



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
June 13, 2012 2:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

JUNE 13, 2012 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Linda Ramsay, Chair
Ned Gay, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
Brian Judson
Zena McClain
Stephen Merriman, Jr.
Ebony Simpson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Member Not Present: Sidney J. Johnson

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Ellen Harris, Cultural Resource and Urban Planning Manager
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approve Minutes of May 9, 2012](#)

Attachment: [05-9-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve May 9, 2012 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay	
Second: Keith Howington	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

III. SIGN POSTING

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

2. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. for Screamin Mimis | H-12-4669-2 | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Board Action:

Continue item to July 11, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson	
Second: Reed Engle	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

3. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. for Screwie Louie's | H-12-4678-2 | 10 Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Board Action:

Continue to July 11, 2012 at the petitioner's request.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Brian Judson	
Second: Reed Engle	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

V. CONSENT AGENDA

4. [Amended Petition of John L. Deering for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4521-2 | 205 Papy Street | New Construction amendments](#)

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

Board Action:	
<u>Approval</u> for the amendments to the parking garage at 205 Papy Street <u>with the following conditions:</u>	
1. Eliminate or revise the ramping and railings to blend in with the surrounding hardscape/landscape features as much as possible with the final design to be submitted to staff for review.	- PASS
2. Signage to be resubmitted to the Board for final review and approval.	
Vote Results	
Motion: Brian Judson	
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of John L. Picker | H-12-4657-2 | 48 East Broad Street | Privacy wall](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval to relocate the existing brick fence at 48 East Broad Street to the rear property line as requested. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Harley Krinsky | H-12-4664-2 | 134 Whitaker Street | Rooftop addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the new rooftop deck on 134 Whitaker Street because it has been designed to be minimally visible and is not visible from the front elevation. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Viet T. Hoang | H-12-4665-2 | 2 North Lincoln Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Board Action:

Approval for the widening of the exterior stair at 2 North Lincoln Street with the condition that the iron railing feature a bottom and top with balusters that tie into the rails and are not spaced more than four inches apart. This approval does not preclude an encroachment agreement which may be required from the City of Savannah if this work is located on city property. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc. for The Public Kitchen & Bar | H-12-4670-2 | 1 West Liberty Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the principal use sign in metallic silver sign, provided that the background not be black but dark in color to coordinate with the new wood columns and the final stucco color be submitted to staff for approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present
Brian Judson - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Ebony Simpson - Not Present
Robin Williams - Aye

9. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-12-4679-2 | 126 West Bay Street | Alterations to rooftop addition and storefront doors](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for the new doors as requested, provided they are inset not less than three inches from the exterior surface of the façade, because the request is consistent with the standards in the historic district ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present
Brian Judson - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

10. [Amended Petition of Matthew Allen | H-11-4526-2 | 409 East Perry Street | New Construction amendments withdrawn by the petitioner](#)

No action required. Petition withdrawn by petitioner.

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

Agenda A (Items 11-15 will be heard at 2:00 pm.)

11. [Amended Petition of Todd Huntington for GPD Group | H-12-4578-2 | 504 East River Street | New Construction amendments](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Materials and Windows.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Previously Approved Elevations.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to amend the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for new construction of a one- and two-story commercial structure at 504 East River Street for exterior modifications to brick, windows and canopies. Ms. Ward reported that the petitioner submitted a sign plan that will be considered as a separate item on today's agenda.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends denial of the proposed brick palette because it is not visually compatible with the predominate materials, textures, and colors used on the contributing structures to which the structure is visually related. The approved brick may be used or a similar substitute if resubmitted to staff for final review.

Ms. Ward further reported that staff recommends approval for the remaining exterior modifications with the following conditions:

1. Reduce the height of the arched window openings to be proportionate with the openings below and to the east.
2. Shutters must be hinged, operable, sized to fit the window opening and the horizontal rail must correspond to the meeting rail of the window. Include

shutters in upper story.

3. Provide railing detail for ramp if required by the Building Official.
4. The string course at the base of the parapet must project from the face of the building to meet the condition of the original approval.

Dr. Williams asked staff to clarify what they mean by saying that the arched opening should be proportionate.

Ms. Ward explained that staff believes they are too tall. The head height should be consistent with that of the openings below. The openings below are five panes of tall glass. But when you go higher they are six panes of glass and one-half on either side. This makes the top look stretched out. It also crowds the coping as not enough space is here. Therefore, this makes it not proportionate with the windows below.

Dr. Williams asked staff where the idea of the arches come from.

Ms. Ward answered that this is new. It is an amendment that is being requested by the petitioner. They had a previous approval, but are asking for an amendment.

Dr. Williams asked for clarity that previously the petitioner was not approved for arches, but is requesting arches at this time.

Ms. Ward said a copy of the previously approved drawings are in the Board's packet. She informed the Board that staff was contacted by a Board member, Mr. Engle, and he asked her to make the images available at the meeting. She asked if she should put the images on the screen now or wait until the Board is in its discussion.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Ward to put the images up now.

Mr. Engle said one thing the staff did not address was that most of the arches on River Street on the river side, not Bay Street side, are segmental and they are not glazed within the arch itself.

Mr. Gay said they are flatter on the top.

Mr. Engle said he pulled five photographs from the Georgia Historical site; they all are segmented and have wood infill above the end post where the arch begins. They are either double hung or casement sashed and with one or two exceptions on River Street, this is how they all were. He said he talked with staff about this as segmental arches are shown. Segmental arches might be appropriate for Bay Street, but they are not appropriate for River Street. With the Board's previous two reviews pertaining to this petition, they pushed the industrial character, but now the request is to spring to a much more elegant non-industrial character than what was approved previously.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Engle if he was saying that sashes are square, but the radius has brick molding.

Mr. Engle replied yes; and they also are heavy jams. He believes this will give a very finished appearance.

Mr. Howington asked staff if this is the first time they have seen the tension rods.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Howington said a slight change has been done in the mass in the little service area. The previous plan showed that it was straight in the back. The "U" shape was taken out. Mr. Howington said an odd shape will be on this side. This does not show up on the elevation, but shows up on the previous plans.

Ms. Ward asked Mr. Howington what page is this show on.

Mr. Howington said on the floor plan of this building it is on the first page of the floor plan.

Ms. Ward said she will pull the plans, but she did not identify any changes in the floor plan. This is something the petitioner can address when he makes his comments to the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Huntington said he was present representing the GPD Group who are the owners and developers of Joe's Crab Shack. They received staff's report, reviewed it and had a few comments. He said the only change regarding the floor plan is an operating issue. Mr. Huntington in pointing to a section said the service yard they had over here previously, the finished floor of the building is raised three feet above grade and the service yard was at grade. He said having the steps and turn-arounds for deliveries was not conducive to the amount of deliveries and getting the materials in and out of the building. They would basically exit out onto a flat surface and then ramp back down to the street. Getting the trash back down and deliveries and everything else, just makes it easier for deliveries. They put the brick coursing on the side, it matches with the side of the building. But in order to accomplish this, they had to raise the industrial door slightly and added some brick coursing underneath to differentiate it.

Mr. Howington said he was referring to the utility room wall which is now several feet less. The wall was originally straight back, but now it seems to be out about five or six feet. Therefore, it creates a weird recess on this elevation.

Mr. Huntington, pointing to an area, explained that it was expanded; the delivery area is here and the trash carts will be stored here. Obviously, they cannot have any large containers here, so the carts will be hauled down. Because of the number of carts and the grease container, they needed additional space to operate as a restaurant.

Mr. Huntington said the old layout shows the stairs taking up a significant amount of space. Now, they want to utilize this area for the trash storage. They are able to bump this and the mechanical room which the Board currently saw in that location was not large enough. Therefore, in order to get everything in and make it work, they bumped this out.

Mr. Howington said the bumping out created a recess in this area instead of a clean nice wall.

Mr. Huntington explained that the recess was in the back. He understood what Mr. Howington was saying about the flat wall with a screen wall in front of it. But, now they are adding one recess to the wall and it sits back off the street and is not in the direct view. Mr. Huntington pointing to an area said, the main facade of what will be seen is right in this area. This was a change on the floor plan. They have every intention of adding the string course to match the top. They have no issue with this. The brick that was previously approved was not a blend, it was a solid color. He showed the Board some additional photos that were not shown during their presentation. He showed a photo of the Bohemian. It is a reddish tone brick and has some orange tones, painted brick, is from older buildings and is reclaimed. Their feelings are it is fitting with this area and is, therefore, compatible with what is down there. They have seen buildings that this blended color brick and the Bohemian is an example. There are a lot of stucco buildings down there and painted over brick. Mr. Huntington showed a picture of the Chart House restaurant. He said it is hard to tell from the photo, but the brick reveals that they are reddish color with orange tones. On the sample board they are showing eight bricks and the variety. The overall scheme does not show much variation. In the example Ms. Ward showed before of St. Louis shows that it is a reddish tone brick. They do get the blended look similar to what is seen at the Bohemian and some of the other buildings in this area.

Mr. Huntington said they took quite a few photos of the Chart House and there are some orange tones in their bricks and a variety of texture. This is essentially the brick that the Board is reviewing now and this is what they are asking approval for; they want the blended look. Regarding the comment about the arched windows, he showed an example of the Bohemian with the arched windows. They are square on the bottom and arched at the top. The intent to go with the arched windows is to give the west facade since it is the two-story facade, having it not be such a plain facade, and it is not that they are just trying to throw a ton of elements in here as they want to keep the industrial theme and be compatible; walking down River Street there is a significant amount of buildings that have this look. He said they are trying to be visually compatible and change the west side of the building to give it a more enhanced look.

Mr. Gay stated that if they look at the photographs, it shows buildings that have arches now, were much more modest. They did not come up to a peak, but where almost flat across the top. He believes this is what Mr. Engle was saying. Mr. Gay said, therefore, he believes Mr. Huntington should try to do this as opposed to doing a more refined arch.

Mr. Huntington said he understood and looking directly across the street at the Olde Harbor Inn, the window sash is square and the piece at the top has a flatter arch. He said, therefore, he agrees that they do not have an issue with this. The staff made a comment about it being too tall. Rather than it being a fifteen window and an eighteen light, they can bring it down to a fifteen light and cover up a portion of the side of top. Therefore, it will be the same height windows as the bottom and they will slightly flatten the arch to address this concern.

Mr. Judson stated that while they are on this subject and on the photo, he believes that staff also mentioned shuttering the arched windows. He asked Mr. Huntington if he and his clients had any issues with this.

Mr. Huntington said the intent of what they are doing on the west facade of the building is they are trying to remain consistent with what is being done throughout the rest of the building. They have the first story windows. He pointed out that they have the storefront windows with the shutters under the canopies. Initially, as the Board saw, they did not have the canopies here nor the shutters. It was just a plain facade. But, after review, they wanted to dress this side of the building up and make it compatible. He said their feelings are not to have shutters on here. They have no issues with bringing the arch down on the window and making it more compatible in the area, but just to put the shutters up there they don't understand. He said it is a lot easier to maintain shutters on the first floor rather than putting them up on the second floor. Consequently, they would not like to see the shutters up there. This is the first hearing he has heard about having the shutters up there. Mr. Huntington said he has not had the opportunity to look into this. As he has said, their thought is not to have them. Mr. Huntington said once again viewing the arches and understanding what has been said about flattening the arches is really no issue.

Mr. Huntington said Ms. Ward raised the point about the ramp on the side of the building having a railing here. They will investigate this with the Development Services department to see if they need do a railing. There is a thirty-six (36) inch drop off at this location and then it goes down to grade at this point. There is no sidewalks on this side of the building for pedestrians to go pass this point, but if they do need to do so it will be the same exact railing as will be used on the rest of the building. He was not sure if this is what the Board was saying could be done at staff level, but their intent is to use the same railing, they will not use something different. They want it to be consistent throughout the building.

Mr. Huntington said in reviewing the example photos of the buildings, they can see that it is a blend of the Bohemian and an older reclaimed brick similar to what is here already. They will use beige mortar with the thicker joints to bring out some of the colors.

Mr. Engle said he believes he brought this up during the last review of this, but the balusters are shown eight (8) to ten (10) inches apart. Therefore, the Board cannot get the full effect of what the handrails will look like. They

certainly will not go four inches on center. He scaled as best he could on the computer and they were about eight to nine inches shown on the drawings. Therefore, an assessment of this was hard to make. However, he assumes they will be four (4) inches on center.

Mr. Huntington said the comment they addressed at the last meeting was to simplify what they were. They had a significant amount of decorative posts. He believes they were saying that every third post would have the forged center; but they changed this to every sixth (6th) post. At most, they will have two in-between each ten foot opening, between the columns. This is the comment they addressed at the last meeting.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Huntington if he addressed the string course.

Mr. Huntington said the bump out is seen at the top, but is not shown on the renderings. But they do not have an issue complying with the string course.

Dr. Henry said, therefore, the only issues with this petition are the bricks and shutters.

Mr. Howington said since this is the first time the Board is seeing the tie-rods over the canopy, especially where the columns are located, the suggestion was made to add some tie-rods. He said personally this does not work for him because the posts hold up the porch. The tie-rods should be for the canopies. He asked Mr. Huntington if he would consider lessening them or may be delete them.

Mr. Huntington answered yes. They discussed at the last hearing to add these here to get away from having the plain facade, especially on the back of the building. This is supported by the posts and not supported by the tie-rods. Therefore, to give it that look, they added them, but they are not providing any other feature other than being aesthetic. They can space them out and reduce on the backside. However, he does not believe that they are really necessary on the backside as they will not be seen. You will be standing down at the River Walk when they eventually extend this. If you are walking down here, it is twelve and one-half feet (12.5) above grade and you are looking at a canopy that projects out from ten to eighteen feet off the building. Therefore, the bottom side of the canopy will be seen and not the tie-rods. He said, therefore, if it is okay with the Board, they would like to remove some of these.

Mr. Shawn Ray, Vice President of Ignite Restaurant Group, said he believes he met with the Historic Review Board several months ago. Mr. Ray stated that he would recap what Mr. Huntington said and why they have come back with some of the requested changes.

Mr. Ray said if the Board recalls, they started out with a building that was completely different than what they are working with now. Their goal as he stated this during the first hearing, was to try and receive approval from the Historic Review Board as quickly as possible so that they could maintain

their development schedule and try to have this project in their 2012 opening. As they can see, they have come one hundred eighty (180) degrees different. They believe they have a building that is functional from an operational standpoint. They also believe that they have a building that is visually compatible with the rest of River Street. What they are here now to address is the fact that they are now a publicly traded company that occurred over the last couple of months. They have stockholders to address; and they also have a board that meets on a regular basis and approves their projects internally. Their board's concern is that they have lost their identity that this building is a restaurant. They understand that they had some historical and architectural standards that they had to follow. However, they are still a restaurant and it is being built as a restaurant. Therefore, as a development team, what they were required to do was to comeback and provide some additional elements that made this building look more like a restaurant. This is why they added the canopies on the west side, changed the window structure on the west side above the canopies and added a different blend of brick to try to give themselves a little bit of identity. Now, as the Board can see, they are completely away from their original design, but at the same time he believes the minor changes that they have added allow them to still be somewhat unique in a very unique corridor.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Ray what was he asking the Board.

Mr. Ray said he was trying to recapture everything that Mr. Huntington said and say that they would like to have these changes approved with some of the modifications they have already addressed with the arched windows, changing the peak of the arch; and work with the ramp on the other side, if they have to add a railing, but the brick and the signage he guessed will be discussed later are elements they feel they have to have in order for this project to move forward.

Dr. Henry said there are only two things left, which are the brick and the shutters. He asked Mr. Ray how he felt about the shutters.

Mr. Ray said he agrees with Mr. Huntington. The shutters will have to be functional and they will be functional on the first floor. But, from a restaurant standpoint those windows are basically false windows to begin with. This entire area is over their kitchen. The windows will not be used and ultimately the shutters will need to be replaced, maintained, and taken care of. Therefore, from a maintenance and facility standpoint on a long term basis, he would rather have something closer to the ground that their facilities team can work with and ensure that it is maintained properly.

Dr. Henry told Mr. Ray that he understood his point about looking like a restaurant, but there are a lot of restaurants in this area and buildings that have been here for two hundred years.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Ray that since he does not like the shutters on the second floor and does not want them there, would he consider deleting the

shutters on the first floor on the west elevation.

Mr. Ray answered sure; they will be okay with this. If the Board wants the building to be similar from the top to the bottom, they can go back to this. He said he believes this is reasonable.

Dr. Williams said he wanted to get clarification. He asked if the upper elevation faces River Street.

Mr. Ray answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) came forward and thanked Ms. Ramsay for making the presentation to the MPC. He thought Ms. Ramsay's comments were appropriate and well placed. Mr. Carey said he appreciates the fact that the Historic District Review Board thought enough to do this.

Mr. Carey said the HSF agrees with the staff's report and with the concessions and adjustments that the petitioner has already stated such as the flatter arch, using fewer tie-rods/support rods on the canopies and adjustments of the shutters. He said regarding the bricks, he thinks the patina has earned over time and the building is new, it should be represented as such. There is room for it not to look like it is right out of the box. A little more consistency and face on the brick such as a more rectilinear form rather one that would seemingly more used. Mr. Carey said it appears that the center panel lights appear to be a little bigger; however, this is a small matter. However, they need to be proportionate as well, especially with respect to what's underneath. There are 5/3 light pattern and a 3/3. Therefore, the squared nature of these, in particular the center window. It just appears to be a little off.

Mr. Carey said he appreciates the fact they have come a long way on this project and he believes the petitioner should be commended for making these changes. But, he believes also that they are this close and these edits are minor and he does not believe that they will delay the project. With the instructions and directions from the Board to staff should be easily taken care of. Mr. Carey said he believes these things can be done; this should not cause a delay and they will get the best product.

Mr. Gay said the bricks are showing every variety there can be. There will be a repetition of all these bricks.

Mr. Carey said they will stand by their comment even with the understanding of the nature of the sample. But he believes that more consistency in color and shape and the finish of the brick as well is what the HSF recommends.

Ms. Ramsay thanked Mr. Carey for his comments and support at the MPC meeting. She asked if there were more public comments.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he agrees with HSF. He believes it is bad to start using recycle material on new buildings. He does not think the hotel is recycle. The point is they want people to know what's old and what's new. It should be contemporary, but compatible. Once you start using recycled brick, why not use recycle doors. It is the same difference and it confuses the public. It is against the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to use this on a historic building. He believes the philosophy here is its a new building and should have new materials. There is no reason that you can't have of a varied color palette, but it should not have clearly old brick. They do not know how much will be in there as it comes out of a pile. He believes they have an agreement that the arches should be flatter and he agrees with Mr. Howington that probably should not have a tie-rod more than every post.

Mr. Howington said the tie-rods should be at a minimum or delete them.

Dr. Williams stated that he recommends deleting them. The buildings in this area are very simple and if the canopies already have posts holding them up, the tie-rods are not necessary.

Dr. Henry said the shutters should be done.

Mr. Engle said it is evident that the second and third floors on River Street had no windows originally. They were for cotton storage. Therefore, they had shutters; when there was cotton in the warehouses, the shutters were shut. The upper two stories were factory offices and everything else. The people worked in there and needed light. They did not need light for the cotton. Therefore, when you look at the old photographs, you never see windows, but shut shutters.

Ms. McClain asked for clarification regarding the issue of the tie-rods.

Mr. Howington explained that architecturally the columns hold up the porch. The tie-rods are structural to hold up the canopies.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Howington if he was in agreement to keep the tie-rods on the canopy over the door and the windows on the western end of the south facade.

Mr. Howington answered that they are not needed and are not necessary.

Dr. Williams said on the topic of the shutters, on the south facade there are three larger windows. The shutter would not cover a single glass.

Mr. Engle said the shutters are bi-fold.

Ms. Ward stated she believes they need to concentrate on the amendments that are being proposed. Approval has already been given for a lot of these

things. She recommended focusing on the amendments and not revisit the things that have already been reviewed and approved.

Dr. Williams said it appears that the petitioner wants a brick that is more varied than the original sample. He believes the point that the Bohemian has new bricks achieve this.

Ms. Ramsay said staff has recommended that a test panel be erected on the site.

Mr. Engle stated that he does not believe that anybody has a problem with the brick variation, but the issue was using old bricks, recycle bricks. This Board has approved varied new bricks lots of places.

Mr. Judson explained that he believes there is a consensus that the Board supports a new use of a new brick with a variation of color, but they do not approve the petitioner's recommendation of the used brick. He believes that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards support this because new buildings get new materials.

Mr. Engle said the petitioner has to build a test panel.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner does not have to build a test panel, but the Board can stipulate this in its motion.

Mr. Judson asked the staff for clarification purposes if they were saying that the shutters on the lower windows on the west wing of the south elevation are not a part of this amendment, but were previously approved.

Ms. Ward explained that the shutters are a part of this amendment today. She believes the discussion was going to the other shutters on the larger windows.

Mr. Judson said he believes the Board needs to come to a consensus on whether there will be no shutters or shutters on both floors.

Mr. Merriman asked if this should not be left to petitioner's discretion.

Dr. Williams asked if this is an option that the petitioner can work out with staff.

Board Action:

Approval of the petition with the following conditions:

1. Use new bricks on the exterior facade and construct a sample panel on site for staff review

- prior to installation;
2. Flatten the arched windows on the western segment of the south facade and use flat headed windows in the openings;
 3. Delete the tie rods above the canopy where the posts exist;
 4. Eliminate shutters from the western segment of the south facade; - PASS
 5. Lower the height of the arched windows to match the neighboring openings;
 6. Provide railing detail for ramp to staff for review and approval if required by the Building Official; and
 7. The string course at the base of the parapet must project from the face of the building to meet the condition of the original approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye

12. [Approval to move Petition of Todd Huntington | H-12-4686 | 504 East President Street from Agenda B to Agenda A](#)

Board Action:

Approve to move the Petition of Todd Huntington for GPD Group [H-12-4686-2] 504 East River Street [Sign] from vnumber twenty (20) on Agenda B to number twelve (12) on Agenda A. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Todd Huntington for GPD Group | H-12-4686-2 | 504 East River Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Todd Huntington of the GPD Group was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior signs on the new approved new construction of Joe's Crab Shack.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends denial of the announcement signs because they exceed the sign area allowed by the River Street-Factors wall sign district Section [8-3120 (2)(b), announcement signs] of the city zoning ordinance resulting in an incompatible treatment of excessive text/signage on multiple awnings for the property.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the projecting principal use sign at 504 East River Street with the condition that the material be replaced with wood or material of a similar texture or appearance to comply with the ordinance and resubmitted to staff for final approval.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward if she said the signs exceed the area; therefore, it is not so much the wording, but the area.

Ms. Ward answered it is both the wording and sign area.

Dr. Williams asked that due to the fact that they are on the front canopies is equally problematic.

Ms. Ward answered yes. The petitioner would need a variance from the ordinance for this as well.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Dr. Henry stated that it would be helpful if the petitioner informed the Board in a summary fashion of what parts he agrees with and what part he disagrees

with of the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Huntington said regarding the projection sign, the material, he has an option that will meet the staff's recommendations. He said relating to the background of the sign which the Board previously decided was the corrugated panel, being metal panel, what they can do is go with a different background on the side and it will be the same material as the lettering and crab was. It is sign foam; it's and can be painted to have the same type of texture as wood.. Mr. Huntington said he believes that the staff's only concern was with the corrugated metal panel on the back and not necessarily the material of the crab and lettering. Consequently, they can use the same material on the background and paint it to meet the requirement of the similar textures. This is what they are proposing to do to meet the staff's requirements. He said regarding the size and percentage of the copy everything else is in conformance.

Mr. Huntington said the discussion they had with zoning regarding the signs being classified as announcement signs, but their interpretation of it is that they are canopy signs. The signs will be mounted on the canopy. They are not a menu that will be displayed for people to come and decide what they want to eat. The signs are representative of Joe's Crab Shack and their restaurant. This goes back to what Mr. Ray said about making sure that people know this is a restaurant. He said the sign can be classified as an announcement sign could be two square feet and a business can have an additional six square feet if they like. He said they are permitted to have a twenty (20) square foot canopy sign on the east elevation.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Huntington if he means the south elevation.

Mr. Huntington answered yes. The side that faces River Street is the only side they will have signage on. No signage will be on the other facades. The sign that they are looking at that is interpreted as a canopy sign is 18.75 square feet is less than the twenty (20) square feet that the canopy is allowed. He said their interpretation of this not being an announcement sign. As he has said it is not a menu sign, but a branding element of Joe's Crab Shack. It will be mounted on the canopy and will be only six inch tall letter; aluminum letter and is not illuminated. There is a section in the code that states "being over an entrance." When they talked with zoning, they classified this as their main entrance into the building. They also have an ADA access on the side. Mr. Huntington pointing to a section said, the ADA access that comes in here is not a main entrance for people to come up through and come in on the side elevation. Zoning classified this as two entrances. Therefore, if you classify this as a canopy sign, it is over an entrance and it meets the square foot requirements and this is really what they are trying to pursue. The additional signs are roughly three and one-half; he believes one sign is 3.0 and the other is 3.8 square feet. Consequently, he would not classify this as an obtrusive signage. There are significant amount of buildings in this area that have a significant amount of signage. The Chart House is one that has awning signs that hang down from the front and are larger than six inches. There are three projecting signs on the Chart House. Therefore, the

compatibility of what is already down here, they are only asking for twenty-five (25) square feet to be classified as canopy signs. If they are over the amount, they will go to ZBA to obtain these variances. They are not asking for new laws to be approved for these canopy signs; he would not classify these as obtrusive.

Ms. McClain asked Mr. Huntington if the purpose of the pictures he provided was the comparison of the canopy signs to Spanky's signs.

Mr. Huntington said he was only giving some example photos of the amount of signage in this area. They will only be six inch letters. As he has stated the two on the west are three and one-half square feet and the on the east it is 18.75. These are small letters.

Mr. Engle said he wanted staff to correct something. The Historic Review Board does not have the authority to provide a variance if it has been ruled that it is not compatible.

Ms. Ward explained that the sign standards are not the Historic District ordinance. They are in the sign ordinance and are interpreted by the Zoning Administrator. She knows that Mr. Huntington may not agree with the interpretation, but this is for the Zoning Board of Appeals to make a decision on.

Mr. Engle asked, therefore, why are they discussing it. They have no authority.

Ms. Ward answered that it requires the approval of Historic Review Board as they make the determination as to whether it is or is not visually compatible.

Mr. Engle said the Historic Review Board cannot approve it if it does not meet the ordinance.

Ms. McClain asked if the Historic Review Board approves it, then the petitioner would still have to get the approval of the ZBA.

Ms. Ward answered yes; it would still have to go to the ZBA.

Dr. Williams asked if the Historic Review Board does not approve the sign, the petitioner can still go to the ZBA and what happens.

Ms. Ward answered that she cannot predict the outcome.

Dr. Williams stated that he realizes this, but the petitioner has a right to appeal to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Ms. Ward asked Dr. Williams if he was saying appeal the Historic Review Board decision or appeal the Zoning Administrator's interpretation.

Dr. Williams answered the latter.

Ms. Ward answered yes, the petitioner has a right to do that.

Mr. Engle said, however, the petitioner can only appeal the Historic Review Board's decision if they make an administrative error.

Mr. Merriman said only if this Board makes a procedural error.

Mr. Judson asked the staff for clarification that if the petitioner goes to the Zoning Administrator and is granted the variance he is looking for, does it then come back to this Board for visual compatibility compliance. If the Historic Review Board says today that they don't feel it is compliant and the petitioner then goes to the Zoning Administrator who tells him that he will go ahead and grant the variance, does this come back to the Historic Review Board.

Ms. Ward answered that she does not believe that it would come back to the Historic Review Board. The Zoning Administrator would have the final word on this.

Mr. Engle stated that Mr. Huntington's examples are probably true, but he has a feeling that the examples were never approved by this Board. Half of what is on River Street was never approved by this Board. Therefore, River Street is not a good example for compatibility. There are a lot of things that were done over the years that have never had a review or approval by anybody.

Mr. Huntington said he understood this. He understands that whether these are classified as announcement sign or canopy signs, they will discuss with zoning and go to ZBA. The comment he made about the obtrusive signage is that may be they were not approved by staff and were installed at the owner's discretion, but they are only asking for twenty five (25) feet that is not illuminated and will be mounted on the canopy. In their opinion in comparison to what is on River Street if the Board thinks this is visually compatible, give them the approval so they can go to ZBA.

Mr. Engle stated that the Historic Review Board cannot approve something that does not meet the ordinance. They do not have the authority to give a variance.

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Ward if she knows whether the hanging signs were approved for the Chart House.

Ms. Ward answered that the signs do not conform with the ordinance. Since she has been employed on staff, they were not approved. Staff looked at this this morning and they do not conform.

Mr. Merriman said another sign is at the top.

Ms. Ward explained that they are allowed to have the directional sign on the Bay Street level, but as far as the under canopy sign, they are allowed to have it, but it just exceeds the amount that is allowed.

Mr. Huntington said their understanding from conversations with staff is that if it does not meet the code they must go to ZBA, but the conversation they have had with zoning is that they need to come before the Historic Review Board to look at this for visual compatibility before they even go to ZBA.

Ms. McClain asked if something is on River Street that the Board can compare this to.

Mr. Gay said the signage that does not conform he guessed they should look at how it got put there and ask them to take the sign down.

Mr. Engle said the petitioner has the main entrance canopy and nothing is on it which is somewhat strange. The handicap canopy has something on it, but not the main entrance. If this was a proposal for something over the main entrance and the handicap entrance which are the two entrances, the petitioner might be able to get a compatibility argument, but they are everywhere, but the main entrance.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Huntington to address why no words are over the main entrance.

Mr. Huntington answered that when you walk down the street and these are not glaring at you, these are not the first things that you. The first thing one will see is their projecting sign and flag. They did not feel it was necessary in the center location to just add more signage. They are trying to limit that and breakdown their totals to about twenty-five square feet; six inch tall letters. This is over the entrance on side and zoning classifies this as an additional entrance; but it is that just these two are not over the entrances.

Dr. Williams asked how far does the central canopy projects out.

Mr. Huntington said it projects out seven (7) feet.

Dr. Williams said he does not know where it fits in to what is allowed by zoning and how it gets classified, but if the petitioner put words on east and west faces of the canopy it would not be visible in this elevation. But if there were words on the left/right and one or two over the middle, they would actually have something that might be more visible to pedestrians. He asked Mr. Huntington if this was considered.

Mr. Huntington asked Dr. Williams, pointing to an area, if he was saying on this side.

Dr. Williams answered that he was saying over the main entrance.

Mr. Huntington, pointing to an area, explained that the main entrance just projects here and the smaller one projects so far. They will be slightly blocked by the canopies that sit directly next to them.

Dr. Williams injected "from a distance."

Mr. Huntington said yes, from a distance. However, this would be there main pull just letting people know that Joe's Crab shack is down here and at this location people could look across the street and see it, but they did not explore the option of doing this on the side.

Dr. Williams explained that what he was suggesting was the two sides, plus something on the River Street elevation.

Mr. Huntington said the issue that they still run into is them classifying this as an announcement sign and telling them that it has to be mounted to either the building, a window or a wall. Therefore, either way it was not in compliance.

Mr. Huntington asked if the Historic Review Board cannot vote on this, what is wrong for them to assume that they were to come here first so they could look at this and then go to ZBA. He has heard this Board say that they cannot vote on it.

Mr. Merriman stated that the Historic Review Board cannot vote to approve it if it is contrary to the ordinance.

Ms. Ramsay explained that as she understands, the zoning administrator has said that these are announcement signs, but the petitioner wants the Board to see them as canopy signs.

Mr. Huntington said no; the Board can see the signs as announcement signs, but he guesses just looking at the overall signage that they are proposing, if the Historic Review Board is okay with it, then they will go to ZBA. It is their understanding that they would need this Board's approval to go to ZBA for these signs. This is what the zoning administrator told them.

Dr. Williams asked staff if this is correct.

Ms. Ward said this is correct. The petitioner has to come to the Historic Review Board. He could go to ZBA first, but he has come to this Board asking for your approval that these signs are visually compatible. This Board is not strictly bound to this ordinance because it is not in the historic district section, but is in the general ordinance. However, in her view, these ordinances for these signs were written to protect the historic character of the area. Therefore, staff is recommending denial because they do not meet the ordinance and, therefore, are not visually compatible. This is the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Ray stated that based on his earlier comments about their board and the changes that they have made in order to make this work, these items whether they are considered announcement signs or canopy signs is really irrelevant to them. But, if they cannot get some sort of identification that this is a natural restaurant, there is a very good chance that this project may not get approved

internally.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said the example that was given based on the Chart House is clearly an example of why they have to go with the sign ordinance. It is just out of control. There is too much hodge-podge. He asked staff if the petitioner can do any kind of signage on the front central canopy and the handicap entrance canopy.

Ms. Ward answered that the entrance where the public accesses would work, but at the other entrances they can have a canopy sign.

Mr. Engle said he does not believe this Board should be blackmailed by "we are going to pull our business out of Savannah." He takes this as a direct threat to the Historic Review Board that they are going to lose business. Mr. Engle stated that he is sorry, but the ordinance is here and it is clear. ZBA has ruled and he believes that this Board needs to stand behind it and if they want to come back with a sign over the main entrance and over the handicap entrance, this Board would see this as compatible. He is willing to make an amendment to leave it to staff to work out signage on the front canopy and on the handicap canopy and let them work it with staff so that it meets the ordinance. But, he is not going to accept the fact that they are going to accept the marbles and go home.

Dr. Williams said he wants to be sure of what canopies they are talking about. When they say the handicap canopy, are they talking about the entire canopy that extends from the main entrance to the end.

Mr. Engle said it is the canopy over the steps and the ramp on the right; not the entire thing. Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward to put the front elevation up on the screen. He explained that he believes the staff said initially is this is technically an entrance. Staff said it would meet the code if the petitioner did the front entrance and the handicap entrance.

Ms. Ward stated that she will work with the Zoning Administrator to ensure that it meets whatever he determines is allowed for that signage.

Mr. Howington said the bigger question is do they visually approve the aluminum letters on the steel porch as presented.

Mr. Gay said the Board is not approving the letters where the petitioner wants to put them. They can come back to this Board and propose those letters over the entrances or work with staff. The Board is not approving those letters because they cannot.

Mr. Engle said this is an industrial character. If it meets the zoning he sees no problem.

Dr. Williams asked if the handicap entrance is at the far right. You can exit the ramp and then go across the facade, then there is the main entrance.

Mr. Judson explained that the center section projects and there is a door.

Dr. Williams questioned if the entire canopy with the four words thereon is the handicap entrance.

Ms. Ward stated that she will have to work with the zoning administrator as he makes this call.

Dr. Williams asked the Board if they were okay with the aluminum letters on the metal canopy and if the zoning administrator is okay with the entire canopy being called an entrance and the other two words are moved towards the door, they can potentially get all the words they want with just moving them from the west to the center. This could be left with the staff to work out.

Board Action:

Approve the petition with the following conditions:

1. The material be replaced with wood or material of a similar texture or appearance to comply with the ordinance and resubmitted to staff for final approval; - PASS
2. Announcement signs comply with the ordinance and be resubmitted to staff and the Zoning Administrator for review and approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain

Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Rebecca Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-12-4656-2 | 327 Jefferson Street | Amendments to rehabilitation/alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Rebecca Lynch was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval to amend the Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations to 327 Jefferson.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the door openings and balcony/railing with the condition that the light pattern of the door match the previously approved design, or have no light divisions to be compatible with the existing building.

Mr. Gay said that the door does not look like a French door. A French door is two doors.

Ms. Ward said it is a multi-light single door.

Mr. Gay said what he was trying to understand is this Board has already approved something and it was not done. He asked, therefore, why did the petitioner come to them in the first place. He does not believe that the Board should be considering something such as is. The petitioner has already been given approval to do something and they should go ahead and do what they proposed that they were doing to do.

Ms. Ward explained that they see alterations to projects all the time. A part of the problem with this is it is after-the-fact as the door has already been installed.

Mr. Thomson explained that Mr. Gay's comments may or may not be relevant, but they should be made after the presentation is heard. The petitioner has made an application to be heard by this Board. If the Board believes that the petitioner should not come back with revisions, then they can comment on this and vote. He believes it is important that the application be heard and the public has its chance to comment before the Board gets into that level of discussion.

Mr. Engle asked how much of this is visible from the street.

Ms. Ward said photos of this are shown on the front page. She does not believe that it depends on whether the doors are opened or not, but the top door is really what they saw. She does not believe the bottom level is visible.

Dr. Williams asked where is the representation of the door that is on sheet five.

Ms. Ward explained that what was previously existing on the top; what was proposed and approved in the middle; and what was actually done. The petitioner has stopped working and they are asking to do a little more to it by adding the balcony railing.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Lynch stated that she is the agent for the owner. She thanked Ms. Ward and said they appreciate the recommendations on this project. Ms. Lynch explained that she was present in an unfortunate position of an after-the-fact application on the door which the owner changed during construction and deviated from the approve plans. However, they have not finished it. The owners are new to Savannah and did not truly understand the process; that they absolutely had to adhere to the drawings and that any changes had to be approved prior to construction. She stated that the owners apologize for any misunderstanding.

Ms. Lynch said while she agrees with the staff's recommendations that another light pattern would be more compatible, she leaves it to the Board's discretion whether the light pattern warrants replacement of the door. The reality is the door is set back . Only the second story openings are visible from the right-of-way because of the courtyard wall that was previously approved by the Board. The reality of this door is that it is set back in the far corner of the property and the light pattern is not readily visible from the right-of-way. The proposed railing will also obscure most of the light pattern on the door. Unfortunately, because the Board only has purview over the building features that are visible from the right-of-way, the reality of the situation is that the owners want to only replace the upper door which will leave the building a bit of hodge-podge. This might not be a consideration for this Board because they obviously care about what can be seen. However, Ms. Lynch said she only wanted to bring up these items for the Board's consideration. The owners will comply with whatever this Board recommends today. Ms. Lynch stated again that the owners apologize for their misunderstanding of this Board's process.

Dr. Henry asked how could anyone think that what any board says they have to do, do something else and start confusion.

Mr. Gay stated that the petitioners asked this Board.

Ms. Lynch explained that this was not her decision. She explained that the owner and the contractor on the project had full control of the construction process. This is where they found themselves in the situation and moved ahead. The owner did not hire her firm to do a construction review. This happened before they were aware of the changes. However, she completely understands the situation and she is here trying to represent her client in an objective manner and leaves it to this Board's discretion to make whatever decision they feel is appropriate.

Mr. Engle said the railing appears to be flat against the building.

Ms. Lynch answered no. The railing comes out four (4) inches. It is like a French balcony railing. They looked at doing it like a grill within the masonry opening that is sometimes seen on a parlor level double-hung window that comes down to the ground. But, they decided that this would be a less appropriate way. She said a French balcony railing is appropriate downtown, but the owners chose not to go in a full balcony way.

Mr. Engle said it does not read as having any shadow line or anything on the drawings. It extends so little over the door opening to either side that he does not know why it isn't in the door opening.

Ms. Lynch said they can make it in the door opening if the Board feels that this would be more appropriate. She believes it extends four inches on either side.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Lynch what was the rationale for her client going from a double door to a single door.

Ms. Lynch answered that basically it was for privacy reasons because in the back corner of the property there are actually a few adjacent properties that have windows and doors. This is located within their master bedroom. Originally, a single window was here. Therefore, they were working with the original masonry opening and just extending it to the floor.

Dr. Williams asked if the owners wanted privacy, why did they not just keep the original window.

Ms. Lynch answered that she did not know.

Mr. Gay said shutters could also be here.

Ms. Lynch said she believes it could have been a cost consideration, but she was not privy to this decision.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry stated that he believes the staff has been very generous in its response to this property and he is inclined to agree with staff.

Dr. Williams stated, therefore, the door opening will not revert to the original double opening, but will remain a single opening, but will stay a door and not a window. It would have a small railing, which he is not sure is typical of

Savannah. It has been said that this is compatible, but he could not think of an example where he has seen this.

Mr. Engle said it is always in the opening unless there is a balcony.

Dr. Williams said this is not a typical Savannah feature, the second floor window.

Mr. Gay said it is no longer a window; it is a door.

Dr. Williams said this is even less typical of doors. However, he agrees with staff recommendation if they are going to keep this as a door.

Mr. Gay said if this is a door, something has to be there in order to keep individuals from falling out.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Lynch if the reason for the French railing as she calls it is that someone would not accidentally walk out the door.

Ms. Lynch explained that the code actually requires this. She believes that a railing is actually required, but she is not sure. However, something is needed for safety purposes and this is why the owners are applying for this.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Lynch that assuming the Board will not approve the door, would she like a solid pane, etc.

Ms. Lynch stated that for simplicity she would recommend a glass door with no light divisions.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Lynch to view sheet one (1) again, the bottom photo on the right showing the balcony. He asked Ms. Lynch if her client had considered something like this.

Ms. Lynch said maybe they could consider this. She believes the owners were considering for structural reasons because they would have to tear up a wall to tie that in. This why they would prefer to go with just a French balcony railing that would come out about four (4) inches.

Dr. Henry asked if he was correct in assuming that the lower storage door is not visible.

Ms. Lynch confirmed that it is not visible as the wall is seven feet, eight inches high.

Dr. Williams said he was concerned about the shallow railing straddling the doorway.

Ms. Lynch said they can project it a little wider and a little deeper.

Dr. Williams asked the petitioner if they wanted it to look like security bars.

Ms. Lynch answered no.

Dr. Henry asked if there would be any structural problems going back to the window.

Ms. Lynch answered no. But going to another door would be the most cost effective route for her client. To go back to a window would cost more as the entire area would have to be re-stuccoed.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board to restrict their comments to the application that is before them.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Gary Sanders, a local architect, pointed out that this is called a balconette. Mr. Sanders said that in the three hundred block (300) of State Street, the big red condominiums, that these type of balconies are here (State and Lincoln Streets).

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said he was tempted to require that the window be replaced. But, he will go along with the staff's recommendation.

Dr. Williams said there would be no light window; basically one sheet of glass would be preferable.

Ms. Ramsay said the staff has recommended either way.

Dr. Williams said his preference is that the railing be a little bigger and more substantial than it is so it does not read as security bars.

Mr. Engle asked Dr. Williams if he saw the details. It is wire-mesh; one and one-eighth inch. He does not believe they would want to make it any wider.

Ms. Lynch said it is actually a two-inch. It is not a mesh, but more like a grate.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Lynch if she tried talking to her clients to get a jam window with a wood panel underneath like such as some of the historic buildings have. A double-hung sash is here for the wood panel underneath. This would be cheaper than the metal French balconette.

Ms. Lynch stated what Mr. Engle said was true; however, she believes that adding a wood panel might be less compatible with the rest of the building.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board had discussed the design of the metal railing.

Mr. Howington asked Dr. Williams if he would rather see a balcony or a

railing.

Dr. Williams said he was only saying that the Board did not address this.

Mr. Howington said the metal railing does not bother him.

Mr. Engle said there is nothing else like this that shows. Staff says it is a modern building, but he does not see anything modern here.

Mr. Howington said it is an old industrial building. They are not trying to replicate history or anything.

Board Action:

Approval for the door openings and balcony/railing with the condition that the light-pattern of the door match the previously approved design, or have no light divisions to be compatible with the existing building. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Brian Judson

Reed Engle	- Nay
Ned Gay	- Nay
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Nay

15. Petition of Twin Rivers Capital, LLC | H-12-4672-2 | 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Demolition and New Construction, Part I

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Mr. Jim Gilburn was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for demolition of the building at 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue and new construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a new commercial structure on the property. A model has been submitted and is on display for the Board's review.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval to demolish the structure at 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions:

1. The Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for demolition not be issued until a COA has been issued approving the replacement structure, to best fulfill the purpose of this ordinance; and
2. Provide thorough documentation of the existing structure to staff prior to issuance of the COA.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends a continuance of the request for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass because the proposed design is not visually compatible with the surrounding historic mid-century modern structures. Staff recommends the following items to be addressed and resubmitted for review:

1. Provide a wide sidewalk and setback on Oglethorpe Avenue consistent with that of the Greyhound Bus Station to the immediate east.
2. Reduce the curb cut to meet the 20 foot maximum standard. In prior actions, the Board has approved a wider curb cut if it is required by Traffic Engineering and/or the Department of Transportation (DOT).
3. Provide a principal entrance on Oglethorpe Avenue to be compatible with neighboring historic structures.
4. Restudy the east elevation to provide some presence, fenestration, and articulation along Fahm Street.
5. Provide a low wall or screen adjacent to the building around the parking areas near Oglethorpe Avenue and Fahm Street.
6. Eliminate the neo-traditional elements which are out of character with the historic mid-century modern corridor in which this building is sited and consider more modern treatment to the fenestration, roof shape, division of bays, and directional expression.

Mr. Engle asked if this request has been before the Board. This was designed for MLK.

Ms. Ward answered that it was designed for a different site. This is why in staff's opinion that it does not work well on this site.

Mr. Engle said it does well on MLK, but not here on Oglethorpe Avenue.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gilburn said they have reviewed the staff comments and they are reworking the architecture. They began with the recently approved Family Dollar on MLK as a starting point. They understand that they need to go more

mid-century type architecture. He believes they are well on their way with this. He said the biggest issue that they will have and they are trying to work through with staff's comments is the setback; trying to lineup with the same setback on Oglethorpe Avenue as the bus station and a wider sidewalk. They are limited to what they can do maximize their site.

Mr. Howington stated that there is no presence on Fahm Street or Oglethorpe Avenue. This is an important corner.

Mr. Gilburn said they have not talked with staff about this yet, but it is not what he wants, but is what the retailer will take. They have to get various levels of approval through them. However, in similar situation to this such as a corner entry. Obviously, the retailer wants their door closest to the parking spots. The staff's recommendation is for the main entrance is to be on Oglethorpe Avenue. But, may be they can go with a corner entry. They have a couple of different things with Oglethorpe Avenue. First, they are maximizing the site and secondly, the grade issue from the east side of the property to the west side of the property. They probably saw this from the previous photos of the bank and the steps coming up out of the existing parking lot beside the bank. He said, therefore, trying to mirror this up even if they as far back as the back, he does not know if they could mirror the grade up with a finished floor. If they went to the corner entry style, then they could utilize some of the proposed landscape area next to the curb cut on Oglethorpe and widen out the sidewalk and make a smoother grade transition. This is what they are looking at now; but they have not done the grading on this. He would like to explore this option if the Board thinks this is reasonable.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Gilburn to clarify which corner of the building he is talking about when he says corner entrance. Are you saying corner by the parking lot?

Mr. Gilburn explained that the is talking about the corner by the curb cut off of Oglethorpe Avenue at the bottom.

Mr. Howington said this would be southwest.

Dr. Williams asked him how does this address the Fahm Street issue.

Mr. Gilburn answered that it doesn't. They will have to look at this.

Mr. Howington asked if this project has gone through site plan review.

Mr. Gilburn said the project has been submitted for site plan review.

Mr. Judson informed the petitioner that the elevation on the Fahm Street side is far more defining of the building and is a far bigger and along with staff's recommendation; but not that this discussion off in terms of input that might be helpful to him, but he wanted to ask the petitioner if he was willing to ask for a continuance because procedurally this is the only way that this Board can grant a continuance.

Mr. Gilburn said he is willing to ask for a continuance as it will give them more time to work on the architectural and see what they can get approved by the tenant. They will come back with some more detailed for discussion.

Ms. Ward reported that Mr. Howington brought up something that should have been included in the staff report and she apologized that it was not included in the staff's report. The petitioner has been working with the site plan review team for several months. She believes the site plan review team has some concerns, too, about the setback on Oglethorpe Avenue and how trucks will navigate around the corner. She said staff will be sure to include this study with its review next month.

Mr. Engle commented that the petitioner has said he will ask for a continuance, but he wanted to say that when this comes back before the Historic Review Board, he believes they need to stress what the staff has said quite strongly. The Oglethorpe Avenue ground elevations have got to interact with the street. Just having a big blank wall turn in your back isn't going to fly. He is unsure what Traffic Engineering will do about the entrance opening onto Oglethorpe Avenue as this intersection backs up all the time. But, with SCAD across the street, they will have a lot of walk-ins. It is just unfriendly. This Board went through a lot with MLK on the design of the building to be interacting with the street and they are not going to turn around and ignore it here.

Ms. McClain said she was concerned about the section that Family Dollar will be in. She said she can understand why it is switched around because Family Dollar stores usually attract a lot of people. Consequently, she is concerned about the parking. The entrance will be facing the parking as it is shown in the Board's packet. Ms. McClain said she understood why the petitioner did it this way; she also understood the Board's concern in needing to see some interaction with the street, but it will be quite challenging and will definitely change the character of this area.

Mr. Engle said there are not any buildings representative of 1950s or 1960s architecture on MLK. On MLK, historically, the buildings were right on the street. However, the 1950s came along and the first thing they did with the bank was to put the parking lot in front. The parking lot to be historical correction ought to be on Oglethorpe Avenue or Fahm Street as this is what they did in the 1950s and 1960s. But, this is doing the exact opposite. They are putting in the parking lot behind the building.

Dr. Henry said there are two buildings here, the bus station and the inn. This strikes him as an expensive proposition to be the 1950s and 1960s in the fairly radical styles that these buildings are; particularly, the addition to the bus station, which is a considerable investment. All he can say in a friendly way is fair warning.

Mr. Howington stated that since this has gone through site plan review and just to clarify how this got to the Board, on the Fahm Street side it says that

there is a proposed 48 inch t-bar aluminum underground extension, he asked if all of this is underground.

Mr. Gilburn answered yes; all of it is underground. However, it probably will be modified somewhat, but it is underground. None of it will be exposed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that the HSF Architecture Review Committee stands ready and offers their input and help to the petitioner if needed in the design as this goes forward. Mr. Carey said he wanted to follow up on a question that Mr. Howington had. He said the tubes on the lower right where the Family Dollar name is shown, those things are underground. Over to the left where the entrance is located, seems like a suburban sized curb cut. Is this now what is required downtown? This seems appropriate for Abercorn Extension, but not for this part of Oglethorpe Avenue. This appears out of scale. Mr. Carey said the three dumpsters seem excessive as well. How much trash will they be discarding? This appears to be suburban style standards. His general concern is what is dictating here. The general site plan has to go through and they are looking at this as a retail store. Therefore, it has to meet all the requirements. However, they are on this finely grained downtown urban grid and he does not know that this works. They have seen this before as they saw it with the retention pond with the other Family Dollar.

Mr. Carey said his final point is on a question raised by Dr. Williams which concerns documenting the building. He does not know the answer, but there are levels of documentation. In fairness, he would say that this does not need to be the most exact or stringent documentation. However, he agrees that it should be documented. But, he would not hold the petitioner to too high a standard on this building, but as he has said, HSF looks forward to working with the petitioner on a new design.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams commented that he believes they need to be careful of their thinking in this area of town; especially regarding Mr. Engle's comment about the historical context of the Oglethorpe Avenue corridor. He said before the 1950s this was a very finely grained historic neighborhood where buildings came out to the street line. Thousands of buildings were in this area. They were raised for FHA housing and the associated buildings coming off the bridge for the tourist industry. Do they want to continue down this suburbanized path for this area? It is a historical fact that this area was suburbanized as a result of rise of automobile travel in the 1920s and 1930s; highway 17 came in the 1930s. But, he believes that the public housing will eventually be redone and the Yamacraw Village area will be rebuilt and publicly restore the fine grain street plan of this area. Dr. Williams said they have to look at this not through the lens of suburban motels that were built at the foot of the bridge, although they exist. His hope is that this will become an extension of downtown and be a more pedestrian friendly area not an area constrained to be only enjoyed by an automobile.

Dr. Williams said he believes that a point was made that SCAD has dorms across the street, museums are going in and this will be an increasingly pedestrian oriented area. However, this is not to say that the setback should not be sensitive to the bus station next door which is a very tall one-story building. He would prefer to see this building have an entrance as close to Oglethorpe Avenue as possible and some recognition of Fahm Street. Two entrances are not probably realistic, but he believes this will be visited as much by pedestrians as by automobiles. He was hopeful that they can embrace a vision from site planning point-of-view not from a design point of view that is accepting pedestrians. Also, a bus station is next door; presumably, people are without cars. The people are coming in by bus and leaving by bus. Therefore, foot traffic to the neighboring building an entrance that they are acknowledging that site next door might cause consideration. From a design point of view likewise he hopes that they are not handcuffing developers to say that have to look like mid-century modern. Dr. Williams stated that he does not believe that they need to be mid-century modern to be compatible. This is an area where an architect can use a greater imagination and come up with some that would embrace the highly modernistic design that is unlike anything in this area; yet, is compatible with the character of the area. He hears comments about make it look mid-century modern; make it look suburban and he gets really nervous about this.

Dr. Henry said he agrees with this, but he believes that the addition to the bus station could either be mid-century or very modern.

Dr. Williams said it could be more contemporary than mid-century. His advice to the petitioner is be bold. This is a corridor of really bold architecture. But, do not necessarily say how would they do it in the 1950s. What does bold mean today? In the photos, they see the bus station and the super structure of the additions have a radical contemporary look to them. Dr. Williams informed the petitioner to open his clients' eyes to the possibility that may be this will not be just an off-the-shelf Family Dollar that would look good on MLK, but take advantage of this site as an opportunity to really design something unlike the other Family Dollars.

Ms. McClain stated that this is her concern. All of the Family Dollars look the same. Even if they build a building, it will have to be quite bold. She is interested in seeing how it will pan out.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes Dr. Williams took his comments wrong as he was not saying mimic 1950s architecture as he said the site plan. The problem he sees with this is there is no entrance on Oglethorpe Avenue or on Fahm Street. Therefore, it is not user friendly for walking people. The problem is you have a limited site. Just pushing it out and giving a ten (10) foot sidewalk on both places is effectively you will eliminate parking which they will have a problem with. Therefore, the petitioner has to deal with site plan issues. Therefore, there is no reason that they cannot have a radically modern building which is totally appropriate according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and still try to bring the feeling of automobile cultures in the 1950s and 1960s onto the site plan, itself.

Dr. Williams stated that this is what he is saying; the car oriented mentality of having parking between Oglethorpe Avenue and the front of the building.

Mr. Engle injected that parking can be on the side.

Dr. Williams stated he thought Mr. Engle was saying push the building back.

Mr. Engle said he was saying push the building away from Oglethorpe Avenue.

Dr. Williams stated he was saying this is what they should not do. He would like for it to be pedestrian oriented.

Mr. Engle said they would not have a decent frontage with a big sidewalk without pushing it back.

Ms. Simpson asked if the Board has reached a conclusion on what is to be done. They give the petitioner so many different opinions, so they are confused. They have two different opinions here. Therefore, she believes the happy medium is what the staff has recommended. They should want the petitioner to leave clear of what they are saying as a Board.

Dr. Henry wanted to know from the petitioner if he was confused with what the Board was saying.

Mr. Gilburn said he was not super confused. He has a pretty good idea from the staff level comments. He believes he is okay.

Dr. Williams said his understanding of the staff's recommendation is to push the building back from the sidewalk to be more consistent with the bus station, but not necessarily directly in line; the sidewalk in front and not parking spots, which he agrees with. Dr. Williams said that they want to keep this urban as opposed to donut parking around it.

Board Action:

1. Approve the petition to demolish the structure at 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions:

a. The Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for

demolition not be issued until a COA has been

issued approving the replacement structure, to best

fulfill the purpose of this ordinance, and b. Provide thorough photographic documentation

of the existing structure to staff prior to issuance of the COA.

- PASS

2. Continue the request for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass to July 11, 2012 at the petitioners's request.

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

16. [Petition of Amy Lee Copeland | H-12-4676-2 | 602 Montgomery Street | Addition/rehabilitation/fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Amy Lee Copeland was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a rehabilitation and addition at 602 Montgomery Street.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the rehabilitation and addition at 602 Montgomery Street because it is consistent with the Historic District standards provided that the following conditions are met and items are resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Methods, materials and specifications for repointing must be submitted and verified to be in accordance with Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar joints in Historic Masonry Buildings, and adopted Board procedures.
2. Provide specifications for hydraulic lift.
3. Incorporate operable windows in the street fronting façade of the addition.

Mr. Judson said he agrees with the fact that the staff has incorporated strong comments about Preservation Brief 2 given this Board's history with repointing. It is one thing to have the petitioner understand and acknowledge the brief, but he wanted to be sure that the contractor understands the brief.

Ms. Ward said the contractor is present.

Mr. Judson said he also wants the subcontractor to understand Preservation Brief 2.

Ms. Ward explained that the Board's policy requires a test patch.

Mr. Judson said he only wanted to ensure that all the way down the line everyone else understands this.

Dr. Williams said it does not appear that the entire wall needs repointing, but just certain areas.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner has not provided this information yet. Usually, this is a staff level review and staff is requesting that all this information is provided to them.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes this is a building that has rare surviving commercial paint on the side of the building. He said that over the left-hand door on Montgomery Street is a name.

Ms. Ward said she believes it has a Board member's name on it.

Ms. Copeland said she has done some research on the history of this property. Merriman Sign Company is the name over the top of the door. Merriman occupied the property and died in 1962. Ms. Copeland pointing to a section said the signage over here looks a lot older and some sort of white paper is here and is peeling off. She is very interested to see what is underneath it.

Dr. Williams said if this is deemed to be a store that the petitioner does not pressure wash all the bricks so that it is even all the way up the building.

Ms. Ward said staff works with the petitioner on this at staff level. Normally, the painting, repointing and cleaning are staff level reviews. The staff first looks to see if the building is historic; is it from a historic period. If the building is not, then staff would not have a reason to ask the petitioner to preserve it. The petitioner may be able to inform the Board as to what she plans to do with those painted surfaces. She would like for the petitioner to address this.

Mr. Howington asked if only the rear addition would be demolished.

Ms. Ward said this is for only the windows and the addition. Everything else will be preserved. The only damaged was the steel girder above the historic front.

Ms. Simpson said she noticed that the plan shows the awnings outside the interior of the windows. How is this usually handled?

Ms. Ward answered that it depends upon the case. She would not say that it has to be one any versus another. Sometimes the openings are big enough that you can fit an awning inside. But, there are other times that they cannot go on the inside because of the vertical clearance requirements that must be met.

Ms. Simpson asked if the awnings would be placed on the inside of the windows.

Ms. Ward replied that the awnings are eight (8) feet - ten (10) inches above the sidewalk. They cannot go any lower than eight (8) feet.

Ms. Simpson asked if the thickness would affect the eight (8) feet.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Copeland said this building was built in 1871 for a grocer named Bernard Graft and his wife, Mary. For a period of about one hundred (100) years it was consistently used as a corner grocery store. She is not sure exactly how old the Merriman signage is. This does not interest her that much. She does not want to pressure wash anything. However, there are some signs on the Huntingdon Street side of the building that look like they have been there for a long time. She believes it is associated with the grocery store as she can make out one word – which is meat.

Ms. Copeland asked the Board to approve the staff's recommendation because the proposed addition and the proposals with the building are consistent with the historic district standards.

Dr. Henry stated he was looking at the picture and said whatever the petitioner wanted to do was okay with him.

Mr. Engle stated that the Board gets a lot of requests for additions; and there are not many that he can say are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. But this addition hits all the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The request is contemporary, but compatible. He congratulated Ms. Copeland for doing a good job.

Ms. Copeland said it was their intent as she described it to the architect as if Godzilla simply was to come and tear off the addition, the entire building would remain intact. This was their point of the addition as they did not want to knock out anything.

Dr. Williams asked the petitioner to clarify her intentions for the bricks below the first floor on the Montgomery Street side as she has mentioned that somehow the white surface would be removed that revealed an older sign underneath. He explained to the petitioner that one of the things this Board is striving for is not to see these buildings as staggered artifacts, but rather documents of evolution. Even though the Merriman sign has been interpreted by the commercial opening which post dates the Merriman sign as it disappears behind the girder. Obviously, the girder and the opening was either enlarged or inserted after the Merriman sign was here. He said that the petitioner is retaining the opening and restoring or replacing the girder which is probably the least historic part of this elevation. Dr. Williams told Ms. Copeland that he is thrilled that she interested in finding out what the commercial signage is on the other side, but he does not know what her plans are for the white paint and the

entire first story. He would like to see the retention of the fragment as he does not know what else is on the façade.

Ms. Copeland stated that she believes the signage is an artifact of time. She believes that it tells the story of a history. This was a store long before it will become her law office. Ms. Copeland said she has spent a lot of Saturdays here with a plastic scraper and a trash bag just going through the white gouge lovingly and gently to see what is under there. She absolutely has no intentions of taking a pressure washer to see what is underneath here as it would destroy a lot that she does not want to destroy.

Ms. Copeland said to answer some questions that were raised earlier about repointing, Capers Martin, a contractor is present. She wanted to tell the Board also that a SCAD class is adopting her building, including a young man named John ended up writing a project on it. John apparently volunteered to do a repointing project at Fort Pulaski and has spoken to them about doing the repointing of their building by hand as his project. He is familiar with the guidelines, but of course they will comply fully with whatever the Board wants them to do. She only wants to put the Board's mind to rest that they will not be looking at a bunch of over stuff, but they will be totally uniform and very consistent, not Disneyland fake Williamsburg type repointing. They fully intent to do it right and are applying for tax credits. Consequently, they are very aware and sensitive of the need to preserve it. She loves this building and is happy that it has not been torn down in the 141 years that it has been standing. She is very pleased that this will be her building.

Dr. Henry was hopeful are getting more petitioners like Ms. Copeland.

Ms. Simpson said she formerly was involved in the revitalization of Montgomery Street. She said on behalf of several people who have fought to bring this area back, she thanked Ms. Copeland. Ms. Simpson said she has waited for many years for someone to purchase this building.

Ms. Copeland said she is very excited and spends many hours at this property. She as met many neighbors who are disappointed that she is a lawyer and not the owner of a Chinese restaurant. She said apparently the Chinese restaurant that was here prior was a popular attraction. But, the neighborhood is really embracing her and she is really looking forward to opening her practice here and being a part of the revitalization that was kind of neglected downtown. She is a proud neighbor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Simpson asked that the petitioner review the awnings with the staff in terms of the clearance to ensure that the standards are met.

Dr. Williams stated that where there is evidence of historic commercial signage or evidence of the usage of the building through time in terms of the paint on the brick, be retained as a contributing feature of the building.

Mr. Engle said the only issue with this is if the repointing is bad, it must be cut out and this will take a part of the sign with it. Therefore, the sign should be documented so that it could be reconstructed.

Dr. Williams said it looks as if the repointing is stable if they look at picture four (4).

Mr. Engle stated that he could not tell from the pictures. They would have to look at it on site.

Dr. Williams said based on what he sees, there is a big crack coming at end of the steel girder and this area needs repointing, but it appears stable in photo three (3). He would be surprised if the mortar would need to be changed here.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Copeland how she felt about the sign over the big sign.

Ms. Copeland said that sign is gone. The white thing just says "New Wall of China" or "Great Chinese Wall" or something to this effect.

Dr. Williams said he was not talking about the white sign, but was talking about the area behind the street sign.

Board Action:

Approval of the rehabilitation and addition at 602 Montgomery Street because it is consistent with the Historic District standards provided that the following conditions are met and items are resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Place the awning within the existing storefront opening provided that the eight foot minimum required vertical clearance above the sidewalk is met;
 2. Methods, materials and specifications for repointing must be submitted and verified to be in accordance with *Preservation Brief 2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings*, and adopted Board procedures;
 3. Provide specifications for hydraulic lift;
 4. Incorporate operable windows in the street fronting facade of the addition; and
 5. Preserve the historic painted signs.
- PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Gary Sanders, Architect | H-12-4674-2 | 125 West Gordon Street | Addition/alterations](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Description.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

Mr. Gary Sanders was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace the rear fire escape with a new four-story stair and porch at 125 West Gordon Street. She explained that she believes this application is simple. The only reason staff placed it on the Regular agenda versus being on the Consent agenda is because some information was missing. However, the petitioner has provided staff with the additional information. She passed this information to the Board.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the rear stair and porch addition because the Historic District standards have been met, provided that a detail section of the railings, and a site plan showing that the project does not exceed the maximum lot coverage allowed (75%), be submitted to staff for approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sanders explained that the drawing that is being passed to the Board, he has highlighted the area that is possibly visible. The railing is simple and utilitarian. It is replacing a fire escape. The paint they have chosen is Savannah Green.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the petition as submitted.	- PASS
--	--------

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson	
Second: Keith Howington	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

Agenda B (Items 16-20 will be heard no earlier than 4:30 pm.)

18. [Petition of Miguel Arias for PQH Group, Inc. | H-12-4677-2 | 115 East Bay Street | Addition and privacy wall](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Plans and Elevations.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Historic & Site Survey Info..pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Material Specifications.pdf](#)

Mr. Neal Dawson was present on behalf of the petition for Miguel Arias as an associate architect. **Mr. Miguel Arias** was also present.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for rear additions and a privacy wall at the rear of the property at 115 East Bay Street.

Ms. Ward stated that the staff had a question regarding the plan as it indicated that a privacy wall was on the east elevation. However, the elevation showed an opening within the wall. Therefore, staff was curious of what was happening here. Is it a closed-off privacy wall as shown in plan or is it open as shown in elevation? Staff had a similar question regarding the back of the property. The plan shows an iron railing, a brick pier, open brick pier and the rest of the wall. She said they need to get clarification on these two items. The project was submitted to the City for site plan review and there were some comments regarding ADA compliant access through the rear, ramping, and storm water; but none of the comments appeared to affect the design.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the addition and fence upon clarification of solid vs. open wall on the east elevation and rear gates, with the condition that the pergola be constructed of one color or material,

provided that the following information is submitted to staff for final approval:

1. Specifications on the sliding glass wall;
2. Sample of the brick color and texture to be used;
3. Colors for metal finishes; and
4. Design for rear entry gate.

Dr. Henry asked if the 75/25 lot coverage is good.

Ms. Ward said that 100% lot coverage is permitted in this district. This is on Bay Street; it is in a commercial zoning district, B-C-1.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that with regards to the staff's comments on the elevation, pointing to a section he said this part is from the lane and this part is actually cut further in and this shows a gate that actually shields the trash storage unit with a brick pier and then the stairs. Therefore, this section is actually cut in a sort of obtuse way to show the back wall, and then you see the stairs that go up. There is a brick post with a metal gate. Therefore, two metal gates will be here as shown on the plan. He said regarding the staff's other comments, this plan is correct. There will be a brick, solid six foot fence to match their pier and brick infill. The sliding aluminum door is the one they presented to the Board last month. It is a nana wall system; it's aluminum and all the metal finishes will be dark anodized, essentially black or Sherwin Williams Green/Grey which is somewhat a Charleston Black.

Mr. Dawson said they are still looking at the brick. Of course they will resubmit the details back to staff. However, their intent is to match the building next door where the fences were built using Savannah Grey's; obviously not contemporaneous with the historic building, but they will use one that is a machine tumbled brick so they will be able to tell the difference between their bricks and the historic bricks. The bricks will have the same color variation to it. They will submit this to staff.

Dr. Howington directed the petitioner's attention to the second page of the drawings. He explained that coming out what he supposes is to be a new door, as you are cutting in the back and stairs are here. The drawings show this as a window, not a door.

Mr. Dawson stated that this is the existing door and window that are here.

Mr. Howington explained that he was speaking of the upper level. He said the drawings so that you are coming out of a door and going up or down some stairs. On the elevation a part of the railing is lined up. Therefore, he was not sure what is happening here.

Mr. Dawson explained that if they cut a section from the back, you will see the stepping down over the door below if you look at the rear elevation pictures. The existing window is really tight to the head of this window. Therefore, there is no structure here. You cannot see the deck in this elevation view, but beyond there will be steps that go down about three risers to a level that is contiguous with the interior of that landing.

Mr. Howington asked if this did not connect to the other finished bar and is this what he was confused about. He just wanted to be sure there was no zig-zag.

Mr. Dawson said it will line up, except there is a piece that goes down a couple of steps. They wanted to be contiguous with the adjacent neighbors and it lines up with the window sills, but this particular landing is down a little bit as they can tell from the head heights. Therefore, there will be three (3) steps down to the entry into the units on the second floor.

Mr. Arias stated his son is the individual who will be over this property. The reason why they have to do the three steps down is because the stairs that are here now are very old (approximately 140 years old) and if they keep the door the same height, they will have to destroy all the stairs and a valuable item from the building. When the patrons are in the restaurant, they will pass through where the stairs are. They want to preserve the stairs.

Mr. Howington stated that he misunderstood as he was thinking the two connected; the upper landing and the bottom.

Dr. Williams asked what are the plans for the sashes that will be removed from the window.

Mr. Dawson said if they can salvage them, they will reuse them, but he does not believe they have any specific plans for the sashed.

Dr. Williams said the sashes are very conventional and projects this. With the removal of historic fabric, this Board most of the times recommends that the pieces being removed, especially window sashes, because if something happens to one of the other windows, you would have two sashes that you could use which were preserved. The Board usually recommends that the historic fabric be preserved on site.

Mr. Dawson stated that he was sure they could find an appropriate space in the building to store the sashes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the addition and fence with the condition that the pergola be constructed of one color or material, provided that the following information is submitted to staff for final approval:

1. Specifications on the sliding glass wall; - PASS
2. Sample of the brick color and texture to be used;
3. Colors for metal finishes; and
4. Design for rear entry gate.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-12-4680-2-2 | 338 Bull Street | Rehabilitation/addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: Dr. Williams recused from participation in this petition. He is an employee of SCAD.

Mr. Merriman left the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Jennifer Deacon was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to replace the existing fire escape on the east end of the building at 338 Bull Street with a new code-compliant egress stair and hydraulic lift, shielded by a vegetative screen.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for replacement stair, lift and screen as requested because it is consistent with the Historic District standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Deacon stated that she was present to answer the Board's questions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the replacement stair, lift and screen as requested because it is consistent with the Historic District standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Abstain

20. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-12-4681-2 | 209 West St. Julian Street | Rehabilitation and alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial looking South.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial looking North.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the report. The petition is requesting approval to modify the fenestration of the lower floor of the building at 209 West St. Julian.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends denial of the requested alterations because the proposal does not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines as required by the historic District section (8-3030)(I)(1).

Preservation of historic structures within the historic district, of the city

zoning ordinance.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that he was representing his client, City Market, and Ms. Marcy Hill was present with him today. He said regarding the staff's report, he completely understands that this is a unique situation to having a largely intact building from the 1840s that really retains all of its historic fabric. In fact, they went back and looked through the old tax credit applications. Mr. Dawson said this is a masterful job of being good stewards of our historic resources the way City Market approached the work in 1985. City Market has not had an application before this Board at least the 25 years that Ms. Hill and he have been in Savannah.

Mr. Dawson explained the reason they are doing the work is because when you come through the double doors it is actually an open atrium. All of the historic fabric on the inside has been removed and it is an open atrium with the elevator in the back that serves as access to the second floor. It is open and actually goes down to the basement as well. Therefore, there is really no historic fabric here. The space has been vacant for some time. Initially, it was designed as access to a food court which was on the second floor on the western bays of the building. But as the food court failed, they have since had about five thousand (5,000) square feet on the second floor and about twelve hundred (1,200) feet in another bay has been vacant. This is the only vacancy in City Market.

The idea of this petition is that the door will give them access to the elevator so that they can get tenants into the second floor and actually activate the space as well. Ms. Ward and he have talked about this and if there was any other way, they would find it. They have talked about possibly altering Congress Street, but as he went through the tax credit documentation, Congress Street is considered the principle facade. If you look at the historic photos, this was the main street at that time, although it certainly had entrances on both sides. Therefore, this is a "kind of pick your poison kind of a problem." He cannot alter Congress Street and he cannot alter St. Julian Street. What they have tried to do is to keep the header of the window that is here intact and extend it down in the most sensitive way that they could without drastically altering the historic fabric. He asked the Board to please consider this and he understands that the Board does not deal with economic distress, but they have approximately seventy-five hundred (7,500) square feet that has been vacant for a long time and this door will help them to lease this space and reactivate this ward in City Market.

Mr. Engle asked the petitioner if there was a reason that he did not consider putting a glass foyer right inside this space with a door in this hallway.

Mr. Dawson said they could do this, but the space would be about four hundred (400) square feet and it would create some awkward issues in terms of fire exiting to have one fire door here at the facade and a vestibule essentially that it would exit through. This could be done, but it creates an awkward space

and already takes 400 square feet of floor area probably down to three hundred fifty (350) square feet.

Mr. Engle said it is an awkward space to start with. He is surprised that the hallway meets fire code. Are they coming off the elevator into the hallway?

Mr. Dawson said yes. There is a stair in the back that leads up to the second floor.

Mr. Engle said basically this becomes a fire trap.

Mr. Dawson said it is a fire escape. There is a similar one on the west end that goes down to Congress Street.

Ms. Hill stated that she is the Director of City Market. She is not one of the owners, but has represented City Market for 25 years. She explained that this is an area that has been unleaseable, it is dark during the day and night. They would like to figure a way to make it become an income producing part of City Market with activity, light and liveliness that they have in the other areas. This appeared to be a very good proposition when Mr. Dawson discussed this with them. She asked the Board to consider that they have kept a major part of downtown Savannah in pretty good shape for the last 25 years. Ms. Hill was hopeful that the Board would look favorably on their petition.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he is concerned about the symmetry. There is an alternative which is to put in a glass foyer inside. Mr. Dawson acknowledges that it is possible. There is another option that they can take both windows out and put two new doors here which would destroy the symmetry, but then they would have a three bay building with three doors. Frankly, he believes this is a slippery slope and the alternative has always been here to put in a glass flare and a door into the hallway.

Dr. Henry stated by his count, fourteen standards (14) are addressed and four (4) are not applicable; three standards are met; and six standards are not met.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Dawson if he would like to come back for a continuance. If the Board denies the request, he could not come back until a year.

Mr. Gay said Mr. Dawson could put it inside and go into one of entrance now and just turn it around.

Ms. Ramsay said the petitioner would still have to come back to this Board.

Mr. Dawson said they were modifying their application to leave the door replacing the window and keep the HVAC and paint change.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for the exterior vent and painting as requested and deny the requested alterations to the window because the proposal does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines as required by the Historic District section (8-3030)(I(1), *Preservation of historic structures within the historic district*, of the city zoning ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Ned Gay
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present
Brian Judson - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

21. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-12-4682-2 | 607 Abercorn Street/516 Drayton Street | Rehabilitation, fence, demolition](#)

- Attachment: [Submittal Packet A2 A3 A4 Historic and Current Photos.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet A5 and A6 Current and proposed site plans.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Project Description.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [aerial.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- Drawings.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Submittal Packet- materials.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Sarah Ward recused from participation in this petition as her husband is the architect on this project.

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

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for multiple treatments of multiple buildings.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval as follows:

On Building A, staff recommends approval on the condition that the work comply with the Secretary of Interior's Preservation Briefs:

2: Repoint Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings

22: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stucco

27: Maintenance and Repair of Architectural Cast Iron

An additional condition includes the elimination of the reconstructed cornice on the penthouse addition.

On Building B, staff recommends approval on the condition that the screening wall is limited to the minimum height necessary to ensure the equipment is not visible from the public right-of-way.

On Building C, staff recommends approval on the condition that the fence be constructed of brick to match the building.

On Building D, staff recommends approval of the demolition on the condition that the construction drawings are donated to the Georgia Historical Society, City Archives, or MPC.

All colors to be submitted to staff for approval.

Dr. Henry stated that he is a little confused about the fences for Building C. He believes that Ms. Harris said the brick wall would match the bricks of Building C.

Ms. Harris answered yes. This is the building that it is connected to.

Mr. Engle asked staff to explain how they arrived at the cupola reconstruction with Standard 6 of the Secretary of Interior's Standard for restoration. They are talking about reconstruction and restoration is when they talk about the cupola. They are not talking about rehabilitation as nothing is here. Standard 6 says "replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence and a false sense of history will not be created by by adding conjectural features or by combining features that never existed together historically [combined standard 6 and 3]." He said it seems to him from the few photos that exist that the cupola came off when the addition went on. Therefore, two put the two together seems to be contradicting the Secretary's Standards except they won't be putting things together that never existed. He agrees the cupola is a great feature, but the porch is still here and obviously needs restoration, but they are talking about reconstruction of a cupola. From the few photos that exist, he is not sure they have accurate information.

Dr. Williams said the base is still here.

Mr. Engle said the point is they did not co-exist with the addition.

Mr. Gay and Dr. Williams questioned which additions.

Dr. Williams said the argument could be made that the portico should not be replaced because the eastern part of the portico did not exist when the addition were here either.

Mr. Engle stated that he was only citing what the standard is.

Dr. Henry stated that he did not believe that adding the cupola was a violation of the standard.

Mr. Engle asked staff did they take this into account in their review.

Ms. Harris answered yes. The staff certainly takes all the standards into account. However, in this case, she believes the interpretation would be at the discretion of the Board staff felt that it did meet the standard. There is enough physical and photographic elements so that it is not a conjectural feature. She said one thing that they may want to consider is that while these are considered additions and that they are attached to the main building, they also may be considered as individual buildings in their own right. They are different styles, materials, architects and periods of time. Also they have different main points of entrance and so forth. Therefore, if they look at the individual buildings as Building A, B, C, etc., the creation of a false sense of history in terms of its development would not be a factor.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Lynch stated that he is the agent for the owner. He said regarding the **D Building**, they do have the original construction documents of the building. They will donate these documents to the Georgia Historical Society. On **Building C**, regarding the wall construction, they are going to change this to brick. They are asking that they be allowed to have painted brick to match the existing building if it is not a problem for the staff or Board. On Building B, there is a comment about the screen wall height. Mr. Lynch said they set the screen wall height essentially about a foot lower than the existing mechanical equipment. They believe that the line of sight from the sidewalk should cover the top of it. They minimized this as much as they could. He said regarding the preservation briefs, they have included them in their specifications; at least on the first phase of the project they will be including them and in the remaining phase. They are submitting this to SHPO as a tax credit project. They have been working with the Historic Savannah Foundation and have actually met with the SHPO office in Atlanta and discussed the project as they are trying to figure out the period that they will be restoring; especially the A Building. They selected 1900 and 1910 before some of the major alterations were done as this is the period they will probably be working with both on interior and exterior. SHPO felt that with the reconstruction of the porch, cupola and cornice that these all were defining features and that they should try

to restore these as best as possible. On the cornice is an issue that they have discussed. The symmetry of the building is really the defining feature and restoring that cornice or not restoring that cornice would be a missing defining element of the structure. They believed further that it mitigated the size of the existing penthouse by almost four (4) feet horizontally and vertically.

Mr. Lynch said originally, they tried to get the owner to agree to actually reconstruct it to match the west wing of the building and go back to a slope roof. But, they could not justify losing the additional square footage, in addition to the demolition of Building D. Therefore, they want to keep this as a component of the project, but they have tried to mitigate the sizes as much as possible. If they were to rebuild the roof, they probably would have built the parapet and reclad it a stucco to match the rest of the building. He stated that they also will have to restucco the majority, if not all, of the building. The present stucco that is on here now is from the 1960s and is in very bad disrepair. The stucco finish will be uniform across the entire structure. They have a lot of detail and have some pretty good drawings and photographs of the corner. Therefore, they believe they have a lot to work from and re-create these as accurately as possible.

Mr. Lynch said with regards to the cupola, this is somewhat the same issue that they began talking with the SHPO office. SHPO as in agreement that they should try to restore it. They do have the base to work from and the base is visible from when you stand back from the building. Therefore, they thought this was a defining feature of the building in 1900.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lynch if his client was not willing to remove the penthouse. This is a remarkable level of restoration. He said even if they were able to achieve the cornice despite the staff's recommendation, it seems to compromise the symmetry and all the other efforts that are going into restoring the symmetry of this building.

Mr. Lynch said he agrees with what Dr. Williams has said and they definitely tried to persuade them to remove it, but they are demolishing Building D and they will lose 38,000 square feet. They asked staff to consider a height variance on some other possible projects as they would like to pick that square footage back up. But, losing the square foot on top of Building A, they said they could not do so. He believes this would be another four or five thousand square feet.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lynch if he considered putting an additional story on Building C.

Mr. Lynch said it is construction cost. Originally, they tried to get them to set the side back a little bit, but by increasing the depth of the cornice or reestablishing the cornice, it will be set back at least three or four feet from edge or the cornice which somewhat mitigates the size at least from the sidewalk. Really only the top six feet of it will be visible. If they leave it in place without restoring the cornice, it is almost ten feet tall. He said they

thought they could in some fashion tie-in the metal panels to the look of the original roof that is on the east wing. Originally, they talked about changing the roof to a membrane roof, but he believes the existing roof will be restored. Therefore, if you are on Hall Street, you would minimally be able to see the roof. In this respect, they thought they would tie the materials together so that it will not be a complete deviation from what was there originally.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lynch if he had a sample of the metal panels that they want to use to clad the penthouse so the Board could see what it looks like.

Mr. Lynch said he believes they submitted a sample to staff previously for the Building B. This is the same manufacturing company.

Dr. Williams said the goal presumably would be to make it disappear as much as possible. His concern is that they will have a stucco building with metal on the roof. Why not clad it in stucco or something else.

Mr. Lynch said they wanted to try to differentiate the penthouse from the remaining of the building. It was a masonry building, he would say yes. But since the rest of the building is stucco, they were trying to match it to the stucco, but in a different color. But they didn't think it was successful.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes the spirit of the restoration is to try to give attention to the 19th century building. He respects the idea of having it distinct, but such as on the other building, there will be a roof top addition with screening that will be quite modern. However, he was not sure this would be the right play here.

Mr. Lynch said they have talked with SHPO about this and they seems to agree with the material. He believes it is the color selection, whether they will be able to tell the difference when they get to that height in the building if the stucco will be less noticeable than metal. He thinks it depends on the color more than the material.

Dr. Henry commended Mr. Lynch on the work they have done; particularly, with the restoring of Huntingdon Street. He asked him what they plan to do with the basement in Building D.

Mr. Lynch answered that most likely they will infill it. They talked about trying to preserve it and use it in some capacity for the school. But they would have to reconstruct the entire existing slab.

Dr. Henry asked if this would be more cost effective than some of the other things.

Mr. Lynch said they looked at the cost of doing this and it would be close to one million dollars to do it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that the HSF was speaking on behalf of this as proposed, but also with most of the staff's recommendations and in agreement with everything the petitioner has agreed to thus far. Mr. Carey said if the sticking points are the cupola and the cornice, he believes there is enough evidence to reconstruct the cupola and a good precedent for it. Mr. Carey said he feels similar about the cornice. As Dr. Williams has pointed out, this is the centerpiece building and is/should be the focal point. With respect to the Secretary of Interior's Standard #7, he believes you can do just as much damage fooling the public by showing them what isn't there when it should have been there. He really believes they help the public understand that this building had a cupola. This shows that reasonable people can disagree when it comes to interpreting the standards. He was not going to pit the State Preservation Office against the Historic Review Board. When they have these rare opportunities such as this where they can do a respectful rehabilitation of the entire complex; really do a restoration of the centerpiece building, he believes they ought to allow this. This is one of those times too few and far in between that they can really celebrate a project and at the same time this becomes a huge development and a great revitalization of a building that has been vacant and blighted for decades. Mr. Carey said that HSF is certainly behind this project as proposed and they support most of the staff's recommendations. However, the leeway on a couple of the items ought to go to the petitioner in this case.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry wanted clarification as to which building the penthouse is on.

Dr. Williams answered the eastern half of Building A.

Dr. Henry asked if the petitioner wants to keep the penthouse.

Mr. Howington answered yes. The penthouse is already here.

Mr. Gay said this is space that can be used.

Dr. Williams said when it comes to the cornice and cupola, he agrees with the HSF. He said to try to restore the other features of the building, the portico, the staircase, and the fencing, although with respect to Mr. Engle's comment about one feature never existing when the other feature was there, he believes the goal is to try to get Building A back to as close to its 1870s character. He believes if he so called "penthouse" has to be here incorporating the cornice even though it will physically be on top of CMU, he believes the idea of restoring the symmetry as best they can would justify the pursuit of this. Dr. Williams said he does not see this as so different as restoring the easternmost two columns of the portico. They will not be historic fabric either, but will replicate what is gone.

Dr. Williams said the other concern about the frosted glass in the arches of the portico, he worries that the spirit of this restoration is to bring back the

historic character of the frosted glass. There is not enough detail in the drawings just to imagine that a sheet of glass frosted unarticulated does not appear to be much of framework or subdivision of any bay. He said that one of the historic photo shows what appears to be metal grids. May be if the frosted glass was articulated, broken up somehow with some kind of framework, but the abstract modernistic frosted glass inside of what is other wise being restored to an historic character.

Dr. Henry agreed with Dr. Williams. He asked staff where the do the portals lead to. Is it just under the porch or almost through the entire building.

Ms. Harris explained that they are enclosed now and currently rooms are here.

Dr. Henry asked if you want through here to get to the restrooms.

Ms. Harris explained that you access the space from the interior. Currently, a blank stucco wall is here. Therefore, they are replacing the blank stucco wall with essentially glass.

Dr. Henry asked if you would be looking inside the restrooms through the glass.

Ms. Harris stated that if the glass was not frosted, you would.

Mr. Engle said if they look at the 1957 photograph, as Dr. Williams said, you have diagonal metal grilles in those archways.

Dr. Williams asked if these were security grilles and behind them were doors.

Mr. Lynch said these are windows that are setback. He said to be clear on the intent of the storefront, they will set it as far back in the opening as possible. They will have probably sixteen inches from the face of the stucco to the glass. The reason they went with frosted versus clear is there are some spaces behind here that they did not want transparency to.

Dr. Williams said he guess the idea of having a sheet of glass that big, if there was some way to mitigate its modernity.

Mr. Lynch said they looked at a couple of schemes where they divided it, but historically there was nothing here. It was just an open porch. Therefore, they thought instead of just going back to just an opening, a single sheet of glass in an undivided opening was more in keeping with what was here than if they divided it. Everything they saw other than this one photo, seemed to indicate that it was open.

Mr. Gay said the house they had on Jones Street had lights on each side of the door and they were frosted. There was a design inside; therefore a tiny bit of it was clear. Most of the lights were frosted and they were original to 1856.

Dr. Williams asked if light was gained through the frosted glass important or

could it have been a solid material of some kind.

Mr. Lynch said it could be a solid material, but they are trying to keep it as transparent as possible.

Mr. Gay asked if they thought about shutters.

Mr. Howington said what about consolidated black sheet metal.

Mr. Lynch said he does not know if he would like the sheet metal. Historically, it was open.

Mr. Engle asked what about nonreflective glass at least.

Dr. Williams said there are some glass products where it almost reads like stone; it has an etched texture.

Mr. Lynch said by setting this far back in the opening, they thought this would mitigate its visibility.

Dr. Williams said when you stand on Broughton Street and the light hits something bright and metallic it will reflect in the windows. Therefore, even if it is recessed back if it is on a vertical plane it will reflect anything that is bright, moving, etc.

Mr. Gay asked even if it is frosted.

Dr. Williams said it depends on which side the glass is frosted.

Dr. Henry said the Board could make a motion that the frosted glass be looked at again as they will not be able to decide this in their meeting.

Mr. Lynch said they had no problem in submitting this to staff. They can come up with a couple of different glass samples.

Dr. Williams said the key is for the glass to be nonreflective.

Mr. Engle said let the glass be a matte finish as it will be more obvious at night when the light is on than it would be during daytime.

Mr. Lynch said this is one reason why they wanted the frosted glass.

Board Action:

Approve the petition with the following conditions:

On Building A, the work must comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Preservation Briefs:

2: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings.

22: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stucco.

27: Maintenance and Repair of Architectural Cast Iron.

- PASS

Additionally, the glass storefront infill in the porch archways will be matte, non-reflective glass, to the extent possible, and a sample submitted to staff for approval.

On Building C, the fence will be constructed of painted brick to match the building.

On Building D, the construction drawings will be donated to the Georgia Historical Society, City Archives, or MPC.

All colors to be submitted to staff for approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

22. [Amended Petition of Nick T. Pierce for Star Finance Company | H-11-4552\(S\)-2 | 555 E.](#)

Broughton St. |Roof Color Change

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4552\(S\)-2 Amended 5-23-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. Amended Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-12-4627-2 | 516 Drayton Street | Rehabilitation and alterations

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4627-2 Amended 5-4-14.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4627-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. Petition of Nicole Carrillo | H-12-4646(S)-2 | 38 Barnard St. | Color Change

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4646\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4646\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. Petition of M. Keith Woods for Commonwealth Construction | H-12-4647(S)-2 | 111 West Oglethorpe Ave. | Wood Fence

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4647\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4647\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. Petition of Michael Koncul for Chatham Home Builders | H-12-4649(S)-2 | 32 MLK JR. Blvd | Stucco Repair/Roof Replacement

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4649\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4649\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products | H-12-4650(S)-2 | 38 Barnard Street | Awning

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4650\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4650\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products | H-12-4651(S)-2 | 36 MLK JR. Blvd | Color Change

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4651\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4651\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Marchese Construction, LLC | H-12-4652\(S\)-2 | 234 MLK JR. Blvd | Garage Door Opening](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4652\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4652\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products | H-12-4653\(S\)-2 | 18 East Broughton St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4653\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4653\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of MCS Contracting, LLC | H-12-4654\(S\)-2 | 515 East Taylor St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4654\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4654\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Nick Finland for Leaning Oaks, LLC | H-12-4655\(S\)-2 | 529/533 East Broad St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4655\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4655\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Rebecca Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-12-4656\(S\)-2 | 327 Jefferson Street | Existing windows and doors/exterior painting](#)

Attachment: [COA - Staff Decision - 4656\(S\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4656\(S\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Robert Hunt | H-12-4658\(S\)-2 | 220 W. Broughton St. | Exhaust Duct and Exhaust Fan](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4658\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4658\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Jeff Whitlow for Whitlow Construction | H-12-4659\(S\)-2 | 31 W. Congress St. | Platform/HVAC Unit](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4659\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4659\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Oglethorpe Avenue LLC | H-12-4660\(S\)-2 | 24 E. Oglethorpe Ave. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4660\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4660\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products | H-12-4661\(S\)-2 | 34 Barnard St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4661\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4661\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Coastal Canvas | H-12-4662\(S\)-2 | 202 W. Bay Street | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4662\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4662\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of EZ Marketing | H-12-4666\(S\)-2 | 309 W. Congress St. | Lighting Fixtures](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4666\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4666\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Subzero | H-12-4667\(S\)-2 | 109 W. Broughton St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4667\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4667\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products | H-12-4668\(S\)-2 | 18 W. Bryan St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4668\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4668\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Travis Brown for Coastal Heritage Society | H-12-4671\(S\)-2 | 124 Abercorn St. | Repairs/Stucco Conservation/Porch Floor Stabilization](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4671\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4671\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Brad Sherman | H-12-4673\(S\)-2 | 105 W. Gordon St. | Install a Solar Voltaic Panel](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4673\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4673\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Winward Shutters | H-12-4675\(S\)-2 | 306 East President St. | Install Operable Louvered Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4675\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4675\(S\).pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

45. [Petition of Nathan Godley | H-12-4683\(S\)-2 | 307 E. President St. | Paint Exterior of Building](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4683\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4683\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

46. [Petition of Patrick Phelps | H-12-4684\(S\)-2 | 2 E. Broughton St. | Replace Non-historic Storefront](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4684\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4684\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

47. [Brown Chevron and 500 Block of Charlton Street](#)

Ms. Ward reported that she did not have time to write up the report, but the Brown's Chevron Station at Oglethorpe Avenue and MLK was painted and a number of signs installed without approval or permit. They are supposed to be contacting the staff regarding this matter. She stated that in the 500 Block of East Charlton Street, some platforms have been built at the bottom of the steps without approval or permit.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

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

49. [Historic Preservation Commission Training, August 23rd, in LaGrange, Georgia](#)

Attachment: [HPCAUGUSTLAGRANGE.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay said the historic Preservation Commission Training is scheduled for August 23, 2012 and will be held in LaGrange, Georgia. If anyone is interested in attending the training to get in touch with Ms. Ward. This is a one day session. Mr. Merriman signed up to attend in the Spring, but he was unable to attend. They agreed to transfer the conference fee to the Fall session. Therefore, we can send an additional member.

Mr. Howington said he will attend the training

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

50. [Petition of Matt Jording and Mollie Sandman for Subdogs | H-12-4634-2 | 5 West Broughton Street | Restaurant Hood and Shaft](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4634\(S\).pdf](#)

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

Ms. Ward reported that Subdogs put a restaurant hood on the back of the building without review and approval. They were cited and came in for after-the-fact approval and received a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) provided that they paint the vent to match the brick color. It ended up that it was galvanized and could not hold paint. The petitioner was worried about the stuff going through the vent especially if the metal was not meant to hold paint.

The petitioner is still working with staff to comply. They wanted to be here today to present their case to the Board. The petitioner is frustrated about several other issues that have surfaced. Ms. Ward said she does not if the petitioner will be staying downtown much longer.

Dr. Williams asked if this petitioner moves, what happens to the vent that was installed.

Ms. Ward answered that it passes on to the next property owner. It is still not in compliance. This really put the petitioner in a jam as it opened up some things between us and the mechanical trade of the City which is good, but it left the petitioner in a bad position. They got a permit for the work they did and, therefore, they were in compliant. The mechanical reviewer did not realize that the petitioner needed a COA. But now they are aware of it and we work closely with this department to ensure this does not happen again. The petitioner just got stuck in a bad spot. If the vent does not hold paint, she does not know what they will do about it. This what the petitioner wanted to discuss with this Board today. The vent is really big; it's about four-stories tall. She would not want to make it any bigger.

Mr. Engle said it is absolutely hideous. The petitioner told Ms. Ward in the beginning that they were going to put in the interior. This goes up four-stories. It is a store from the corner. Therefore, you see it.

Dr. Williams asked if the petitioner can be ordered to remove it.

Ms. Ward said we can see about this, especially if they vacate this space. May be the property owner can be held accountable for the change.

51. [Petition of Northpoint Hospitality Group, Inc. for an Amendment to the Historic District Height Map](#)

Attachment: [Text Amendment Historic District Height Map - Application and Submittal.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward reported that the Historic Review Board was aware that the Height Map Amendment that went before the MPC. Chair Ramsay did a wonderful job at the MPC meeting.

The Historic Review Board submitted a letter to the MPC outlining their concerns. The MPC approved the proposal regardless of this Board's comments. It is now scheduled to be heard by City Council at their June 28, 2012 meeting.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward if the letter was sent to the individual members of Council.

Ms. Ward explained that the consensus of the Board was to wait and see what happened at the MPC meeting as they knew they would have this meeting prior to the amendment of the Historic District Height Map going to City Council.

Mr. Engle said one MPC Board member said that this Board was dictating to MPC what to do. But, his feelings are the MPC is telling them that they have to accept height and mass of an eighty-five foot tall building which they have already said that they do not believe is compatible. Factually, it is not compatible in terms of height and mass. This puts this Board in a situation that they are being asked to approve something that they have already said they don't want to approve as it does not meet height and mass.

Ms. Ramsay said there is nothing here that can be visually compatible. She said "visually compatible" as designed in the ordinance are things you can see from a thing rather than what one member said.

Dr. Henry said whoever writes the letter needs to let them know that this Board is unanimous against the Amendment to the Historic District Height Map.

They will send the same letter to City Council that was sent to the MPC.

Mr. Thomson said certainly they heard Ms. Ramsay's testimony. In response, if City Council changes the Height Map and the applicant comes in with a seven story building right up against the line he had two questions:

1. Based on what this Board has said can they find it visually incompatible and deny this design? Typically speaking when they do other things they meet all the standards [and one standard is the height] can you deny the application and what role does visual compatible play against the standards to allow the height?
2. Can this Board under the ordinance, even if the applicant meets one of the three conditions, deny an additional floor, which he suspects is the next thing that will happen, can they still find it visually incompatible?

Mr. Thomson said he may ask the City Attorney for advice.

Ms. Ramsay said her thought would be such as a petition they heard today on Oglethorpe Avenue and Fahm Street, they talked about making it recessed to the Grey Hound Bus Station. She certainly think driving up and seeing how many eight and one-half story tall parking garage here, they could say it is visually compatible as no structure is built to the property line. How about recessing it to line up with Georgia Power which is the closest. She believes this Board can do those kind of things. However, she believes they will dealing with a slippery slope dealing with the Marriott as their visually compatibility structure. But, her personal feeling is that it is outside the Historic District, they built it beside the Historic District because it did not have to meet any of the standards.

Mr. Engle said the way it was presented was disingenuous. His guess is without a scaled plan that the Marriott eighty-feet south of shoreline. They said if you make it two stories, you will still see the Marriott. But, you don't see the Marriott because it is eighty feet to the south when you are walking down the River Street. You are allowed to build higher, but it does not does not say you must go higher. Because you are eligible does not mean that you have a right as everybody keep saying. Eligible is not the same as you have a right to do it.

Ms. Ward said whatever the decision of this Board is, at every meeting, they need to be sound and on solid footing. Ordinances specifically talk about

visual compatibility with regarding to contributing structures. This Board needs to keep in mind that there are no contributing structures over there. Therefore, it is hard to say that it is compatible and it is hard to say that it is not compatible.

Mr. Engle stated by Georgia Power's own admission, it is registered eligible. Therefore, the Secretary of Interior's Standards tie-into this.

Ms. Ward said she disagrees. If this went to court and was appealed, that building is not listed as contributing, this Board does not make decisions on what is contributing or not contributing. The fact is that there would be a public hearing, it goes to City Council and they make that decision.

Mr. Engle said they are supposed to access the register eligibility of that building. It is 50 years old.

Ms. Ward said if the proposal is to demolish, then this Board would. But, otherwise, this Board has no role to play in this.

Dr. Henry asked what is meant exactly by "contributing structure?"

Ms. Ward explained that a purple dot on the Historic District Map shows a contributing building. If there is no purple dot, then it is not a contributing building.

Dr. Williams asked, therefore, City Council approves what becomes a purple dot.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Judson stated that he was wondering if the Board should consider running their letter as an open letter to the editor of the Savannah Morning News. They can all sign the letter.

Mr. Engle said the newspaper is not getting the facts.

Mr. Judson said unless people read it and others don't put pressure on their Alderman and may be City Council will not uphold.

Mr. Thomson said is two suggestions are: Format a letter and say some different things to City Council. Let the Chair be flexible to structure the letter with the concept that the Board is against the proposed change in the Height Map. The staff was sort of suggesting and their recommendation was not between their position and what they were proposing, but based on more consistent with the original idea of Chad bourne. Therefore, they built their recommendation around this. This sets it back from the river and does not turn the entire thing to the river.

Mr. Judson said he believes the Board would be upset if they did not voice their concerns and influence to get other people to exercise their voice.

Mr. Thomson said he believes there is a sense, because they have had four years of major dip in things, that they have to be somewhat desperate about anything that comes along. There are people who will use this as leverage. The City has a tax allocation district (TAD) that they are paying about one million out of General Revenue to payoff because the development did not come forth as expected. He has heard it said that the arithmetic has been figured out on this and it will generate one million five. They are doing their job in making their points. Would someone else go away completely if the City Council agreed with different versions of the map. Maybe they would, but maybe someone else would come along and do a better job. He was sure the representative of Joe's Crab Shack was sent here to say what he said. But, money should not enter into the good decisions of this Board or any of our boards. Our job is not to make people rich, but apply the ordinance and do it fairly and objectively. If it makes people money, then great. If it doesn't, then it is no fault of this Board or staff.

Mr. Engle said in all the presentations, they keep saying how this will create a public park. He said it is only fifty-two hundred square feet. This is a small lot. It is a median strip between two roads. It isn't a park; but, yet they acted like they were giving us a fifty acre park. But, it is a little tiny grass median.

Dr. Henry asked if the Board reached a conclusion regarding sending their letter to the editor.

Mr. Engle said instead of just the blanket two-story on the river, but if they tied it specifically to the east-west line of the Marriott so that it would be two stories south from the river until the east-west line of the Marriott, this would give City Council a justification not to deny everything. This was not done this way at MPC. If they could say here is an elevation and looking down River Street at ground level showing the two stories. Remember, Mr. Shay came back and said this will block the Marriott. However, the Marriott does not show for eighty (80) feet. Therefore, you could put in a two-story building and it would not hide the Marriott.

Mr. Thomson said it would not extend beyond the front of the Marriott.

Mr. Engle said Mr. Shay was saying that the Marriott was seen right from the river. But, it isn't, as it is eighty(80) feet back.

Dr. Henry stated that Mr. Thomson's answer surprised him about writing the letter.

Mr. Thomson asked Dr. Henry if he was referring about going to the editorial.

Dr. Henry said yes; he thought Mr. Thomson was saying that it might not go down well as to the future of the Board.

Ms. Ward said this is her concern. The Board could put themselves out there to be used by the newspaper that is trying to sell papers.

Mr. Engle said the public does not know what is going on and will not know what is going on from Savannah Morning News.

Mr. Thomson said another option is to have a nonprofit such as the Historic Savannah Foundation chair write a letter and then he could refer to the position of this Board and staff. He said this should be taken off Mr. Carey's shoulder also.

Ms. Ramsay said the president is Bill Lovett.

Mr. Howington said may be not just rely on Historic Savannah, but others could send letters as well.

Mr. Thomson said he saw a few letters in the Vox Polli.

Mr. Judson said he knows that the cruise ship liner has been proposed as an economic rescue, but there are still many people who are saying that this will ruin the character. He believes that people are concerned and that everyone is just looking for the economic base.

Mr. Thomson said he made the point to MPC that you have to be careful. It is just like having too many visitors downtown. You kill the goose that laid the golden egg and produces the historic district. The golden egg is the money that it brings in, he guesses; but frankly and he has talked with staff about doing a little white paper about office day time workers, people who actually live here, historic district verses some place else, and tourist have gotten out of whack. He does not mind thirteen million tourists, but the other two need to be raised up.

Mr. Judson said he talks with many tourists at Ruth's Chris four nights a week. They are here because of the historic district. They are not here because we have more hotels or taller hotels; they are coming because of the charm of this city. If he tells them he is on the Historic Review Board, they say this is wonderful. This Board is charged with preserving the Historic District and he believes it is a vital part of the economy here to keep it as it is.

Mr. Engle said Atlanta should not be our standard. The point now is to build Montgomery, Bay, River and this end of River Street. Now, they want to put two more hotels here.

Board Action:

Approval to send a letter to City Council outlining

their concerns against the approval of amending - PASS
the Historic District Height Map.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Not Present

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

52. [2012 HDBR Annual Retreat](#)

Attachment: [HDBR 2012 Annual Retreat - August Calendar.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward said she was recommending August 31, 2012 as the date to have the Retreat. This date appears to be the best date. Some of the Board members stated that they would not be able to attend on August 31. Ms. Ward said she will see what dates are available by the agency where she plans to have the retreat and get back with the Board.

Ms. Ward reported that Mr. Thomson reminded her to let the Board know that because Savannah is a certified local government, which is a federal program, we are required to monitor the ordinances anything changes are made. Therefore, the changes must be sent to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and give them the opportunity to comment. Consequently, the proposed text amendment to the Height Map has been sent to the state. Ms. Ward informed the Board that she has a meeting setup with the CLG Coordinator next Friday.

Mr. Howington stated that regarding River Street, he believes it was said that they were looking for more research of what buildings were down on River Street at one time; looking for some examples.

Ms. Ward stated that an intern listed what is there now and what is historic. But, she focused more on Factors Walk than on River Street. Her internship ended in March. She has a new intern scheduled for this summer. But, she will be doing a new project.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

53. Adjourned.

There being no further business to come before the Historic Review Board, Chair Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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