



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
April 11, 2012 2:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

APRIL 11, 2012 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Linda Ramsay, Chair
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
Sidney J. Johnson
Brian Judson
Stephen Merriman, Jr.
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Ned Gay, Vice Chair
Zena McClain, Esq.
Ebony Simpson

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approve Minutes of March 14, 2012](#)

Attachment: [03-14-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve Minutes of March 14, 2012. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

2. [Approve Minutes of Special Called Meeting March 21, 2012](#)

Attachment: [03-21-2012 Special Called Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve Special Called Meeting Minutes of March 21, 2012. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

III. SIGN POSTING

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

V. CONSENT AGENDA

3. [Petition of Wubbena Architects & Designers | H-12-4607-2 | 201 Habersham Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the roof and canopy alterations at 201 Habersham Street as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of Laura Scott-Adkins | H-12-4622-2 | 610 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the signs at 610 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of Merrill A. Levy | H-12-4624-2 | 3 West Liberty Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the new metal gate at 3 West Liberty Street. This approval does not preclude any permit or encroachment agreement that may be required. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects | H-12-4626-2 | 2 East Broughton Street | H-12-4626-2 | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the removal of the non-historic storefront system and installation of a new butt-glazed storefront system with internal frame and granite base with the condition that a granite sample be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Speedi Sign | H-12-4628-2 | 112 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use sign as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
------------	-------

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Greenline Architecture | H-11-4408-2 | 108 West Gordon Street | 12 month extension for an addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Request for extension.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - original application and specifications.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Plans and Elevations.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Move to Consent Agenda. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

Board Action:

Approval for the 12-month extension to expire on April 13, 2013, 12-months from the prior- PASS expiration date.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

9. [Petition of Haresh Bhojwani | H-12-4591-2 | 30 Barnard Street | ATM Addition](#)

Item withdrawn at the request of the petitioner.

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

10. [Amended Petition of Sean Dillion for Gonzalez Architects | H-11-4438-2 | 13 East Perry Street | Wall and Mechanical Screening](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Sean Dillon was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval to amend the Certificate of Appropriateness at 13 East Perry Street to incorporate a low masonry wall on the low elevation and screen the rooftop mechanical equipment.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the low masonry wall on the lane elevation and approval for painting of the new rooftop mechanical units, to reduce visibility from the public right-of-way, at 13 East Perry Street. This approval does not preclude any permit or encroachment agreement that may be required from the City of Savannah.

Mr. Judson stated he knows that it is not within the purview of the Board, but he wanted to know if current access to the ramp requires someone jumping a six (6) inch curb with their wheelchair. Is this a part of the city's review or a part of the encroachment agreement?

Ms. Bryant answered that she believes it would be the City's review.

Mr. Judson wanted this to be noted within their approval because if someone is in a wheelchair they would not be able to access this ramp.

Ms. Ramsay said she does not believe the ramp meets any of the ADA requirements. She does not believe that the ramp is proposed to meet ADA.

Mr. Engle said an eight inch curb wall would be needed to meet ADA.

Ms. Ramsay said this is a question they can ask the petitioner when he comes up to make his comments.

Mr. Engle asked if this means that in the future the Board will be defining screening as a

paint job. In the past when they required screening, they were physical objects and not just painting them.

Ms. Bryant explained that the Board handles screening in many different manners. This is before the Board to decide if they think the painting of the mechanical units is adequate screening. This is what the petitioner is proposing for the screening of these mechanical units on this building.

Dr. Williams asked if there are dimensions that would let them know how far this is from the lane.

Ms. Bryant explained that some of the units were preexisting. She pointed out where the two new units would be placed and the preexisting units that were there prior to the alterations that the Board approved on June 8, 2011.

Dr. Williams asked which units are being proposed to be changed.

Ms. Bryant answered that she believes all the units are being requested to be changed, but this is a question that the petitioner can clarify.

Mr. Engle asked if the petitioner is requesting to add more wall here.

Ms. Bryant replied correct. She pointed out where the current wall ends. The petitioner wishes to extend the current wall to the end of the building face.

Mr. Engle asked if the petitioner will take the wall to the end of the property line.

Ms. Bryant answered yes.

Mr. Engle said if a curb cut occurs because of the wall, it will have to occur on someone else's property.

Ms. Bryant said the Board could ask the petitioner this question.

Mr. Engle said this would be a six inch curb access on someone else's property that will not allow access. What if the person doesn't want the curb cut next door. Shouldn't this stop short of the property line so that there would be access to the ramp?

Ms. Ward explained that she does not believe that any of this is on their property. She believes all of it is on the city's right-of-way; the sidewalk, the wall, and the ramp. There may be a curb cut at the end of the block, but she was not sure.

Dr. Henry stated that the staff's report says that the petitioner is requesting to screen the rooftop mechanical. Is the petitioner requesting to paint it?

Ms. Bryant stated this is what the petitioner is requesting to screen with and staff is recommending approval because it is such a low one-story building. She believes that any other type screening would add mass. However, the Board can decide whether or not they think the painting would be an appropriate screening.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dillon stated that the low wall and encroachment issues have been submitted to the City. He should know within a couple of days when the request will be on the City's agenda. There was an existing encroachment. However, the previous owner who installed the ramp onto the right-of-way did not go through the proper channels to get it done. Therefore, they have been asked to go through the proper channels. This is a part of a legal document. Mr. Dillon said with regards to extending the wall, the City's Development Services Department asked them to do this and they are fine with doing so. This is why they are adding this into the proposal. He said two neighbors down from this address have their HVAC equipment on the side which is blocked off.

Mr. Johnson asked the petitioner if he knew whether sanitation trucks travel through the lane.

Mr. Dillon answered that he believes so. It is a fairly wide lane.

Mr. Johnson asked the petitioner if he has talked with the neighbors about this.

Mr. Dillon answered yes. He has talked with a couple of the neighbors and they are happy to have a business here. There have not been any objections. He explained that on the back side of the building, there will be three units; they have been here for years. The addition as Ms. Bryant pointed out, two vents are for the bathrooms and then a vent for the kitchen equipment/hood. They are not extremely visible, but they are new and bright. This is why they are asking to paint it as it will tone it down. It is not an eyesore, but they don't want to add a bunch of mass to try to cover it up. This is a small building.

Dr. Henry asked the petitioner if the other two units are functional.

Mr. Dillon answered yes. All the equipment is functional.

Dr. Henry asked if the new units would be painted the same color as these.

Mr. Dillon stated yes, in this same kind of tone. It is not the exact same color, but if they are asked to paint all the equipment that color is perfectly fine. They have no issue with it. However, the darker gray color is not that bright shining stainless steel that can be seen miles away.

Dr. Williams said the staff is concerned about increasing the mass on the three older units in the back, but he asked the petitioner if he had some type of screening that were no taller than the units but assemble them closer together so they would screen the view of the new element and paint them in the darker gray that is being proposed. He asked Mr. Dillon if he had considered the screening as opposed to the paint, at least for the rear.

Mr. Dillon answered that they did; but as he has said, they did not want to add mass to it. However, it is easier to use paint to sort of hid it.

Dr. Williams said the profile of the new vent painted dark will make its silhouette more noticeable. It won't be shiny, but perhaps it will be even more mass. This one is the biggest

aesthetic challenge; because the others are low if they are painted dark, he believes they will blend away as the building is painted a light color. He could see a screen on the back working effectively.

Mr. Dillon said it is not as noticeable. You would have to step back very far to see it over the pediment. It barely sticks up over the edge.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dillon if this is in front of the Savannah Theater.

Mr. Dillon said they are in front of the other roadway.

PUBLIC CIOMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said they have reviewed this four times and they were concerned about the front elevation, the gable and pediment. This has been compromised by the air vent and the unit. He is concerned about now it it being said that paint is a screen. However, paint is not a screen and in three years it will probably start flaking off, there will be no way to make the person repaint it. Paint is somewhat like putting in a tree which could be cut down and then there is no screen. A screen should be permanent. Mr. Engle said he would hate to see them sliding into "let's paint it" and pretend that it does not exist syndrome. The paint might come off next year.

Mr. Merriman said if the screen wall is put in the back, it would make the back look much better. However, he wanted to know if the screen wall would be somewhat like a movie screen that highlights what is seen from the front.

Dr. Williams said it would almost need all the vents to be like a sandwich of screens. A screen on back and as closest as possible to the large vent in the middle, so that from the street the screen would not be seen. It needs to rise six to eight inches higher than the peak pediment and if the screen actually conforms to the shape of the pediment, it would read as the extension pediment back in space. If the petitioner is going to do this, he believes he would need a low screen in the front near the vent that would block any view even from across the square and one for the rear since this is a wide lane and the elements are noticeable.

Ms. Ramsay said they are getting into the design. She believes the comments are good, but if the Board does consider painting the screening, they need to take appropriate actions.

Dr. Henry stated that he believes it is in the Board's purview to say that they would like a screen that replicates the peak, not as a design element, but the height and mass.

Mr. Merriman said the Chair has stated that the petitioner is not asking the Board to approve the screening, but whether or not they will approve the painting. Therefore, a motion would need to be made against painting as screening.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board could approve one part and not the other.

Mr. Engle said the irony to reinforce his comment about the tree is when the crepe myrtles were on the front of this building, you could not see the units, but since they have been cut down to six feet above grade, now the units are seen. Therefore, this shows them how trees do not work as screens.

Mr. Merriman said the Board could say that they are not going to approve the painting of the screens which means that they will stay just as they are; they may never be screened.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board could approve the painting, but not in lieu of screen. The petitioner would have to screen them.

Mr. Merriman asked if the units would definitely have to be screened in accordance with the ordinance.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes, in accordance with the ordinance. She asked staff if this is correct.

Ms. Ward said while she does believe that it is important that the Board not be a design symposium, it would be helpful to give the petitioner some direction as he is here today because they did some things after-the-fact. Therefore, they need to be in compliance. The petitioner proposed painting as a way of screening the HVAC units. Staff is supportive of this. They have heard a couple of things, but she believes the petitioner needs some direction so they could come back knowing exactly what they need to do.

Dr. Williams said the proposal that has been submitted to the Board is that painting be in lieu of screening.

Dr. Henry said he does not agree with the painting being in lieu of screening.

Board Action:

Approval for the low masonry wall on the lane elevation and the painting for the new rooftop mechanical units with the condition that a traditional screening method is also used to screen the rooftop mechanical equipment. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye

Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

11. [Amended Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4500-2 | 126 West Bay Street | Rooftop Addition](#)

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 to amend the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the new rooftop addition on 126 West Bay Street.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the amendments to the rooftop addition to 126 West Bay Street because the proposed amendments to the rooftop addition meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Historic District Ordinance (Sec. 8-3030) standards.

Dr. Williams stated that his recollection is that the south side of the roof terrace was not accessible to public. He asked if he was reading the lower plan correctly that almost the entire perimeter will be roof terrace.

Ms. Bryant stated she believes this is correct.

Dr. Henry said the staff is recommending approval of the request, but he heard Ms. Bryant say that the standard is not met concerning additions to historic buildings located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building, etc.

Ms. Bryant stated this is correct. It has always either been visible from the Bay Street facade or the Board determined that it was minimally visible and the visibility was acceptable. It was not met in the previous approval and the site line has increased slightly. Therefore, the Board needs to make a determination whether they believe the increase has pushed it over too much.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Bryant if she was saying back to section shown by the red dotted line.

Ms. Bryant answered, pointing to a section, that it has more to do with this portion. But also with the roof profile. Because they have added a portion, they have eliminated the bump out portion that was originally on the facade.

Mr. Engle said the petitioner is entitled to the additional floor because of Factors Walk. There is no way they can build it without it being visible. Consequently, there is a building conflict between our law and the Secretary of Interior's Standards. This reads as if it is wrong, but they have the right to build the bottom floor.

Ms. Bryant said that the Board determined this the last time the petition was before them.

Mr. Engle said the Board does not make the determination, but the law determined this. This was brought up in 2005 when they restored Factors Walk.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that they would like to characterize the modifications from their September 2011 approval as a sort of minor refinements based on structure code, mechanical systems. As Ms. Bryant has pointed out, the most significant change is the addition of the second elevator. They were able to eliminate the second bump out for the fire stairs, therefore where they could, they tried to minimize the building and it is actually a bit smaller. The height is two inches taller overall and fourteen inches taller on Bay Street. But, again they tried to minimize all the dimensional changes, but they are primarily driven by engineering as they got more in depth into the project. Mr. Dawson said as Mr. Engle pointed out, because his client has spent about \$500,000 on improvements to Factors Walk, it entitled them the right to do an additional story on the building. However, they have tried to minimize the impact of this.

Dr. Henry asked the petitioner to show the Board the bump-out that has been eliminated.

Mr. Dawson, pointing to a section, said that on their prior plan they had a fire stair that encroached here, popped out and created a little bulge in the facade. They were able to eliminate this, although it looks a little funnier than planned. But it is better than elevation because now they have a smooth facade. They have also changed the storefront system. He explained that before they had overhead doors which he believes is somewhat unrefined, but now they are using a NanoWall system which he believes has better and a sort of rhythm structure system. Therefore, he believes the facades read better now than they did in the prior submittal. This changes the elevator shaft as what was one elevator is now two elevators. With the rooftop restaurant that has been incorporated they must have two elevators. One for service and one for patrons.

Dr. Williams asked if the new plan shows mechanical equipment along the south terrace, but the whole pavement of the terrace appears to go all the way around.

Mr. Dawson said he believes it is just their drawing nomenclature. He said, pointing to an area, that the rooftop occupiable areas goes from this stair to this side here.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, it is being extended somewhat to the south side.

Mr. Dawson said it is being extended. The corners are being extended to the stairs on the Bay Street side. But, it is also being truncated on this side and they extended it all the way to the liquor store to the east. A part of this is because the Fire Marshall is concerned about the number of people on the roof, how they get off and so forth.

Mr. Judson said he concurs that overall this is a more attractive design. The staff has described the increase in visibility as minimal. But, he believes what has made the difference is how much closer it is to the parapet on the south side. The visibility factor to him has increased more than threefold. Is it necessary that it be that far to the south?

Mr. Dawson answered unfortunately it is. The alignment of the stair-shafts has to work all the way from River Street to the roof. Therefore, as they can imagine there is a great deal of complexity involved in making the things fit. He would much rather have it pushed inward but it simply cannot work with kitchens, hotel rooms and so forth.

Mr. Judson said he believed that Mr. Dawson had given this complete consideration, but he just wanted to ask the question to be sure.

Mr. Dawson said about ninety (90) percent of the roof is still the same. He said, pointing to a section, the site line is here and the red line versus the current proposed line is here. The majority of the building, although it is higher, it is really an inconsequential change. However, Mr. Judson is right. It is the tower that has made the difference.

Mr. Judson said going back to the bump-out, what is the approximate width of the two elevators?

Mr. Dawson said the shafts are about eight feet each. Therefore, he would say about sixteen to twenty feet overall. There is no further way that they can push this back.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Dawson if they looked at bringing the roof down over the sheets. Is there a reason that this cannot be done?

Mr. Dawson said if they look at their prior submittal, the stairs are actually tucked in under the piece that came down further. They could do this same technique again, but they felt quite frankly that this looked a little funny as having it expressed as a mass.

Mr. Howington asked isn't this what the metal roof does now. The metal roof is under the stairs.

Mr. Dawson said they could do the same thing with it coming across to the shafts. It would cut approximately three or four feet off the shaft. But when they drew it, it looked a little awkward.

Dr. Williams asked looked awkward from where.

Mr. Dawson answered wherever you could see it, Bay Street.

Dr. Williams said it reduces its visibility from Bay Street by three or four feet which is not insignificant. He said they are talking about visibility from hundreds of feet away.

Mr. Dawson said if they could imagine that the elevator shaft would come to the face of the wall and the roof would wrap at a lower level around the front. Therefore, it would be less mass.

Dr. Williams said if he understood, Mr. Howington's suggestion would be just as they see it in the petitioner's old proposal. He said if they go to page 6, the right hand half of the element would be brought down. Where would the mass be reduced if this is done?

Mr. Dawson said it would be cut at the eave line and an extension would be at the same

curb coming down.

Dr. Williams said this would be a substantial reduction.

Mr. Dawson concurred and said technically it is very feasible for them to do this.

Mr. Engle asked if the curb reflects the roof shape.

Mr. Dawson answered yes.

Mr. Engle said they are talking design, but he believes it would work.

Dr. Williams said it is an issue of visibility conforming to the Secretary of Interior's Standards which would help in coming close to meet it. On one level, it was said that it would look odd, but look how much it is above the dotted line.

Mr. Dawson said as he thinks about it, it would actually get the edge of the roof close to the dotted line. They would still be able to see the peak of the elevator tower.

Dr. Williams said it would be a significant less amount.

Mr. Dawson said he agrees with that. But, he believes it just looks funny to him. But, they will be willing to do this.

PUBIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they made their position clear at the last meeting. They had a good meeting with the petitioner yesterday. Certainly, there are improvements to this proposal which they have endorsed. However, he wanted to take a minute partly for consistency sake and for the records to voice Historic Savannah Foundation's concern and objection over rooftop additions. He said the word "entitled" was used a couple of times today. This was one of his issues when they looked at this the last time. He believes the word is "eligible" for the rooftop addition, but not "entitled." There is a big difference and he believes is an important distinction to make. The HSF would like to see some exploration with may be the staff, MPC staff, and the City about these rooftop additions. Particularly, along River Street. He believes the perspective is changing dramatically and will change even more along River Street with the construction and the development that they are starting to see. One of the things that may be they should consider is, "what is the appropriate advantage point or perspective on what is happening along River Street?" Is it when you are standing on River Street, Bay Street or when you are standing on Hutchinson Island and looking across the river? Really, this provides a better perspective on what is happening or what can happen along River Street. Certainly, with respect to height as the tree line is so important that it kind of framed for many years what they thought River Street should look like in limiting heights and so forth. He believes this is changing, but the perspective is best seen from Hutchinson island. Therefore, rather than single out this particular project, they want to say this subject is worthy of more exploration and discussion. The HSF would love to be a part of the discussion. As he has said, he believes they will see more issue such as this. Mr. Carey said the rooftop additions, particularly along River Street can be troublesome.

Mr. Richard Williams said he is the president of the board of the West Building in the News Place Condominium. There are approximately 22 resident owners here. The east business representative is working today and, therefore, could not attend the meeting. However, he shares the same thoughts. Mr. Williams said they found out about the additions to the building by knowing a person who works at Fiddler's Crab. The individual told him that a hotel bought the building and was going to add an addition to the roof. Mr. Williams said he looked into this and they did have almost two feet by two feet white plaque that was on the building across the street. He came to the MPC office and spoke to Mr. Thomson who showed him how to retrieve the information. What he saw was fifteen feet on both sides, nicely put back from the street. He is not trying to stop anything; but what they were told when they bought the condos were they are historic buildings and could not be changed. This is the reason they spent \$700,000 for the views. Initially, the first suggestion was that there would be a large space on both sides. Since then it has increased. Since he has lived on Bay Street, they call the police to come to the Bohemian all the time. They play music at 2:00 a.m. and turn out inebriated people. Eventually, they will have to talk about Whitaker Street and the new Screaming Mimi's. Mr. Williams said he shares Mr. Carey's concerns. May be it's okay putting another rooftop up there, but they need to be careful and try to figure out who this is affecting. He lives here and has two condos right across the street. To put something on the roof at least without having some consideration of forming it, just to see another huge obtuse black stucco box is not beneficial to any of the views of Savannah and certainly not to the owners of the condos.

Mr. Engle said he realizes that the elevator shaft has to be masonry, but there is no other stucco and the petitioner is using standing seam as a material for cladding. He asked why.

Mr. Dawson explained that it was his personal preference. He thought for the vertical elements that may be they would read differently in stucco. Now, as he thinks about it he does not want it to read at all.

Mr. Engle said this makes it stand out from everything else on the roof.

Mr. Dawson said it clearly makes it more distinguishable and he believes if they modify the roof to bring the front piece down, if it was clad in the same material would be less obtrusive. Mr. Dawson said he would be willing to modify his petition to include this. This is a good suggestion.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Thomson if there was anything, as the Board, they could do to make sure the comments by Mr. Carey and Mr. Williams go forward.

Mr. Thomson said the Board could make a recommendation to staff to look at the regulations relating to this. Two years were spent recently updating the ordinance. But, they will happy to follow the directions of the Board and come back with a report.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board members if they felt it would be important enough to restudy this.

Mr. Engle said this building has been sitting empty for many years. It is not an easy task to bring investors in to try to bring back life to these buildings.

Ms. Ramsay stated that what Mr. Carey was recommending that they study how additions can be made. He was not saying prevent them from being done on River Street.

Mr. Engle said this is not what he was referring to. He empathizes with the condo owners, but he does not know who gave them the advice that nothing could be built across the street.

Mr. Judson in addressing one of Mr. Williams' comments said that the Board does not want to appear insensitive, but issues such as noise abatement and behavioral modifications are outside of the purview of this Board. The function of this Board is to consider architectural design and changes. He believes also as he has read the ordinances that a point of view has always been from the street level. Now, this certainly isn't to discount the owners investment and the view they have gotten nor is it implied that this Board would be insensitive to it. Mr. Judson said he just wanted it to be on record that whatever decision this Board may or may not make does not appear to be insensitive to the neighbors.

Mr. Merriman said Mr. Dawson nor his clients were entitled to anything, but they have earned it. They have spent a lot of money on Factors Walk only because it would give them the chance to have this. Therefore, they have earned the eligibility.

Ms. Ramsay said, however, at the same time it has to be visually compatible.

NOTE: The Board directed the staff to look into the ordinance and report back to the Board their findings.

Board Action:

Approval for the amendments to the rooftop addition with the condition that the roof height over the laundry/refuse shaft attached to the elevator is reduce to follow the contour and profile - PASS of the main roof line and the elevator shaft is clad in standing seam, to match the material of the addition.

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-11-4569-2 | 412 Williamson Street | Findings for New Construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting clarification and findings for two issues concerning the proposed new construction for a five-story hotel at 412 Williams Street. They are not here to review Part I or Part II today. They are here to consider two findings for standards that are in the Historic District Ordinance. This is a little different than what they normally do, but this is a large project. It has been before the Board twice for Part I and they are trying to break this down into smaller pieces so that certain aspects can be reviewed of the project without looking specifically at the related design elements so that they can consider the standards. They will make a determination if the standards have or have not been met. The Part I design elements will be reviewed at the next meeting. Consequently, the petitioner is requesting clarification and a finding by the Board with regard to:

1. The 30 foot parking setback standard; and
2. The criteria for the additional story above the height map.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends that the Board make::

1. A finding that the Parking Area stand [Sec. 8-3030 (n)(14)b.] which states, *structured parking within the first story of a building shall be setback a minimum of 30 feet from property lines along all public rights-of-way (not including lanes)*, has been met; and
2. A finding that criteria (iii) to qualify for an additional story above the Historic District Height Map, under subsection 8-3030(n)(16)e.ii.2. for Large-Scale Development, which requires *multiple ground floor uses permitted in the base zoning district (including but not limited to retail, lobby, restaurant) span the length of the facade on all street fronting elevations (not including lanes) and maintain individual primary exterior entrances*, has been met.

Mr. Merriman stated that he is disappointed that the other criteria was not used, but he understands that a lot would be involved. He asked that when they get to Part II would the Board get an opportunity to see what will happen here regarding the hotel.

Ms. Ward explained that if the petitioner is doing it, she believes the Board will have limited involvement. Normally, if it is the City's right-of-way, the City reviews it and it has

to meet all the City standards. Staff is certainly engaged in this process. If there were any structures as they saw in the last submittal such as a ship mast as a work of art, this would go before the Historic Site and Monument Commission for review and approval. There may be certain elements that come back; especially if there was an awning, canopy or any kind of structural. But, otherwise, it would most likely go to the City for review.

Mr. Merriman asked if something would have to be built here because of the development of the property.

Ms. Ward believed something would have to be done. Meetings are scheduled in the future. She believes the petitioner is meeting with the City next week to talk about how to move this part forward. They are having a staff meeting on Friday to discuss the project and the specific right-of-way improvements. Therefore, they are not just turning their backs to this. It will happen.

Mr. Merriman said it is in everybody's best interest to do something here.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay thanked Chair Ramsay and Ms. Ward for meeting with him and work through the language of the ordinance to be sure they all understand what is being said. Mr. Shay said he had a fundamental misunderstanding of the earlier staff reports and it was not until they sat down together and reviewed the ordinance that he and Ms. Ward were saying the same thing, but were meaning different things. Mr. Shay said he is not here today for the height and mass approval, but will be back as soon as they can. They have already considered some of the things that have been suggested, but they are not prepared to present them to the Board in the full three dimensional submittal until they settle the questions that are before them today.

Mr. Shay said they have been asked on behalf of the developer to meet with the City Friday, April 13, 2012 on the Montgomery Street right-of-way. He believes this meeting is only to get the ball rolling; he has no idea whether this will take ten weeks, ten months or ten years. However, he is hopeful that they are going to be able to work out something where there is a way for the City and the developer to collaborate on making something really exceptional happen in the Montgomery Street right-of-way. But as a part of this hotel development, they will never show this Board anything about it again. This was very controversial and did not really further their cause. He said they want the clarification to the standards regarding the setback for the first story parking. They believe they have met the standard and they welcome the staff report. This corner received much contention at the last meeting. He said, pointing to a section, that not is there only an entrance here with activated use that goes back to the corner, but they have also provide a corner entrance here and an activated use above. Therefore, they actually have two stories of activated use, both are accessible to the public in a pedestrian way. It happens that the slope makes it possible to actually have access on two different levels. There is no long gap any where along this side of the building nor on any other sides that face the streets.

Mr. Engle thanked Mr. Shay for working this through. It is good.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Ramsay explained that the Board has to vote on a finding of fact whether they agree with what has been presented.

Board Action:

Find that the Parking Area standard [Sec. 8-3030 (n)(14)b.] which states, structured parking within the first story of a building shall be setback a minimum of 30 feet from property lines along all public rights-of-way (not including lanes), has been met.

Find that criteria (iii) to qualify for an additional story above the Historic District Height Map, under subsection 8-3030(n)(16)e.ii.2. for Large-Scale Development, which requires multiple ground floor uses permitted in the base zoning district (including but not limited to retail, office, lobby, restaurant) span the length of the façade on all street fronting elevations (not including lanes) and maintain individual primary exterior entrances, has been met. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington
Second: Sidney J. Johnson
Reed Engle - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Brian Judson - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Robin Williams - Aye

13. [Petition of Brenda K. Pearson for Dawson Architects | H-12-4599-2 | 1 West Liberty Street | Alteration](#)

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

NOTE: Mr. Johnson left the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

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

Ms. Brittany Bryant the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the commercial space at 1 West Liberty Street. She passed a sample of the stain for the mahogany doors and columns. Signage for the business will be submitted at a later date.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the alterations, including reconstruction of the storefront, removal of the corner entry and relocation of the principal entrance onto Liberty Street with the following conditions:

1. The color of the new stucco treatment on the southern most portion of the wall on Bull Street must be submitted to staff for final approval;
2. The Bull Street egress should be a wood door to match the proposed wood doors to be installed on Liberty Street;
3. The doors must be inset no less than three inches from the building facade; and
4. The storefront glazing must be inset no less than four inches from the building facade.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Bryant to explain the dark area in the middle of page six.

Ms. Bryant answered that it is the prior IPE submittal.

Dr. Henry asked if the petitioner was getting rid of the IPE.

Ms. Bryant said the petitioner no longer wants to install the IPE on the southernmost wall. The wall will be stucco. They are no longer proposing IPE on the columns, but will be mahogany columns.

Dr. Henry stated that he believes this is a step backwards. He likes the old ones.

Mr. Engle asked staff if they can tell whether the gate has been moved. The Board went through this before about the gate.

Ms. Bryant explained that the gate was on this month's Consent agenda and the gate was proposed to be moved to another area and it has been approved.

Mr. Engle said it was requested before that the gate be moved, but the Board said no. Is it staying where it is?

Ms. Bryant answered yes. The petitioner is constructing a new gate at the bottom of the stairs.

Mr. Engle asked if historic gate is being moved.

Ms. Bryant answered that the gate will remain intact.

Ms. Ramsay said, therefore, it is not a part of this application.

Ms. Bryant answered that the gate was on this month's Consent agenda.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that he was not present at the last meeting, but was told that discussion was held on the IPE. Therefore, they wanted to simplify the design to stucco as they believe it will be less controversial, but he believes less successful. They have modified the storefront to mahogany which he believes is a traditional and frequently used material in the Historic District. The storefront is pretty well fixed in the plain because of the existing columns. Therefore, in order to meet the four inch setback, they had to protect the columns; proud of the existing storefront face. This creates an issue with the existing stucco cornice that is pointed out in this detail that the column face would then be proud of this stucco. Mr. Dawson said, therefore, what they are doing is with the lukabond piece at the top, they are essentially creating a facade element that is four inches proud from here to the north and then to the stucco which is an existing plain. This is why this cornice remains exposed here, but is covered there so that they can meet the four inch setback requirement.

Ms. Ramsay asked if this dimension is on the drawing.

Mr. Dawson said there is not a dimension and he was not sure why there isn't, but it is actually more than four inches. It is about six inches. He said with regards to the staff's recommendation on the door, it is a service door. They feel fairly strongly that the main entrance door on Liberty Street needs to be the mahogany which is a traditional main entry material and that the service door on the Bull Street side should remain an aluminum storefront door as it is just a service door.

Mr. Howington stated he believes this is a step in the right direction. Just because it is a traditional material, his concern would be if it was the spine of Bull Street. It is a beautiful design, but may be it is a little contemporary for the spine of the History District. He asked that where it stands four inches proud at the lukabond, are the awnings going to be on the same plane?

Mr. Dawson answered yes. They will have a different frame at the two on the south end.

Dr. Henry said the design change appears radically from what was first submitted. He asked Mr. Dawson if there was a reason why this was done or was it due to feedback he was getting from this Board.

Mr. Dawson answered yes. However, he feels strongly that the IPE was a beautiful solution for a nonrated structure. He believes it was appropriate for a contemporary design, but they are the Board and he is here to make sure that it is visually compatible. Therefore, they modified their proposal.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said every architect on this Board said they liked the IPE board and he took them seriously. He liked the IPE, too. He believes the concern was that it did not fit into this building or whatever was the context. He believes that something needs to be said when something is a good quality, it will fit-in anywhere. This Board should have thought about this rule.

Ms. Ramsay said if they go back to the last meeting, the Board did not deny it. They wanted to see it contextually, perhaps a rendering. But that is not the issue before this Board today. What they asked for was a rendering or something that would show the context. At the last meeting the Board members did not believe they had enough information to determine visual compatibility. Therefore, they asked for additional information and they got what was received today.

Mr. Howington stated that the IPE is very dark and would look nice, but they are going to get the same look from what is presented today.

Mr. Merriman said the drawing looked great, but he did not believe that it fitted in as it should.

Mr. Engle said the stucco panel and cornice may be the only original parts of this structure along with the gate. They are 80 to 85 years old. This building has a lot of history and it is amazing to him that this building was never listed in the first place. A really good case could be made for this building.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Engle if he was saying that two corners that are going to be covered up are historic.

Mr. Engle said two sections are going to be left exposed. He explained that he was saying that the stucco wall panel is shown in an early photo. Therefore, almost one hundred years is on the two panel stucco.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board discussed at the last meeting the IPE and now it is going back to stucco.

Mr. Howington said the only thing that has changed is an IPE was on the columns and now it is mahogany. An IPE wall panel now will be stucco. There will be mahogany columns instead of IPE and is stacked. Therefore, it will be a horizontal look stacked up.

Dr. Williams said some of the major cornices Mr. Dawson showed will be covered with metal.

Ms. Ramsay said as she understands it, this is to get the four inch depth for the windows.

Mr. Dawson clarified that the stucco cornice piece is historic; surely the turn of the century. However, the stucco below as they have gotten some exploratory demonstration, the stucco is actually mounted on the storefront that still exists back behind that is buried in the wall. The stucco is clearly not more than thirty to forty years old.

Mr. Engle asked if this includes the panel.

Mr. Dawson said steel two columns appear to him to be from the 50s or 60s. The building certainly has been modified significantly over time. The only reason they are covering up the cornices is because they can not bring the columns proud.

Dr. Williams asked how is the cornice panel affixed to the building. It appears that a two by six and a two by four behind it.

Mr. Dawson, pointing to an area, said the steel beam is here and there is actually a concrete beam that they discovered since the drawings were done here. Therefore, original stucco is down to here, but everything below that is stucco applied over, which is basically a plywood panel that is screwed to the storefront.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dawson what is the reason for the columns projecting in front of the cornices.

Mr. Dawson answered to create the rhythm of windows and solids structures applied by the ordinance.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, they have a situation where one part of the code is going to cause another part of the building to suffer.

Board Action:

Approval for the alterations, including reconstruction of the storefront, removal of the corner entry and relocation of the principal entrance onto Liberty Street with the following conditions:

1. The color of the new stucco treatment on the southern most portion of the wall on Bull Street must be submitted to staff for final approval; - PASS
2. The Bull Street egress should be a wood door to match the proposed wood doors to be installed on Liberty Street;
3. The doors must be inset no less than three inches from the building facade; and
4. The storefront glazing must be inset no less than four inches from the building facade.

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Gerald Cowart, AIA | H-12-4625-2 | 18 East Macon Street | Alteration/addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Application, Plans, and Specifications.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)

Mr. Gerald Cowart was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to enclose the existing second floor wood porch on the rear of the townhouse at 18 East Macon Street. The existing porch will be rebuilt with new brick piers and posts that are not visible from the right-of-way due to an existing privacy wall along Harris Street. A 1.5 percent lot coverage variance is requested from the 75 percent maximum permitted in the RIP-A zoning district to cover 76.5 percent of the parcel.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the porch enclosure provided that the roof material is not visible from the public right-of-way. If the roof is visible upon completion of the construction, it must comply with the standard to be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles. The staff further recommends that the Board recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) approval of the 1.5 percent lot coverage variance because it is consistent with the intent of the ordinance and the existing footprint on the smaller Trust Lot.

Mr. Engle asked if the new roof will be at the same pitch as the existing awning.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner is taking the roof back to the building. She believes the existing awning comes under this.

Mr. Engle said the existing awning goes under the window sill on the second floor.

Ms. Ward stated that there is a bump out addition that extends along the entire back of the building and the awning comes under this and out. The new roof addition will go back to the end of the building.

Mr. Engle said looking at photo two of four, the awning is quite visible. Therefore, he does not know how the roof will not be visible.

Ms. Ward explained that this is why staff identified this as a concern since it is not a clear cut case for them that it will not be visible.

Dr. Henry asked that with the approved variance it will be 1.5.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Dr. Henry asked staff what does the rule says regarding variances. Is it air or ground space?

Ms. Ward answered that the ordinance is about building coverage; it is not about open space that is left here. The ordinance says there is a maximum building coverage. Therefore, it concerns anything that has a roof over it and not more than 75 percent of the parcel in the RIP-A zoning district.

Ms. Ramsay said to follow up on Mr. Engle's comments, what if the roof is visible.

Ms. Ward answered that before the Certificate of Occupancy or the Certificate of Completion, the standard must be complied with. Inspections are done during the construction. Mr. Mike Rose, City Building Inspector, could not be at this meeting today, but he will call if something is not right and the staff will go out and check. But, before they can sign off on the release of the permit, the petitioner must comply with the standards.

Ms. Ward said it was identified in the petitioner's plan that they are building next to the adjacent property owner. Therefore, a fire wall will need to be built, but it will not have an effect on the design of the building.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cowart stated that Mr. Chris Novak, the property owner, was present with him. Mr. Cowart wanted to reiterate that they are building in the shadow of an existing deck and it presently violates the lot coverage ordinance by 1.5 percent. They are not asking to go beyond the limits of what is presently here. The roof that they are proposing will not be higher than the existing roof that attachés to the existing building; the cornice of it will actually be a little higher than the outside edge of the awning that is here now. Mr. Cowart said if the Board is looking at a photograph of the awning and can see the top of the awning, not the fascia, they may see the top of the roof from across the street. But, since there is a large Magnolia tree right behind the lot, they could not give a photo that clearly shows this.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Cowart, for clarification, if he was saying that the roof will not be visible.

Mr. Cowart answered that they do not think the roof will be visible because of the height and the angle of the roof. The roof is difficult to see because of the Magnolia. They had to take the picture of the existing roof from a weird angle that is included in their submittal packet.

Mr. Judson, for clarity, asked Mr. Cowart that should the inspection reveal that the roof is

visible, if he had any issues with the compliance of the roofing material standards.

Mr. Cowart answered no. He explained the configuration of the roof. The present roof can be seen from the street. He said, pointing to a section of the roof, that the angle of the roof goes from here to here.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation said there seems to be a couple of seemingly esoteric points. The light pattern on the windows, he believes it was suggested to have something other than six-over-six. They understand the reasoning for this is the differentiation between the old and the new. But, in this case, the HSF would argue to keep the six-over-six light pattern here. The fact that it is an addition speaks for itself. Therefore, he does not believe that any further distinction is necessary. He does not believe that the change in light pattern will do anything, except look out of place with the rest of the rear of the building. He does not know if the petitioner will consider this or even if staff or Board would think this is acceptable. The HSF, however, is in favor of retaining the traditional six-over-six pattern and whatever is the accompanying appropriate light pattern in the door. They are talking about enclosing something that already exists. He does not know if this is really new construction or not. He considers new construction to be something brand new. In this case he would argue against using Hardi-Board and is in favor of using wood. Mr. Carey believes the wood be more in keeping and whether it is or is not new construction, is a debatable point.

Mr. Novak said he is not the property owner yet. This home has been for sale more than four years. If everything goes well he will close on it. He said he is a civil engineer and this Board is the experts when it comes to architectural features. He trusts what Mr. Cowart says; whatever Mr. Cowart feels is comfortable is fine with him.

Mr. Cowart said they will be happy to do the six-over-six. He would like to keep the Hardi-plank. It will be painted and there will be very little distinction between the Hardi-Board and wood because they will be using little of it. Mr. Novak is concerned about maintenance as everyone else. However, this is not a make or break subject as he has said this will be a small amount and they can do it right.

Dr. Henry asked the staff how they feel about the six-over-six.

Ms. Ward answered that did not consider the six-over-six because the petitioner proposed two-over-two. Staff felt this was a good call. She wonders if the door light platform would need to be changed to match. However, as an addition, staff believes it is clearly distinguishable with the six-over-six light pattern just as it would be with the two-over-two pattern. Therefore, staff would recommend approval of six-over-six.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Cowart that in his drawings in the upper left, if this is what they are showing as the existing kitchen roof. He said the neighboring house has this as well.

Mr. Cowart confirmed that the entire row has it.

Dr. Williams said it can be assumed that it is fairly historic, the original roof plain. He was looking at the Sanborn from 1888 and it appears that there is a one-story component

on the back of the house.

Mr. Cowart said it is roughly a six foot bump out in the back and has some indications that it is historic, but probably was a porch original.

Dr. Williams said it might have been on the second floor. But, it is shown as a one-story bump out and he does not know if it was the ground level.

Mr. Cowart asked Dr. Williams if the Sanborn shows it as a porch.

Dr. Williams answered that it is shown as masonry.

Mr. Cowart explained that there is masonry separation. He said that is right, it is masonry.

Dr. Williams stated that Mr. Cowart has proposed that the roof modification in the section below the elevation in the lower left is existing. He said Mr. Cowart mentioned the roof plane that the Board saw in the photo is the existing roof plain and the new roof will come at a different pitch, 1.5:12. What will happen to the existing roof under the new roof? Will it be removed?

Mr. Cowart answered that if it is historic, they will certainly leave it there.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Cowart if he originally planned to remove it.

Mr. Cowart answered that they had not addressed this.

Dr. Williams said the original roof, which is at the steeper pitch comes out six feet and the new roof above. His question, therefore, is what will happen to the original roof which appears to be a part of the original fabric of the building.

Mr. Cowart stated that they will preserve this roof and the structure material once they remove the obvious later added membrane roof that is on here now. In fact, there may be a metal roof under here .

Dr. Williams said if Mr. Cowart do this with encapsulating this would be great because if it was ever removed, they would still have the integrity of the original structure.

Mr. Cowart said they will encapsulate the existing roof.

Mr. Engle said a dotted line on the drawings is shown as air conditioning units on the roof, which is the existing roof. He asked Mr. Cowart if the units would be removed and put on the new roof.

Mr. Cowart explained that the air conditioning unit is raised on a curb and their assumption is that they can build around this and leave the existing unit undisturbed. They have had the HVAC technician look at it and it is adequately sized to condition the new addition. Therefore, they should not have to disturb this at all.

Dr. Williams asked if the north wall that is painted white will remain also.

Mr. Cowart explained that a short piece of brick on the far right end of the wall that Dr. Williams was speaking about looks as if it probably was not a part of the original brick wall; it was removed.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Cowart, therefore, what he is saying is the wall that is painted white is not historic.

Mr. Cowart answered that he is sure that it is not. It is wood construction.

Dr. Williams said obvious the wall next door is brick. He asked Mr. Cowart if they were talking about the same surface.

Mr. Cowart checked and said they were talking about two different things. He checked to see if they had a photo of the house next door. Mr. Cowart said there is also a wood infill on the unit next door that is relatively the same size. May be what happened is that half was brick and the other half was open porch. This would not have been unusual to have an open porch on the service side of the building.

Dr. Williams said he was sure that parts of these buildings have been manipulated over the years. He asked that the white area that is painted under the awning with the two double-hung windows with the door and transom, this wall is currently what material.

Mr. Cowart said it is T-111.

Dr. Williams asked, therefore, it is not brick. It is not historic.

Mr. Cowart explained that there is an eleven foot brick opening in this wall that corresponds with the wood infill. They will be removing this wall, but none of the brick.

Board Action:

Recommend approval of the 1.5 percent lot coverage variance because it is consistent with the intent of the ordinance and the existing footprint on the smaller Trust Lot and approve the porch enclosure with the following conditions:

1. A six-over-six window light pattern and corresponding door light pattern be used to be compatible with the historic residence; - PASS
2. The roof of the historic addition be preserved and encapsulated into the new addition; and
3. The roof material must not be not visible from the public right-of-way. If the roof is visible upon

completion of the construction, it must comply with the standard to be covered with standing seam metal, slate, tile or asphalt shingles.

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associate Architects, PC | H-12-4627-2 | 516 Drayton Street | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Sarah Ward recuse from participating in this petition as her husband is a consultant in this project.

Mr. Andrew Lynch was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation and alterations to 516 Drayton Street. This is a part of the Old Candler Hospital, but the petitioner will be doing the project in phases.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation and alterations to 516 Drayton Street with the following conditions:

1. The metal pane pattern and color must be submitted to staff for final approval;
2. The infill brick and mortar must be submitted to staff for final approval;
3. A four foot by four foot test patch of the proposed repointing, as it will appear finished, must be installed in an inconspicuous location on the building for staff approval;
4. Consult and follow the National Park Service *Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings* prior to undertaking any repointing, and *Preservation Brief 22: The Preservation and Repair of Historic* prior to undertaking any stucco repair.

Ms. Bryant reported that since the publication of the staff report, a few Board members made concerns that the preservation Secretary of Interior's Standards may apply to this building. She said she has written a memo regarding the standards and placed a copy

in each Board's member addendum packet. She reported that although the building at 516 Drayton Street is not listed on the History building Map, it may be eligible for historic designation because it was constructed in 1955 and designed by local architect Daniel L. Grantham in the International Style. The Board may make a determination that the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are applicable for this project

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval with the conditions mentioned in the staff's recommendation because the proposed rehabilitation projects meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Mr. Merriman said staff says that the building may be eligible for historic designation. He asked if the building is not listed, does it come under the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Ms. Bryant said they had this issue come up with the Kehoe Machine Shop. She said she would read the wording of the ordinance. The ordinance says that "any historic structure and any out buildings or appurtenances related to visible from the public street/lane including but not limited to walls, fence, light fixtures, steps, pavings, sidewalks, and sign shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered or maintain in a manner that will preserve the historic and exterior architectural features of the historic structures or appurtenances."

Ms. Bryant said in the past, the Board has determined that for certain additions that the Secretary of Interior's Standards can apply even if they are not listed as historic.

Mr. Merriman said, therefore, the building may be eligible or may not be eligible, but judging from past decisions, it could apply to this building.

Ms. Bryant said the Board could make a determination. In the past the Board has made the determination whether they wanted to apply the eligibility to something that was not listed as historic. The City Attorney has said it is legal to apply the standards.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she believes if the Board reads this carefully, they will see that automatically the Secretary of Interior's Standards applies as it is pertinent to historic buildings regardless of the age.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, the building's age makes it eligible. The fact that it is not listed does not mean that it isn't. The carriage houses were listed in 2000, they were 150 years old. Just the absence of listing does not mean the absence of historical standards.

Mr. Engle said it is an addition to an historic building. It would never be listed separately. It is a part of the historic building. He believes they should find that these should be incorporated as a part of the staff's recommendations, not as a separate memo.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommendations is already a published document. But, if the Board decides that they should be incorporated, they will be included in the Board's decision.

Mr. Engle said the Board would not individually vote every time an addition comes up; it is automatically included.

Ms. Ramsay the Board would automatically vote if they did not apply. They have had some

clarification. It is clear from this language that if it is pertinent to a historical building, the Secretary of Interior's Standards apply.

Mr. Merriman asked whether the building was built in the 1950s or whenever.

Ms. Ramsay answered it does not matter.

Mr. Engle said if it was a free standing building, it would be quite possible that it would be individually eligible; but it is an addition.

Dr. Williams said not every addition is automatically historic. In a sense there is some basis for evaluating the addition on its own merits to determine whether it deserves to be considered as a contributing component of the building.

Ms. Ramsay explained that she believes the question is whether the Secretary of Interior's Standards automatically apply.

Dr. Williams said he does not believe that the Secretary of Interior's Standards apply to every addition.

Mr. Merriman asked if they were saying if the petitioner wanted to demolish this, that the Board might look at it differently than they are now as the request is to alter it.

Dr. Williams said he believes that they need to be careful to say that "any addition" on a historic structure is therefore a contributing historical fact component.

Mr. Engle stated that they were not saying this.

Ms. Ramsay explained that they are saying that the Secretary of Interior's Standards apply.

Mr. Engle said this means changes to that addition impact the historic building and they should be consistent with the standards. In this case, it is over 50 years old. But even if it was ten years old if the standards did not apply it could be painted whatever color you desired. The standards do apply even if it is ten years old. Only in the fact that the changes will impact the historic structure.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Bryant to point out the parts that will be added on the port-cohere that is compatible, that will be new but does not replace something that was originally here.

Ms. Bryant explained that originally the port-cohere was completely open. The petitioner is proposing to install a glass storefront in between the columns. Ms. Bryant, pointing to a section on the monitor, said that a portion of the column will be on the exterior of the building and a portion of the tapered columns will be on the interior of the building.

Dr. Williams stated, therefore, the original wall plane was behind the columns.

Ms. Bryant answered yes.

Mr. Howington stated that they are not restoring, but just tearing off the bad addition that

is not historic.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that he is the agent for the owner. He said that they do not have any exceptions with the staff's recommendations. He clarified that they will be following the Secretary of Interior's Standards. They are seeking to get federal tax credits. They will meet with SHPO next week. They will present a couple of different options to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Mr. Lynch said this will be finalized with SHPO and then they will bring the final design by to the staff. The color will be white, but the profile might change.

Dr. Williams stated he guessed the original port-cochere had windows behind it. He asked where were the original exterior doors located.

Mr. Lynch said there is actually an ambulance loading dock with steps that came to the front. They have not been able to find any pictures of the original. The original slab has been removed. There were stairs that came down and he believes a solid panel was in front of a ramp that goes down into the lobby and then there was another doorway.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lynch if the things he said are no longer there.

Mr. Lynch replied yes. He said currently the nonhistoric addition comes out about twenty (20) feet beyond the columns. They want to demolish this wall and establish a butt glaze storefront system to give the allusion of what was originally here. There was a nonhistoric section of roof that extended almost to the edge of the building. Another stucco addition was added in the 1970s. These will be removed.

Dr. Williams said there are three original angle columns. He asked if all three are extinct.

Mr. Lynch answered yes.

Dr. Williams said he guessed one question to ask SHPO is that obviously it will be an improvement. But, will it be too much of a modification from its original form or will it come close to the spirit of the original form.

Mr. Lynch said he believes the current design they have comes back to the spirit of what was here originally. However, they do not have any documentation of exactly what was here.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lynch if this will function as the main entrance.

Mr. Lynch answered yes, for now as this is really just the first phase of the project. They will probably submit for the next phase at the next meeting. Within the next weeks they will be addressing the original Candler Hospital building and then the exterior of the 1930s building.

Dr. Henry stated that his understanding is that the petitioner eventually will be using the entire building at some point.

Mr. Lynch said the school is trying to move into the building by September 2012. Therefore, they will essentially take two floors of the brick wing for September and then they will get the upper two floors by the first of 2013. They will start doing the renovations on this building during the same time.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Lynch if he was saying to the renovations on the 1880s structure.

Mr. Lynch answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said this is an exciting project. He is looking forward to seeing the next phase. He is assuming that they will save the Candler Oak in the process.

Dr. Henry asked if the only reason they are not putting in the original version, the 1955 entrance, is because of the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Ms. Ramsay answered no.

Mr. Engle said there is nothing left of it.

Board Action:

Approval for the rehabilitation and alterations to 516 Drayton Street with the following conditions:

1. The metal panel pattern and color must be submitted to staff for final approval;
2. The infill brick and mortar must be submitted to staff for final approval;
3. A four foot by four foot test patch for the proposed repointing, as it will appear finished, must be installed in an inconspicuous location on the building for staff approval; - PASS
4. Consult and follow the National Park Service *Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings* prior to undertaking any repointing and *Preservation Brief 22: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stucco* prior to

undertaking any stucco repair.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

16. [Petition of Mary Anne Hogan, Principal for St. Vincent's Academy | H-12-4629-2 | 311 Lincoln Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Mary Anne Hogan was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for fencing around the front of the property. The fence serves as a barrier to protect the landscaping that was installed from students and pets and the chain is removable for special events and photos.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the fence provided that the unpainted wood posts are replaced with painted metal posts and a heavier chain or pipe rail be incorporated between posts and the details be resubmitted to staff for final approval.

Dr. Williams said his worry would be to have a fence that is incompatible with the modernization of the building.

Ms. Ward said she agrees with Dr. Williams and this is why the staff stated in their report that a low masonry wall would be a compatible treatment. She believes stylistically this would be the most appropriate treatment. She showed the Board the fence type that the petitioner is requesting to use. Ms. Ward believes that there are examples of these in the historic district. Therefore, it is a compatible treatment. Maybe a way to make it more appropriate to the style of the building is to not have any decorative designs. Just keep it simple and plain. She believes it needs to have a finished treatment and a color that responds to a color on the building.

Dr. Williams was wondering if there was an example of the railing somewhere in the district in front of a more modernist building. He does not know if there are more examples besides what the Board has seen.

Ms. Ward said staff is willing to work with the petitioner any way they can. She believes that the petitioner wants to keep it as simple as possible. Therefore, they prefer to go with the post and chain type fence.

Mr. Merriman said with the post and chain, the landscape would still be able to be seen. If a wall is put here, it will not look as nice.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Hogan said they are in agreement to work with the staff's recommendation on behalf of the school. It is very important to them to preserve the landscaping and the green space. As they are in the middle of downtown, they have very limited landscaping. Therefore, they want to make use of this whenever possible; with the very limited structure they have put into place, they are still able to visually see the green space and green area. However, they are able to remove the chain when they have functions in the gym or in the cafeteria. When they have functions such as a Mother/Daughter breakfast, Ring Day or Graduation, they are able to use this as a backdrop and the girls are able to take photos here. They see this as something very appealing to them. However, they are certainly agreeable to working with the staff on whatever recommendations the Board makes for them.

Dr. Williams said he would say choose a vocabulary in working with staff that says functional, yet modern. He suggested that the petitioner resist the temptation to make the fence look Victorian or the such. A pipe rail fence is from the period of the 1920s and St. Vincent is a school. He suggests something simple even for the vertical post.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the fence provided that the unpainted wood posts are replaced with painted metal posts and a heavier chain or pipe rail be incorporated between posts and the details be resubmitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

17. [Petition of Judge Realty | H-12-4606\(S\)-2 | 347 Abercorn St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4606\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4606\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

18. [Petition of Gary Sanders | H-12-4609\(S\)-2 | 443 Whitaker St. | Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4609\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4609\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

19. [Petition of Charles L. Deane | H-12-4610\(S\)-2 | 24 West Wayne Street | Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4610\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4610\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. [Petition of PeterThompson | H-12-4611\(S\)-2 | 537 East Harris St. | Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4611\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4611\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Paul Miller & Shea A. Slemmer | H-12-4612\(S\)-2 | 224 Houston St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4612\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4612\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Coastal Canvas | H-12-4613\(S\)-2 | 423A East River St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4613\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4613\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products | H-12-4614\(S\)-2 | 309 West Congress St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4614\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4614\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Tamara Ryan Johnson | H-12-4615\(S\)-2 | 407 E. Gordon St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4615\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4615\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

25. [Petition of Joseph S. Tarella for Sawickitarella Architecture + Design, P.C. | H-12-4616\(S\)-2 | 318 E. Broughton St. | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4616\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4616\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Arthur A. Lamas | H-12-4617\(S\)-2 | 106 E. Broughton St. | Remove Metal Canopy](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4617\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4617\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Michael Schulz | H-12-4619\(S\)-2 | 140 Abercorn Street | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4619\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4619\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Michael Schulz | H-12-4620\(S\)-2 | 210 West Huntingdon St. | Replace Roof Hatch](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4620\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4620\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Joshua Ward | H-12-4621\(S\)-2 | 110 Barnard St. | Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4621\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4621\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Leon W. Quilloin | H-12-4623\(S\)-2 | 310 Alice St. | Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4623\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4623\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Stratton P. Leopold | H-12-4630\(S\)-2 | 720-22 Habersham St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4630\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4630\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of St. John Baptist Church | H-12-4631\(S\)-2 | 522-528 Hartridge St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4631\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4631\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Gale Steves and Philip Perrone | H-12-4632\(S\)-2 | 304 E. Gaston St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4632\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4632\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Boys & Girls Club of the Coastal Empire | H-12-4633\(S\)-2 | 510 E. Charlton St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4633\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4633\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Matt Jording and Mollie Sandman | H-12-4634\(S\)-2 | 5 West Broughton St. Unit A | Hood/Vent](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4634\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4634\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

36. [Staff Report](#)

Ms. Ward said the report on work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) is included in the Board's folder. She said last month staff did a lot of final inspections and Certificate of Occupancy. This month they have been stamping plans for new work to begin.

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

37. [National Alliance of Preservation Commissions Forum, July 18-22, 2012, Norfolk, VA](#)

Attachment: [Invitation to attend and apply for scholarships to the 2012 NAPC Conference, July 18-22, Norfolk, VA.pdf](#)

38. [National Trust for Historic Preservation Annual Conference, October 2012, Spokane, Washington](#)

Attachment: [NTHP Conference in Spokane, WA.pdf](#)

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

39. [Final draft of amended HDBR Bylaws and Procedural Manual](#)

Attachment: [PROCEDURAL MANUAL and BYLAWS-2012.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay said she was hopeful that the Board members have had a chance to review this document. She has a couple of comments. Regarding the chair person remarks, the vote after the approval of the minutes, it needs to be indicated that they are required to vote on this item. Presently, it is not there. There is a conflict between the chair person's remarks and the procedure for presentations to the Historic District Board of Review, which is on page 11 in the by-laws. This pertains to the public comments section. Also under presentations to the Board, it shows that once they go to Board Discussion, no public comment is allowed.

Mr. Engle said this came up two meetings ago where a person wanted to come back and comment on what the Board was commenting on during their discussion. If this is allowed, the discussion could go on for some time. But, today, they asked the person to make comment.

Dr. Henry said it could be listed as invited comment.

Mr. Engle said the Board should be allowed to ask for something to be clarified during their discussion period if a question arises, but he does not think that after the public has had their time that they be able to come back

again. If this is allowed, the discussion could go on forever.

Mr. Merriman said it could be left within the power of the chair to regulate this.

Dr. Williams said may be a statement is needed that says the Board "at the discretion of the chair can invite members of the public or petitioner to address the Board again."

Mr. Thomson said definitely cutting off public comment is the appropriate thing to do. He said it could be that a member through the chair could ask a question for clarification purposes of staff or the appropriate person. He believes that anybody that comes to speak would have already had their opportunity to clarify anything that they said.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Ramsay if it is already under the discretion of the chair to limit the amount of time that a member of the public can speak.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes, under certain conditions. It is limited to five minutes each if a certain number of persons are coming to speak on the same item.

Mr. Judson said he believes it should be made known explicitly that at the discretion of the chair, Board members can ask additional questions of principles in the discussion.

Dr. Williams said regarding a quorum on page 17, regarding Certificates of Appropriateness, it shows seven members. He asked if the chair is a voting member and does the quorum include the chair.

Ms. Ramsay said the quorum includes the chair.

Dr. Henry asked why is the Board going to be reduced to nine members.

Mr. Merriam asked if this Board will definitely be reduced or it is possible that the Board will be reduced.

Mr. Thomson said when the Unified Zoning Ordinance is adopted, whatever number is stated therein would be when it is done.

Mr. Merriman said he was aware that they talked about this at the Retreat, but he does not really remember what was said.

Mr. Engle said if the Board is decreased, the quorum would be five members.

Mr. Merriman said the decrease in members would cut down on the diversity of the Board. Presently, when items are discussed, each member brings a different perspective. He believes if the membership is cut, it would cut some of the effectiveness of what this Board is designed to do.

Mr. Howington asked what is the status of the UZO.

Mr. Thomson said he believed that a consensus was reached by MPC that they will begin reviewing the chapters one at a time. Originally, he scheduled five meetings through the end of June and they have only had one meeting so far.

Mr. Engle asked if the Board would be moving to have their meeting every three weeks.

Ms. Ward said she sent out a tentative drafted agenda to the Board members last month. This is not included in the draft by-laws, but she would like for the Board to give some consideration to this. But, if the Board wants to incorporate the meeting changes, they need to vote on it at the next month. This is a significant change and she wants the City Attorney to be aware of this before it is adopted.

Mr. Engle said he believes that six and one-half hours is really three and one-half hours too much. It is not fair to the applicants because some times after four hours, he gets grouchy. They need to do something that is fair to the applicant and for the Board. He said maybe they don't need to make it a part of the by-laws, but just say that they are going to try the three weeks meetings for six months. Can the Board do an experimental project?

Ms. Ward explained that the reason the by-laws would need to be amended is because they say that the Board meets regularly on the first Wednesday of every month. Therefore, the Board would still need to meet regularly on the first Wednesday of every month as they need to follow their procedures.

Mr. Engle asked why can't they say that the Board meets regularly.

Ms. Ward said potentially, they could do an amendment as such. They want to give people predictability and want them to know what the calendar is for a year. The people are bidding on projects and putting the information together to come before the Board. Therefore, the Board must provide some level of certainty.

Mr. Engle said the by-laws could say that the Board meets regularly and then the staff could publish a year agenda. It could be a big bust. They could meet every three weeks and still have a six and one-half hours meeting and maybe the next meeting might be for one and one-half hours. He does not know how to regulate this.

Mr. Merriman said if they were saying meet every three weeks to see how it works out.

Ms. Ramsay asked if any Board members had objections to doing this. Or feel strongly with the other way.

Mr. Engle said they knew today that the meeting would last until about 6:00

p.m. He asked if there is a way they can say that they will have a four hour meeting every three weeks. If the staff looks at something and sees that it will put the time to seven hours, don't accept it until the next meeting. There is no law that says they have to take everybody that applies.

Mr. Thomson said he believes that there is a lot of money riding behind what the Board sees every month. The Planning Commission sort of started going the other way as they were meeting twice per month and they did not have anything to meet about. They canceled meeting and so forth. As he recalls, they proposed a three week schedule and adopted a three week schedule for about one-half year. As they were doing this, they amended the by-laws in away that if they needed to go back to the every two weeks schedule without amending the by-laws again. Mr. Thomson said maybe Ms. Ward would feel more comfortable talking with the City Attorney, but if the Board adopts a schedule with the deadline dates and met according to the schedule, it was noted and distributed, he was not sure if there was an issue with the by-laws. If the Board likes the three week schedule, then they can make the by-laws change. Mr. Thomson said he may be saying this, but the staff could be saying they can hardly handle one meeting per month, but now they will have two meetings per month. This has to be a part of the consideration.

Mr. Judson said he would rather be here until 8:30 p.m. or 9:00 p.m. than block an extra Wednesday off his calendar. He is losing income and having to juggle baby sitting.

Mr. Merriman was in agreement with Mr. Judson.

Dr. Henry asked if they were saying keep the meeting dates the same.

Mr. Merriman said his workday on the meeting date stops at 11:00 a.m.

Dr. Williams asked that with a long agenda if there is a way that they can tell the petitioner that if they are the 12th person that may be they can come about 3:30 p.m. During it this way, they will be guiding the persons so that they are not sitting here for the full meeting.

Ms. Ward reported that when the opportunity arises, staff does this. It is only her and Ms. Bryant and she is trying to reach out as much as she can. People are afraid that their items may come up before they get to the meeting and they want to be here on time so that they are not missed and continued to a later meeting.

Ms. Ramsay asked if this happens, could they procedurally move the person to the end of the agenda.

Mr. Thomson said this is what they are thinking about doing for the MPC meeting. They had a long MPC meeting the last time and people sat through the entire meeting. They also have a big agenda for the upcoming meeting. What they would have to say on the agenda that these cases will not be aired before 3:00 P.M., etc. But, then the Board would have to wait unless some raises their

hand and make it known that they are here.

Mr. Engle said it does appear that this Board wants to go to the three week schedule.

Mr. Howington said it is harder for him to get away two times per month, then it is one time per month. However, he would be flexible either way. But, he prefers the one time.

Ms. Ramsay said a couple of typos were in the bylaws that need to be corrected.

Board Action:

Approval of final draft of Bylaws and Procedural Manual with additional Board comments and corrections. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Robin Williams - Aye

New Business

40. [Changes In Enforcement Department](#)

Ms. Ward reported that recently the inspector for downtown services has obtained other employment. She does not know if this position will be filled as it was previously. The City's Zoning Administrator has accepted a position in a different department and one inspector is no longer working in the department. Therefore, within the Zoning Department they are down to three people.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

41. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chair Ramsey adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting is Wednesday, May 9, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 East State Street.

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.