



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
December 14, 2011 2:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**DECEMBER 14, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Brian Judson, Chair  
W. James Overton, Vice Chair  
Ned Gay  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Keith Howington  
Sidney J. Johnson  
Linda Ramsay  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

**HDRB Members Not Present:** Reed Engle  
Stephen G. Merriman, Jr.  
Ebony Simpson

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

**City of Savannah Staff Present:** Tiras Petrea, Zoning Administrator

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

1. [Order and Welcome](#)

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

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2. [Approve Minutes of November 9, 2011](#)

Attachment: [11-09-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve November 9, 2011 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Not Present

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

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

**IV. SIGN POSTING**

**V. CONTINUED AGENDA**

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

3. [Petition of Pete Callejas for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4553-2 | 42 MLK Blvd./411 West Congress Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet I-Written Description.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet III-Color Samples.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Mr. Keith Howington recused himself from participation in this petition hearing as he is an employee of Greenline Architecture**

**Board Action:**

Approval for the alterations to the non-historic masonry wall to incorporate a new opening and bar top at 42 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd./411 West Congress Street. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

4. [Petition of Stephen D. Barnhill, Jr. | H-11-4559-2 | 301 Williamson Street | Sign](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval for the non-illuminated principal use  
facia sign at 301 Williamson Street for the  
business the Boiler Room. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

**VII. REGULAR AGENDA**

5. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4478-2 | 502 East Broughton Street | Alteration](#)

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

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

**Ms. Brittany Bryant** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting to amend the previously approved application for rehabilitation and alterations to 502 East Broughton Street. The petitioner is requesting to semi-enclose the underside of the landing on the lane elevation with wood columns and composite louvers. The petitioner is also requesting approval for the existing wrap-around balcony on the Price Street facade.

**Ms. Bryant** reported that staff recommends approval for the exterior alterations at 502 East Broughton Street with the condition that the enclosure and balcony is painted or stained with color selection submitted to staff for final approval.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lynch** stated he agrees with the conditions as stipulated by staff.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Lynch why the owner is adamant about keeping the side balcony.

**Mr. Lynch** answered that the owner was not opposed to doing it until they found out the modification cost. They are looking at approximately \$250.00 additional cost just to replace the railings versus about \$10,000 cost to do the demolition and reconstruction. They would have to redo the entire roof. They do not have any photos of the historic structure; therefore, they do not know whether it would be historically accurate. He believes this is the reason they are asking for a reconsideration.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked the petitioner if he said they would have to do the entire roof framing.

**Mr. Lynch** explained that the roof hips at the corner; therefore, a considerable amount of the roof's structure would need to be done and reroof the entire front porch.

**Mr. Gay** stated that he observes that all of the porches have wrought iron balconies, but this is a wooden balcony.

**Mr. Lynch** said they noted this, too. They all are masonry structures where they have a wood frame and a Victorian style structure. Therefore, they did not think that would be appropriate.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that they agree with the staff's recommendation for approval and support the retention of the existing wrap-around balcony as it is visually compatible with other balconies throughout the district.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Johnson** asked if the petitioner has selected the colors.

**Mr. Judson** explained that the petitioner will submit the colors to staff for final approval.

**Board Action:**

Approval for the exterior alterations at 502 East Broughton Street with the condition that the enclosure and balcony is painted or stained with color selection submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: W James Overton

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

6. [Petition of Charles Angell for The House Doctor | H-11-4548-2 | 128 East Taylor Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**NOTE: MR. NED GAY RECUSED HIMSELF FROM PARTICIPATION IN THIS HEARING AS HE IS CO-EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE.**

**Mr. Charles Angell** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Brittany Bryant** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alteration to the east (Abercorn Street) facade of 128 East Taylor Street. The petitioner would like to alter the central window bay, on the garden level, into an egress door for the garden level apartment.

**Ms. Bryant** reported that the staff recommends approval for the alteration of the window opening on the east facade of 128 East Taylor Street into an egress door with the condition that the door is inset at least three inches.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Angell** stated that he is the agent for Ms. Bass, the Executor for Mr. Francis McNairy. He said that Mr. McNairy was in the middle of this project when he died approximately two years ago. The basement apartment has been remodeled except for trim out. To get to the kitchen, you have to walk through the bedroom. What is being proposed

now would enable entry into the living room, the bedroom would be on the left and the kitchen would be on the right. As it is now, there is no flow. Mr. Angell said they would appreciate the opportunity to make the window into an egress door.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation** stated that they feel that both the existing ground level door and the door to be added should be solid doors to suit the new residential use and be in keeping with the traditional ground level service doors. HSF suggested that a less formal vertical panel design with a small single light at the top.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** wanted to know if the petitioner had a response to the HSF's recommendation.

**Mr. Judson** explained that as a point of procedure, if in the Board's conversation they feel the response from the HSF is an appropriate change and wanted to put it forward, then they could ask the petitioner to respond. He does not normally ask the petitioner to respond to the public comment. As the Board moves forward with its discussion, if they feel this is a good point and they are in agreement with, then it would be appropriate to ask Mr. Angell about it. But without it being driven by the Board at this point, it is a moot point whether or not Mr. Angell agrees with the public comment.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes the doors should be solid.

**Ms. Ramsay**, too, believes the doors should be solid.

**Mr. Judson** informed Mr. Angell that it appears that there is support on the Board for the public's comment about the doors. He asked Mr. Angell if he wished to make a comment about this.

**Mr. Angell** said he believes they would be open for the suggestion of the solid doors. He has no problem bringing this to the owners attention. They will meet with the staff regarding the style of the doors, etc.

**Mr. Judson** stated that the petitioner has suggested that there is some flexibility and willingness to the changes that the Board may propose regarding the doors. Two Board members have voiced their concern that the solid doors would be more acceptable. He asked if there was anymore discussion on the matter.

**Dr. Williams** was in support of the solid doors, but believes that they were saying that a glass panel should be at the top.

**Ms. Ramsay** said that a glass panel at the top for the entry door would be appropriate, but she does not believe that the bedroom door has to match the entry door.

**Ms. Ramsay** explained that the door which will be the entry door replaces the window could have a window. She was not suggesting that they take the existing door to fifteen light panels. This would require two doors. One door solid and the other could, with staff approval of the appropriate design, have a window or upper panel so light could still get into

the area since the window is being removed.

**Mr. Overton** asked Ms. Ramsay why she was saying the door needs to be solid.

**Ms. Ramsay** explained that a solid door would be more appropriate for service level entry for the ground floor and for security also.

**Mr. Overton** asked if this is consistent with the other buildings in the area.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered yes.

**Mr. Howington** asked what will happen to the old window. Could the two be switched?

**Mr. Angell** said the old window will not be used. The door will remain a door and they will put in whatever panel the Board directs. They will not throw the window away. It will be retained on site.

**Board Action:**

Approval for the alteration of the window opening on the east facade of 128 East Taylor Street into an egress door with the following conditions:

1. The door is inset at least three inches;
2. The southernmost door is replace with a solid panel door and submitted to staff for final approval; and - PASS
3. The new egress door design is submitted to staff for final approval.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Ned Gay	- Abstain
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Gretchen O. Callejas for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4554-2 | 222 East Jones Street | Additions and exterior alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photos and Color Renderings.pdf](#)

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

**NOTE: MR. HOWINGTON RECUSED HIMSELF FROM PARTICIPATION IN THIS HEARING AS HE IS AN EMPLOYEE OF GREENLINE ARCHITECTURE.**

**Mr. John Deering** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior and new construction of a three-story addition on the north (rear) and west facades of the building at 222 East Jones Street.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval of the three-story addition and exterior alterations on the north (rear) and west facades of the building at 222 East Jones Street with the condition that the metal roof panel dimension be submitted to staff for review and that a drip edge be incorporated around the perimeter.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deering** entertained questions from the Board.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Deering to what extent will the historic fabric be removed from the building.

**Mr. Deering** pointed out the area where the historic fabric would be removed.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the historic fabric below the windows would not be removed.

**Mr. Deering** said the fabric would be removed to the second floor line.

**Ms. Ramsay** said, therefore, all the construction between the left side of one window and the other window would be removed.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes. He pointed out that this area has been infill. He said like many 1850 townhouses in Savannah, this house had a masonry vertical element in the back and two recessed porches. The French doors and windows are rotten. The brick work appears to have been done some time ago.

**Ms. Ramsay** said when demolition of historic materials will be done, it should be indicated on the drawings. Because this has been a point of contention in the past, when backs are removed, the parts above it are structurally in jeopardy. She asked Mr. Deering if his intention is to remove it from left to right.

**Mr. Deering** said if Ms. Ramsay was speaking of the back masonry and the masonry above the doors, they would remain and will have steel at the location. They want to maintain as



much of the historic fabric as possible.

**Mr. Gay** asked if this was being done to allow for entrance into the back part and the new addition.

**Mr. Deering** explained that is to expand the rear room which now is about nine and one-half feet deep.

**Mr. Gay** asked Mr. Deering if this is now a porch.

**Mr. Deering** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering to point out the current location of the rear wall.

**Mr. Deering** pointed out the location of the rear wall.

**Dr. Williams** said he was having trouble seeing the persistence of any of the wall. He said he sees what appears to be a kitchen on one floor and a bedroom on the other, but he was not sure what is shown for the second floor.

**Mr. Deering** explained and pointed to the portions of the walls that would remain. He pointed to where the French doors were located. They are removing the masonry from between the two French doors. They are doing the same thing on the second level.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the walls do not read well; especially on the second floor plan. He said he sees counters.

**Mr. Deering** said it is case work.

**Dr. Williams** said, therefore, it is inside.

**Mr. Deering** said yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked where was the porch.

**Mr. Deering** pinpointed the approximate area where the porch was located.

**Dr. Williams** asked about the walls that were shown on page 1 of the photos in some of the other documents that were submitted.

**Mr. Deering** explained that there is a dividing line where the masonry is different. The porch structure was located in this area.

**Dr. Williams** said this is not apparent in the photo.

**Mr. Deering** said that it is not apparent in the photo, but on site it is very apparent.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering that as far as he could tell if the wall that is here now is not the original rear wall.

**Mr. Deering** confirmed that he does not believe that the original rear wall is here.

**Mr. Gay** said he believes that because of the brick columns, these houses traditionally had back porches; but some one infilled this to make it a room.

**Ms. Ramsay** said it would help if there was some documentation.

**Mr. Deering** asked Ms. Ramsay if she was speaking of a Sanborn map or something similar.

**Ms. Ramsay** replied that a Sanborn map would help.

**Mr. Gay** stated that downtown a lot of this would be wood infill instead of bricks. Obviously, this was done a long time ago as it appears they had trouble matching the bricks.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked where would the condensing units be located.

**Mr. Deering** said presently two are on the roof and will remain and one is in the garden and it will remain also.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the rear elevation was lacking some of the detail that is on the courtyard elevation.

**Mr. Deering** said they missed this and apologized.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation** said they agree with the staff's recommendation, but are additionally concerned about the visibility and operation of the elevator since windows are proposed for this area. Ms. Meunier said they suggest that the interior of the elevator's shaft and cab be painted a dark color to reduce the visibility or replace the proposing windows with louvers. The HSF feels that the massing as a whole of the addition reads very heavy; especially in the renderings as mostly it is painted all one dark color. They understand that the intention of this color choice was that it blends in with the trees and landscaping. However, HSF suggests that for the appearance to be minimized, the color be changed from white to the color of the rest of the addition so that it will not stand out as much, but blends in and disappears a little more.

The HSF is also concerned about the lost of historic material as has been identified. They were not aware that the material may not be the original material, but they would definitely be concerned if all of this is being removed.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Ms. Ramsay** said this is not the primary facade, but she is troubled by the lack of alignment with the windows on the rear. She understands functionally why they are as such, but this is a great concern for her.

**Mr. Gay** asked that the windows that are on the elevator shaft, would the petitioner

be opposed to putting shutters in front of them instead. Otherwise, they will see the elevator going up and down.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the 1898 Sanborn does not show a rear porch, just the brick building going to the back. There is no internal porch or any indication of any kind of porch. He cannot tell if it indicates that the rear wall that is here is the original wall.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if it shows that it was filled in before.

**Dr. Williams** said it was not there in 1898.

**Mr. Gay**, looking at the Sanborn map, said it is much deeper than the houses and going towards the back, that would be the porch. A porch was probably on the first and second floor with the brick columns supporting it.

**Dr. Williams** said normally the porch would be indicated with dotted lines.

**Mr. Gay** said Dr. Williams was correct. Therefore, it must have been done a long time ago.

**Dr. Williams** said porches are shown on neighboring houses.

**Ms. Ward** pulled up the area on the 1898 Sanborn map on the video screen.

**Dr. Williams** said the question is whether the existing building is the footprint as shown.

**Mr. Judson** asked the Board members if what they are saying now is germane to to an objection.

**Dr. Williams** said a part of the petitioner's argument is that removing a part of the rear facade is based on the assumption that it is not a part of the original building, but a later infill. The map suggests that at least in 1898 there was not an open gallery porch that was subsequently filled in.

**Ms. Ward** reported that when staff did their report, they did not know that there was a porch. They looked it up and felt that it was an intact building and had always existed as such. The staff report is based on the assumption that this is the original wall back there.

**Dr. Williams** said that in 1898, it appears the same. Therefore, the Board's question is, are they comfortable with removing this much of the historic fabric. It appears that the basement level preserves the walls on the plans, but not the other two floors. On one hand it makes the house more usable on a larger scale, but on the other it gets back to the issue of preserving historic material.

**Dr. Williams** asked if material will be lost on the side elevation.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the petitioner will be inserting windows. She asked staff if they recall whether any other materials would be lost.

**Ms. Ward** said that the petitioner could probably better answer this question. However,

staff used the floor plan to gauge this. They could see the lost of building wall in one area, but on the side elevation, it looked like the walls are intact. There is an opening to get to the stairs, but the side walls appear to be intact even as they go around the corner.

**Mr. Judson** explained to Mr. Deering that the Board questions whether any historic fabric will be removed from the side of the building.

**Mr. Deering** said on the west side of the building, they are adding a window into the stair hall; adding a window below it on the ground floor into a bathroom; and they are cutting a door opening in the west wall and on the ground floor at the same location to access the new stair to the ground floor.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the wall on the second floor would remain behind the stair access.

**Mr. Deering** said yes. They can leave the third floor openings as they are and not change it with the exception of taking out the masonry material below the window sills.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Deering what was the rectangular object in the middle of the room.

**Mr. Deering** answered that it is a cabinet. But, they could leave the masonry wall there and not have it. Then they would get a sense of the openings on the third floor and the architecture evolution of the building.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she would feel much more comfortable with this given the history of walls accidentally tumbling in.

**Mr. Judson** informed Mr. Deering that the Board had a question about louvers along the elevator windows.

**Mr. Deering** said they could take the HSF's suggestion of painting the interior of the elevator shaft a dark color or the same color as the exterior, but they really want to keep the glass as it makes a difference, he believes, when you are in the inside in a residential situation. Especially, this particular garden is so nice that if you go up and down the elevator and two of the elevator's walls are glass, you can look into the garden; he believes this makes it a much nicer experience.

**Ms. Ramsay** said that the HSF made a recommendation that the window muntins be painted the darker color rather than the white.

**Mr. Deering** said they can do this as well. But he would rather keep the light color to match the house so that the windows are delineated. This makes it tie-in better and will not appear to be so massive and dark. They did follow the Hartridges' house and the Andrew Lowe house rear facade where everything is dark, except they have stucco columns on their porch. They would like to keep it dark, but he believes that having the windows relate to the masonry portion of the house reads better.

**Mr. Judson** said it appears that the petitioner proposed a compromise with regards to the third floor and material that might satisfy the concerns of some Board members.

**Dr. Williams** said he agrees with Ms. Ramsay that it is important to keep as much of the historic fabric as they can. He appreciates the petitioner's willingness to compromise on this.

**Mr. Gay** stated that since a porch was back there at one point and the addition that comes out, could they somewhat mimic the porch on the exterior and where it is proposed to be windows, have shutters up and down. Where there are columns, let this be brick or something else to indicate that it is a porch as opposed to a room.

**Dr. Williams** said the proposal is essentially requesting a room.

**Mr. Judson** said the Board has now entered the realm of design symposium as opposed to considering the proposal that is before them.

**Dr. Williams** said also the Board does not know what the rear elevation originally looked like. Therefore, they would be entering into historical speculation.

**Board Action:**

**Approval** of the three-story addition and exterior alterations on the north (rear) and west facades of the building at 222 East Jones Street with the following conditions:

1. Retain the existing brick wall on the north elevation on the top floor to make the addition more reversible and limit the removal of existing fabric; and - PASS
2. Provide the metal roof panel dimension to staff for review and incorporate a drip edge around the perimeter.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4555-2 | 510 East River Street | Demolition and alterations to site](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

**Mr. Neil Dawson** was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to demolish two non-historic buildings, remove all paving, fencing and curbs on the property at 510 East River Street and to elevate the west side of the site to meet the minimum flood elevation requirements to prepare for future development. The petitioner has provided a stated regarding FEMA's requirements and the City of Savannah's requirements for flood elevation. This area is in a flood plain and has to meet certain requirements. As the letter states, the City is already working with the petitioner regarding the requirements. The minimum that would be accepted is to elevate the site approximately four (4) feet.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for demolition and site work with the condition that alternatives to fully connect the adjacent sites to provide a seamless elevation are developed and submitted to staff for review.

**Mr. Gay** believes the four (4) feet is required because it is lower than the three (3) feet next door.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the rules have changed and the flood maps may have been incorrect. Actually, there are two things involved in making it a little higher than the other side. However, the petitioner could better inform the Board of the four (4) feet requirement.

**Mr. Gay** questioned how it would be seamless since they are moving from one block to the next and one will be a foot higher.

**Ms. Ward** stated this is what she would like for the petitioner to study. It may not be fully seamless, but may be a transition here. She would like to see some sort of connection.

**Mr. Overton** asked staff if the Board looked at this site approximately six months ago and at that time it was proposed to be a food establishment. He asked if this is now a new application.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. The petitioner has abandoned the food establishment idea and this application today is a new application. The petitioner did not move forward on the food establishment plans.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Dawson** stated that he is the architect for River Street Market Place who are the owners of the property. As Ms. Ward has stated, this project is actually somewhat a two part project. They have a tenant that is engaged in a land lease. He works for the

land owners. The tenant will have a land lease and there is another architect who will design the building. This is why the retaining wall on the River Street side and the east side were left out. The building design will incorporate, hopefully, some infrastructure that would allow the building to engage more to the sidewalk level. Their hope is in working with the other architect that they will have a building by all street front appearances meet the street much in the same way that River Street projects do on the other side.

**Mr. Dawson** explained that the flood plain allows for a lower area of about three hundred (300) square feet that is not in the flood proof if it is durable material. Consequently, their hope is that there will be a facade that presents a street rhythm that is consistent with River Street where you would walk into a small vestibule and have either steps or ramps that goes up to the elevator. He said their hope is that when the projects materialize on the River Street side, it will look like a river street building and not like something on a little plateau. Mr. Dawson said the architect plans to submit the plans for next month, but he is a little further away then what he thought. Regarding the difference in elevation of the adjacent site, the City added a requirement for a foot of free board above the flood plain. The FEMA level has not changed, but there is an additional foot of free board that is now required that was not required when the buildings were built. This site is slightly lower than the adjacent site.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that they have future plans for sort of a restroom facility that serves the marketplace and creates a connection between the elevated plaza and what will be the plaza associated with the restaurant; and hopefully some other type of development that will happen on the far east side. The owner has plans to engage the same kind of waterfront development standards that the City has used with the waterfront edging. They have met with Ms. Ward and the City Engineer to discuss some of this. However, this is in the works as well as the public amenity building that creates the connection. At this point, however, because of the land lease, they have to deliver the site to them in March, there will be three other applications that will becoming forward that includes the River Street improvements, the amenity building and the restaurant.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Dawson that in his drawings on page 2 (the cross section at top right), if the left-hand side of the drawing showing River Street, sidewalk and future brick pavers, represent ground floor grade.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that this is the River Street elevation. They will do a ten (10) foot sidewalk and at some point the building face will be at ten (10) feet. Therefore, they are planning on this being built to line in the same way that River Street has a datum line. This aligns with the edge of the plaza for the adjacent Market Street. On the river side, they are doing a hard retaining wall and as he has said, future brick pavers to match the River Street plaza improvements. The same kind of design will be executed on the west side as a hard edge is here, but the east side where it opens to the rest of the lot as they tear out those buildings or the tenant tears out the asphalt, at some point bring this up to the same level; landscape it and hold it for future use for the same kind of development in the future.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the neighboring walls to the west that have the open sided sheds are presently at the higher level.

**Mr. Dawson** answered that they are about a foot below this level.

**Dr. Williams** asked if these are steps. He was trying to remember what the experience is on River Street.

**Mr. Dawson** pointed out that they are little steps that go up and around. They don't see this as an attractive future plan for going forward on River Street; while it is okay for what this building is, they don't see the building being set back another ten (10) feet on the little pedestal. They want to see the buildings brought to a built to line.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that one of the challenges is that there aren't any precedences existing presently for the anticipated building the petitioner has because historically the shed is what was on the north side of River Street.

**Mr. Dawson** said the standards do not allow for buildings that match the historical development pattern on the north side of River Street. It calls for buildings that are located with a long access perpendicular to the river, whereas, you can see on the Sanborn that all of these had the long access parallel to the river. There will be a way of finding as they go forward on north of River Street development. They are working on another project further down. Therefore, he believes that there will be some talk about how do they establish what they want the north side of River Street to look like.

**Dr. Williams** asked the petitioner why was he going a foot higher than the site.

**Mr. Dawson** answered that it is required as a free board ordinance above the flood plain.

**Dr. Williams** asked if a different standard was in place when this was done.

**Mr. Dawson** explained that the City, at this point, said the flood plain had to be met. Now, they are saying you have to meet the flood plain, plus a foot for wave action. This helps to reduce everybody's insurance rates.

**Mr. Judson** said the points Dr. Williams made about future developments were well taken, but, basically as he understands it, their purview regarding this application is the specific proposed retaining wall and the demolition that this Board has to approve with the destruction of any buildings and establish they're non-historic.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation** stated that they agree with the staff's recommendation; specifically that the site be connected as seamlessly as possible to the adjacent sites. Ms. Meunier stated that she believes that an indication was made in the proposal that some portion of the site would be landscaped once the buildings were demolished in the interim. HSF feels that it is very important that the entire site be landscaped or site improvement be made and that the outside appearance be regarded and considered because of the length of interim time is currently undetermined. River Street is sort of the front door so to speak; therefore, HFS feels it is important that something be addressed in this regard.



**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Johnson** asked if the petitioner said something about another architect working on this project.

**Mr. Judson** explained that for the proposed development on site. But, the Board is not considering that application today. They are considering the application for the retaining wall and the demolition of the two existing buildings.

**Mr. Johnson** question if some kind of conflict might surface as another architect will be involved and he heard the HSF make a comment about landscaping the site in the interim.

**Mr. Gay** said he believes that the HSF's concern is that the next project, which the Board is not looking at today, could take a long time. Therefore, in the meantime, they don't want a pile of dirt here.

**Dr. Henry** asked if there was anything in the staff's recommendation concerning this.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated she believes the Board can ask Mr. Dawson if there are plans for landscaping. She realizes that this is not a part of the Board's purview.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that his client intents, assuming that all the wheels fall into place, to go ahead and build some retaining wall on that part of the site and landscape it on the interim as it may be two or three years before it is developed. This is the intent, but because of the time crunch and as they go through the site plan review process just to go out there and put a retaining wall and plant some trees, may take two or three months for approval. This is not included in the current application.

**Ms. Ward** stated that landscaping is not within the purview of this Board, but they may talk about the landscaping if they believe it is important. She believes the HSF's comment is important, but once they approve the application it will be for the demolition and alterations. They have not seen any future development. The Board could require some surface treatment. The Park and Tree Department will have tree quality points that will be required for commercial development if they were removing any trees from the site, but currently it is a developed site with asphalt covering the entire site.

**Dr. Williams** asked that when the Board discussed the drainage on the site on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard whether it was outside their purview.

**Ms. Ward** explained that a part of the discussion at that meeting was whether or not this was a part of this Board's purview. It was handled in that meeting that the staff work with the SPR team to recommend that the petitioner comes up with an alternative solution which they did and submitted a revised plan. This Board does not look at storm water treatments nor landscaping. They look at structures and buildings appurtenances to these structures.

**Dr. Williams** said the cross-section shows brick pavers as the top of the retaining wall. He asked if this essentially becomes a structure.

**Ms. Ward** said that paving materials are certainly within this Boards purview. But she

believes at this time, the petitioner is only proposing to do compacted earth and have brick paving as a cap for the retaining wall.

**Dr. Henry** had a concern that a big mud pile would be here. He believes that the Board could add as an appendage that they will look at the record of upkeep. In other words, he just wanted to get it in the records of how the Board feels about it.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that he would be willing to modify their petition and say that within 90 days they would come back with an application for the future building and site development adjacent to the east.

**Mr. Judson** explained that certainly the Board could voice their concern that this not become a dust ball or mud pile.

**Dr. Williams** asked that the sidewalk that is marked on the cross-section, future pavers, there is a twenty foot (20') section going to the existing bulkhead says "four inches concrete mud bed." He asked the petitioner if this will be installed pending approval.

**Mr. Dawson** answered that according to the engineer, they must keep some impervious surface over the bulkhead and soldiering system so that water does not get in, infiltrate and cause slippage. He believes, therefore, that it will be asphalt and something will be poured over it.

**Dr. Williams** said he was speaking of the brick that connects into the existing Riverfront walkway. He asked the petitioner if they would build an exposed trail of concrete retaining wall.

**Mr. Dawson** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** said the petitioner will be building the retaining wall anyway, then why not go ahead and build the brick paver so that the sidewalk would be immediately usable.

**Mr. Dawson** said this is private property and they want to build it to the City's standards. They are in discussion with the appropriate City departments. Apparently, the river edge bulkhead that exists in Rousakis Plaza is no longer a code compliant treatment with the big bolsters and the signal bar where little children could slip off the seat into the river. They are in discussion with the City about how they can improve this to meet a standard that they consider acceptable and still meet their onerous budget. But, they have not finalized what the design will be.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Dawson if he said they will have a full development plan before the Board in 90 days.

**Mr. Dawson** answered no. He explained that what he said was that they could bring back a plan in 90 days that would show the Board what is their intention for the building that is to go on this site and for the improvements for the property to the east.

**Dr. Henry** said this would be okay, but it would not address the maintenance issue.

**Mr. Judson** said this is certainly a valid concern, but it is not within the Board's purview.

**Dr. Henry** said he believes that the Board can make it clear that the Board approves the request based on their responsibilities to the citizens.

**Dr. Williams** asked Dr. Henry if his concern is that the mud will spill over into River Street.

**Dr. Henry** explained that he does not know whether the mud will spill over into River Street, but it would be an unsightly site.

**Mr. Judson** stated that in terms of reviewing the compacting and the elevation, they have other engineering departments within the City that are working with the petitioner.

**Mr. Johnson** said the Property Maintenance department will be one department that will be involved in the mud situation, but this is not within this Board's purview.

**Mr. Judson** said although the maintenance of the property is not within the Board's purview, they do go on record regarding their concern about the maintenance of the property. Hopefully, the petitioner works with the City to ensure that the the surface is timely addressed.

**Board Action:**

**Approval** for demolition and site work with the condition that alternatives to fully connect the adjacent sites to provide a seamless elevation are developed and submitted to staff for review. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4556-2 | 209 West Congress Street | Alteration, Fence, & Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet I-Written Description.pdf](#)

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

**Mr. Neil Dawson** was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Brittany Brant** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the rear facade and revisions to the approved rooftop equipment screening. The applicant is also requesting approval for new openings in the west facade and improvements to the adjacent parking lot to the west, including a new courtyard space, structure, and fencing. Ms. Bryant said the petitioner just informed her that they are not proposing to do the structure in the courtyard. Therefore, the structure is not included in the application.

**Mr. Gay** asked what is the petitioner saying that they will not build presently.

**Ms. Bryant** explained that the petitioner was proposing to build a trellis and bar structure, but the petitioner just informed staff that they will not do so at this time.

**Dr. Williams** asked staff if there is any indication whether or not the rooftop equipment screen will impact the original wood structure.

**Ms. Bryant** answered that she would have to defer this question to the petitioner.

**Mr. Overton** stated the staff's recommendation suggests that a restudy of the design to be more compatible with the historic development in the area.

**Ms. Bryant** stated that is correct and it is not that staff opposes the courtyard improvements, the wall of continuity or the wall on Congress Street, but has concerns regarding the design of the structure. However, staff was just informed by the petitioner that they are not going to build the building. Therefore, the structure that was proposed to be built in the courtyard is not a part of this application. The staff is in agreement with the wall of continuity on Congress Street, Congress Lane and the courtyard improvements as they would rather see a courtyard than a parking lot and also the openings.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Dawson** stated that he is the architect for B & D Burgers. He said that the staff's report is clear. Mr. Dawson apologized for them having something in their application that they later rescinded, but after they read the staff's report, it seems better not to try to tackle that.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the new equipment screen impacts the original roof structure in anyway.

**Mr. Dawson** explained that the new equipment for a new restaurant weighs thousands of pounds. Therefore, there will be new steel beams added to the existing roof structure. The

existing pair metal roof that exist behind the parapet will still be here, but it will be dramatically altered structurally to include steel to support the equipment.

**Mr. Judson** asked if this will be behind the parapet.

**Mr. Dawson** answered yes. This is why the screen was modified much taller and longer than it was in their original application.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that based on what they are looking at now, they agree with staff. The HSF appreciates the petitioner's proposal to improve this lot as they see the proposed courtyard additions as a better use than the existing parking lot.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for the alterations to the rear facade, revisions to the rooftop equipment screening, new openings in the west facade, and improvements to the adjacent parking lot to the west including a new courtyard space and fencing. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Michael Schulz | H-11-4557-2 | 214 West Huntingdon Street | Addition/alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Robert Schulz** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to cover an existing

rear deck to create a one-story porch on the back of the residence at 214 West Huntingdon Street. The Historic Savannah Foundation maintains a covenant on this property and will, therefore, have a review over this addition.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval to cover the existing rear deck at 214 West Huntingdon Street with the condition that the roof be covered with standing seam metal or architectural shingles if visible from the public right-of-way and the column capitals extend outward of the porch architrave in as depicted in the section drawing.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Schultz** stated that he was representing MCS Construction. He entertained questions from the Board.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that as noted in the staff's report, the HSF maintain a covenant on the property. HSF agrees with all of the staff's recommendations; specifically that the column capitals extend past the architrave. Ms. Meunier said they will be working with the petitioner on improving the design.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Ms. Ramsay** commented that architectural shingles on the low sloop roof is not a good idea.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the face of the column should align with the fascia to protect the cornice.

#### **Board Action:**

**Approval** to cover the existing rear deck at 214 W. Huntingdon Street with the condition that the roof be covered with standing seam metal if visible from the public right-of-way and the column capitals extend outward of the porch architrave as depicted in the section drawing. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: W James Overton  
Reed Engle - Not Present  
Ned Gay - Aye  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

11. [Petition of Daniel Brown | H-11-4560-2 | 106 East Taylor Street | Rehabilitation/alteration, fence, and shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Written Description and Color Brochure.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings and Photos.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 1 - Assessing Cleaing and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 2 - Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings.pdf](#)

**Mr. Johnson left the meeting at 4:30 p.m. due to an earlier commitment.**

**NOTE: Mr. Judson stated that Dr. Williams disclosed that he is a colleague of Mr. Brown. However, he saw no reason for Dr. Williams to recuse himself from participating in this petition. Dr. Williams is not economically involved in this and Mr. Brown does serve in a supervisory position over Dr. Williams at SCAD.**

**Mr. Daniel Brown** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation, exterior alterations, rear stair addition, and fencing at 106 East Taylor Street.

**Ms. Ward** reported that the staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation, addition and fencing at 106 East Taylor street with the following conditions:

1. Provide a revised elevation of the rear railing to match the section drawing with a railing no taller than 36 inches in height;
2. Provide further documentation to support the removal of the red tinted front facade to staff for final review and approval;
3. Provide specifications for mortar and exterior cleaning of the masonry surface that are consistent with Preservations Briefs 1 and 2; and
4. Install a cleaning and repointing test patch prior for staff review prior to cleaning and repointing the exterior.

**Mr. Overton** asked staff if the tinting is stained.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she believes it is different in different cases, but here she believes it is a wash. It is appropriate on masonry buildings as it is breathable, but in this case she does not know if it is original. The petitioner is showing that there is evidence to support that it may not have been. A beaded joint is very elegant in a white mortar. But,

this has been here for some time and if the tinting was done in the 1920s or 1930s, it has probably gained historical significance by now and would be considered a character defining feature of the building. If it was done in 1970s, it is not historic.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Brown** said they are recommending that the height of the handrail be 36 inches and the guardrail 42 inches. There are safety issues with having a shorter handrail. Both of the gentlemen are six feet - four inches (6'- 4") tall. A guardrail is there for the public safety. It becomes a life safety issue and if the handrail is correct at 36 inches, 42 inches guardrail is correct for anyone above 36 inches high. This is the reason they left the guardrail at 42 inches, but if the Board requires 36 inches, he will take it back to the owners. One of the biggest things they found with the tinting of the brick is it is more about the mortar joints and how they are patterned. The last photo he provided to staff shows that throughout the years mortar lost has occurred. Some of the joints have been filled with caulk and at some point when the mortar fell out and the building started showing its age, someone came back and tinted it. The way they see this is if you look at the mortar joints, tint is all the way back through the mortar joints. Therefore, it is past just being the topical application, it is inside of the joint. This means that the mortar fell out after the initial installation of the beaded joint and the tinting happened after that. **Mr. Brown** said they want to make this building look as prominent as it should. The beaded joint is beautiful and they want to have it across the front facade completely. Therefore, they want to strip the tinting off; strip everything that has been growing on the building and then come back and put the beaded joint back. They will use power washing; they are not going in here with the intent of taking the mortar off, but just take out anything that was growing on the building and remove the dirt that has accumulated on the building and then remove the tinting from the building.

**Mr. Brown** said after they clean the building, they will have the staff review the repointing and the mortar joints.

**Mr. Howington** asked the petitioner if he is opposed to the red tinting.

**Mr. Brown** answered that he is against the red tinting. On the east elevation, you can see the red tinting which actually takes a zig-zag pattern depending on where the wall was. This creates a haphazard movement through the wall. He would rather the building be more uniform around the exterior.

**Dr. Williams** asked **Mr. Brown** if the building abuts a building on the east.

**Mr. Brown** answered no. There is a two foot space. When you go to the front of the elevation, it actually jogs back halfway through the house. **Mr. Brown** pointed out where this building is located.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes **Mr. Brown** was explaining the west side of the building.

**Mr. Brown** apologized and said he was on the west side of the building and that the building does abut a building on the east.

**Mr. Brown** explained and pointed out that what he was saying about the tinting is that it runs to a point and then pops out at several sections. There is no clear edge to the tinting.



**Dr. Williams** asked if the facade and the side elevation bricks are different.

**Mr. Brown** answered yes and the mortar is different as well. The bead is a flush mortar joint on the side and a beaded mortar joint starts at a point and goes all the way across.

**Dr. Williams** said in other words, Mr. Brown said he hopes to achieve a more uniformed appearance across the entire building although it originally had two different materials. The front facade appears to be a finer brick and the side has a different brick.

**Mr. Brown** said this is an assumption because they were not able to find any photos showing any of the buildings, staff and he looked for more details. It appears at one point that a wall may have gone up (he was not sure what happened between the two buildings) but he is not sure.

**Dr. Williams** said these are finely tooled joints with the rounded bead . He asked Mr. Brown how would they remove the tint without impacting the profile of the bead.

**Mr. Brown** answered that they will have to go to the site and investigate how to do this correctly without damaging the bead. They are concerned about the joints and any joints that are damaged or previously missing, they will replace with the same bead.

**Dr. Williams** said on page five (5), one of the photos shows an existing brick one and existing brick two. The bead is still legible even with the tinting; it is just that the mortar from a distance will appear to blend with the facade. He agrees with staff that the tinting is probably before World War II and, therefore, is not something modern. He said that under the stairs Mr. Brown made comments that the tinting is missing. But some of the tinting under the stairs is still there if he is reading the photo correctly. Dr. Williams said from the photo you cannot see this as well, but on the screen you can see that some tinting is still apparent about a foot and one-half up above the ground.

**Mr. Brown** said the tinting here depends on where it is on the building as it is dark in some spots and light in others. The mortar has fallen out in some places and he believes in the section where the mortar is still there, he assumes the mortar is modern. He believes further that the mortar was not replaced, but just tinted. At some point the back got bad, fell out and the mortar joints were caulked. He is not saying it is original or not original, but trying to figure out what it is and what information he can find other wise. This leads him to believe that it is not original.

**Dr. Williams** said the assumption is that it was only tinted once.

**Mr. Brown** said the cost of tinting it, when did the person who started putting in the caulk buy the house and the person that was tinting the house go away. These are astronomically differences in price. Therefore, this is what they are trying to figure out and he is not saying that one is correct and the other is incorrect. He is only being investigative just as the Board.

**Mr. Gay** believes there might be some other houses with the same sort of red brick. It looks as if the mortar was tinted that color when it was mixed, but it looks like it was

sprayed on this building.

**Mr. Brown** asked staff if this is what they saw. The tinting looks like it was facially applied and is not a tinted mortar.

**Ms. Ward** answered that staff has visited the site numerous times and she believes it is tinted. She does not believe that the mortar was tinted, but a surface treatment was applied.

**Dr. Williams** stated that as far as he knows, both techniques were used historically. The most expensive one is to mix the mortar tint before application.

**Ms. Ward** explained that this is what was common in the Victorian area. This is why they have the examples of buildings in the Landmark District from this time period that copies this, but did not fully execute it. A wash was used over it.

**Dr. Williams** said even if the tinting was not here when the building was built, but acquired through the life of the building, has it become a character defining feature or is it something that reflects a change in evolution of the building. Therefore, one of the challenges is rather the tinting should be removed or not. The second question is, even if they agree that the tinting is dispensable, can it be done without harming a definite character defining feature, which is the mortar bead. May be a small test patch could be done just as was done with a building earlier this year.

**Mr. Brown** said this is what the staff and he have agreed to do. As they remove the tinting, they will remove a test patch as much as possible from underneath the stair. If they find anything else along the patch, they will be fine with keeping the tinting and just remove the debris that is on the facade.

**Mr. Judson** advised that to keep the Board on track, they should focus on questions pertinent for the petitioner rather than asking the petitioner to engage in more discussion. He cautioned the Board regarding getting too far off track.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the use is single-family.

**Mr. Brown** answered yes.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said their largest concern is something that Dr. Williams has already brought up. The HSF is mostly concerned about the integrity of the historic materials. They see the evidence that the tint may not be original. However, the date is also important and they are mostly concerned that removing it is going to be detrimental to the mortar. They encourage following preservation briefs, but even in doing so, they believe it would be difficult to remove the tint. Ms. Meunier said definitely test patches are needed.

**Mr. Judson** said a word was used earlier in terms of the petition that makes him think of the second preservation briefing. He wanted to remind everyone that the intention of any repointing is never to achieve uniformity on the building. He does not know that when they discussed this and reviewed it at length over several months, that they ever considered a

case such as this where they were dealing in colors as opposed to condition, contour or anything else. But, he wanted to remind them that this is the wording of the Secretary's Interior Preservation Brief regarding repointing. It is not just simply deciding rather it is historic or not, they also have to look at the context of need. The repointing needs to be justified based on the condition of the mortar, not just the color of the mortar. Mr. Judson stated that they could end up with a building that gets repointed in places with white where the tinting is left on the material. He could not visualize this as being a good outcome; but as they discuss this and as they talk about setting up the perimeters for test patch, they do have to remember that uniformity is not the intention of proper repointing.

**Mr. Gay** stated that it was not just the mortar that was tinted, but the bricks were tinted also. Therefore, the bricks will change color, too if the petitioner is able to get it off.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the Secretary's Interior Standards were saying that a spotty building is okay.

**Mr. Judson** explained that when they reviewed this pertaining to building on Tattnell Street where at-large repointing was done, the petitioner's justification was they wanted it all to look nice, but this is not historically accurate. The repointing is done as needed. He believes that the wholesale removal of a tremendous amount of grout is subject to structural issues as well. Mr. Judson said he does not offer this as a solution to any, but it is points to consider.

**Dr. Henry** said may be the Board could vote on the items other than the repointing.

**Dr. Williams** said there are sections that need repointing such as in the detailed photo. If these are being repointed, they can be repointed with a tint.

**Mr. Gay** said the caulk should be removed also.

**Mr. Judson** believes there is a lot on the petition that the Board can approve. But, he believes as the Board stipulates the establishment of the test patches. The test patches should be representative of more than one spot on the building and give staff clear guidance on how to work with the petitioner on establishing what is needed and what is the overall intent.

**Mr. Brown** said if the test patches lead to the tint being inside the bricks and has been here for a long period of time that they will clean the brick and leave the tint there on the brick and mortar. They are not here to change the character of the building or the historic fabric of the building.

**Mr. Judson** told Mr. Brown that he appreciates hearing this as he heard before that he wanted to get rid of the tint.

**Mr. Brown** said the reason they are going for the uniformity is because they do not believe that the tinting is historic. If the tinting is found to be historic during the test patches, they will leave it on the building and as he has said, just clean as much as possible.

**Mr. Howington** knew they were talking about test patches, but they can do exploration

patches as well to find out what really is historic. It is not necessarily uncommon for the front of this building to have a finer bead joint than the sides.

**Mr. Brown** said they agree with this.

**Mr. Judson** stated that he believes they have established that even the bricks on the front are a higher quality than the bricks on the side.

**Mr. Overton** stated that he suspects that when the petitioner gets into these test patches, they will realize economically that it is impossible to remove the tinting from the grout and replace it back as it was. He asked if joint is grapevine.

**Mr. Brown** said he believes it is a beaded joint and not a grapevine joint. The bead at the joint is very straight and very crisp. The grapevine joint tends to have a little bit of movement to it, but it is not one or the other because the beaded joint is supposed to be inside the brickface and is suppose to have a ledge to it. Therefore, he could not answer this question because it is either/or.

**Dr. Williams** said one way to approach this especially with regards to tinting is that in the absence of any hard evidence that it is or isn't historic, it may be best to err on the side of let's assume that it is. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Brown that when he says clean the building, he means removing the mold and other things. Will it not be so invasive as to remove the tint?

**Mr. Brown** answered that with the first test portions, they would like to see what the tint does if they clean it. They put power washing down because this is the only way they could specify it. If he had said brush, he does not want to get into scraping the mortar, but wants to see what comes of the brick. This is the first step they will take.

**Dr. Williams** asked the petitioner that if he cleans it in a way that the tint remains on the face of the brick and the mortar joints, particularly, on the front facade, assuming that the tint remains intact, even though there may be some irregular points, the owners would be amiable to leaving the tint on.

**Mr. Brown** said yes. However, it gets back to Mr. Overton's comment about if they are going to clean everything and try to power wash everything, repoint and retint everything, what they would do at this point is clean the heads and sills as much as possible; clean the dirt off, any vegetation that is growing on the facade and leave the tint as there is no reason to go through trying to clean it off and reapply.

**Board Action:**

**Approval** for the rehabilitation, additional and fencing at 106 East Taylor Street with the following conditions:

1. Conduct a panel study to retain the red brick tinting on the front facade when cleaning;
2. Provide specifications for mortar and exterior cleaning of the masonry surface that are consistent with Preservation Briefs 1 and 2; - PASS
3. Install a cleaning and repointing test patch prior for staff review prior to cleaning and repointing the exterior; and
4. Provide a revised elevation of the rear railing to match the section drawing with a railing no taller than 36 inches in height.

**Vote Results**

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

**VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS**

**IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

12. [Amended Petition of Linda Ramsay | H-10-4307\(S\)-2 | 122 East Taylor St. | Wood Panel Door](#)

Attachment: [Amended Staff Decision 4307 \(S\)-2 11-9-11.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Amended Submittal Packet 4307\(S\)-2 11-9-11.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

13. [Petition of Alexander Grikitis | H-11-4518\(S\)-2 | 351-355 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4518\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4518\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

14. [Petition of Harold Yellin for Stratton and Mary Leopold | H-11-4537-2 | 720-722 Habersham St. | Replacement Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 720-722 Habersham Street.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4537-2 720-722 Habersham St. 11-8-11.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

15. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products, Inc. | H-11-4547\(S\)-2 | 49 Barnard St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4547\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4547 \(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

16. [Petition of E. C. Burnsed | H-11-4549\(S\)-2 | 32 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Roof Repair/Stucco](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4549\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4549\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

17. [Petition of Stratton Leopold | H-11-4550\(S\)-2 | 720-722 Habersham Street | Replace Vinyl Siding](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4550\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

18. [Petition of Wubbena Architect & Designers | H-11-4551\(S\)-2 | 201 Habersham St. | Roof Repair/Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4551\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4551\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

19. [Petition of Susan Hacker |H-11-4558\(S\)-2 | 454 Price Street | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4558\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4558\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

**X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

20. [News Article](#)

**Mr. Judson** said on the front page of the Savannah Morning News today was a story regarding the power washing of Christ Church. He asked staff if this is something that comes under the purview of the Historic District Board of Review.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she will look into this. She thanked Mr. Judson for bringing this to the staff's attention as she did not read the paper today.

## **XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF**

### 21. [22 Barnard Street | Report on Sample Panel](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Sample Panel 121411.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ward** reported that the awning at 144 Lincoln Street is scheduled to be heard in Recorder's Court on January 23, 2012 as the owner has failed to rectify the situation.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Judson** informed the Board that in their blue folder they will find a report from staff regarding 22 Barnard Street. Ms. Ward has reviewed the on-site sample panels and the color changes. He particularly called the Board's attention to figure 3.22.

## **XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

### **Notices**

22. [Next Meeting - Wednesday January 11, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

### 23. [2012 Calendar of Meetings for the Historic District Board of Review](#)

Attachment: [HRB CALENDAR YEAR 2012.pdf](#)

**Mr. Judson** informed the Board that inside their blue folder is the 2012 Calendar of Meetings for the Historic District Board of Review.

### **Acknowledgements**

### 24. [Certificate of Appreciation for Mr. Overton, Vice-Chair](#)

**Mr. Judson** stated that a large void that will be present on the Board in 2012 is the absence of Mr. Overton. A Certificate of Appreciation was presented to Mr. Overton for his untiring and dedicated service to the Historic District Board of Review.

**Mr. Overton** stated that when he joined this Board, he believed that he knew a lot about the subject, but after becoming a part of the Board he found out so much more. He is grateful for the opportunity he had to serve on this Board.

**XIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**Unfinished Business**

25. Nominating Committee Report for 2012 Officers

**Mr. Judson** said the Board has been given a modified report from the Nominating Committee as Mr. Overton will no longer be able to serve on the Board. Ms. Linda Ramsay will take over as Chair and Mr. Gay will be the Vice-Chair.

**Mr. Judson** stated that it has truly been a pleasure for him to serve in the role of Chair for this Board. Just as Mr. Overton stated, it has been an ongoing experience for him also.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she appreciates the service Mr. Judson provided as Chair. He served as an excellent chair and did a magnificent job.

**Board Action:**

Accept the report of the Nominating Committee. Ms.Linda Ramsay, Chair - PASS and Mr. Ned Gay, Vice Chair.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle	- Not Present
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye



26. [Unified Zoning Ordinance - discussion and draft comments](#)

**Ms. Ward** explained that the letter with comments on the Unified Zoning Ordinance (UZO) was distributed at last month's meeting. The Board members were to read the ordinance and make comments. She only received comments from two members. This is included in their folder. The letter will be sent reflective of the Historic District Board of Review.

The Board did not have enough time to discuss the UZO at its last meeting. She heard from Mr. Merriman in the interim who believes that members of the Board should be City residents. Ms. Ward said if there are conflicting statements, the Board needs to decide how they want to proceed with it.

**Mr. Judson** said these are only recommendations from the Board. He feels, however, in light of Mr. Overton's situation, that the revised wording they have put in there allows for nonresidents and allows the City Council the right to remove someone, but does not mandate that they remove them reflects his feelings. Mr. Merriman's exception is noted, but their revised wording is the feeling of the Board members.

**Ms. Ward** said that the deadline for public comments has been postponed to no date certain. There are things in the ordinance that affect this Board. One of the things that came up this summer was it was recommended by a member of the public that staff have the ability to review HVAC screening which is required by the ordinance. It was especially hot this summer and people wanted to put the units up, but had to wait and come to the Board for the monthly meeting.

**Mr. Thomson** explained that initially September 30, 2011 was the deadline to receive the public comments. When the UZO is ready, they will give a 60 days notice.

\*\*\*

**Dr. Henry** stated that he believes the hotel has appealed to the MPC regarding its window.

**Ms. Ward** explained that they sought a variance from the design standards to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and were approved for the window that came before the Historic District Review Board.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff what is the situation with the McDonald's building on Broughton Street.

**Ms. Ward** explained that McDonald's has gotten their construction documents prepared and staff has signed off on these. They are now requesting the other

needed encroachments from City Council which basically is for the awnings, signs and the sidewalk cafe. They have an item before City Council, but the City Attorney has some concerns with the proposal.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Ramsay** reported that she came to the training of the newly appointed member to this Board, Ms. Zena E. McClain. Ms. McClain made a comment that she thought it would be helpful if the Review Board held pre-meetings. Therefore, this means that they would meet before the actual meeting. Ms. Ramsay said she understands that the Metropolitan Planning Commission does this. She asked for feedback from the Board members and are the meetings legal.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the pre-meetings would be public, not private meetings. The pre-meetings would be advertised and anyone who desired could attend the pre-meetings. No decisions are made in the pre-meetings; they are held for informational purposes only.

**Mr. Judson** apologized for not attending the training. He is at a point where he is not sure he could commit to one more meeting a month.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes the pre-meeting would be held on the same day of the regular scheduled meeting.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the idea would be that they are having a lot of concerns from Board members about how long these meetings are lasting. They are trying to come up with suggestions to deal with the long meetings. She said she would suggest two meetings a month.

**Mr. Judson** asked Ms. Ramsay if she was saying the pre-meetings would be held the day of the regular meeting.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered yes.

**Mr. Judson** said he could probably accommodate this as he is usually here for the meetings at 1:30 p.m.

**Ms. Ward** said if needed, the regularly scheduled meetings could be moved to 2:30 p.m. instead of 2:00 p.m.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Ward** apologized that the new 2011 Edition of the Design Manual for the Savannah Historic District did not get put on today's agenda. Ms. Bryant has worked the entire year on the manual. This is an edition that is long overdue. It has been out of date since 2003. The last edition was done in 1997 when they incorporated the Sanborn guidelines into the ordinance. Therefore, this is a significant undertaking. A copy of the manual was given to the Board members to take home with them and a copy will be placed in each member binders.

**Ms. Ward** reported that the manual will be posted on the MPC website. The manual basically has all the intent, study and reasoning behind what this Board does.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Ward** said 128 East Taylor Street had an agreeable applicant. They had an existing door that was approved and was there, but the Board asked them to change it. However, the Board cannot really require that they do so. They had a feature that they were entitled to use. She cautioned the Board.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Ward** said that Dr. Henry brought up the surface treatment on River Street. She believes that the points made by the Board and the Historic Savannah Foundation were valid. However, it was the vegetation part that become somewhat tricky. Ms. Ward said she believes that if the Board felt so, could have required that some surface treatment be done here. They could have said you have to gravel it, protect it and preserve it from rain water. But just to say that you have to install vegetation is what is very difficult to enforce.

**Mr. Overton** asked if this was something that the demolition permit would require.

**Ms. Ward** replied she hopes so. But at Bay and Whitaker Streets, demolition was approved for a four-story building. It remained a big hole for quite some time. Finally, they filled it in with dirt, but had to put temporary fencing around the site because it was so dangerous.

**Dr. Henry** said he believes that Chair Judson did a good summation on this aspect. If they should have something that comes up again such as this, he will say gravel it.

**Mr. Howington** said his concern with 502 East Broughton Street were that examples were not real examples and this is existing and was approved along time ago. He did not believe that the Board had the right to say tear it all off; even though he did not approve of the style of it, but the fact that it is there, they cannot make them tear it off like they did.

**Ms. Ward** said during the meeting, the petitioner thought about it and said it would be very costly. The petitioner updated their petition and provided examples. Their initial petition did not have any examples.

## **New Business**

### 27. [HDBR Bylaws requested amendment for staff decisions](#)

Attachment: [HBR PROCEDURAL MANUAL & BYLAWS 2008.pdf](#)

The Board will discuss amending Article VI, 2.I. Staff Decisions of the HDBR Bylaws to add (8). HVAC and mechanical screens at their meeting of January 11, 2012.

#### XIV. ADJOURNMENT

28. Adjourned

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward  
Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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