



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
May 9, 2012 2:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

MAY 9, 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
Sidney J. Johnson
Brian Judson
Zena McClain, Esq.
Stephen G. Merriman, Jr.
Ebony Simpson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Chair Ramsay called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and welcomed every one in attendance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve Minutes of April 11, 2012](#)

Attachment: [04-11-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve April 11, 2012 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

III. SIGN POSTING

3. [318 East Broughton Street](#)

Mr. Merriman said he went by this address early and the sign was blown down.

Mr. Engle said he believes the sign was posted.

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

V. CONSENT AGENDA

4. [Amended Petition of Matthew Allen for J. Leander LLC | H-11-4526-2 | 411 East Perry Street | New Construction/Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the amendment to 411 East Perry Street as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Brian Judson

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

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

5. [Petition of Bill Norton for Signmart | H-12-4645-2 | 404 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

No action required by the Board. Item removed from the agenda at the request of the petitioner.

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

6. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-11-4569-2 | 412 Williamson Street | New Construction Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

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

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

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction Part I, height and mass, of a five-story hotel at 412 Williamson Street. The property is located within the Factors Walk Character Area of the historic district and the building is large-scale development as defined in the ordinance. The Board approved the request to demolish the existing structure and continued the request for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass at the January 11, 2012 meeting. Part I, Height and Mass was continued from the March 14, 2012 meeting to address the Board's concerns and to qualify for the additional story. These items were considered individually at the April 11, 2012 meeting.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass, with the condition that the projecting balconies fronting Montgomery Street be supported by brackets. Staff also recommends the following items be considered during the Part II, Design Details submittal:

1. Balcony rails, floors, and corner posts should be made of a complimentary material

different from the principal material (such as metal) to reduce the mass.

2. Consider a masonry parapet instead of a recessed metal railing on the River Street facade.

Ms. Ward reported that she has met with the City three times since the Board's last meeting. They will not have an elevated sidewalk along River Street at this site. Presently, it is elevated about eighteen (18) inches above the street and is consistent. Consequently, they will redo the sidewalk at the normal height and, therefore, will not need any kind of railing or stair. They are continuing to study what will happen with the Montgomery Street right-of-way improvement. This is really why the group met. There was a large committee of City staff, but they formed a small working group to come up with some design concepts to take to City Council for their review. The group will also try to incorporate some ADA requirements so that there will be an accessible path to get from the top of Williamson Street down to River Street. This is one of the big things they are trying to do and still make it open in a large staircase of some kind for public use.

Ms. Ward stated that earlier today, staff received a memo from the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF). She believes that the HSF will cover this under the Public Comment section. However, a copy of the memo has been provided to the Board in their addendum folder.

Dr. Henry said it appears to be a lot of different styles on the facade. However, the staff has recommended approved.

Ms. Ward said they are dealing with height and mass at this time. Therefore, she believes there is a lot of opportunity for architectural refinement and detail that they will see in Part II. One of the styles that conflicts that the staff has noticed and they have put it into the recommendation are the balconies on Montgomery Street. This is a very heavy balcony treatment for this classic building and staff would like for it to be a more traditional balcony treatment.

Dr. Henry said he was of the opinion that the Board would be addressing fenestration as a part of voids.

Ms. Ward said she does not see a stylistic conflict. They asked the petitioner do a more industrial fenestration pattern and she believes the petitioner has done so.

Dr. Williams asked if there was a concern with the shape of the three arched windows, would that be a part of height and mass or fenestration.

Ms. Ward explained that the shape of the opening is height and mass. What's inside, such as the mullion pattern and how many windows are there, are a part of Part II Design Detail.

Dr. Henry said he was referring to the shapes. There appears to be a lot of different shapes.

Dr. Williams asked how much solid wall there is between a window and the corner of a building in relationship of solids to voids. Is this a part of height and mass?

Ms. Ward answered that it is as it deals with the solid wall and the void.

Mr. Engle asked that page 14 be shown on the monitor as he wanted to get some clarification. He knows the Board is only dealing with voids, but the ordinance is explicit about applying the 5:3 relationship. Obviously, if the triple window was a 5:3 relationship it would be a lot wider or would be a double window.

Ms. Ward replied it will probably be a double window.

Mr. Engle asked if the voids are determined by the 5:3.

Ms. Ward stated that she would say if it is a single window.

Mr. Engle said none of the windows are 5:3. He said that a broader window was recommended but there is not a single one that meets the ordinance. Therefore, how could the voids meet it?

Ms. Ward explained that the ordinance says not less than a 5:3. She tabulated the calculations and they all are greater than the number that they would get. But, she would say on an opening such as this on the smaller windows is why they are bringing this up now. She believes it is a Part II issue, but staff wants the petitioner to be aware that they will have to make the windows meet the standards to be the 5:3 ratio. However, the ordinance says not less than; but it can be greater than.

Mr. Engle said it would change the void shape or the size.

Ms. Ward stated that she does not know that it would.

Mr. Gay asked if the standards were met for having the sixth floor.

Ms. Ward answered yes; this was determined at the April 11, 2012 meeting.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay stated that his understanding of the standard is that not every window has to be 3:5. The standard is basically if they want the windows to be taller than they are wide by that proportion. The standard does state that it doesn't apply to the overall opening, but applies to the components of the individual windows. Otherwise, you would not be able to have a tripart-type window anywhere in the Historic District because the overall opening would not be in proportion. They tried to come up with two derivative window sizes. Two eight by five-six windows and one eight by five-six window which can be doubled and is the only time it is ever used in the drawing or it can be grouped into three and then at the stories that are taller than the upper stories, add a transom so that it highlights the fact that this story is different. He knows this adds a layer of complexity, but it is really a complexity that grows out of something that is a very simple principle. They used this on the facade to differentiate the segments because when you have a building that is two hundred (200) plus feet long if you just do it; and the hotel franchise reviewer guys would love it if it was just one all the way down the facade. However, they have tried to introduce some variety to the overall building so that it isn't as boring as it would be if it just had the monotony repetition of only 3:5 windows.

Mr. Shay said they concur with the staff's report. Regarding the projecting balcony that is on the Montgomery Street side, they are excited about the opportunity if the Board allows them to move into the design details so they can begin looking at the refinement of the particular details. They will come back to the Board with the refinements. One thing that they have seen on other buildings, including some that they have designed themselves in the past, is that when the bracket comes all the way up and touches the cantilever structural element, it is not convincing as it might be as it sort of looks like something that has been added that is not actually carrying the weight. One of the things they would like to do is to introduce a beam so the bracket can carry the beam and the beam will carry the balcony. They are also looking at some different ways to incorporate something on the corner that might introduce a little bit of light. They want to bring this back to the Board in their design detail submittal as this is where it is appropriately discussed. However, he did not want the Board to think that because at the height and mass stage they are not getting into this level of detail that it doesn't mean that this is ultimately where they want to go.

Mr. Shay said they have a garden wall that continues the wall of continuity. They have been through a number of different levels. Actually, the lowest level of the hotel room block at this point is setback forty (40) to seventy (70) feet from the Williamson Street side and is screened by this particular garden wall element.

Ms. Simpson stated that on the right side of the elevation (page 13) there is a rectangle block. She asked what is it.

Mr. Shay answered that it is a bracket and they believe a banner could go here or some form of identification. It is not an architectural element; it is shown in the three-dimensional renderings that was presented previously, but they decided in this particular go round to just show the side elevations.

Dr. Williams asked that just above level five (5), is this where signage will be installed. Is this why no window is there?

Mr. Shay answered correct. This is also a stair tower. But, they are leaving both of these as opportunities for identification. Many people arrive on Montgomery Street and this corner is the entrance corner for the hotel.

Dr. Williams said a little higher at the roof level, it appears that the parapet rises up. Why is it rising?

Mr. Shay stated that some of the stairs have to access the roof. But, they deliberately chose this one as they wanted the corner; again, he does not have the three-dimensional model, but basically they can rotate it and see that it makes the corner very prominent when you get to the corner of Montgomery and Williamson Streets. The element reflects on that side and a solid is here. The idea is that the entrance on this area will be a classic void between two solids.

Mr. Shay said the issue of the railing they can make a solid parapet here. A roof garden is up here; the height of the parapet would have to be a minimum of forty-two (42) inches. It would be nice if you were sitting on your balcony and could actually see the Talmadge bridge and the river. Unfortunately, when you are sitting down you cannot see anything

from eye level down, but can only see from eye level up. But this is not something that they are adamant about. If this is something that absolutely needs to be solid, they will do so, although, it will probably still have a pilaster and some relief in here as he does not like having this long stretch of unbroken wall.

They have an opportunity to hear the Board's comments about the design details, but what they would like is to have the height and mass approved today and take into consideration the Board's comments and the comments of the public; then be able to come back to the Board at some point in the future; hopefully not too long from today, with the level of design detail where they begin to talk about how far the mullions and windows will be; talk about the industrial sash or will they be the more traditional windows that they see on buildings on the main street. However, he wanted to tell the Board that one thing they have learned since this has evolved is that when they started with this design they applied the same rules that they would to a building on Bay Street as they have done large scale buildings on this street. The staff has helped them to understand that because this is in the Factors Walk area, those same standards don't actually apply in the same way. This is why on River Street for example where their instinct was to divide that mass into segments and recess the second floor with a five bay rhythm in order to break up the mass, Ms. Ward helped them to understand that this would actually be inconsistent with what is seen on the River Street ranges. Therefore, they are trying to do everything that they are led to do and he is learning as he goes along. But, really they have followed-through on every comment the Board has made and has worked directly with staff on all their concerns. Therefore, he would like for the Board to approve height and mass now so they can move on.

Mr. Howington stated that on the small corner building, he believes it is a better solution than the previous building. He asked Mr. Shay if instead of the exterior stairs going up on the outside, the wall was pulled all the way and it was a bigger mass. The roof seemed to be out of place, but the corner seemed to be more of an object and the mass was brought to the corner, like a true corner entry instead of being stepped back with a strange roof. He is not sure how the roof is going to look. It looks like a different style of building, but it is better than it was before.

Mr. Shay explained that what they tried to do (and it was at Mr. Howington's suggestion) copy from the wedge building that is at the end of the range and do a much more simplified roof and gable line. They want to study this more in the design detail. The reason that it takes the form it does is in response to a lot of the concerns and criticisms that people had about this side not being pedestrian activated enough. Therefore, where they had a curvilinear stair and direct entrance into the corner, created a little porch which is consistent with some of the other architecture of the smaller buildings on the opposite side of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. This also allowed them the possibility of multiple entries into this space. He does not know whether it will be subdivided, but once it passes the life of the building which may be fifty (50) years, it will probably be subdivided and unsubdivided many times. This is their logic behind it.

Mr. Howington said he likes the logic, but he believes that what he was saying is that may be if the second floor story wall was pulled towards the front and down below was glass like a true storefront corner.

Mr. Shay stated that he would love to do this, but it would become an arcade and every time that he has proposed this, which is almost every time he does a building in Savannah,

he gets his hands slapped. A porch is a porch and he guesses it will be like the Marshall House. He is not saying that it is wrong, but it is relatively uncommon, unfortunately in his view to have the building mass and then have the porch recessed from the face of the building mass. If the Board would allow him, he would be happy to explore this, but this has been rejected in the past.

Dr. Williams asked if the principal entrance into the hotel lobby is from Williamson Street.

Mr. Shay answered yes, at this point. They could not depend on the improvements that are in this area to happen, they moved the primary entrance to the Williamson Street side, but they also reserved the potential for at least if a sidewalk ever comes on this side, then the pedestrian entrance could be on this side. If the negotiation over what the cascading stair is on Montgomery Street is successfully and elegant enough, they will basically have two entrances.

Dr. Williams asked that even if the Montgomery Street improvements were done, would the entrance on Williamson Street still be activated and used.

Mr. Shay answered correct.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, he guesses his question is partly of legibility and hierarchy that the petitioner has an ensemble of two-story high windows facing east on the Montgomery facade, which are elaborate windows, but on the Williamson Street facade (page 13) the entrance area is much less monumental; speaks less of saying this is the main entrance. He sees four large arched windows on this building; three facing east on Montgomery and one by itself on the northwest corner of the building. The corner pavilion where the stair hall comes on the corner, is a section that will be likely seen at an angle rather than this view which almost in reality would be impossible. The frontal view from hundreds of feet away as there will be a building across from Williamson Street; it will be seen from Montgomery Street on an angle. Since it is a narrow pavilion, why not treat the two facades more consistently; either arch the windows on both or at least arch the windows on this facade, which is going to be the principal access point. As it is now, it appears that emphasis is being placed on the secondary facade and will not be actively used in the short and may never be a significant entrance as the Williamson Street entrance.

Dr. Williams said he had an issue with the articulation of what is primary, what is secondary, why the windows are arched on one facade and why not arched windows on this facade. Just as Mr. Shay has said, the tower will be seen at an angle. These two facades do not speak to each other and in looking upstairs at the second and third floor level plans, there are rooms behind the big arched windows. They are not significant halls or ballrooms. These are regular rooms that will have windows the size of the room. Therefore, he was trying to visualize what is the rationale behind the windows as well.

Mr. Shay stated that they did a study of the elevation that used the single arch window. They presented this and staff had some difficulty with it. They alternated it on this side. Although it is fair to say that there are high tower rooms in both these positions and in the arch windows on the end, the views looking out the range to the east are spectacularly good; and the views looking in this direction are not as good. Pointing to an area, Mr. Shay said

these are in hallways and these are inside a guest room. He has to also make good hotel rooms. If the Board would allow him he would like to leave a more monumental and dominant elevation facing Montgomery Street in hopes that he can hang onto that through what they hope will be negotiations with the City to allow them to make this the primary entrance. He said it appears that he would have to sacrifice the arched windows and he will probably have to agree to this.

Dr. Williams said he was not saying sacrifice, but make the windows have some logic and work with the adjacent facade facing Williamson Street. He believes it is laudable to look down the road and say this is going to be a pedestrian activated entrance. It is never going to be a drop-off zone for cars because basically it is a dead end street. Williamson Street allows the cars to move through and drop off. They do not know how many people will be dropped off by car and if they pull in there, it is not like a regular hotel where you can just pull in, if someone parks behind you pulling in, you are stuck. Dr. Williams said, therefore, he does not know if this will ever function as being a primary entrance.

Dr. Williams said he has concerns about the variety of fenestration. His concern is there are segmented arches elsewhere on the building. If they google historic warehouses, you will almost never see fully round arched windows. They are almost always segmentally arched. The petitioner has them elsewhere and he believes that one of the ways to resolve these two will be to try to compromise in that segmental arches be on both sides; big picture windows on that elevation, but if the petitioner could work with segmental arches, which could still work within the beam frames areas rather than arches which are so vertical, he believes a harmonious solution could be found if the petitioner works with segmental. The arch window on the northwest corner is a sort of stray window. Also there is no significant space behind the big arch window on the northwest MLK elevation shown on page nine (9).

Mr. Shay said he believes they have them in context.

Dr. Williams stated that he knows the petitioner is evoking the round arches in the power plant.

Mr. Shay said this is an industrial building and this is the most exuberant expression that is in the immediate vicinity of the building. Therefore, rather he googles it or not, it is right there.

Dr. Williams stated that if the petitioner is going to do this, why not have arches all around the building. There is a single arch adjacent to an elevation that is rectilinear. The arch from the stairwell is the corridor. To the left on every level above the first level are rooms.

Mr. Shay said these are over-sized rooms, they are like suites.

Dr. Williams asked if half of the room will have the big arch window and half will have the regular windows. He told Mr. Shay that this is labeled "C" on his plans. So, it will be half the masonry facade and half a big mass of window with one suite behind it. Therefore, to him, if the arch window was the circulation, it would make sense having the arch here, but it seems to be just slapped on in accordance with the building next door. However, there are no arches anywhere else carrying on this vocabulary. At the end of the power plant,

there are three arches and then there is one because it is on a different plain. He likes the segmental arches and believes there should be more on the ground level. There are a few on the upper level, but then there are four stray round arches. He does not know how the other members of the Board feel, but to him, these round arches are arbitrary. He asked why not make the stair hall the arch component rather than the window. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Shay if he was trying to make the special suites with large windows.

Mr. Shay answered yes. They have the most spectacular view, which is looking to the west of the Savannah river and at the Talmadge bridge. He said also if they permits him, he thinks that River Street is destined not to end at MLK. He believes there is a time not to long from now when one of the significant approaches to this corner will be from a distance and from the west. They wanted to provide something that could be seen from a distance.

Dr. Williams believed this could be accomplished with may be not wall-to-wall windows on the last bay of the elevation; he believes if the petitioner had a more consistent vocabulary of segmental arches and may be sacrifice the round arch. He said through materiality and the vertical elements, there are other ways to acknowledge the building across the street. In his opinion, this does not belong within the rest of the design.

Dr. Williams asked that where the building rises above the little pavilion, there is a pattern of solids and voids. He said starting at the stair hall, there is a thin and then a fat; the windows; then two fat solids; then a window; two fat solids; a window; and then a very single skinny solid holding the corner. In other words, the corner of the building is ending with about two to three feet of masonry and everything to the left of the windows are more substantial pieces of masonry. Therefore, why not shift the windows over. To the right of these rising up to the roof, there is a very thin sliver of masonry that is holding the corner. This seems inadequate. He is not worried about symmetry, but he just wants the corner articulated more firmly. He said on the River Street elevation (page 10) the central pavilion shows five segmentally framed windows at the top, but only three at the bottom. He encouraged the petitioner to have the outermost bays of the entrance pavilion to have five at the bottom just as they are at the top. This would enable it to read consistently all the way up. Dr. Williams said he encourages the petitioner to put more of them towards the outer corners as well. The center would then speak to the outer corners.

Ms. Simpson stated that the first floor shows an opening to a void that is not anywhere else. She asked if this is a necessary wall.

Mr. Shay answered that the wall must be there, but the location of the window does not.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Shay if he is saying that the wall could not be changed to be consistent with everything else.

Mr. Shay answered that this was not what he said. He explained that a building element must be here to separate the inside from the outside of the building. But, the location of the window which is setback approximately six or eight feet from the other windows over here is in the back of the little arcade at the corner. However, if it bothers the Board that it is not centered, they can center it.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Shay to go to page 13 again as he wants to revisit the east side of the south elevation. He still has a problem with the entire corner. Mr. Engle said a rectangular element is here that does not exist anywhere else along the roof line. He believes, therefore, it is top heavy and has no grace at all. He does not see that this is compatible with anything else on the building; diagonals are everywhere else on the roof and they are bringing in a block. Mr. Engle asked staff that he thought when they gave an extra floor there was a limit on the height of the parapet. But, this is six feet above the parapet. He asked staff if this meets the standards for an additional floor.

Mr. Shay stated that it is not an additional floor; it is a stair tower. There is no livable space here. The Board does have the ability to consider compatibility, but as far as it being a violation of the height limit, it is not.

Mr. Engle asked if the stairs are running right against the exterior wall.

Mr. Shay answered yes. The stairwells are generally at the end of the corridor.

Mr. Engle was aware of this; but he found this very clumsy. This is a rectangle sticking up on the roof line that is made up of diagonals. He could not understand why it is here. The continuation of the parapet and recessing the stairs back a bit would be a lot more effective. If they look at page 9, every elevation is sticking out.

Dr. Henry asked if the entrance would be from Williamson Street.

Mr. Shay answered yes. The people that are arriving or departing by automobiles is the Williamson Street side because it allows for valet parking stand, a place for cars to cue up at 3:00 p.m. when hotels are getting crowded. This is the way that people will first arrive and last depart. He said that a hotel guest in Savannah generally arrives and departs if they come in an automobile at all. Sometimes, they come in a taxi. However, during their stay in Savannah, they come and go many times by the pedestrian side. Therefore, they gave prominence to what they hope will be the pedestrian entrance in and out of the building. This is not to say that the pedestrian cannot walk out of the doors as they certainly can, but the idea in his mind is secondary because it is devoted primary to the experience of automobiles. When you come out of it you will be looking at the taillights of a whole row of automobiles that are parked at the hotel across the street. What they decided to do was that since the project does not have a lane, they said that Williamson Street was the least of the four frontages and this would be where they would try to focus the attention of the automobiles. Mr. Shay said, however, he begs to differ with Dr. Williams as he does not think that this entrance needs to be as heroic as the one they are hoping to be the way that people will remember coming and going to their hotel in Savannah. This is not unusual for hotels both in Savannah and outside of Savannah. There is a way to arrive as a guest in an automobile that is suitable and comfortable.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Carey said he understood from Ms. Ward's presentation of this petition that the Board received the memorandum that the Historic Savannah Foundation (HFS) sent regarding the proposed hotel. He said if the Board has had the opportunity of the reading the memo, he would not do. A number of the Board members have raised some of the same concerns that they have raised in their memo.

Ms. Ramsay suggested that Mr. Carey highlight the HSF's concerns stated in the memo. She was not sure that all the Board member had the opportunity to read the memo from the HSF.

Mr. Carey stated that this is a challenging site. It is a large building and, therefore, makes it a difficult project. They know this is in an industrial area and know that the building has been sort of characterized as classical and may be the primary reference point is the Georgia Power Plant. They are trying to expose some greater consistency in the design. Particularly, with respect to solids, voids, the varied shapes of the buildings and the facades. There seems to be a sort of classical collision, which is mostly apparent on the north and west elevations where the building appears to be divided against itself. If they could choose one path or the other, classical or brutalist, he believes they would be better off and would probably move this project forward.

Mr. Carey said they understand the ordinance requires the breaking up of large buildings, but they are looking for a more consistent rhythm of solids to voids which they believe is better achieved in the center section of the building as submitted, but it is lost in the eastern and western portions of the building where the solids appear to overpower the voids and the rhythm turns from a vertical orientation to a horizontal orientation. Given that this is a strong east/west building, they believe the vertical voids needs resolution in favor of verticality in order to preserve balance.

Mr. Carey said the way the HSF reads this, especially in the center section they see five vertical segments; two bases, a middle and a top (actually there are two tops in the center section). By better articulating the cap and base of the structure and probably raising the base in a two-story expression that is more vertically aligned rather than broken up by the second story row of larger more horizontal windows, then that elevation will be more consistent. He said that he agrees with Mr. Howington that the proposed multi-use building on the south west corner needs greater attention and detail. Mr. Carey said personally, he was not a great fan of the monitor design they had the first time as he believed it was too much, but now he believes they do not have enough. He is sympathetic to the problems that this presents to the petitioner. But he believes that more glazing and a bolder may be less deferential design to the main block might be considered. This is an important building and he believes this is a focal point to the building and could really draw people in. Therefore, they believe this corner building deserves a little more attention and articulation.

Mr. Carey said regarding arched windows in general, they agree with Dr. Williams that if the arch windows are going to be used, they should be used in proper proportion, number, placement and so forth. The east elevation appears to actually be the best most consistent elevation; it hangs together best. This might be the best reference point for the petitioner to try to resolve the problems on the other facades and other elevations. The large arched window on the north west corner of the building is referential to the Georgia Power building, seems awkward. It is alone and much larger than the building on the Georgia Power building, maybe this could be reduced in size. The arched pattern should be replicated on this facade and others around the building for more consistent use. He believes the trio of arched windows on the east facade are better placed and better proportioned. This could serve as a reference point. They, too, have the question about the rectangular mass that appears to be protruding from the east elevation. Mr. Carey said they

understand that the petitioner was directed to go back and not produce so much detail on the building so that they couldn't understand height and mass. Some times a building needs to be simplified to really appreciate and make a good ruling on the height and mass. However, he believes that some of the lost of details led to a couple of the problems that he believes Ms. Simpson brought up which is the apparent inconsistency between the floor plans and the drawings. Two examples are one on the west elevation and the lower right corner of A-8. A void is shown on the drawing, but the floor plan shows a solid on A-2. Therefore, A-8 and A-2 appear to be in conflict on this corner. Likewise, on the south elevation which is the lower center section of A-11, the drawing shows single doors flanked by sidelight whereas the plan A-3 shows French doors opening onto the pool deck. Maybe these are seemingly small matters but to them it indicates a sort of lack of detail and consistency which may bleed over into other areas and makes it difficult for them to make a good judgment. They believe that a building of this magnitude deserves as much or more scrutiny as a lot of the other projects that they view. Mr. Carey said even in understanding, accepting and sympathizing with the challenges presented by the site and the fact that a need is to pack a lot of rooms in this space, it is an important project, it will be with us and it is a big footprint. Therefore, it deserves as much scrutiny as they can afford. Mr. Carey was hopeful that their comments would be helpful and that a lot of the solids and voids comments can be resolved. He believes the rhythms are out of whack here and there. But they need to get more consistency in what they are trying to do. If it is the classical approach and the use of the arches, let's do that in a more consistent and respectful way.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Carey to define what he meant by "brutalist." Show the Board exactly what he means.

Mr. Carey answered that Dr. Williams as the architectural historian could teach them on this, but the best word that the HSF could use to describe the opposite of the classical and the areas that they are talking about would be on the ends and the east and west ends.

Dr. Williams asked if this was the most abstract almost industrial look.

Mr. Carey answered yes. If the Board wants to correct the use of that term, it is fine. They are just trying to make a distinction between the two.

Dr. Henry asked which area is brutalist. He asked Mr. Carey to point out the areas.

Mr. Carey answered either end of this. If they are going to go the classical route, then do so. But, the other elements that were introduced just makes it needlessly complex.

Dr. Henry asked how would this be fixed. Would arched windows need to go all over?

Mr. Carey answered no. Just on the key sections. If they look in an architectural digest book and see some classical way to design buildings, they will see some arched windows with a lot of rectilinear windows. But, there is a balance, a pattern and a rhythm.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Shay if he wanted to respond.

Mr. Shay said he grew up and studied architecture when he was a young man. The brutalist movement was earlier. He does not believe that they are using the term correctly, but he

guesses he understands what they mean which is they don't want the industrial mixed with the elements of the classical. Mr. Shay said for the record, he is sort of aggravated at having his drawing slandered. He is not perfect. The reasons that the windows are shown in elevation are not shown in plan is because a plan is also a section. When you cut the ground plan and it goes below ground it becomes a solid wall. It could also very easily be somewhere near the ground level and this is what is shown on the elevation. This is not a mistake, but just the fact that it is hard to show a building when it is diving into the ground in plan without choosing one place or another to show where it would be cut. The elevation that has the double windows is actually not visible from the street because a courtyard wall is here. He wanted the Board to understand that the area that has been spoken of is actually sixty to thirty feet deep and is not at the street level. If they are given the opportunity they will decide whether they want single windows, single doors or double doors. If it is the Board's desire, he will submit a document that will show only single doors in this area. They were asked to use single doors for security reasons.

Mr. Shay said in addition to the other comments that have been made, this is difficult. They were here two meetings ago and were very careful to make sure that the Board communicated to them what the issues were as there were many issues that were presented that needed to be corrected in order to come back for the height and mass approval. They have done all those things, plus what the staff has asked them to do.

Mr. Shay stated, therefore, he is asking the Board to give them the height and mass approval. He will restudy whether the arches over the windows are round or segmented. He will study whether or not the glazed areas are going to be narrower or shifted slightly. But, there is a point where you have to be willing to let it go to the design detail so that he will have an opportunity to present to the Board where the pilasters are on the building and what the masonry detailing is. They only have one material to work with as far as exterior and it is masonry. Therefore, they do not have the ability to do some of the things that are done on the other buildings on the high bluff where there is stone at the base and so forth. Consequently, they want to have the opportunity to get their teeth into the design detail. But how to articulate this, the River Street side consistent with River Street which has a completely different character than the other side of the building and still make the entire thing come off as an ensemble.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry summarized that he believes the Board is concerned about the rectangle on the east corner; the shape of the arched windows; the simplification of the windows; and the large window on the west elevation.

Dr. Williams stated that he believes there are some more general concerns about the cohesion of the entire design around all four facades. He said you can shift windows, beef up a corner, alter the shape of a window head from fully round to segmental are the great scheme of things that are more easily adjustable. He believes that what this Board has to come to some resolution about is this is a big complex building. He thinks the desire to mirror surroundings too much almost turns the building into a contortionist. Dr. Williams said the building is complicated by means of its shape. If it was a rectangle building then some of these gymnastics might be more valuable, but if you take a complex building and then add all the complexity to it, he believes that it makes coming up with a cohesive

solution more difficult. Therefore, simplify; such as the central pavilion on the north and south elevations. The pediment at the top does not correspond to anything significant inside. However, the corner which is the entrance, actually seems less significant than the middle of the south elevation overlooking the pool. The center elevation has a pediment, but the entrance seems to be more simplified vocabulary. Things as simple as these pediments are contributing to the design or they just little nods to the pediment on the power plant, but not really helping this design to communicate what is going on. To what point do you contextualize and mirror what is going on next door. It is important that the design speak to the pedestrians whether they are arriving by car or on foot. When he sees an elaborate architectural detailing such as pediment, arches, larger scale windows says that it is an important part of the building. He said especially as when they were looking at the single or double doors on the courtyard near the pool, the A-rooms project forward. Dr. Williams said the logic of what is being emphasized and what is not being emphasized could be resolved. He is less concerned about the little details such as balconies, but he is concerned about the big picture elements.

Mr. Judson stated that he does not disagree with any of the design details or the context in which they have been raised. The site is challenging and what they are looking at in terms of the board elevations with a full spectrum from every corner isn't the reality of where the building sits or how it will be viewed from any approach. To take an analogy of the book, they are not going to start at the beginning of the book nor are they going to read it through to the end. They will see snap shots from a multitude of angles and a multitude of contexts. He said he was not raising this point to dispute any of the design issues that have been raised, but he just want to remind the Board that what they are looking at on the screen is not going to mirror the experience that anyone is ever going to have of this building from the street or from any of the context around the building. He wanted the Board to keep this in mind because if they are striving for unification for the sake of unification, this view will be lost. They are not looking at it from across Ellis Square as they looked at the Cay Building and saw two full sides of the building all at once and all on the same context. Where this site is given the elevation, given the odd angles; given the surrounding buildings, to him some of the arguments are rendered mute by the fact that they are never going to see it in the full frame context.

Dr. Williams said what Mr. Judson stated enforces what he was saying. The corners are the emphasis. Mr. Shay has said this is where he put the round arches. Yet, if they look at the profile, this elevation suggests that the middle is the emphasis. Therefore, he could encourage him to accentuate the corners which will be the focal point seen urbanistically from River Street. The north west and south east corners are going to be the big deals. Yet, when you look at these elevations, they are not. These are long facades and having this big thing in the middle, he knows they are trying to break up the facade, but he believes they can do so with the ends being extenuated and the middle being simplified.

Dr. Williams said given what is already designed, he believes some adjustments could be made to parts of this. He said for example, if the Board likes the pediment detail, why not put it on the ends some where on the corners as opposed to the middle. He guesses it gets back to the point that the Historic Savannah Foundation suggested is do they want classical logic prevailing with the pediment or do they want a more industrial building where the corners could be emphasized.

Mr. Engle said the pediments will not be seen from River Street. They will be seen on Williamson Street, MLK and Montgomery Street. He just went up the river last week and he does not believe you will be able to see the building beyond the power plant from the river. But, he agrees that there is a lack of coherence in the five parts.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board members if they were ready to make a motion or ask the petitioner if he wanted to ask for this to be continued.

Dr. Henry said it appears that there are two choices.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Shay that he has heard the Board members comments. She told him that he had the opportunity to ask for a continuance.

Mr. Shay stated that he would prefer the option where the Board identify the elements that they want them to refine in design detail. They have been through four or five meetings and have tried to harvest the comments all along. Now, today there are a lot of new criticisms. There was a time that when they presented the round arches, they were very popular. It is almost impossible for him. When he comes back does he address just Dr. Williams's comments. Who is he trying to please? The ordinance says the standards are met and the staff has told the Board this. There is a higher standard and he is flattered that the Board holds him to a higher standard, but how is he to interpret this and even if he is good enough to be able to interpret it the way the Board seems for it to be intended by being somewhat clairvoyant. He has clients and, therefore, has to go back and tell them what they have to fix.

Ms. McClain asked if the petitioner could satisfy some of the concerns at the next part. They are now dealing with height and mass. She knows some of the issues have to do with mass.

Ms. Ramsay said the second part is the design detail. She explained that in the past, when they have approved things in height and mass dealing with voids and they were not corrected in the design details, they have run into trouble as they had already approved height and mass.

Mr. Engle said a window shape is a mass issue. He does not know if the entire Board has a problem with the arched windows. They were applauded two meetings ago.

Ms. McClain asked if the Board approves the height and mass, but in actuality when the petitioner comes back for the design detail, could the window shape change in the design details.

Ms. Ramsay answered no. They will have to approve it as presented.

Ms. McClain stated, therefore, in the design detail the petitioner could not change it.

Mr. Shay stated that if he came back and had made the corrections that were identified today and they identified how they were different and what was approved in height and mass, he believes that this is not uncommon with a large building. If it is frozen right now and nothing could ever change, then this Board should never approve height and mass on

anything. He has structural engineers, mechanical engineers, civil engineers and approximately fifteen (15) departments within the City of Savannah that he has to deal with, his client, the budget and schedule. Therefore, there will be some little things about this that he will want to change.

Ms. Simpson explained that the issue is if the Board approves this, the situation is they could change, but would they change it as they would have already said yes.

Mr. Shay said the motion could be made condition on those things and then it would be a reasonable expectation that the petitioner would come back and fix those things. This is what he is suggesting to the Board.

Ms. McClain said the motion could be crafted and make it specific. She believes this will give the Board leeway to defend it.

Dr. Williams stated to Mr. Shay that the characterization of the building sort of ranging from having classical elements to more industrial elements such as the hip roof and the pediments, are they more to satisfy the classical character, but the hip roof is not functional. He asked Mr. Shay if this was a fair statement.

Mr. Shay said the hip roof is functional in a sense that he is trying to create places for mechanical screening. The rise of these buildings, the silhouette, how they meet the sky is much more important than whether or not there is a near classical pediment on the facade. Because all these big machines end up here and if he does not give a place where he can tell the engineers to put all the stuff inside here, then it will end up being all over the roof. They have many examples of this downtown. The buildings that are iconic and they are covered up with roof top equipment, cell towers and so forth. He is trying to create a place where this could be screened.

Dr. Williams said Mr. Shay could accomplish this with a parapet. Maybe he could do as was done at the Ryan hotel where they had issues with the site lines. He told Mr. Shay that from the river he probably does not need a parapet to not see what is on the roof because it is very steep, but from three blocks down Montgomery Street, they will probably be seen. Therefore, there are certain places where the height of the parapet could be calibrated depending on site line. He said he remembers during Mr. Shay's first presentation, they talked about the industrial character and he lauded Mr. Shay's design for having simplified pilasters and not a lot of ornament as the Board had just reviewed another much more neo-classical hotel. It appears that there are a few of these classical elements such as the pediment, hip roof and the four arched windows. He could only speak for himself, but if these were simplified, he would be willing to approve with conditions if there was a list of things that the Board identifies that need to be addressed. Dr. Williams said, however, he believes that emphasizing more simplified industrial character will ultimately give the petitioner more latitude whether its not segmental or rectangle arches. The building needs to speak more coherently. He understands the petitioner's motivation to have big windows and so forth, but the exterior experience with this building, especially on the two corners, is paramount.

Mr. Shay said if it is the will of the Board for them to make their building less ornate and more industrial in character, they would be happy to do exactly this.

Mr. Engle told Dr. Williams that the Board told Mr. Shay that they like the round arched windows two meetings ago. They are totally a compatible reflection of the power plant next door. Now they are totally reversing themselves. He does not have a problem with the windows as much as he has with the pediment. The windows are industrial; they are on the power plant. Three of them are industrial and you do see them in the same elevation.

Mr. Gay said that Dr. Williams was making a suggestion for himself, he is not speaking for the entire Board.

Mr. Engle said, however, it has to be clarified as they are talking about the Board. If they are going to modify height and mass, it has to be done by the majority.

Dr. Williams asked if the four arched windows are in the same location as they were in March.

Mr. Engle answered yes; and they all liked the windows.

Mr. Shay said he can make the elements whether they are round or segmented. He can make them less classical and more industrial. This is what you do in design detail. He is excited about the opportunity; but give him clear direction because now he has no directions. He has been told that they do not like the stair tower up above the parapet in the corner. But, believe him, he will find some way to get it up on the roof.

Mr. Howington said he believes the three classical windows on the east side are okay. He asked Dr. Williams if he was against these windows. The window on MLK seems to be out of place even though it sort of represents the corner well.

Dr. Williams said he was only speaking about the cohesion of the ones with the adjacent facade. He likes the arches.

Mr. Engle said making it segmental will not change much.

Dr. Williams asked if this window has been there since March.

Mr. Howington answered yes.

Mr. Shay asked for a continuance on the two-story pavilion on the northwest corner at (Williamson Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard) in order to restudy the roof, columns, and massing).

Board Action:

Approval for Part I, Height and Mass, with the following conditions:

1. The stair tower on the northeast corner be relocated or adjusted not to rise above the parapet and reconsider the rectangular box

- below;
2. The projecting balconies fronting Montgomery Street be supported by brackets;
 3. Eliminate the gabled pediments throughout the building;
 4. Augment, or make more substantial, the south corner pier of the six-story portion of the west elevation fronting MLK Jr. Blvd.; - PASS
 5. Restudy the arch on the northwest corner of building, fronting MLK Jr. Blvd., to clarify corner and give cohesion to the elevation.

Mr. Johnson, Mr. Merriman, Jr., and Ms. Simpson cast nay votes against the motion.

The two-story pavilion on the northwest corner at (Williamson Street and MLK Jr. Blvd.) was continued at the request of the petitioner to restudy the roof, columns and massing.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Nay
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Nay
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Nay
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. Amended Petition of Christian Sottile and Timothy Bright | H-12-4603-2 | 22 Barnard Street | Addition and alteration

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Mr. Christian Sottile was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner initially was requesting approval to amend the Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 22 Barnard Street to increase

the size of the door opening along Whitaker Street and install a freestanding clock along St. Julian Street. The petitioner has withdrawn their amendment to change the door size on Whitaker Street. Therefore, the request now is only for the clock.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the clock provided that alternate text indicating the street (St. Julian Street) or ward (Decker Ward) be considered in place of Ellis Square because it has a direct relationship with those elements of the urban plan and is not located within the square.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sottile said they are recommending that Ellis Square be the lettering on the clock. They have given this a great deal of consideration and felt that it was appropriate as visitors move between Johnson Square and Ellis Square to have the name of the square presented to them. It is within thirty (30) feet of the square. Therefore, it is much closer and already deeply within the ward at this point. He said that one thing they have noticed in Savannah is many of the north/ south streets always announce the squares that you are coming to, but the east/west portions generally do not. Consequently they felt this would be an opportunity, especially since this is such a traveled part of the center city, to be generous and share the fact that the individual is approaching Ellis Square. This is the reasoning behind their choice for using "Ellis Square" as the lettering on the clock.

Mr. Judson assumed that facing of the clock will be seen from both ways.

Mr. Sottile stated that the clock has two block faces.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Sottile if his point is that when you are moving westward on St. Julian Street and you see Ellis Square before you, his justification is this is a way of announcing the square. He asked that could be when you are going eastward from the square towards Johnson Square that the west elevation of the clock could say St. Julian Street because the square is at your back as you are leaving and what is before you is actually St. Julian Street. Dr. Williams asked Mr. Sottile if he would have an issue with it saying Ellis Square when you are facing the square and St. Julian Street when you are facing the other way.

Mr. Sottile stated that they prefer not to use the street name. As the Board may recall with the main application for the building, they had an opportunity to engrave the street names on the corners of the building. Therefore, as you are on St. Julian Street either approaching having crossed Whitaker Street or leaving the square onto St. Julian Street, it currently does say west St. Julian Street on both sides of the building. They felt this was addressed and this is why they ruled out using the street name.

Mr. Sottile said he brought the diagram with him indicating the location of the proposed clock relative to Ellis Square. The diagram gives a sense of how close this really is to the square and in relationship to the two wards that they are talking about.

Mr. Engle stated he believes that as you are going away from Ellis Square, it will say Ellis Square, but it should say Johnson Square on the back side because you are walking towards Johnson Square.

Mr. Gay said Johnson Square is so far away.

Mr. Merriman questioned why would Johnson Square be mentioned.

Mr. Engle said, therefore, why have Ellis Square because you are not going towards Ellis Square on the back side.

Mr. Judson said his thought might be "Cay Building."

Mr. Gay said this or nothing.

Mr. Engle said in the past, they would identify the store that installed the clock. He believes that the jewelers did this at one time.

Mr. Merriman asked if the Levy Jewelers clock or any of the other clocks have this on them.

Mr. Engle said they have the name of the store that installed them.

Mr. Gay said the clock at Liberty National Bank had their name on it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said the examples of the photos of historic clocks shown on pages four (4) and five (5) do not have script. The clock on page three (3) has room for script, but he cannot tell whether script is thereon.

Mr. Gay said he knows that Liberty National Bank has script on its clock, but it is a porcelain sort of face on the clock.

Ms. Ramsay asked Board if she was understanding that the Board prefers not to have script on the clock.

Ms. Simpson said may be there could be some sort of floral design or whatever was in some of the design examples that were given.

Mr. Gay said when you look at the other side, it looks fine without anything being there.

Mr. Engle said either put "Cay Building" as the script as they are the ones putting it up or nothing.

Mr. Merriman said the "Cay Building" seems like the most logical choice.

Ms. McClain stated if the street clock concept is their sketch, on page seven (7) no text is shown. She believes this is more in line with the historical precedent.

Board Action:

Approval of the petition provided that no script be applied to the clock. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

8. [Petition of Angela Bean for Doug Bean Signs | H-12-4644-2 | 318 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Doug Bean was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for two illuminated principal use fascia signs, one fronting onto Broughton Street and one on the west facade, at 318 East Broughton Street. This commercial building is not a rated structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. However, it was constructed in 1947 and may be eligible for historic designation. She stated that the Zoning Administrator has determined that two principal use signs, fronting onto Broughton Street and on the west facade, are permissible because the building maintains a presence on Lincoln Street and a history of signage on the west facade. However, the two signs should not exceed the total square footage allowed for the principal use sign on the Broughton Street elevation.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the two illuminated principal use fascia signs at 318 East Broughton Street with the condition that the signs be reverse lit channel letters either a plastic or aluminum face.

Mr. Judson asked if the awning in the rendering is existing.

Ms. Bryant answered that she believes it is the metal awning that has been removed from the building. The petitioner wants to install a similar fabric awning.

Dr. Williams asked if it is a part of this petition.

Ms. Bryant answered no. The awning has already been approved by staff.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bean said he promised his client that he would implore the Board to allow them to do plastic face internally lit channel letters. He asked the Board to please approve the plastic face internally lit channel letters.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Bean what is the reason for requesting the plastic face channel letters.

Mr. Bean answered that his client is convinced [and he certainly agrees] that these signs are seen at a greater distance. The staff is recommending a halo lighted letter. But, they want to push light through the face of the letter instead of bouncing the light off the building.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Bean that should the Board not grant the request of the plastic face internally lit channel letters, if he and his client are amenable to the staff's suggestion.

Mr. Bean said his client understands that they have to work within the confines of rule.

Mr. Judson asked if there is a photo that the Board could see pertaining to the type of sign that Mr. Bean is suggesting be approved.

Ms. Bryant answered no. However, staff is recommending that the petitioner may do the plastic with channel letters similar to what McDonald's did with their sign. They are back lit illuminated; this is what was recently approved for Subway. The Melting Pot sign is also an aluminum sign face and is back lit illuminated.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Bryant that when she says back lit illuminated, there is an opaque solid element with lighting behind and no light is coming through the letters.

Ms. Bryant answered correct; it is bouncing off the building.

Dr. Williams asked if there are any internally illuminated sign that the petitioner is requesting anywhere on Broughton Street.

Ms. Bryant responded that Welsh Pawn at the west end of Broughton Street.

Mr. Engle stated he believes the Board does not want to go with the internally illuminated signs because if they do, they will end up with these type of signs everywhere. The Board

has been trying to discourage internally lit letters. One pawn shop with this type of sign is enough.

Dr. Williams said the petitioner stated that FedEx has this type of sign. He asked if this is on Broughton Street.

Mr. Bean said FedEx is on Broughton Street near Bull Street.

Dr. Williams asked if the sign is on top of the architectural element of the building.

Mr. Engle said he believes that this type of sign was not suppose to be at FedEx. He does not believe that the sign was approved.

Ms. Ward stated that the sign was approved for FedEx. It was a different time, a different Board, and this staff did not recommend approval of the sign. She does not see how the Board can say that it is visually compatible in the Historic District.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said he was trying to take the pressure off the petitioner so that he would not have to undermine his client as he is going to implore that the Board do not allow the internally illuminated signs.

Board Action:

Approval for the two illuminated principal use facia signs at 318 East Broughton Street with the condition that the signs be reverse lit channel letters with either a plastic or aluminum face. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Ebony Simpson
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye
Brian Judson - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

9. [Petition of Keith Howington for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4423-2 | 27 Bull Street | 12-month extension for a rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Keith Howington recused from voting on this petition. He is an employee of Greeline Architectural.

Board Action:

Approval for the 12-month extension to expire on May 11, 2013, 12-months from the prior expiration date with the condition that the door is inset no less than three inches from the facade. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Abstain

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

10. [Amended Petition of Gretchen O. Callejas | H-11-4380\(S\)-2 | 411 Alice St. | Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4380\(S\)-2 Amended - COA 411 Alice Street.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4380\(S\) - Amended 4-19-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

11. [Petition of Ethan MacDonald | H-12-4636\(S\)-2 | 109 East Jones St. | Gate](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4636\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4636\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

12. [Petition of Cilantros | H-12-4637\(S\)-2 | 135 West Bay St. | Awnings](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4637\(S\)-2 - 135 West Bay Street.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4637\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

13. [Petition of John Largent | H-12-4638\(S\)-2 | 225 W. Broughton St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4638\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4638\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

14. [Petition of Mark Sanders | H-12-4639\(S\)-2 | 12 Price St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4639\(S\)-2 - 12 Price Street.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4639\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

15. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products | H-12-4640\(S\)-2 | 14 Price St. | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4640\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4640\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

16. [Petition of Chris Brown | H-12-4641\(S\)-2 | 150 W. St. Julian St. | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4641\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4641\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

17. [Report on work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness \(COA\)](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Work Without COA 050912.pdf](#)

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

18. [Report on items deferred to staff](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Items Deferred to Staff 050912.pdf](#)

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

19. [Next Meeting - Wednesday June 13, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

20. [Archaeology Panel, Saturday May 12, 2012 at 2:00pm, Trinity Church](#)

Attachment: [Archaeology Panel Flyer.pdf](#)

Proclamations

21. [Brittany Bryant, Preservation Planner - acknowledgement of service](#)

The Board thanked Ms. Bryant for her excellent service and wished her well in her endeavors.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

22. [27 Bull Street - Section 106 Review Process](#)

Mr. Howington stated that he wanted the Board to be aware of the proposed elevator that the bank at 27 Bull Street is installing inside the lobby as there is no other place to put an elevator. They did their best to minimize it. He said the Board may look at the drawings. It is wrapped in case work and looks like a piece of furniture. It is a very high style elevator. This is not within the purview of this Board as they look at the exterior, but this was sent to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) who felt that it was an adverse affect visually, but not to the historical integrity of the building. The FDIC wanted to carry this further and they went to Section 106. The Advisory Council for Historic Preservation did not feel that they should be involved. Therefore, the process came to a memorandum of agreement that everybody has accepted. They went through some litigating factors. The adverse affect was such as minimizing the case work details to separate it from the historic version.

Mr. Howington said a conference call was held and Ms. Ward, Historic Savannah Foundation, FDIC and many other persons were involved. He informed the Board member that if they or the public had concerns with this, to voice the concerns to Ms. Ward or him.

Dr. Williams asked if someone wanted to view the drawings, where can they do so.

Ms. Ward said a copy of the drawings is in the Board's packet.

Mr. Howington said he is bringing this to the Board's attention not as a Board

member, but as concerned members of the public.

New Business

23. 2012 HDBR Annual Retreat

Ms. Ward reported that every year the Board has a retreat. She was looking at some possible dates for this year. The summer months seems to work best because of the agenda load. In the fall it starts to pick up. Normally, a Friday has been good for most Board members. They have done half-day retreats in the past, but she has found that a full day is much more productive. Oftentimes, discussions that need to be held get cut short when half-day is done. Ms. Ward said she was looking at Friday, August 17, 2012 or Friday, August 24, 2012. On August 8, 2012, the Review Board meeting will be held. If these days are not okay, they could possible have the retreat in July.

Ms. Ward said she was recommending August 17 or 24. She asked the Board members to look at their calendars and let her know.

Dr. Williams said he will be out of town on August 17 and 24.

Mr. Engle asked if they could look at some earlier dates in August. Probably the August 3 or 10.

Mr. Judson said he will be in California on August 17 and 24.

Dr. Williams suggested August 31, 2012.

Mr. Engle said August 31, 2012 is the week before Labor Day. This might not be a good day.

Ms. Ramsay said tentatively they will have the retreat on August 3, 2012 and if anybody has a conflict with this date let Ms. Ward know.

Dr. Williams said he could not come the morning of August 3.

Mr. Judson said some of the Board members are concerned that it is a bit much to be away eight and one-half (8.5) hours.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board members to send their available dates the middle of July to the end of August to Ms. Ward.

Dr. Williams suggested that may be they need to send available dates not just Fridays because another day could be better. Mondays may be better.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board members to send their available dates to Ms. Ward.

Ms. Ward asked the Board members that if they have any suggestions for topics to be included on the agenda, to please let her know. She asked that if they know of places where they could possibly have the retreat to let her know this also. She has a number of ideas for topics such as an update to the Unified Zoning Ordinance.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

24. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 5:00 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.