the mortar color and composition and joint width and profile match the prior condition. For the historic property, the Savannah Gray bricks should read as the dominant exterior material and brick edges should be clearly defined and not obscured by the joint material. Currently, the new mortar joints are wider than the original joints and extend over the corners and in some cases, the face of the bricks. This excess material should be removed with the most delicate means possible. The entire facade to achieve a uniform appearance should not be the goal, but rather only repointing to repair damaged or deteriorated mortar to match the existing as needed. The mortar type that the petitioner has proposed, appears to be appropriate and meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Mr. Overton wanted to know if a building permit is required to do this work.

Ms. Ward replied no; the petitioner may need a sidewalk permit if scaffolding is going to be on the sidewalk, but repointing is similar to repainting which does not generally require a permit.

Dr. Williams asked what kind of mortar the petitioner used initially.

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioner is present and could better answer Dr. Williams' question.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Swenson stated that she brought a sample of the mortar for the Board's review. The mortar is buff.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Swenson if she was clear on the staff's recommendation of cleaning and removing the excess mortar to expose the brick edges and faces.

Ms. Swenson answered yes.

Mr. Engle said he was a little concerned with the pictures that he believed were submitted as being what the petitioner believes are examples of good pointing.

Ms. Swenson stated no, she just went around town taking pictures of other pointing to compare with what they were requesting. At the last meeting, things appeared to be awkward; therefore, she believed a comparison of the work would be appropriate.

Mr. Engle said a lot of what is shown are examples of bad pointing. The petitioner has two stories of mortar that have not yet been touched. This should be the guideline of what it should be. He went out and looked at this very carefully and believes that only about 20% of the building needs repointing. However, what happened is that 100% of what has been done to date has been repointed when it did not need that much. How can the Board be sure that the petitioner is only going to cut out the joints that need to be repointed?

Ms. Swenson stated that what has already been done is done. There is not much they can do about what is here now. She believes going forward they will try to keep it consistent and make the building look uniform.

Mr. Engle stated this is exactly what is wrong. The Secretary of Interior's Standards state that the building cannot look uniform. What has been applied to date will destroy the original brick work because the mortar is harder than the Savannah Grays. It has to be removed or it will look like the wall around the Board of Education building. The damaged sections that were done without a permit and approval need to be removed and then repointed correctly.

Mr. Judson asked if he was correct in his understanding that a subcontractor is doing the repointing and is not present at the meeting today. This goes to his concern about the supervision of the project. The Board can certainly share their views clearly with Ms. Swenson and she understands the Secretary of Interior's Standards, but his concern is getting this communicated effectively to the subcontractor so that the work will be done properly.

Ms. Swenson said the subcontractor is no longer doing the work. Therefore, they will abide by the staff's recommendation and find someone to do the work.

Mr. English said he proposes to do the work in sections with a different contractor and see how the repointing will look. He needs an engineering expert to tell him to remove the pointing that has already been done. The mortar looks fine. They have taken pictures of approximately 50 houses and they all were done differently.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. English when he stated that the mortar looks fine, was he referring to the new or the old.

Mr. English said the new mortar looks fine and they have taken more than 50 pictures of repointing jobs on Jones Street and other streets.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes the petitioner and owner were trying to illustrate where the new mortar was put in was bright and uniform, but unfortunately if the intent is for these to be seen as positive examples and justification for leaving the lower half of 433 Tattall as is, this cannot be done. It may aesthetically look okay, but in the long run the portland mortar will destroy the bricks. Therefore, it is in the interest of the petitioner that he removes the old mortar from the wall.

Mr. Judson explained that staff's concern, and he believes is the consensus of the Board, is that the mortar does cover more than just the original joints. It extends over the face and corners of the brick. Maybe cleaning will make a difference, but now it pops to the point where the eye sees the mortar and not the brick.

Dr. Henry informed Mr. English that he was sympathetic to his situation as he understood that he was not in town when the work was done. He asked Mr. English what actually was he requesting.

Mr. English said he was wondering what aroused all the interest in the repointing and he is trying to comply with how the Board feels the repointing should be done.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) introduced two of their staff members that were present with him today. They were: Terri O'Neil, Development Director, and Sherene LaMarche, Membership and Events Coordinator. Mr. Carey said he supports the recommendation of gently removing the new mortar and replacing it. He wanted to underscore what the owner offered which is starting with a four-by-four test area before they proceed further. This needs to be shown that the work can be done in an unobstructive way and come to a conclusion of how it will be done. Mr. Carey said then the staff could inspect this and approve it before proceeding. The four-by-four test area would reveal if this approach is correct and will offer a determination for the remaining portions.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Carey if he was envisioning that the four-by-four patch would be happening in the area where the work has already begun.

Mr. Carey confirmed that he was saying start in the lower half of the building and if done correctly, then inspect the upper half of the building. He concurs with Mr. Engle that a pound of cure may have been brought to something that only needed an ounce of prevention. He does not know if the staff has the latitude to make recommendations for other contractors to do work, but HSF is in a position to do so. Therefore, HSF makes the offer to assist in this area.

Mr. Judson explained to Mr. English that the HSF is a private organization that would be willing to lend some assistance to him. However, the Historic Review Board does not refer any work to any contractor. The HSF is a resource both in terms of guidance on projects and resources in the community. HSF has much experience with contractors.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Judson explained that the Board does not have a petition before them saying specifically what is being requested to be done. They have a situation that began without a Certification of Appropriateness that at the Board's insistence was halted for them to review the process. Therefore, as the Board moves forward in its discussion and a motion, he believes they need to be clear and offer guidance to the petitioner of what would be the correct next steps.

Dr. Henry stated that this may not take a lot of discussion. It seems clear to him that the petitioner is trying to work with the Board. Therefore, he believes a motion needs to be made asking the petitioner to continue working with the Board and staff. In terms of the contractor, the HSF can be of assistance to the petitioner.

Ms. Simpson said there are some things that need to be acted upon by the Board.

Dr. Henry said he was referring to what Mr. Engle said regarding the nature of the repointing materials.

Mr. Gay stated he believes approving what the staff has suggested would be the correct motion.

Mr. Engle said what still concerns him is a statement was made that "they want it all to match." He does not believe that the staff's recommendation is exactly explicit enough as it gives an option of finding suitable pointing techniques.

Mr. Judson believes that if a motion is worded specifically in that the Board wants to defer staff's recommendation as far as the remediation and cleaning of the brick. Mr. Engle's point is well taken regarding the untouched portions of the building that they be subject to a thorough inspection before any work is done.

Ms. Simpson asked for clarity if the Board was requesting that the petitioner remove the work that they have done initially.

Mr. Judson stated yes.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board was also requesting to follow up the suggestion regarding the four-by-four test patch.

Mr. Judson explained that he envisioned that step one would be to follow staff's recommendation regarding the prompt cleaning of the surface; the second step is to produce the test patch and that no other work is done until advised by staff in their review of work that has been done.

Board Action:

Approval for exterior repointing provided that the mortar in the previously repointed area be carefully removed with hand tools, the brick cleaned with the gentlest means possible, and a four-by-four test patch with type N mortar, in area previously repointed, be established for staff approval. For this historic property, the Savannah Gray bricks should read as the dominant exterior material and brick edges should be clearly defined and not obscured by the joint material. Currently, - PASS
the new mortar joints are wider than the original

joints and extend over the corners and in some cases, the face of the bricks. Repointing the entire facade to achieve a uniform appearance should not be the goal, but rather only repointing to repair damaged or deteriorated mortar to match the existing as needed. The applicant shall work with staff in the field to determine the scope or repointing on the upper floors where needed.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Addendum.pdf](#)

Ms. Kathy Ledvina was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations to install a 42 inch tall railing around the roof-top decking area. The railing is made by Atlantis Rail System, Nautilus 1 style for the top rail is proposed around the perimeter of the existing Trex decking system. The petitioner has brought a sample of this to the meeting today. Additionally, the petitioner is proposing to remove the brick lattice wall on the east property line fronting Habersham Street and relocate the existing pedestrian entry gate to the north and to install reinforced columns clad in Savannah Gray bricks to support new cast iron vehicular gates made from ironwork removed from the building ca. 2005 that is stored on the property.

Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner has requested that the portion of the proposal relative to the driveway and vehicular entrance gates be continued to the June 8, 2011 meeting as they are still working with Traffic Engineering and Park and Tree Departments to ensure that they can put a driveway in this area.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends continuing the portion relative to the driveway and vehicle entrance gates to the June 8, 2011 meeting for review by the City's Infrastructure Departments including Traffic Engineering and Park and Tree and for

submittal of a site plan. Staff recommends approval for the roof-toop railing with the condition that it is relocated to the center of the building so as not to be visible from Jones or Habersham Streets.

Ms. Ramsay asked if this is a one or two family residence.

Ms. Ward stated that she does not know; this is a question that could be answered by the petitioner.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward when she referred to the sample, is this what she referred to as being invisible.

Ms. Ward replied she was not saying it is invisible, but it is transparent. From the photos provided, they can see through it. A picket fence is visible and there is a solid surface. Something was used that is translucent, clearly modern and is not trying to convey a false sense of history. However, staff does feel that it alters the roof-line of the building which is a character defining feature and it does not meet the design standards.

Mr. Engle explained that the parking lot on the back is not the owner's property. This is why they are requesting a driveway from Habersham Street. However, his concern is that when the driveway goes here, two trees will have to be removed if there is a substantial curb-cut.

Dr. Williams asked if there is a site plan that shows the driveway.

Ms. Ward explained that at the last Board meeting they requested that the petitioner provide a site plan to review the vehicular gate and wall. The petitioner then requested that this portion of the petition be continued to the June meeting. Consequently, it was said when the petitioner brings the site plan, it would be heard by the Board.

Dr. Williams stated that if he understood Mr. Engle's point without the site plan, the Board does not know which trees will be saved which could impact the visibility element.

Ms. Ward stated she believes at the last meeting it was clear to her that when determining whether something is visible or not visible, trees are a bad measure. The trees could easily go during the winter and things are much more visible than they are during the summer.

Mr. Judson said he remembers that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards say that on historic buildings, roof tops shall not be visible from the front elevation.

Mr. Engle stated that on corner property both elevations are main elevations.

Ms. Simpson said staff has recommended that it not be visible from Jones Street nor Habersham Street.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward if she said that the fence will actually be higher than shown in the photos.

Ms. Ward stated she believes it will be as it sits upon some chimney pots. However, the petitioner is present and can answer this question as she installed the fencing.

Dr. Williams said it would be helpful to know that if an individual went to the site, stood on the opposite sidewalk and did a line of subjectory from sidewalk to an average height of six feet high, cross the cornice of the building, how far back does it have to be before it is in the view shadow as it was at the cornice? He explained that if the Board knew this, then they would be able to ensure whether it would be visible or they could make a recommendation that they do the exercise and then follow-up on staff's recommendation.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Judson asked the petitioner, procedurally, if she requested that the curb-cut, gate and garden wall be continued to the June 8, 2011 meeting.

Ms. Ledvina answered that she asked for the continuance for the garden gate. She stated that she brought with her today a sample of the railing. The architect drew more of a cresting than a railing. She felt this was not visibly attractive and definitely deterred from the building. Therefore, she tried to find a railing that would be invisible. The roof top is existing and, therefore, her solution to the railing problem would be to find something that was transparent. The two photos were taken across the street. The first photo was taken without using zoom and the second photo is zoomed up approximately ten times. The top photo shows what the railing looks like from across the way. As the Board can see, they really cannot see it. The two posts are five feet and raises forty-two inches. This would cost her \$4,200 and she does not want to spend this much money not knowing. Therefore, they are dealing with a small section where the railing is only two feet apart.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ledvina how high is the sample that the Board is reviewing. The code says 42 inches.

Ms. Ledvina stated that it is four feet from the ground.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ledvina, therefore, the railing will not be taller.

Ms. Ledvina answered yes. They have set the railing back four feet and she guessed they could set it back from Habersham Street. She has no problem sitting it back from the chimney as well.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ledvina to clarify the statement she made regarding Habersham Street and the chimney.

Ms. Ledvina explained that there are two feet on one side of the chimney and two feet are on the other side of the chimney. This is what is visible from Habersham Street. She stated that she could go back a point from the chimney. She stated that from the lane side of Habersham Street is where it is zoomed ten times.

Dr. Williams stated that photo 1 shows a person standing by a branch. He asked that assuming this person is at a normal height, "what is he standing on?"

Ms. Ledvina answered that the person is standing on the roof deck.

Dr. Williams explained that the roof comes up to the individual's waist. Therefore, it could be expected that the parapet he is leaning against is at least 42 inches high.

Ms. Ledvina answered unfortunately, no.

Dr. Williams asked her if she knew the height of the parapet.

Ms. Ledvina answered that there is not a parapet.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ledvina if the individual is not standing by the parapet.

Ms. Ledvina replied that the individual is not by a parapet.

Mr. Gay stated that there is no parapet.

Ms. Ledvina stated that there was a parapet and a hip roof was behind it, but when they constructed the decking for the roof they went across from brick-to-brick.

Mr. Engle stated he would like to see a two-by-four set up on the roof so the Board could go to the site and review at what point it's no longer visible. The ordinance is clear. You are not allowed to have a roof deck that is visible from either primary elevation. Ms. Ledvina installed the deck without a permit.

Ms. Ledvina stated that she did not install the deck without a permit. The deck was installed in 2005 and she had nothing to do with the project.

Mr. Engle said it does not meet the ordinance if it is visible. Now, the Board is being asked to take Ms. Ledvina's word that it is not visible. However in every picture, he sees it. Therefore, he would like to see from what point it could be recessed from the edge and would no longer be visible.

Mr. Judson stated that it is not the charge of the Historic Review Board to engineer this in terms of feet recommendation. If the Board's recommendation is it meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards and not be visible from across the street, then the Board can ask the petitioner to move it back far enough so that it is not visible.

Ms. Ledvina asked if the Board is meeting the Secretary of Interior's Standards rather than the Historic District ordinance.

Mr. Engle said the Board is meeting them both.

Dr. Henry stated that the ordinance states that the Board follows the Secretary of Interior's guidelines. The staff's recommendation is clear. He has no problem with following the staff recommendation that it be relocated to the center of the building so that it would not be visible from Jones Street or Habersham Street.

Mr. Engle stated how does the Board know that it will not be visible.

Ms. Ledvina stated that if the Board wants her to make a mock-up, they must realize that a two-by-four is solid and is a lot more visible than the piece of silver.

Mr. Engle stated that the piece of silver is highly reflective.

Mr. Judson stated that they are getting off track. If the point is that it be moved back far enough not to be visible, it does not matter whether it is ribbon or a four-by-four. If the height is consistent with the code standards of 42 inches, the petitioner needs to move it back far enough so that it is not visible. It really does not matter what the material is and regarding mock-up, they are not consulting engineers. It is not left to this Board's discretion to find the angle or the distance. This Board's purview is to find the expectations of the final project which is that it not be visible.

Ms. Ramsay asked what the building beneath would be used for.

Ms. Ledvina answered that it is a single-family residence.

Ms. Ramsay stated that on a single-family residence, the railing only has to be 36 inches high. The code specifically states that it not exceed 36 inches for one or two-family residence.

Mr. Gay asked if it could be lower.

Ms. Ramsay explained that the code said it has to be 36 inches. It can be exceeded according to the code, but for the ordinance it cannot exceed 36 inches.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ledvina if she would consider any other handrail material other than what she has proposed.

Ms. Ledvina stated yes. She can put wood here.

Mr. Overton asked if she considered glass.

Ms. Ledvina stated that it would be the same encasement. She could look at the cost.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle stated that personally he believes it is great material and the Board has recommended it on other projects. But, not on the roof deck. This is his problem.

Mr. Gay said it could be set back where it cannot be seen.

Mr. Johnson stated that the materials should not matter.

Mr. Judson explained that it is the same question on almost every decision they render. If the Board said a building has to be painted one color and it gets painted another color, he does not see where this is any different out of this scope. He wants to avoid the Board

becoming engineers on the project and the defining angle. The result is what the Board is defining and the definition is that it be removed back far enough so that it is not visible. If it is not moved back far enough then it is not in compliance with the Certificate of Appropriateness and becomes a zoning issue.

Dr. Williams stated that it would be within the staff's purview to go out and check to ensure that it is not visible. However, it will be visible from the lane. There are also some places on Habersham Street, although it is not a principal facade, but his concern is that across the back where it might be flush with the facade depending on how light hits highly metallic, shining objects that the reflections could be more prominent. The cabling is fairly transparent, but the frames are highly reflective and substantial.

Mr. Gay believes it needs to be done in black.

Board Action:

Approved the petitioner's request to continue the portion of the proposal relative to the drive-way and vehicular entrance gates to the June 8, 2011 meeting for review by the City's Infrastructure Departments including Traffic Engineering and Park and Tree and for submittal of a site plan. - PASS

Vote Results

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

Board Action:

Approval for the roof-top railing with the condition that it is relocated so as not to be visible from Jones or Habersham Streets. - PASS

Vote Results

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

8. [Petition of Ryan Broadwater for BW Signs | H-11-4419-2 | 63 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Sign and Paint](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

The petitioner was not present.

Ms. Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior paint color changes and to replace two non-illuminated principal use signs and a supplemental identification sign. Additionally, the petitioner is requesting approval for a paint color change on the service bay. A two color scheme is proposed; the lower portion will be painted with Sherwin Willimas paint in Brandywine and the upper portion will be painted in Rowhouse Tan.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval of the principal use signs, supplemental identification sign, and exterior painting with the condition that the principal use signs be reduced to no more than 40 square feet each. Staff has worked with the petitioner and he is in agreement to reduce the size to 40 square feet.

Mr. Engle said he was missing something as it says the principal signs are 46.6 square feet. Yet, it is shown that the signs are four feet-ten inches tall and twenty-three feet long. He said that his calculation shows it would be ninety-two square feet, not forty-six square feet. The drawings show that they are ninety-two square feet.

Mr. Gay stated that signs will be much smaller than what is believed.

Ms. Ward stated that when calculating the square footage of signage, the Zoning Administrator works with the applicant. They will actually draw boxes around the individual letters for the calculations. This is what has been done for Firestone.

Dr. Williams stated that the lower dimensional of the overall area is seventy-four square feet. It would be interesting to know what was used to arrive at that figure as it is still twenty feet square feet smaller than the overall dimensions suggest. He asked for an explanation pertaining to the existiing Firestone sign that is facing MLK on the two story section.

Ms. Bryant explained that presently the sign does not have a backer board and the new sign will have a backer board. This is the principal difference along with some graphics.

Dr. Williams stated that the two-story brick part is on two parts. He asked how old is the existing sign.

Ms. Bryant stated that the existing sign was approved in 1991.

Mr. Engle stated that he did not understand why the white section is not counted.

Ms. Ward stated that it needs to be considered when they look at the design of the sign, how it is placed and is it visually compatible, but as far as doing calculations for the Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Administrator determines how the calculations are made. The staff refers this to him. Basically, if the Zoning Administrator makes a determination that they cannot use the box around the letters and the petitioner must use the ones showing seventy is fine. The sign just needs to comply with the requirements of the ordinance and this is what staff is recommending.

Mr. Gay stated he could see that counting the square footage would make sense if it was like the old sign which is just letters.

Mr. Engle stated that a big white background is on the sign.

Dr. Henry believes it looks smaller and looks fine.

Mr. Gay said he likes the old sign.

Ms. Simpson asked if the new sign meets the requirements, what can the Board do?

Mr. Judson stated that the Board can make a ruling that it is not visually compatible.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Gay stated again that he likes the old sign, but he guessed the purpose of the new sign is to let the public know that there is not only tires, but others things too.

Dr. Williams stated this is why he asked about the age of the sign. If the sign was from the mid 1960s, he would be saying "don't touch the sign." Although it is not yet 50 years old, you can see that the shadows being cast by the letters and he believes it works with the brick wall a lot better than the new sign. Based on compatibility, he believes that the old sign is more visually compatible than the new sign.

Mr. Engle stated that the white against the white garage would be fine, but it really is intrusive. You would really be seeing ninety-two square feet of white.

Mr. Gay said the Board can make a motion to continue this hearing as the petitioner is not present to answer their questions.

Board Action:

Continued to the meeting of June 8, 2011. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

9. [Petition of Jay Guth for Emily Stubbs | H-11-4420-2 | 410 East Gwinnett Street | Rehabilitation, Alterations, and Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Jay Guth was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the ground level porch and to install a masonry privacy wall.

Ms. Ward stated that staff recommends approval for the alterations and privacy wall with the condition that a louvered screen or shutters be used within the side porch. Staff further recommends that the petitioner consider retaining evidence of openings that are being enclosed to convey the physical evolution of the building for future restoration of the property.

Mr. Gay asked what would the staff think about putting the gate within the side porch instead of where it is presently located.

Ms. Ward stated that she would recommend approval of this; however, she would have to look at the framing. If the petitioner wanted to consider this, it would be fine.

Mr. Engle asked if the existing house is masonry or wood.

Ms. Ward answered that it is masonry. The columns are stucco.

Mr. Engle stated that wood brackets are here.

Ms. Ward confirmed that wood detailing is on the porch.

Dr. Williams asked how far back is the wall on the left hand side shown on page two.

Ms. Ward explained that if they look at the photo, it does not show a window on the front.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward if she knew how far back it is.

Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner would be better able to answer this question.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Guth stated that the wall on the left sets back approximately ten feet.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Guth which window will be sealed.

Mr. Guth answered that they are not going to seal up the door, but will put a window here.

Dr. Williams stated, therefore, there will be no sealing of window or door, but a door will be installed.

Ms. Simpson said a window is near the stairs.

Mr. Guth said a door is here now. The old staircase came right in front of it. They are replacing the staircase. This window will be closed.

Mr. Gay asked where is the staircase.

Mr. Guth said it is in the courtyard. It is not visible from the street.

Mr. Gay stated he believes the petitioner is saying they want to switch the door and window.

Mr. Engle stated that in this neighborhood he could not think of any stucco walls near the sidewalk. The one that was put in approximately 10 or 15 years ago has been recessed ten feet. This bothers him; it is not downtown where garden walls are right to the sidewalk. This is the Victorian area where most of the walls are pushed back from the street. Mr. Engle said he would be more comfortable if the wall went back to the second column as Dr. Williams alluded to.

Dr. Williams said matching the other wall would be ideal. Evidently the petitioner's goal is to match it and achieve a certain amount of balance; at least the elevation view suggests this.

Mr. Gay stated that the wall will not come out to the sidewalk as the house is already setback from the sidewalk a great bit.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Guth his opinion regarding the suggestion of relocating the gate

door to the actual space where the porch is located.

Mr. Guth stated he would not mind going so, but he prefers to do shutters underneath. The gate is a separate element to the right. There is straight access all the way to the back rather than going on the porch.

Dr. Williams stated he was wondering if shutters could be here and if there was a way that the wall could be recessed from the edge of the porch to match the other side. He was unsure what it would hit under the porch as there needs to be some type of intermediary wall or piers.

Mr. Guth said their main objective is security. There is a lot of foot traffic in the area. They are trying to create a play area for the small children.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that their position has evolved to reflect some of the things that the Board has expressed with respect to a possible setback on the wall. HSF supports staff's recommendation regarding evidence of the openings. The HSF recognizes the introduction of the brick complementing the stucco. They were wondering if the bricks could be covered with stucco and then score the piers as well. Is it important that the bricks be different from the rest. Besides, this would almost be consumed by the ivy. A green wall would be the best scenario. Maybe the brick piers could be painted; however, he realizes that they are not enthused with painting bricks. But, in this case the bricks just seem to stick out for no obvious reason. Mr. Carey believes this would improve the entire project.

BOAR DISCUSSION

Mr. Judson stated that he wanted to remind the Board that they are not a design symposium. Therefore, if they have a specific alteration to the plan and want to voice that as a part of a motion, they can get the petitioner's feelings as to whether he is amenable, but he just did not want the Board to try to consider all the alternates.

Dr. Williams stated that he missed a detail as he now knows which windows will be replaced. He asked the petitioner that the rear "L" where he wishes to relocate the two windows to the right, he was curious that since he is removing the wall that is between them on the outside, what is the motive and how essential it is to the project?

Mr. Guth answered that the entire downstairs has not been renovated yet. But a family room, den, and bedroom will be downstairs. The door is in the middle of the bedroom and the owners want to get rid of the door; and the door going to the back of the building is in the den area. The owners just want one access to the deck.

Dr. Williams stated that the petitioner wants to remove the door from the front to the back and remove the two windows to the right as you enter in the room.

Mr. Guth said they want to put a big fireplace here. This basically looks out to the block wall.

Dr. Williams asked if there is anyway that it could be finished from the inside, but not remove the windows. In other words, retain the windows and just sealed them up from the inside and put shutters or something on the outside.

Mr. Guth said they could do as Dr. Williams suggested.

Mr. Engle asked if the Board could make a proposal suggesting that the stucco wall be removed back to be on line and follow through with staff's recommendation that they put shutters at the street front and let the details of the four feet gap be worked out with staff as to whether the stucco wall returns to the front or whether the shutters go back to meet the wall.

Mr. Judson stated certainly the Board can make a motion to that effect. However, if the petitioner was defiant and did not want to comply with this, then he could ask the Board to either approve or disapprove the petition as it stands. But, he gets the sense that the petitioner is amenable to the idea.

Mr. Guth confirmed that it is not a problem; they can sit it back. However, it does create a funny little "L" shape.

Mr. Judson explained that the Board is charged with preserving the Historic District . The long term affect of improving the wall would be: a) not particularly in balance with the other side of the building and, b) that it would not be right on the sidewalk.

Ms. Ward stated that she wanted to be really clear on the Board's expectations and also see if there is any margin for error. For example, if the proposed wall location after it is laid is actually five inches different, would it be okay if the petitioner keep it there.

Mr. Judson said yes.

Board Action:

Approval for the alterations and privacy wall with the condition that a louvered screen or shutters be used within the side porch, privacy wall be set back to match the existing wall on the west side of the property, and the windows openings by the chimney be retained to convey the physical evolution of the building for future restoration of the property. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

10. [Petition of Kathy Sliz | H-11-4421-2 | 339 Tattall Street | Alterations, Rehabilitation, and New Construction \(Shed\)](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Kathy Sliz was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a garden shed and alterations to the decking and rear door.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the garden shed, decking, replacement door and paint colors provided the door frame on the historic brick structure is inset not less than three inches from the exterior surface of the facade.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Sliz stated this is basically a storage shed, but they want to make it attractive. They will put plants in the yard. The owners want a gardening environment inside the courtyard.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that they had two minor observations: 1) they believe the design of the shed is good and compatible; their Architecture Review Committee questioned the need for the brackets. They thought the contemporary design was good without the scalloped brackets and 2) they realize the petitioner is trying to fit the door into the existing space, but the sidelights appear to be a little out of scale as they seem to be a little narrower.

Ms. Sliz stated that the security door has always been here. They are trying to replicate the sidelights with the same width and have the door in the middle.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Sliz if they were widening the steps.

Ms. Sliz stated yes; the door swings outward and you step outside the French door onto a little narrow part of the stair. They just want to extend the narrow section back to where it was originally.

Dr. Henry asked if the shed would be seen from the street.

Mr. Sliz answered the shed is not seen from the street unless someone goes up close and

look inside the gate.

Mr. Gay said the top of the roof might be seen.

Ms. Sliz pointed out on the monitor that where the plastic storage bins are located, a drive-in gate is to the right, the owners want to remove all the plastic storage bins and install the garden shed here. Therefore, you would not be able to see it from the street, but if you go right up to the gate, you would be able to see it.

Board Action:

Approval of the garden shed, decking, replacement door, and paint colors provided the door frame on the historic brick structure is inset not less than three inches from the exterior surface of the façade. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

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

11. [Petition of Pete Callejas for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4423-2 | 27 Bull Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Keith Howington was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for rehabilitation and alterations to the building.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation with the condition that the door is inset no less than three inches from the facade and the mechanical units be screened from view and screening submitted to staff for approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Howington stated that the staff's report sums up their request well. The building will be restored and rehabilitated. The sample they have is only an example of the type of material and how it will be put together with the joint system. They would like to submit a color that is similar to this. The color submitted initially was too bright and he believes had too much reflectivity. They want the color to be a little duller, if possible. They don't want bronze as it will stand out too much.

Mr. Howington passed the samples to the Board for their review.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Howington if they have come up with a plan to screen the mechanical units.

Mr. Howington stated that they did talk about this. He believes that the units that will be replaced are about the size of the units here now. The units are hardly visible. However, some times when a screen is put at this level, it tends to stand out and make it more bulky. Therefore, he believes the screens should not be put there.

Dr. Williams said the building has an attic that rises above the cornice that projects at the top of the building. If an attic parapet was put above the cornice, the petitioner would be replicating the vocabulary of the building which already has a parapet above its projecting cornice. The screening affect could be achieved that the staff is recommending in a way that would be compatible with the building. A short parapet would be proportionate to the size of the drive-through. He asked Mr. Howington if he had considered this.

Mr. Howington answered that they did consider this. This is a large building. The height of the drive-through cornice is four feet now. They felt anything added would make it more massive.

Dr. Williams stated that he was not talking about the height, but just doing something short because given the angle of view, even something half the height of the entablature. In order words proportionate to the scale of the drive-through. Right now, they have a cornice ending with nothing above it when in fact the building reads with a piece rising above the parapet.

Mr. Howington stated that he did look at this by putting the extra parapet wall up there, but to him it appeared a little heavy. However, he was not saying that they should not do it. It goes back to the screening that he believes is a good solution. He said he was trying to lessen the weight and could paint the units the same color.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Howington if they plan to restore the clock in front.

Mr. Howington answered no. He cannot find the clock and does not know what it would cost.

Mr. Engle stated that this has been one of his nightmares. The real estate sign on this building has been there for at least two or three years. A five story addition was shown on the back, so he kept having nightmares. He believes this is a good elegant solution and the color of the units will be the issue. If they end up green or something, they will stick out, but if they are painted to match the stucco it should be okay.

Mr. Howington said they looked at other options of putting them far up on the roof, but there is a nice lobby inside and he did not want to see lines, columns and pilasters with a lot of detailing here. He believes this would be a poor solution as well.

Mr. Engle asked if they could go behind the gate.

Mr. Howington stated that would be an option. On the plans by the meter, he has designated a service area.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Howington to view photo five in the center. He stated that he did not know why if the units got tucked in here behind the gate and brick wall, they could be screened effectively and then they would be off the roof totally.

Mr. Howington stated that would be an acceptable solution. He said with reference to the little parapet, the further you are away, the more it would be seen. There, it is in a location that it will be seen at some time. Consequently, putting them on the ground and putting a screen around them is definitely an option.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that the suggestion from their Architecture Review Committee was to remove the units from the top of the drive-through and put them in the corner as Mr. Engle suggested. The HSF does not believe that this would disturb what they believe is a vast improvement on the drive-through. Mr. Carey believes just as the petitioner that adding a parapet would make it heavier. He believes minimal treatment is needed on the drive-through and this is what the petitioner is putting forth. Mr. Carey believes everything would be taken care of by just relocating the units to the corner and leave the drive-through as proposed.

Board Action:

Approval for the rehabilitation with the conditions that door is inset no less than three inches from the façade and the mechanical units be relocated behind the screen wall on St. Julian Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. Petition of Josh Ward for Dawson Architects | H-11-4426-2 | 531-535 East Liberty Street | Rehabilitation, Alterations and Demolition

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for demolition, exterior rehabilitation/alterations, and fencing.

Ms. Bryant reported that the staff recommends approval for the demolition of 531 East Liberty Street, surface parking on the newly vacant lot, fencing, and exterior rehabilitation/alterations on 535 East Liberty Street with the following conditions: 1) signage to be resubmitted to the Historic Board of Review for approval; 2) provide information on HVAC and screening to staff for final approval; and 3) reinstate the public right-of-way and tree lawn if approved by the City of Savannah Parking Services.

Mr. Overton asked rather than using postal address numbers, what was the use of the area where the proposed new parking is to be located.

Ms. Bryant explained that this area has always been used as a lumber yard. The Sanborn Map dates this to 1884.

Mr. Overton stated, therefore, this was never used as a storefront other than what is seen today.

Ms. Bryant stated what is seen today is the new storefront.

Mr. Overton stated that it is illogical in mid city block to have cars go through what would be the sidewalk. He asked how does this relate to a Historic District neighborhood.

Ms. Bryant stated that the curb cut is already existing; therefore, a new curb cut is not being created. Additionally, the property is next to a similar system relative to the building and parking lot. This is not out of character for the 500 Block of East Liberty Street.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Bryant to point out the area where Brassiere's parking lot is located.

Ms. Bryant pointed out Brassiere's parking lot and the new proposed parking lot.

Dr. Williams stated that there will at least be rhythm.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ward clarified that the glazing will be set back four inches from the front of the building.

Mr. Engle stated the design is good and it is great to see that the tree lawn will be replaced as there has been parking on the sidewalk.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the demolition of 531 East Liberty Street, surface parking on the newly vacant lot, fencing, and exterior rehabilitation/alterations on 535 East Liberty Street with the following conditions: 1. Signage to be resubmitted to the Historic Board of Review for approval; 2. Provide information on the HVAC and screening to staff for final approval; 3. Reinstate the public right-of-way and tree lawn if approved by the City of Savannah Parking Services. - PASS

Vote Results

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

13. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4427-2 | 209 West Congress Street | Rehabilitation and alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

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

exterior alterations and rehabilitation for the B & D Burgers.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the exterior alterations and rehabilitation including the ramp addition which encroaches into the lane with the following conditions: 1) mortar joint samples are submitted to staff for approval; 2) the doors be inset no less than three inches; 3) the windows are wood and true divided light; and 4) signage be submitted to the Board at a later date for approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

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

Mr. Engle stated that based on their previous experience, he asked Mr. Dawson if he would be amenable to doing a test panel for staff's approval before it proceeds.

Mr. Dawson answered yes; this is not a problem. The building is true to form from 1855 and this will be a tax credit project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for exterior alterations and rehabilitation including the ramp addition which encroaches into the lane with the following conditions: 1. Mortar joint samples are submitted to staff for approval; 2. A four-by-four test sample is established for staff approval; 3. The doors be inset no less than three inches; 4. The windows are wood and true divide light; and 5. Signage be submitted to the Board at a later date for approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay
Second: Ebony Simpson
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Brian Judson - Abstain
W James Overton - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams

- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

14. [Petition of Daryl L. Walker for McDonalds | H-10-4219-2 | 246 West Broughton Street | 12-month extension for rehabilitation and alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Danielle Williams and Mr. Daryl Walker were present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. Mr. Walker is requesting approval for a 12-month extension for alterations that were approved by the Historic Board of Review on April 14, 2010 at 246 West Broughton Street.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval of the 12-month extension, thru April 14, 2012, for the rehabilitation, alteration, and signage with the following conditions from the original approval: 1) Eliminate the supplemental sign next to the new opening on the west elevation (Jefferson Street) if it is determined by the Zoning Administrator to not meet the ordinance; and 2) Approval of the awning does not preclude the encroachment agreement required from the City of Savannah. Internally illuminated awnings are prohibited.

Mr. Gay stated that he believes the extension expired April 14, 2011.

Ms. Bryant explained that the application for the extension was submitted prior to the deadline, but due to the closeness of mail outs to the Review Board, it was unable to be placed on the April 13, 2011 meeting agenda. Therefore, this the reason why it was put on the May 11, 2011 meeting agenda.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Walker stated that they have been in negotiation for some time and have had several contractors looking at the building and submitting bids. They are working hard to get things fine-tuned.

Mr. Judson stated this is not a part of the Board's purview, but is the issue regarding the tree and the sidewalk resolved with the City of Savannah.

Ms. Williams said they met on site many times with Mr. Denny and they came up with some good solutions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the 12-month extension, thru April 14, 2012, for the rehabilitation, alteration, and signage with the following conditions from the original approval: 1. Eliminate the supplemental sign next to the new opening on the west elevation (Jefferson Street) as if it is determined by the Zoning Administrator to not meet the ordinance. 2. Approval of the awnings does not preclude the encroachment agreement required from the City of Savannah. Internally illuminated awnings are prohibited.

- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

15. [Petition of Richard O. Smith | H-11-4415\(S\)-2 | 625 Tattnall St. | Window, Door](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4415\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4415\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

16. [Petition of Alethia Canady for Coastal Canvas Products, Inc. | H-4417\(S\)-2 | 346 MLK Jr. Blvd. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4417\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4417\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

17. [Petition of Keith Howington | H-11-4424\(S\)-2 | 208 Bull St. | Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4424\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4424\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

18. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc. | H-11-4428\(S\)-2 | 15 W. Broughton St. | Color Change, Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4428\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4428\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

19. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects, PC | H-11-4429\(S\)-2 | 13 - 17 W. Bay St. | Color Change, Awnings](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4429\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4429\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

20. [Bull and Broughton Streets](#)

Ms. Ramsay asked what was being done at the corner of Broughton and Bull Streets on the SunTrust Bank parking lot.

Mr. Overton stated that he asked this question two days ago and was told that a leak is behind the parapet which has caused the entire facade to deteriorate. The leak is being repaired, repairing the parapet flashing, and replacing it in-kind as it was initially. Therefore, aesthetically, there is no change. This is the reason it has not come before the Historic Board of Review.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

21. [File H-10-4325-2 | 111 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Sign for Utrecht](#)

Attachment: [Memo Sign Approval 050411.pdf](#)

Mr. Judson said Ms. Ward will make a report on Utrecht sign at their meeting of June 8, 2011.

22. [File H-11-4370-2 | 411 West Congress Street | Canopy Addition](#)

Attachment: [Memo File Sprinkler 050411.pdf](#)

Ms. Bryant explained that the Fire Marshall had a sprinkler system installed in the canopy system. Ms. Ward requested that the sprinkler system pipes be painted to match the canopy supports. This has been done.

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

23. [May is National Preservation Month](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Month Events 2011.pdf](#)

Mr. Judson said that May is National Preservation month. He missed the chance to present this at the City Council meeting.

Mr. Overton reported that **Ms. Ward** and he attended the City Council meeting and Ms. Ward made the presentation. He believes that the Mayor and Council are appreciative of their work.

Mr. Thomson reported that Ms. Ward will present a proclamation to the Planning Commission on Tuesday, May 17, 2011 to be signed by the Commission recognizing May as National Preservation Month.

24. [Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Sustainability](#)

Attachment: [Secretary of Interior's Guidelines-sustainability.pdf](#)

Mr. Thomson explained that this is the latest standards. The Board might want to place this in a folder for easy access. This is given for information purposes only.

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

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

Mr. Judson stated that the Board has been given an invitation to tour SCAD museum on July 19, 2011 from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

Mr. Thomson reported that Ms. Susan Meyer, a member of the Planning Commission, went on a tour of SCAD museum. Ms. Meyer was very excited with the tour and asked that a tour be set up for the entire Planning Commission. Consequently, they are extending an invitation to other boards to tour the museum.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

26. [Congratulations](#)

The Board extended congratulations to Ms. Brittany Bryant upon today being the first time she presented the petitions.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

27. [Next Meeting - Wednesday June 8, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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