



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
July 10, 2013 1:00 p.m.
Revised Meeting Minutes

July 10, 2013 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Linda Ramsay, Chair
Ebony Simpson, Vice Chair
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
T. Jerry Lominack
Marjorie Weibe-Reed
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Member Not Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr.

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Ellen Harris, Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation
Leah G. Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner
Jack Butler, Comprehensive Planner
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Jessica Archer, Preservation Intern
Alyson Smith, Preservation Intern

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Ms. Ramsay called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. She welcomed everyone in attendance to the meeting.

2. [Resolution of Appreciation for Sarah Ward](#)

Ms. Ramsay presented a Resolution of Appreciation to Ms. Sarah P. Ward on behalf of the Historic District Board of Review for eight (8) years of dedicated service to the Board. Mr. Eric Meyerhoff and Mr. Brian Judson, past Board members, came forward and thanked Ms. Ward for her professional services as a staff member during their tenure on the Board.

Ms. Ward thanked everyone for the resolution and said that it was a pleasure working with the Historic District Board of Review past and present members. She said she will still be in Savannah and hopefully will be seeing everyone.

3. Preservation Interns

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Harris to introduce the new staff members.

Ms. Harris introduced Mr. Jack Butler, Comprehensive Planner with the MPC for six (6) years. Mr. Butler works with the Development Services, Comprehensive Planning and Zoning Board of Appeals. Ms. Jessica Archer is interning this summer. Ms. Archer is a Master of Fine Arts and Architectural History candidate. She is working on a project looking at the Victory Drive corridor. This corridor has recently seen a lot of development. This corridor is a cultural landscape which has been eroding. Ms. Harris said, therefore, they want to develop a plan for its restoration to maintain the cultural features.

Ms. Leah Michalak introduced Ms. Alyson Smith who is working this summer as an intern. Ms. Smith is a student at SCAD and is a candidate for a Bachelor of Fine Arts in History Preservation. Ms. Smith summer work involves the expansion of the local Mid-City Historic District to the boundaries of the current Thomas Square Streetcar National Register District.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

4. Petition of Signs for Minds | 13-002781-COA | 209 West Congress Street | Sign

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a sign at 209 West Congress Street with the condition that only one light source be utilized to be more visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack
Second: Keith Howington
Reed Engle - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

5. [Petition of Lott + Barber | 13-003159-COA | 421 Abercorn Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the petition for a fence at 421 Abercorn Street. (Note: Approval by the Historic District Board of Review does not absolve the property owner of any parking standards/requirements associated with the use). - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack
Second: Keith Howington
Reed Engle - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

6. [Petition of Dave McKinley Coastal Canvas | 13-003171-COA | 320 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the sign at 320 West Broughton Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. [Approve Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approve Agenda for Meeting of July 10, 2013. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

8. [Approve Minutes of June 12, 2013](#)

Attachment: [06-12-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve June 12, 2013 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Approve Minutes of June 12, 2013 Special Called Meeting](#)

Attachment: [06-12-2013 Special Called Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve June 12, 2013 Special Called Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

10. [Petition of Anthony D. Hampton | 13-001767-COA | 532 East Taylor Street | Alterations and Additions](#)

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of August 14, 2013. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Keith Howington	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

11. [Petition of Roy Ogletree for East End Development | 13-001862-COA | 545 East McDonough Street | New Construction Residences: Part I and Part II](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Facing North.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Staff Report2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context Photographs2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Specifications2.pdf](#)

Mr. Roy Ogletree was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details of five (5), three and three and one-half story residential townhouses at 545 East McDonough Street. The trust lot is bounded by East McDonough Street to the north, Houston Street to the west, East Perry Street to the south, and two attached townhouses to the east.

Ms. Michalak stated that at the June 12, 2013 Board meeting Part I and Part II were continued. She said the Traffic Engineer advised staff on July 1, 2013 that the petitioner needs to submit a revised General Development Plan to the City. Ms. Michalak said the petitioner has met the standard for the wall of continuity as sliding gates have been added to enclose the driveways at the West Building and swinging iron gates have been added to enclose the parking areas at the rear of the East Building. The second submittal of the Part II, Design Details includes the following Visual Compatibility Factors: materials, textures and colors. The following Design standard apply to Part II review: commercial design standards (where applicable); window and door standards; roof standards; design details for balconies, stoops, porticos, and porches; fences; character area standards (where applicable); service/parking areas; utilities; and mechanical systems.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details for 545 East McDonough Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the commencement of construction:

- a. Submit the revised General Development Plan to the City for review and approval.
- b. Change dormer light pattern on the West Building as requested by the Board during

the June meeting.

c. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the buildings.

d. East Building: Add vertical posts/columns to the underside of the porches. The columns shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave.

e. East Building: Remove the proposed stucco privacy walls between each porch unit.

f. Provide staff with a color selection for all metal gates.

Ms. Michalak additionally reported that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the maximum residential balcony depth design standard variance required under Section 8-3030(n)(10)b. to allow four feet deep balconies on the West Building at 545 East McDonough Street because the proposed balcony is on the interior of the courtyard and not over the public right-of-way and because the same condition exists within the same block.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Michalak if the balconies have brackets.

Ms. Michalak said presently the brackets are shallow. They are underneath the fascia board and this is exactly the way they are designed on the other townhouses.

Ms. Simpson asked how far should the brackets extend.

Ms. Michalak answered that the maximum per the ordinance is three feet.

Mr. Lominack asked if the space between the windows on the Houston Street elevation ratio of solid to void meets the criteria. He said it looks like the solid is awfully big in relation to the window.

Ms. Michalak said the Board approved this during Part I. It is almost exactly to the maximum width allowed.

Mr. Engle said shutters will enhance it.

Ms. Michalak said the shutters could be a part of the Part II, Design Details consideration.

Mr. Howington asked if there are other examples of the privacy wall in town. He believes he has seen this in other new construction buildings where the balconies are not six feet, but may be street deep with a privacy wall with an angled cap.

Ms. Michalak answered that they have seen smaller ones especially on new construction. It seems to be a code requirement. This is something that the petitioner can elaborate on.

Mr. Howington said that it might be okay if the balcony was shorter and the wall could be shorter so as not to be such an impact.

Ms. Michalak replied potentially a different shape or width. She believes it has to do with the need for a fire separation.

Mr. Engle said the Board has approved them with trellises, etc.

Ms. Michalak said the petitioner could elaborate on this.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ogletree said his understanding is that Part I walls of continuity has been satisfied with their adding of the gates. His comments would concern Part II. The civil engineer is preparing the specific development plan for the project which will address the issues with the City staff. Mr. Ogletree said prior to this, the general development plan was submitted and the City provided comments. The only change was the sliding gates. He has talked with Cindy Cottingham about this.

Mr. Ogletree said he was not actually aware of the problem regarding dormer light pattern. He was not at the last meeting, but had a representative present. He believed that the size of the windows dictated four-over-four light patterns. However, it is not a problem to do six-over-six. He believes, though, that the panes would be out of portion. They will be willing to go either way, but he feels that what they have presented is appropriate and is what is on the units at the other end of the square that were approved in 2006.

Mr. Ogletree said the door frames are inset and they have provided details for the windows showing the inset and the doors. The request for vertical columns on the rear porches of the East Building is a broader issue that came up about what is a porch and what is a balcony. The issue that he has looked into is whether or not porches and balconies that are not facing the right-of-way are even governed by this particular section in the ordinance. Mr. Ogletree stated that the ordinance, itself, as an item 10 and talks about balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos and porches. He read that "balconies, stairs, stoops, porticos and porches within the public right-of-way may be permitted with approval of the encroachment by the Mayor and Aldermen provided the following criteria are met." He said criteria is listed as a sub-set to this. Therefore, when you follow this through, it is such as conventional specification writing, the subsets "A thru L" are underneath item 10 pertaining to item 10. They are not their own items, they are as it says "provided the following criteria are met." This only applies to those stoops in the right-of-way.

Mr. Engle said compatibility and visual compatibility count everywhere. He said Mr. Ogletree was talking about design standards. This Board judges visual compatibility.

Mr. Ogletree said he understood what Mr. Engle said, but everything that has been talked about has hung its statement on this particular code section. He said he was only pointing out that this code section does not state that balconies beside those in the right-of-way fall under this. Therefore, visual compatibility is one issue; but whether or not they have to go for a design variance is another issue. Mr. Ogletree said he has been talking with staff about this issue and there is a little bit of disagreement in this. He explained that a part of why he feels that he is correct in speaking about this is because of the statement in the staff's report today. He said that when they built the buildings on East Broad Street in 2006 and they were approved it says in this staff report that "the Board approved the four feet balconies on August 9, 2006 and the staff report noted that they recommend approval for the four feet projection as it is over looking the interior courtyard space and not over the public right-of-way." Mr. Ogletree said, therefore, the report was recognizing that the

three foot restriction had to do with the public right-of-way. This is why the four feet balconies were allowed.

Mr. Ogletree said following that same train of thought that was approved in 2006, if the idea was that the four feet balconies were not requiring a variance then, it should not require a variance now. At the time, the staff supported this premises that the three foot restriction had to do with over hanging balconies into the right-of-way. In support of this, he said that he went out and took a series of photographs in the Landmark Historic District which show examples of porches or balconies that are in excess of three feet. Mr. Ogletree said all of these instances are not in the right-of-way. They are at either the side of the building or rear of the building, all visible from the public right-of-way just as their balconies are, but they are not in the public right-of-way. He showed a series of images.

Mr. Ogletree said the issue of the separation wall [privacy] between the townhomes on the east units is in order to support those porches all the way across and also have the columns underneath that are inhibiting the parking which is in this same area where they have expanded it across, the use of the privacy walls give them the ability to get some fire separation of the structural wood balconies from one to another. There are three units that need two privacy walls separating those units. He explained that they have done them in stucco to be compatible with the building. They shaped them so that they would not be quite as overpowering in size and mass. This is exactly what they are proposing.

Mr. Ogletree said, therefore, he feels that the enforcement of a three feet deep balcony that is not in the right-of-way is not a correct application of this particular part of the code. They are trying to provide the developer a better situation for the people who will live here to have a usable porch on their own private property. He said that a three foot depth would be almost unusable; and a four foot depth on the west unit is marginally usable; but they agree with this. They originally had six feet, but they have agreed to go back to four feet since it does mirror what is at the other end of the property. They want the porch for the East building to be six feet deep. It is totally in their backyard and is screened by the walls of continuity. Therefore, there is very little view of it from the public right-of-way. The reason they want the deeper porches here is because the required parking is taking up the backyard which leaves no public space. The porch will encourage the people who will live here to use the parking. They will, therefore, be able to use the porch on the living level for their own private space. This encourages off-street parking which is what they have been trying to accomplish in this project.

Mr. Ogletree stated regarding the columns to the ground on these porches, the porches on the East building are not easily viewed because of the wall of continuity. Therefore, they believe that the columns are just inhibiting the parking and the use of the lower level. Consequently, they do not provide any aesthetic gain to the project. They would, therefore, prefer to fully expand across from wall-to-wall for those porches. The stucco privacy wall is a code issue, but it is also a quality of life for the people living there. Mr. Ogletree said he believes there is at least one good example in the Historic District that is successful. It is here to use as a precedence for saying it is an acceptable way to separate the townhomes. He said regarding the color selection for all metal gates, they intend for the color to be Charleston Green, but did not submit a chip. The Essence Green is similar and they will work with staff to decide which color works better.

Mr. Ogletree said the second major item on the staff's report refers to the need for getting the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) review for the four feet balconies. However, in his estimation, there is no need for a variance. If this gets approved by the Board, he does not believe it is a ZBA's issue. It is an architectural aesthetic issue. Therefore, he said, he believes that whatever the Board rules on today should be for the balconies and it should not be redundant and has to go to the ZBA.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Ogletree if he was saying that it is somewhat visible from the public right-of-way, but a portion is not visible. He asked Mr. Ogletree if he was referring the balcony or the porch.

Mr. Ogletree answered that the four feet deep balcony on the two west units are not readily visible because they have the wall of continuity.

Dr. Henry asked if the balconies are partially visible.

Mr. Ogletree answered that the balconies are partially visible. They are up a little higher; you would have to be far off to see them, but they can be seen.

Mr. Howington said he wanted to address the dormer and the light pattern as he made the comment at the last meeting. He said typically in his experience on a historic pattern of a window, the panes are more horizontal than vertical. Mr. Howington explained that in his opinion the two-over-two would be a more appropriate pattern in the dormer.

Mr. Ogletree said this is not a sticking point; they were following what was done prior.

Mr. Lominack said looking at the plans for the units that face west, it may be a drafting error, but the roof does not line up with the porch.

Mr. Ogletree said Mr. Lominack was correct; it is a drafting error. The porch roof plan did not get the right depth.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Michalak if she wanted to comment on anything that Mr. Ogletree said.

Dr. Henry said it appears that Mr. Ogletree is in a little disagreement with the staff. He wants this clarified.

Ms. Michalak said she believes it appears to be more so confusion than disagreement. She explained that staff is not asking the petitioner to change the depth because they are supported, but is only recommending more support to actually be more compatible with what Mr. Ogletree has shown which are center supported as well. Staff is supportive of the four feet deep balcony because it is not over the public right-of-way and because it matches the other building on the trust lot. Although staff is supportive of it, they do recommend that the Board recommend approval to the ZBA as this will vary a design standard that needs to be approved by ZBA.

Dr. Henry asked staff, therefore, they disagree with the petitioner's subset listing.

Ms. Michalak answered yes; the staff is not asking the petitioner to change the depth of any of these, but only asking that the petitioner go the ZBA.

Mr. Engle asked if the other unit predates the revised ordinance.

Ms. Michalak stated that these are not new standards, but the revised ordinance.

Mr. Lominack said he personally believes that the petitioner's analysis of that applying to balconies with the right-of-way is correct.

Mr. Engle said they are looking at the visual compatibility.

Ms. Michalak explained that staff interprets it a different way.

Mr. Lominack said if the staff is recommending approval, staff is satisfied with the visual compatibility.

Ms. Michalak said staff is satisfied because of the other unit on the trust lot.

Mr. Lominack said he believes to require that this be sent to the ZBA is not compatible with the wording of that particular section of the ordinance.

Ms. Michalak stated that staff dissected this at great length when this came up. They feel that it is saying that they are allowed over the public rights-of way as long as these criteria are met. It is not saying that these criteria are exclusive to balconies over the right-of-way because rear, side porches and decks are never over the right-of-way. These are very specific design standards listed under that as well. They can be here, but they have to meet all of the criteria. However, they will need it to be permitted by the Mayor and Aldermen.

Dr. Henry stated that this sounds reasonable, but do they need the City Attorney to make an interpretation.

Ms. Simpson asked if the Board would need to decide this in Board discussion or do so now.

Ms. Michalak said it is left at the discretion of the Board to make its decision. This is only what the staff was recommending.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated she was somewhat confused based on the discussion, but she believes that Ms. Michalak has clarified some of the confusion. She said that the HSF agrees with staff's recommendation to add support porch columns below the balconies on the East building. As long as they are more than four feet, they believe it should be a porch and, therefore, supported. Ms. Meunier said the HSF further agrees with the removal of the stucco privacy walls. They believe that they can be individual and not continuous. There are many examples of this throughout downtown. If they are going to remain balconies if this is what the petitioner prefers, then they do not think that they should exceed past three feet in depth. Additionally, they do not believe that they will require screening or privacy walls

between. There are many existing balconies, not porches that do not have divisions. Examples of these are DeRenne Apartments; Desoto Hilton; and on River Street when a balcony is supported by brackets there is not generally a screening wall between it. Ms. Meunier said this would be the HSF's recommendation.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Meunier if she was saying make them individual balconies.

Ms. Meunier answered that if they are going to remain balconies at three feet then they can be individual, but if they are going to be deeper than three feet, they believe that they should be porches supported by columns and post. She believe the screening wall should be restudied. They either need to be separate or there needs to be a different type of screening to separate the units because of the fire code and so forth.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Meunier what she meant by separate as the screening wall is to separate units.

Ms. Meunier said she meant individually and not continuous porch with separate footprint, but extend from the building as opposed to one continuous footprint for a porch that has a wall dividing each one.

Dr. Williams said regardless whether they are continuous or separate to him it seems that the wall between them is privacy.

Ms. Meunier stated that if it is continuous, the HSF is not in support of the stucco privacy wall. They believe that this needs to be restudied. She was not making a suggestion on how they should be nor what they should look like. But, she does not believe that the stucco privacy wall would be appropriate with the wood balcony with wood and porch supports.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Ogletree if he wanted to respond to the comments made by the HSF.

Mr. Ogletree said as he said earlier, and Mr. Lominack also addressed this issue, he believes that in studying this that the ordinance is clear as written. The three feet porch balcony or porch issue is intended and written to address balconies and porches that extend into the right-of-way. He said that he does not think that they were intended nor written to address balconies or porches that are on the private part of the property; particularly, not facing a street or right-of-way. Therefore, this opens up whether they agree or disagree makes a big difference because the porch depth and balcony depth hinge on that three feet qualification. Mr. Ogletree said they want to run the porches on the East building the full width so that they will be able to clear span which allows them to have better accessibility underneath those porches because the tightness of these pieces of property downtown when the two automobiles are pulled into the courtyard if they put in intermediate supports, they will either have problems with people not putting their larger vehicle (if they have one) are in the space or parking on the street or they might park one car here. They are trying to encourage people not to park on the street and by clearly spanning it, works better for the homeowner. He believes the visual impact is minimal and he does not believe that adding some columns under there will enhance the architectural expressions of the these buildings; especially as they are partially screened from view by the wall of continuity.

Mr. Ogletree said he is aware that you could walkup and look through the gate; this is a point that was brought up, but they are considering those walls of continuity screens for trash cans, electric meters and mechanical. Therefore, if this is considered a screen for those, then it should be considered as a screen to keep people from looking through and looking at architectural columns that are supposedly out of view as well. However, they would like to go with the six foot deep porches and clear span. He said that he believes that there is enough examples in the Historic District that supports the look and concept. They want to maintain the four foot balconies on the West building consist with the rest of the buildings and not go to the ZBA to get a secondary approval because he believes it is an unnecessary step as the ordinance does not state that it is a variance.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Ogletree to explain why he did not put brackets on the balconies. He said that the other balconies that are on the existing buildings have garages underneath. Obviously, a bracket could not go there, but the historical buildings are visually related and all have brackets on their balconies. This is just a cantilever beam and he was not going to get into the issue whether they are on the right-of-way or not. They are visible from the right-of-way and the ordinance is specific that balconies should be supported by brackets of some sort. A cantilever beam is not a bracket.

Mr. Ogletree stated that he believes Mr. Engle was asking two things. He said that Mr. Engle mentioned the existing townhomes which the Board saw in the drawings do have cantilevered steel beams and they do go to a shallow bracket which is somewhat stretched because architecturally they are not a bracket. They are shaped to not just be a pure structure as they do have some shape at the end; welded, cleaned up and painted to give them a shape; intentionally, it is not just a cutoff square. Therefore, because of the garage door, there is not enough room to put a true balcony bracket like you would have on the façade of a building that does not have a garage door. Consequently, they are repeating the same thing on the West building. There could be an effort to add a decorative bracket; it would not be structural at all, but there could be a bracket. However, the spacing of the beams logic would be that a bracket would be at every beam, but the spacing of the beam would have to be closer than you would be able to put brackets because of the garage doors. Mr. Ogletree said at best, it would be sort of a cosmetic applique of three brackets instead of every five feet as the supports are.

Mr. Ogletree said going back to the ordinance, it states that you have to have brackets, but this same ordinance is still the one that applies to porches within the right-of-way.

Mr. Lominack said this section of the ordinance says that it shall be supported by brackets or other types of architectural support.

Mr. Ogletree said in the ideal situation, they would not have garage doors here anyway in a historic building, but the fact that this is what they are doing and they cannot put the brackets where the doors are. Therefore, they are hand-tied on this issue.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Lominack said personally he does not care for this project. But, he does not believe that they, as a Board, have the right to misinterpret the ordinance. He said that if the intent of the ordinance was one thing, but is not written that way, it is not the petitioner's responsibility to try to determine what the intent was if the wording does not support

that. He believes this is an issue that has come up on some other things such as structured parking and issues where this Board ends up sending people to the ZBA with a requirement that they must pay a decent size fee to go before the ZBA for issues that should never have been an issue because of lack of clarity in the ordinance. This is one issue; however, where there are a series of conditions that exist on the site that cannot be addressed by trying to wallpaper - up some historic-esque on the site and make it meet those criteria.

Mr. Lominack said he believes that they find themselves, as a Board, in a position of reviewing things that are trying to look traditional, but the criteria in the ordinance does not allow for anything other than a traditional solution. He believes this is a real dilemma that they, as a Board, need to address as a part of the ordinance. However, because of what he has just said, he has not voted in favor of this project one single time. He believes it is an inappropriate planning solution for this particular site.

Mr. Engle stated that with Part II, the Board needs a separate motion on requiring the petitioner to seek variance approval from the ZBA.

Ms. Ramsay said the recommendation to ZBA will be a separate motion.

Dr. Williams stated that the plans do not show where the board-line of the balconies would be relative to the cars.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she believes having the columns will be a hazard.

Mr. Howington stated that he believes it is more of a hazard to have the columns here; if you put one in the center, to him it would not be architecturally correct. While it is a clear span, it is supported on the outside wall. Mr. Ogletree showed the Board an example of porches with columns, but also some without columns that are supported on those outside walls. Therefore, it has support. Mr. Howington said he agrees with the interpretation, while it is open to an interpretation, that Mr. Ogletree is correct with the way he understands the ordinance saying that you should not have to go to ZBA. He said that the way he reads the ordinance is that it says "within the public right-of-way." Therefore, there is an argument for this as well.

Dr. Henry said it is not in the Board's purview to get into parking issues, but it is the Board's purview to get into visual compatibility.

Ms. Simpson said in terms of the petitioner going to ZBA, she agrees with the staff's recommendation. She is okay with privacy walls, but she does not agree with this design. Ms. Simpson said she does not believe the design is visually compatible nor the material. The privacy wall will be alright, but it needs to be redesigned because it is too heavy.

Ms. McClain said the ordinance says "may be permitted." Therefore, this gives the Board some leeway.

Dr. Williams said he recommends that given the issues the Board has heard about safety and space constraints that (d) recommendation on the staff's report be removed and (e) be restudied and submitted to staff.

Ms. McClain asked Dr. Williams why he was proposing that (d) be removed.

Dr. Williams explained that if the posts are here, potentially the yard would not be feasible for parking which would lead to Dr. Henry's concern about more cars on the street.

Mr. Engle stated that the drawings do not show where the cars will be parked in relation to the porch.

Mr. Lominack said he believes the cars will be on the street so that they will use the space as a courtyard.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board if they want to restudy it or eliminate it.

Dr. Williams stated that he recommends eliminating it.

Board Action:

Approve New Construction: Part I, Height & Mass and Part II, Design Details for 545 East McDonough Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

a. Submit the revised General Development Plan to the City for review and approval.

b. Change dormer light pattern on the West Building as requested to a two-over-two configuration.

c. Ensure that the door frames are inset not less than three (3) inches from the exterior surface of the façade of the buildings.

- PASS

d. Restudy/redesign the stucco privacy walls located between the rear porch on the East Building.

e. Provide staff with a color selection for all metal gates.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Nay
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

Board Action:

Decline to refer the variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals because a variance is not necessary because the standard does not apply, and the balconies are visually compatible. - FAIL

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack
Second: Robin Williams

Nicholas Henry	- Nay
Reed Engle	- Nay
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Nay
Linda Ramsay	- Nay
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Nay
Robin Williams	- Aye

Board Action:

Approve to recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the maximum residential balcony depth design standard variance required under Section 8-3030(n)(10)b. to allow four feet deep balconies on the West Building at 545 East McDonough Street because the proposed balcony is on the interior of the courtyard and not over the public right-of-way, and because the same condition exists within the same block. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Keith Howington

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

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Paul Miller | 13-002430-COA | 224 Houston Street | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Paint color mockup.pdf](#)

Mr. Paul Miller was not present to represent the petition.

Ms. Harris explained this petition is a request for a color change. Staff is recommending approval of some of the colors and denial of another color. Therefore, staff decided to bring this to the Board for their decision rather than disapproving it at staff level. Ms. Harris stated that about five (5) minutes prior to the Board meeting, the petitioner called and informed her that he was stuck in Atlanta due to his flight being delayed. However, he really wanted to be in attendance at the meeting in order to present his case to the Board. Therefore, the petitioner requested a continuance. However, since the petition was properly posted as a part of today's final agenda, she was not sure whether the Board wants her to go ahead and present the petition now.

Ms. Simpson said she believes the petition needs to be continued as requested by the petitioner.

Board Action:

Continue the petition for a color change at 224
Houston Street to August 14, 2013 at the request of - PASS
the petitioner.

Vote Results

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye

Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-002612-COA | 151 Bull Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs, Drawings, and Specifications.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed recused from participating in this petition. She is an employee of Dawson Architects.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. This petition was continued at the meeting of June 12, 2013 by the petitioner. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations, additions, and awnings to the property located at 151 Bull Street. The project location consists of the southern ground floor portion of this four-story building.

Ms. Michalak stated that with the continuance, the Board asked the petitioner to consider several items and the petitioner has submitted the following comments:

1. Per the City Traffic Engineer, the Right-of-Way Management Plan is covered under the General Development Plan;
2. The General Development Plan was submitted to the City on June 24, 2013. The City has determined that the fall protection gate is required;
3. The details for the gate are included with the revised submittal packet;
4. Pertaining to the proposed baluster spacing for the guardrail, etc., all the required information is included with the revised submittal packet;
5. Pertaining to the proposed windows on the ground floor of the west and south faces to meet the preservation and design standards. All the required information is included with the revised submittal packet;
6. All the required information is included with the revised packet pertaining to the section through the window to ensure that sashed are inset not less than three inches (3") from the interior façade of the building, etc.;
7. The transaction window has been revised and all required information is included with the revised submittal packet;
8. All requested samples and specifications will be provided to staff for final review and approval;
9. Fixture mounting heights are included with the revised submittal packet;
10. The proposed ductwork could not be relocated or redesigned.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends to approve the petition for alterations, additions, and awnings to the property located at 151 Bull Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

1. Provide wood storefront paint color selections.
2. Provide light fixture specifications and color selections.
3. Provide an awning fabric sample and color selections.
4. Provide the size of the duct, dimension extension of the duct above the roofline, and the proposed color of the duct.

Dr. Henry asked what street is the façade facing.

Ms. Michalak answered that it faces the adjacent parking lot which is owned by the same owner; but it is highly visible.

Mr. Engle said the Board was told approximately three months ago when they were reviewing a petition for stainless steel ducts that no paint that would adhere to it and, therefore, they could not paint it.

Ms. Michalak answered that there is paint that would adhere to ductwork. Staff is still working with that petitioner at staff level.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson stated that they have talked with the mechanical inspector regarding the ductwork. Rather than have a big mushroom at the top, they would like to put an inline fan below. Therefore, this will be simply a duct that terminates with a little rain diverters so there will be less a big blob at the top of the ductwork and more of a streamline in-line fan. This allows for easier cleaning and access to the duct. It will be a little less ugly at the top of the building. Mr. Dawson said they do not have any other options. As he said at the last meeting, they did pursue the idea of a self ventilating fan; two have been used in the Historic District at a couple of restaurants. However, they are quite expensive, cumbersome, and hard to maintain. Frankly, it does not work with their kitchen layout. Mr. Dawson pointed out where their kitchen is located; the duct comes out through the window. They feel that this is the least intrusive plan. He explained [pointing to a section] that the circulating hood would actually have a down-draft discharge somewhere here or out underneath the awnings. They feel that this would be a worse pedestrian experience than the idea of painting a relatively small duct that discharges on the side of the building.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Dawson if he is aware of the history of this house as to who lived here.

Mr. Dawson answered no.

Ms. Ramsay said the house was built for George Wayne Anderson who was one of the most prominent persons of 19th century history. He was the president of Planter's Bank for 40 years. He served in the war of 1812 and was asked by President Jackson to be Secretary of the Treasury, but he declined. Ms. Ramsay said that this house was built in 1836 and she would not like to see the ducts coming out of 1836 windows.

Mr. Engle said there are 10 million living wall trellises available today. In fact, he believes that Mr. Dawson used one to screen an elevator shaft on another site.

Mr. Dawson confirmed that he has used a trellis to screen an elevator shaft.

Mr. Engle said that he finds it absolutely ridiculous that the Board requires screening on a four foot high condenser; but they can put up a three-story stainless steel duct and have no problem with it. There are thousands of living screens available today four feet wide that

would screen this. It does not need to go back to the building, but at least it would screen the duct. This Board requested that the County [they still have not done it] screen the top of the Old Courthouse compressor.

Mr. Engle said the duct is intrusive and stands out from the building as it has to wrap around the corners. There has to be a way for duct to be screened; even if they build a brick chimney on top of it. He said that this bothers him because it is happening all over the Historic District. Every time they look around, there is another restaurant conversion and a duct is sticking out three stories out the back. This is totally visual from the streets. He believes that the architecture community has to come up with ways to properly deal with this.

Mr. Dawson said they have tried some alternate approaches even requesting a variance from the mechanical code to do discharge onto the parking lot; but the code requires ten feet clearance from any opening, which obviously would be impossible down low. They have done a bunch of sketches with the mechanical inspector, but he is between a "rock and a hard place." Mr. Dawson said he agrees as this is not the greatest, but they find themselves with these issues on nearly every restaurant that they do.

Mr. Engle said they have to come up with a way to deal with this.

Mr. Dawson stated that on projects where they control the entire building, they are able to break into the building and plan for them, build chases, make them work and they are much more seamless. But on a building such as this where he has a tenant and multiple tenants are in the building and he is not working for the landlord, it is very difficult for him to go in and tell the person that they will have to take one of his closets and make it a duct chase. This really presents a problem; however, he does not believe that building a cage and trying to grow thick vine 45 feet in the air is any less intrusive than a brick painted metal duct.

Mr. Howington said his concern is that it will have to be attached to the building as well to support it. He likes the idea of screening more than the duct, but you would have to attach it and anchor it to the building which would do more damage to the historic fabric than the duct will do.

Mr. Engle said this is standing out from the building. The duct will be on brackets all the way up.

Mr. Howington said if a 45 feet screen is built, it has to be anchored some how.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dawson if he gave thought to possibly moving the duct towards the back corner.

Mr. Dawson said the code is basically like a plumbing line; it has to have a slight pitch to it and clean-out so that it does not return.

Dr. Williams said Mr. Dawson said something about ten feet. He asked him if he could have it terminate.

Mr. Dawson answered no; it has to terminate above the roof.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dawson if windows were on the north face.

Mr. Dawson answered that actually this screen wall is only setback approximately three or four feet. There is really not an opportunity to turn the corner and go up the back. If he did, he would still have to run horizontally a considerable distance.

Dr. Williams asked what if it ran horizontally, turned the corner above the arch and went up.

Mr. Dawson [pointing to a section] said this is sort of a breezeway that connects access to the residential units. He does not know if it gets a lot better getting to this corner at all. As they see, this space is already an electrical room; and there is an elevator room. Therefore, he cannot really move his hood's starting point any further to the north. The meter box is here.

Dr. Williams said his thought was assuming that it has to exit the building where Mr. Dawson has it and then go back to the elevation. He said the arch would be above it and the wall is recessed about one foot.

Mr. Dawson said he believes it is more than a foot, but not enough space that would allow him to get the duct from the north wall.

Dr. Williams asked that once it is snaked over the arch, it could theoretically be tucked. Is this a foot square duct?

Mr. Dawson answered that it is probably 18 by 20 inches. They do not have the actual size yet. But, it will be something in this range.

Dr. Williams asked if the windows on the third floor facing the arch are now facing into the adjacent building.

Mr. Dawson answered yes.

Dr. Williams said what he is probing is can it be routed to the back corner and then maybe turn the corner at the earliest opportunity and push it further east once you clear a certain point.

Mr. Dawson stated that all these things are true, but to him they would be making a sculpture out of ductwork rather than the shortest distance between two points and letting it be what it is.

Mr. Lominack said they will be getting into some band strength problems, too. Gravity works with you on a vertical.

Mr. Dawson said as they know, the more distance, turns and maintenance create more potential for fires. The mechanical inspector obviously prefers that the ducts be straight up.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he agrees with everything that the staff has recommended with the exception that they don't know how big the duct will be, which means they do not know what it will look like. He would like to see how it will look and would like to see alternatives. This is an important building and it is a high visual location. Mr. Engle said it is not visually compatible and he does not believe that it meets the Secretary's standards. He said that Dr. Williams has spoken with the petitioner about alternatives. This Board's concern is not how much it will cost. Maybe it wants to be wrapped in brick or may be a brick veneer and look like a chimney. Mr. Engle said he is willing to vote approval for everything else, but not the ductwork.

Dr. Henry said he concurs with Mr. Engle. It will look awful and will face one of the busiest streets in town. There must be another way to do it besides painting.

Ms. Simpson said Mr. Dawson has stated that he must be careful of creating more damage to the building in terms of the other alternatives.

Mr. Lominack stated that the less made of this, the better they are; it does not do anything to damage the façade fabric of the building as it is clearly separated from the building. It is easily removable and it puts an important corner to good use in the Historic District. These kinds of things seems to go away when they are there.

Mr. Howington said "yes" when they are painted to match the brick. He agrees that it is not a great solution, but perhaps snaking it around the building might make it an even more visual object; wrapping it in brick or some other thing might make it stand out. He said, however, the buildings have to evolve and they have to use these buildings.

Dr. Williams said an option would be some kind of green planting on the parking lot would help obscure the side of the building.

Ms. Simpson stated just as Mr. Dawson said, it will be 45 feet in the air and with the green screen will still draw attention to it.

Dr. Williams stated that this is not what he was saying. He explained that he was saying in the masonry parking lot may be they could plant some tall skinny trees along the front entrance of the parking lot might help mitigate some of the issues. He said he agrees that wrapping it in masonry sleeves might cause more damage to the historic fabric than just allowing the pipe to be attached to the building. Dr. Williams said he would love to see this corner activated; it is a great location.

Ms. Ramsay said landscaping is not the purview of this Board.

Dr. Williams stated that he was only suggesting. He has seen options at other sites where vacant lots have vegetation.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board can only vote on what is presented.

Mr. Howington said if this was on a lane, they would not have an issue with painting it. Or if another house was built close to it, they probably would not have an issue with it. Therefore, the fact that it is a parking lot and is quite visible and they see it, he understands that it is not necessarily visually compatible, but it seems to be the best solution presented.

Ms. Simpson said couple with the fact that the petitioner is trying to paint it.

Mr. Lominack said he believes this would be the least damaging to the existing building.

Dr. Henry stated that he realizes that this Board's concern is not about trees, but could they just state their opinion about it.

Ms. Ramsay stated again that it is not this Board's purview to make a recommendation about landscaping. She said either what has been presented is visually compatible or it is not.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for alterations, additions, and awnings to the property located at 151 Bull Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

1. Provide wood storefront paint color selections.
2. Provide light fixture specifications and color selections. - PASS
3. Provide an awning fabric sample and color selection.
4. Provide the size of the duct, dimension extension of the duct above the roofline, and the proposed color of the duct.

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Reed Engle	- Nay
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

[Blvd. \(508/512 West Oglethorpe Avenue\) | New Construction Hotel: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial and Ward Map.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photographs of Adjacent Historic Buildings.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Sustainable Roof Certification Letter.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Sample Panel Guidelines.pdf](#)

NOTE: Ms. Weibe-Reed recused from participating in this petition. She is an employee of Dawson Architects.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part II, Design Details, for a six-story, 137 unit hotel on the vacant parcel at 135 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

Ms. Michalak stated that Part I, Height and Mass, was approved with conditions at the April 10, 2013 meeting. She said that the petitioner made the revisions as outlined in the staff's report. Ms. Michalak said based on all the changes, all the Part I standards and conditions are met.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I and Part II for the hotel to be located at 135 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard with the following conditions:

1. Screen the HVAC units at the front of the building, submit to staff for review and approval.
2. Signage must be submitted for review and approval by the Board.
3. Construct a sample panel on-site for review and approval by staff, in accordance with the adopted Sample Panel Guideline.

Mr. Lominack asked if the lighter color panel will be on the walls of the building.

Ms. Michalak explained that the darker color is the brick; the limestone will be on the front façade at the bottom.

Mr. Lominack asked if it is the same brick.

Ms. Michalak answered yes.

Mr. Lominack stated that it was confusing as it appeared as though it was a different color material. He asked if there were any details of the green roof in the drawings. He did not see a wall section that showed this; he saw the plan.

Ms. Michalak said the staff does not review the green roof. This information was provided to the City's team who reviews this.

Mr. Lominack said he believes it is important for this Board to know about the green roof as the additional story has been granted because of it.

Ms. Michalak said as they discussed last month when the first green roof was certified for a different project, there is a covenant by the City on this property that they are required to perpetually maintain the green roof. She believes that the City has done a good job in covering all the bases. They now have a legal covenant on it now. The green roof cannot be taken away nor can the limestone be taken off which is a part of it as well. There are some serious design covenants and so forth that this has to be perpetually maintained even if the ownership changes.

Mr. Engle asked if the railing will be visible.

Ms. Michalak answered that it is not a railing, but a four foot (4') parapet which has already been approved.

Dr. Williams asked if the green roof is accessible at the other end of the building or is it simply an environmental feature.

Ms. Michalak said it is accessible as an elevator and a stair will go up there, but whether it would be accessible by the patrons is a question they would need to ask the petitioner.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Deacon said they have worked hard with their clients and with the MPC staff. They also met with the Historic Savannah Foundation in trying to revise the elevations for this project and meet the requirements in order to get the additional story at this location. She said in recent discussions with the clients to address the staff's comments, in developing this plan they are still in the early design stages; therefore, they do not have their HVAC design complete yet. Ms. Deacon said they were only trying to give a scenario of where they thought they might need mechanical units. However, in talking with the owner and his staff, they believe that they might be able to do away with those two units. They would be okay with making this a condition of the Board.

Ms. Deacon said to address the comments of the green roof, the requirements of the ordinance in order to get the additional story included having all masonry exterior construction and on the street facing façade, which would be Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, they would have quarried stone, which is what the limestone is. Therefore, all the stones shown on the elevation will be limestone. The other elevations that show stone will be cast stone. She said in order to have the roof meet the requirements of the ordinance, they had to have a green roof that covered 50% of the total roof's area. Therefore, what they are showing now exceeds that requirement. They have been working with landscape architects to get a conceptual design to decide what kind of plants are going to be put on the roof. Because when you do a green roof you have a shallow depth for the growing materials, most of the plants will be very low. What they are showing in the center area will be some sort of drought tolerance turf so that the hotel guests will actually have a grass surface that they can walk on. Ms. Deacon explained that near the edges of the roof, they will have taller plants, but these plants will probably not exceed the four feet height of the parapet. Therefore, they do not intend for the green roof to be visible from the ground level.

Ms. Deacon said their client's specific request was that if they are going to have the green roof that they would have access to the roof so that it will be a usable amenity for the hotel. She said overall, she believes this will be a real benefit to everyone involved because if they are using it as an amenity, they will maintain it well. Consequently, there should not be a lot of maintenance issues in terms of weeds growing up there.

Ms. Deacon they had to submit a maintenance plan, several documents concerning the types of membranes that they would be using in order to meet the requirements of City Manager's office to get their green roof approval. It is actually a full green roof system and they only have certain ones that they will approve. She stated that by going through these steps put them further ahead in the design of the green roof. Based on this regard, she believes they are able to address the Board's questions that they might have about the green roof. Ms. Deacon said she believes they will be able to eliminate the mechanical units that the staff has requested to be eliminated from the project.

Ms. Ramsay thanked Ms. Deacon and said this looks much better now than when they saw it initially.

Dr. Henry said he came to the office and looked at the plans. This is a big improvement.

Dr. Williams said with moving towards the cut stone for this project seems very rustic in character. He was wondering why not have more finished hard pressed brick that will compliment the cut stone. Is there a reason for using this product?

Ms. Deacon stated that this was actually a comment that came from the staff. She said originally they chose a much more rustic brick. They wanted to stay within the same color family so that they would match the stone that they had chosen, but the one that they resubmitted is actually much rustic than the one they had initially. Ms. Deacon said she was sure if this is something that would hold them up from moving forward with the project, they would reconsider the type of brick if the Board feels that it needs to be more refined.

Mr. Lominack said Hansen makes a brick in this same color range. It is more of an engineering brick.

Dr. Williams said the more rustic the brick, the more dust it collects. This hotel will be on a street where many tractor trailers, loading and buying diesel and other trucks. He said that his office faces this same street. These bricks will catch dirt; he believes a more smoother faced brick would probably be advisable on this site. There must be hundreds of brick options that they could use. Dr. Williams said his advice is for the petitioner to go with something smoother.

Ms. Deacon said since this is a material selection, she asked if they would be able to do this as a staff submittal before they receive their Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Lominack said this project requires sample panel anyway.

Ms. Deacon said with the all the railroad buildings in the area, there is a lot more red brick. This is something that they might look into. They will revisit this and submit it to staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for New Construction: Part I and Part II for the hotel to be located at 135 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. with the following conditions:

1. Revise the brick selection to a more manufactured style brick to be more compatible with the contributing building to which this building is visually related; submit to staff for review and approval. - PASS
2. Screen the HVAC units at the front of the building, submit to staff for review and approval.
3. Signage must be submitted for review and approval by the Board.
4. Construct a sample panel on-site for review and approval by staff, in accordance with the adopted Sample Panel Guidelines (attached).

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye

15. [Petition of Time Machine Portrait Company | 13-002780-COA | 205 West River Street | Signs](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Tracy Grant was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval for three removable signs, each 24 inches square, one of which is on a stand, two are fastened to the exterior staircase at 205 West River Street.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends denial of the after-the-fact request for the three removable signs at 205 West River Street because the signs do not meet the standards.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Grant stated that he is the manager of the Time Machine Portrait Company. The owners are in Miami, FL and, therefore, are unable to attend the meeting. He said that they submitted an application to the Review Board earlier about placing signage for their business. They were denied due to the historic nature of the building that they could not put any signs on the building, itself. Mr. Grant [pointing to a section shown on the screen] said the sign on the left is freestanding; it is not attached to the building. The other two signs show the portraits of what they do. Mr. Grant stated that 90% of their clientele is walk-in business right off the street.

Mr. Grant explained that the Time Machine Portrait Company is located on the second floor of the building. The first floor houses a clothing store. There is no way they can get anybody's attention up on the second floor to show that they exist up there. He said that he was not aware of the ordinance when he put the signs up. He apologized and said, however, the signs are removable. They are not permanently attached. They take the signs down and change the pictures from time-to-time. Because this is a walk-in clientele basis, he really does not have any other means of getting the people to come in their shop. He has no other place to put their signage. Mr. Grant said the staircase ends directly at the right-of-way where people walk by. Therefore, there is no room for them to put up a large sign to the front of the building. The signs are basically one inch thick and this is about as much room he has between the right-of-way and where the property owners property line begins.

Mr. Grant solicited suggestions from the Board that they believe might work that would help them to be able to keep their clients coming in and have signage on the front as there is no back entrance and no place else for them to put up signage for this business.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Grant if he thought of using sandwich boards as an option.

Mr. Grant answered that they did have a sandwich board. The problem they had was that the sandwich board encroached into the right-of-way. He explained that if they put the sandwich board where the sign is now, it will encroach into the right-of-way. Their main concern is having someone trip over the sign.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Grant if he gave thought to placing the sandwich board under the stairs.

Mr. Grant said he could place a sign under the stairs where they see the shadowing effect from the stairs, but the problem with this is that it will only be visible if you were standing in front of the building. If the sandwich board is put here and it faces toward left or right where the people travel, they would only see one side of the sign. The clothing store below has the clothing racks and they go all the way out to the right passage. Therefore, it would be blocked on either side by the either the stairs or by the clothing racks.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if the business has windows.

Mr. Grant stated that the store has two windows. The windows are inset quite well. As the windows are on the second floor in the direction of the sun, they are very reflective. At one time, he had a sign in the window, but it was very hard to see any sort of signage placed there. The sign that they put in the window was lit and they were told that it had to be removed because it was a lit sign.

Ms. McClain stated that she was sure there is a sign that Mr. Grant can put in their business that could be coordinated.

Mr. Grant said that he understood, but it is just not visible for traffic to see the signs. There are other businesses such as Dockside next door and the Chart House that have signs hanging from their balconies in front of their businesses.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Grant what signage is this over the sidewalk to the right.

Mr. Grant said the sign belongs to the business below. The sign has been raised to the level it is now. He said he believes that the Historic Board at some point said the sign was too low. Mr. Grant stated that when they approached the Board the first time about putting signage up for the business [pointing to a section] their proposal was to put their sign here. But, the sign for the business below, as he has said, was too low and the business owner had to raise the sign higher. Now, the only problem is that the air space above the top of the sign where the limit is, is only one foot and one-half inch. There is a height requirement that they can not exceed.

Dr. Williams questioned the area where the sidewalk sets off.

Mr. Grant said this is private property of the owners of the building who live above. The right of passageway is the bricked area. He said [pointing to a photo] that the picture shows where the sandwich board sign was setup. But, they were told because it came out in front of the bricked area that they could not use it. Therefore, they used a sign that was placed flat against the wall.

Mr. Engle said he did not know why they were hearing this request as they do not have the authority to overturn the sign ordinance. Why is the Board hearing this request?

Ms. Harris explained that the petitioner has the right to petition the Board and ask for the signage. The staff has recommended denial because the sign does not meet the standards.

Mr. Grant said it appears that the standards do not allow them to have a sign of any kind.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Grant to consult with a sign company that does work in the Historic District or a sign company that does signage in the River Street Factors Walk area.

Mr. Howington said staff could also help the petitioner find a solution that could work for him without possibly being a great cost. He said he believes there is a way to do this and meet the ordinance. He asked the petitioner to work with the staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Denial of the after-the-fact request for three removable signs at 205 West River Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

16. [Petition of Harold Yellin | 13-003086-COA | 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Garage Opening](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Project Narrative and Garage Door Specification.pdf](#)

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

Attorney Harold Yellin was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to install one 16 foot wide garage door opening on the rear wall of the property located at 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue. This new opening will replace the existing seven foot - ten inch wide garage door and pedestrian door opening on the rear. On November 14, 2012, the Historic Board of Review denied the position to install an eight foot high by 16 foot wide garage door, reduce the height of the historic opening, and remove the non-historic siding. The Board also did not recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a variance from Section 8-3030(n)(13)(d) to allow for the 16 foot wide garage door opening. The standard states that "*garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.*"

Ms. Michalak explained that on November 27, 2012, the ZBA approved a variance from Section 8-3030(n)(13)(d) to allow for the 16 foot wide garage door opening with a "*note that this does not remove the requirement that the petitioner attain approval of the design for the proposed door from the Historic District Board of Review.*"

Dr. Henry, for clarity, asked staff that on November 14, 2012, that this Board did not recommend the approval of granting a variance for this request.

Ms. Michalak said the Board recommended denial of the variance and did not recommend

approval for the variance to the ZBA. However, the petitioner went to the ZBA with his request and it was approved. She explained that with regards to the Secretary of Interior's Standards, none of the standards are met. But, the petitioner has received the variance from the ZBA.

Ms. Simpson asked if the standards are not met, how is it approved.

Mr. Engle explained that the design standards were waived, but the compatibility standards were not waived as they cannot waive these standards. Consequently, the visual compatibility standards is what this Board is judging.

Ms. Michalak said Mr. Engle was correct. These are the only ones that basically apply at this point. The variance has negated the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the Design Standards that state that "*garage openings shall not exceed 12 feet in width.*" She explained that the petitioner has received the variance from the ZBA.

Ms. Michalak explained that as Mr. Engle said, this Board is left with a decision on the visual compatibility factors. She showed an image of the lane on the screen and said all the garage doors shown are existing and the siding is above.

Dr. Williams asked what does the siding cover.

Ms. Michalak answered that it covers the original opening height. She pointed out the original historic opening height and said that all the rest of these have been lowered which was the petitioner's original request and it was denied. Ms. Michalak said that the siding covers just the rest of the opening height. This brought this down and there is an eight foot tall door. The openings are behind the siding.

Ms. Michalak explained that the height is the existing height of the historic masonry opening now instead of lowering it which was denied by the Board. This portion of the historic brick due to the variance has to be removed because this is the 16 feet width with an existing ten foot height.

Dr. Williams asked, therefore, this is not as wide as the previous proposal.

Ms. Michalak answered that it is the same width; just taller.

Dr. Henry stated that if he recalls, the Board was told that it is not possible to put the door in that tall.

Ms. Michalak stated it was not impossible, but that it would be extremely expensive which is not this Board's purview. She reported that based on visual compatibility, staff recommends approval of the garage door and trim design as requested because the design is visually compatible with the adjacent garage door openings.

Mr. Engle said the Board was not given any drawings showing the lintels or details. Therefore, they do not know what is going in here.

Ms. Michalak stated that the petitioner can describe further, but basically this is a full deck wood trim. The petitioner can clarify, but a steel lintel is needed which will not be

seen because it will be trimmed out with wood.

Ms. Ramsay asked that with the existing opening, would there have been a lintel across there.

Ms. Michalak said the petitioner will still need something in between because the historic brick will be removed. She believes it would probably be two lintels, but she cannot see inside.

Ms. McClain asked if there are other double garages in the area like this.

Ms. Michalak pointed out the double garages in the area, but they are lower. The petitioner was denied the lower one the last time.

Mr. Lominack said now it is high.

Ms. Michalak answered yes. She explained that at the meeting held November 14, 2012 staff recommended denial, but staff said if it was going to be approved, they preferred the original opening height to remain the same as it was.

Mr. Howington said, therefore, the petitioner is proposing to keep it at the original height.

Mr. Lominack said it is just that it encompass the door and the garage door.

Ms. Michalak explained that the non-historic siding approximately 26 square feet of brick will be removed.

Dr. Williams stated that this proposal removes even more of the historic fabric.

Ms. Michalak said some of what is requested to be removed is not historic. She said this would have to be clarified with the petitioner, but her understanding that this would not have been able to remain because a new lintel was needed.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Attorney Yellin stated that his wife and he own 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue. They are one of the eight units located at Oglethorpe Row which is commonly known as the Derst Bakery Building. The building was originally built as an auto dealership. It was not originally built for the bakery. It was occupied by the bakery from 1928 to 1949. Since that time various commercial uses were here including a general warehouse, general retail and a furniture store. Attorney Yellin stated that he brings this to the Board's attention because what is on the back at York Street Lane is not a carriage house which is often what comes before them. This building stretches from Oglethorpe Avenue to York Street Lane as one continuous building. The garage they are looking to put on York Street Lane will actually be one of 21 garages which appear in York Street Lane in this short segment between Habersham and Price Streets.

Attorney Yellin said he believes Ms. McClain asked if there are other large doors in the

area. He explained that directly out of his door he looks at a door that he believes is closer to 12 feet than ten feet. It is used by an artist whose gallery is inside and the doors are frequently opened and literally as he walks out his back door, this is the garage door that he sees. Attorney Yellin said, therefore, he just wants to make it clear that there is a variety of doors here. However, it is commercial in nature. He is only bringing all of this to the Board's attention because of the nature of what is here in the back.

Attorney Yellin said procedurally, they are here for the second time. The first time they were asking for a garage door that was 16 feet wide and eight feet high to replace an existing substandard garage door and an existing entry door. He explained that the reason he asked for this the first time around [pointing to an area], these are the meters to the pump room that service the entire property. They belong to his neighbor who cannot move them. The only ones that can be moved are his and his electrician tells him that they can be moved to one side or the other. Therefore, unlike most folks at Oglethorpe Row, he does not have 22 feet to work with, but only 16 feet. Rather than having one substandard garage only serving one car, he came before this Board asking for permission for two cars to be able to park there.

Attorney Yellin said they originally asked for the 16 feet because his neighbor two doors down from him, at 410 East Oglethorpe Avenue, has a garage door 16 feet -8 inches and you can see where brick was put in above the door and painted the color of the building. To the other side of him, his exact next door neighbor, you can actually see the siding from his door was also 16 feet - 8 inches door and you can also see the brick that was added and painted. The Board's vote was very close. It was five to three. He understands that some members thought about changing their vote because they realized that it was that close of a call as what do you do with a property such as this. It is not the average property; it is not residential in nature; it is a warehouse building. He said in fact the original Chadborne Guidelines which talk about 12 feet, talk about carriage houses and lanes. They certainly are a lane, but not a carriage house.

Attorney Yellin said he appealed the decision to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) who granted the variance with a condition that he returns to the Historic Review Board for the design. After that decision, he spoke with Ms. Sarah Ward and Ms. Leah Michalak. He said Ms. Ward emailed him that the recommendation from staff has been that "the new door as approved by the wider dimension from the ZBA should be taller to fit the existing opening, thus preserving the commercial character of the rear façade which is a reflection of the front façade." He said that both Ms. Ward and Ms. Michalak emphasized that they should not create a false sense of historical development.

Attorney Yellin said the proposal that was shown to the Board today is not entirely correct as four panels were shown. The one they are proposing has five panels. He said pointing to an area that in looking from west to east in York Street Lane, they will see that there is a ten foot door here; and then they go eight feet three times; next is his with a siding and the remaining is eight feet all the way down the lane. Attorney Yellin showed a close up view of 404 East Oglethorpe Avenue which was obscured by the trees in the previous photograph. This is a ten foot frame. Therefore, the proposal is rather than having an eight foot door, they thought it would be appropriate rather than to introduce a third design, come back with eight feet or come back with ten feet which follows this pattern. He said that he appreciates the staff's finding that this is an adaptive use. They, too, believe that it is an adaptive use that allows two modern day vehicles to park in a

garage. Attorney Yellin said he also appreciates the finding that their proposal this time does not convey a false sense of historical development and they are finding that going to the ten feet now becomes five panels rather than four (4) would be visually compatible with the adjacent garage doors.

Attorney Yellin respectfully request approval of the staff's recommendation. He entertained questions from the Board.

Dr. Williams said that in a previous picture, one of the garages 16 feet wide has a post in the middle with a light on it; in other words, two smaller garage doors. He asked Attorney Yellin if this was a viable option for his situation.

Attorney Yellin answered that he wishes it was. They are using the full 22 feet of that building and he has 16 feet to work with. In fact, his next door neighbor has two garage doors with a door between her two garage doors and she is actually a part of the problem because her meters [under the declaration of condos] she is allowed to come on any part of the façade. He explained that he is sort of the last to arrive at the building. If he had the full use of 22 feet, there would be a lot of other things he could do. But, as he said, he only has the use of 16 feet which gives him a choice of either having one substandard, two substandard which would probably be about seven feet - eight inches and put in a center column. He said he had this before this Board the last time he was here, the other would be seven feet - six inches or seven feet - four inches. This does not work; they would like to have a home where two cars can park and what they are asking for is really no difference than what is to left of him or what is to the right of him. They are simply coming back now to this Board trying to find something that makes sense. They prefer the eight feet, but he understands now that staff has explained it to him, it makes sense to return to the ten feet.

Ms. Simpson asked Attorney Yellin if the new eight feet bricks in his first proposal would have been painted.

Attorney Yellin answered [pointing to a section] here is 422 East Oglethorpe Ave; it is existing. He lives at 420 East Oglethorpe Avenue. He showed the Board his photograph and said this is what it looks like. The Board can be the judge. The Board can see there is a line here. The paint is identical as it all was painted at the same time. The building is 270 feet long from Price to Habersham Streets; it is a continuous building. He said that his unit is exactly in the middle. If you are traveling south on Price Street you will not see his garage and if you are traveling north or south on Habersham Street, you will not see his garage. He guesses if you walk down the lane, you will see his garage. Attorney Yellin said he believes the question is whether or not this is satisfactory. He said you will be able to tell the difference. Pointing to an area, he said the brick was added here.

Ms. Simpson said she was asking Attorney Yellin if with his, you would be able to tell the difference.

Attorney Yellin said he could not judge what his brick mason would be nor how good they will do, he believes, however, they will do a good job. He said [pointing to an area] here is 410 East Oglethorpe Avenue.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said it might look better than the surrounding brick.

Ms. Simpson said her point is if you would be able to tell that the replacement brick is not original.

Attorney Yellin answered yes and no; he believes that 410 East Oglethorpe Avenue looks better than 422 East Oglethorpe Avenue. He would not want to tell the Board what kind of job is brick mason would or would not do. There are certainly reasons for his door to look just like his neighbor to the right and left. He understands the reasons for wanting his door to be ten feet high which is to go back to what was perhaps the original opening. There is a broken header; but at the end of the day, he believes these are his two choices. However, he would hate to introduce a third element and this is why he came to this Board. Initially, he asked for eight feet; but today he is asking for ten feet.

Ms. Simpson asked Attorney Yellin if he would be amicable to eight feet.

Attorney Yellin answered yes. He would be amicable to eight feet or ten feet. He is ready to get started.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she believes the eight feet door would work better.

Mr. Engle said they would be taking out less fabric with the eight feet door.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said may be the brick could be salvageable and used elsewhere.

Attorney Yellin said they will do everything within their power to make it look more like 422 East Oglethorpe Avenue.

Mr. Howington said that Attorney Yellin presented the 10 feet door, but has stated he is agreeable to either the eight foot door or the ten foot door. He asked him which door was his preference.

Attorney Yellin said he would be honest, but it is not for historical reason. He likes the idea that when he pushes a garage door, that it closes sooner not later. He assumes that an eight foot door closes sooner than a ten foot door. This probably is the wrong reason to give to the Board as it is not a historical response, but he believes he prefers an eight foot door for that reason.

Ms. Michalak explained that there is a standard that says "historic carriage houses and accessory structures the original entry dimension shall not be modified." She said making the entry appear lower without differentiating that the opening has changed does not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Ms. Simpson said this is why she asked the question about whether you would be able to tell the difference. She said you should be able to tell that it is different.

Ms. Michalak said this was the basis that the Board denied the request the last time. She just wanted to clear this up. It is suppose to be differentiated per the Preservation Standards.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Patrick Shay said he was speaking as a neighbor. He resides further down the block at 434 East Oglethorpe Avenue. Attorney Yellin is his attorney and they work together on a lot of things. He said that he has also helped Attorney Yellin on some of his plans for the inside of his unit.

Mr. Shay said he was the architect, developer and builder of the row that Attorney Yellin is getting ready to move into. He wants the Board to understand about the brick. At the time that they began their work there about 15 years ago, there were probably at least 20 different kinds of brick on the buildings as it had been piece-meal modified so many different times. This was the reason that after a lot of soul-searching that they decided to paint the building as it really looked terrible. Mr. Shay said each time the brick was added, there was no thought at all given to color, texture or anything. Therefore, it was not only 20 different kinds of bricks, but it was 20 different kinds of pointing. He said many of the garage doors were already there on the lane side. The building was used as warehousing for a generation at the time that they acquired it. All the garage doors on Oglethorpe Avenue side, that has all the front doors and the beautiful tree lawn, were concrete apron and garage doors.

Mr. Shay said, therefore, to the extent that they could, they tried to use all bricks that they could. This is why there is so many different bricks here and why it would be not inappropriate, but very difficult to try and remember all the different iterations of what it once was. He did not want the Board to belabor too long about the fact that there will be different kinds of bricks or even texture and different mortars. The thing that blends it all together is the color that they chose to paint it. Mr. Shay said they looked at a bunch of different colors and at the end of the day someone said to him why not paint it a brick color.

Mr. Shay said as a neighbor he believes it is very appropriate. He said that at the time they redeveloped the building, it was here and is very close to the lane. The buildings on the opposite side were also very close. Therefore, the maneuvering room between the buildings is narrow. Because of this it is hard to maneuver in and out of even an eight foot garage door successfully and reducing it to a seven foot - six inches would make it really impossible.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Simpson said she believes that it should be noticeable that there is a drop from the ten feet.

Mr. Engle said technically the bricks should not be painted.

Dr. Williams asked if the motion could include that the bricks be painted as necessary.

Mr. Engle answered yes, that the bricks be painted as necessary to match the rest of the building.

Board Action:

Approval of the garage door and trim with the conditions that the opening be reduced to eight feet (8'), that the coursing of the brick infill above the door be differentiated from the existing brick, and that the new brick be painted to match the existing. - PASS
The revised design is to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Chad Jason Brock | 13-003154-COA | 521 East York Street | Pergola](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Chad Jason Brock was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for construction of a pergola at 521 East York Street. The pergola is located along Houston Street and is approximately nine and one-half feet tall, the top 19 inches of which are visible above the existing courtyard wall. It is proposed to be painted Charleston Green, and has a slightly pitched roof to be covered in grey shingles.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends denial of the after-the-fact pergola at 521 East York Street because it is not visually compatible and does not meet the standards.

Dr. Williams asked if the pergola was lower and not visible would this be within this Board's purview.

Ms. Harris answered that it would not be with this Board's purview.

Dr. Henry said if the petitioner lowered the pergola to seven and one-half feet or even eight feet and they would not have a problem.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if the pergola is on a platform.

Ms. Harris said this is not visible from the street. She believes the raised section could

be a patio.

Mr. Engle said asphalt shingles should be on the roof.

Ms. Harris confirmed that it is proposed to have asphalt shingles.

Mr. Howington said the application states that the pergola is partially complete. He said may be some pieces maybe missing. They keep to in mind that it could be trimmed and painted.

Ms. Harris said the pergola is presently unpainted, but it is proposed to be painted Charleston Green.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Brock stated that a deck is on the interior. The 1978 addition was on a concrete slab about 20 inches tall. The deck comes off the door on the back. This somewhat increased the height. They thought it would be underneath the height of the wall, but when they start constructing it, they saw that it would be a little bit over. They did not realize that it would be that visible. Mr. Brock said that they would gladly knock it down below the wall; except with the deck there, it is not a workable height. If the Board is agreeable for him to keep the height on the interior of the courtyard, but slope it down where it comes down below the wall so that it would be less visible. It would still be accessible where someone could walk in and sit down on the seating area.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Brock what he meant by saying less visible.

Mr. Brock stated that the part that is adjacent to the wall would not be as high; if he could increase the pitch and keep the height that is in the courtyard.

Mr. Engle said then the asphalt shingles would be seen from the outside.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Brock that since the pergola is partially constructed is the intent to put trim around. He said that some rafters are exposed.

Mr. Brock said it will be trimmed, but he stopped working on it when the inspector came by. But, his idea was to have a trim piece here. He was trying to keep it simple. Mr. Brock said this is trying to bridge two gaps here; there is the 1840 structure and a more modern structure. The Charleston Green came from the windows and the modern addition.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Brock if the wall is nine feet.

Mr. Brock answered yes.

Dr. Henry said he saw no reason why the deck could not be lowered as well as the roof and he would still be able to stand underneath it.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Brock if the wall was raised 18 inches one and one-half years ago.

Mr. Brock answered yes.

Mr. Engle said if the Board looks at the elevation, the photograph shows where the original wall height was. The Board approved raising a wall 18 inches a couple of years ago.

Mr. Howington asked that picture #4 be displayed on the screen. He explained that if the pergola was trimmed down and painted green, it would be much less noticeable. Mr. Howington said while there is not a standard for this and maybe this is staff's discussion, but he would argue that this is a trellis. The ordinance says trellises may be made out of wood.

Dr. Henry said a roof is on the pergola.

Mr. Engle said trellises do not have roofs. If it was a trellis with vines on it, this would be a different ball game.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Brock if there was an option of having the deck step down close to the wall so that basically the entire structure could be lower. This is one of the ways to solve the problem. He asked Mr. Brock if this would be a possibility for him on his end.

Mr. Brock stated that he had a builder build the deck. Therefore, he was not positive on this.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Brock if the deck was wood or concrete.

Mr. Brock stated that it is a wood deck.

Mr. Lominack said, therefore, the deck is removable.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said he does not believe that trimming this will fix the problem.

Mr. Lominack said if quality drawings were submitted with the application, the staff probably would not have brought this before the Board. The drawings do not describe how this will be completed.

Board Action:

Denial of the after-the-fact pergola at 521 East York Street because it is not visually compatible - PASS and does not meet the standards.

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.	
Second: Reed Engle	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 13-003155-COA | 0 Alice Street | New Construction Multiple Residences: Part I, Height and Mass

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Ms. Maggie Ward was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ellen Harris gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, of four detached two-story single family dwellings at 0 Alice Street, between Jefferson and Montgomery Street, and Alice and Gaston Streets. The building are oriented to front Alice Street. As a part of this development, the parcel will be subdivided into four parcels. She passed the model to the Board of their review.

Ms. Harris reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions:

1. Eliminate the one foot front yard setback.
2. Increase the height of the foundation to 24 inches.
3. Increase the recess of the faux windows to at least one inch to provide greater contrast on the façade.
4. Increase the roof pitch to 4:12 so that the pitch on the gable will meet the standard and be more consistent with contributing buildings.

Dr. Henry said in his recollection, he has never seen in the Historic District four identical houses. They are separate than row houses obviously.

Ms. Harris stated that there are a number of row houses that are typically identical. This was mentioned by a Board member. Therefore, she did a preliminary visual survey. But, she will not say that it was an in-depth survey. Ms. Harris said she was able to find one example within the immediate vicinity of three identical houses. However, the houses are not historic, but they did go through the review process and were approved.

Dr. Henry asked when were the houses approved.

Ms. Harris pulled up a photo of 419, 421 and 423 Tattnell Street showing that they were

identical ad noted that they were built in 2000.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Ward stated that she is employed by Gunn Meyerhoff and Shay. She was representing the project and the owner. She said that they agree with all of staff's recommendations. They have added sills and headers on the east end of the over-accessed. They have added a little more visual entrance to that side.

Ms. Ward said they do not have an issue with any of the staff's recommendations. They will be happy to correct them.

Mr. Engle said looking at this neighborhood, he can see single family homes, but this neighborhood is generally rows of five, six or duplexes which are identical each half. He said what bothers him with this is there are four identical family-houses, but the stoops are recessed. They are already recessing the front elevation one foot. Mr. Engle said, however, he could not think of another case in this neighborhood where a stoop is recessed behind the front elevation and not projecting outward. Particularly, the steps are recessing into the stoop.

Mr. Engle stated that he has no real problem with a foot [it will end up being a weed patch], but the point is if they are asking for a variance to setback a foot from the line, why are the stoops somewhat projecting outward.

Ms. Ward explained that she may have read it incorrectly, but she believes that a part of the ordinance is to have a parallel projection to the street. She said she was only trying to continue with one of the visual compatibility standards.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward what was she trying to parallel.

Ms. Ward answered parallel to the street; she said have a parallel plan to the street. She believes she read this at some point. Therefore, she was trying to keep the projection of the roof parallel with the façade of the building. Ms. Ward said this is why she did this, but she would be happy to actually project the stoop over to the property line.

Mr. Engle said a recessed was shown, but it was a recessed entry not a stoop.

Ms. Ward said she looked at a bay condition. If they look at a bay window and how it may actually recess the stoop inside, it is another visual compatibility that she was looking at in the neighborhood as well. She pointed out that this is shown on page 15.

Dr. Williams said the stoops project toward the bay.

Mr. Engle said it reads as flat. The stoop should be a statement. But, it does not read as such.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said if the petitioner agrees to elevate it, another riser of treads need to be added so that it projects.

Ms. Ward said they are no longer asking to set back a foot; they agree with staff on this.

Dr. Williams said stoops can project outward onto the sidewalk. He asked why not build a row of houses.

Ms. Ward explained that their client specifically asked for detached homes and they agreed with him. He is trying to reach a broader clientele of someone who desires to move into an urban setting, but still have a detached home. Ms. Ward said she looked around in the area and she saw these types of homes within the neighborhood; not exactly and completely repetitious, but compatible buildings as some of the recently improved buildings such as shown by Ms. Harris.

Ms. Simpson asked why faux windows.

Ms. Ward said that it is on the property line; it is a code requirement.

Mr. Lominack said there is no code requirement for the windows, but for the noncombustible wall.

Dr. Henry said he lives in a row of duplexes which are a little different, but he has never seen four identical houses. He said if they look at the top row facing Alice Street as shown on the petitioner's submittal on page 20, he has never seen anything like this in the Historic District.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board approved the row of detached townhomes on Perry Street at Price Street with minor modifications.

Ms. Ward said she looked at this as an example and decided to go with the matching height and mass.

Mr. Howington said his opinion is that the townhomes on Perry Street are too much the same. He knows the Board approved this, but he would not use this as a good example.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes that if an identity for each building is desired, this is something that could be addressed in the design details standards such as the fascia color, shape, add some sort of different bracketing, color of doors, trim color and so forth to give each individual building their own identity.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ward if it was possible for them to just redesign the front. Maybe two of the four could be different.

Ms. Ward said maybe just do a different shape and form.

Dr. Williams said the petitioner's problem is she is trying to achieve an effective row with detached houses. He said if they want them identical, then they have a row. If they want more detached houses, then give them individual character.

Mr. Engle said if Ms. Ward is going to rework the stoops to have them projecting, it gives the opportunity to do some real changes. One might be flat roof and the other may be something else; one could have a porch.

Ms. Simpson said the Board is not designing the houses.

Ms. Ward said she realized this, but she likes the suggestions of making each stoop different from building to building.

Dr. Williams said there are a lot of different ways that the petitioner could stay within the approximate parameters of these with varying bay shapes, fenestrations, door locations, single windows over the stoop, and double windows over the stoop.

Ms. Ward stated as she said when she was doing the research for this project, she looked at the Perry Street buildings and saw that there was a differentiation between each building. This pushed her even further to want to do the matching height and mass and then do individual characteristics.

Mr. Lominack said that he does not believe that they should be giving this kind of design direction, but he would be very careful about throwing gimmicks on buildings to make them look different. They have seen so much of this come before this Board where things even reach the point of not making sense just to be different from each other. He said if the right façade is gotten, stick with it. He does not see any need to change it for the sake of change.

Mr. Engle said it is not an issue until Part II, but he would mention the lintels. He said that lintels are supposed to be lintels.

Mr. Lominack said the windows look like something that someone filled them in for some reason.

Dr. Henry suggested that Ms. Ward ask her clients to go to a rowhouse format or duplex.

Ms. Ward said she will bring this to their client; and she will also bring to his attention of trying to change each building individually.

Mr. Engle said they asked for the four windows on Tattnall Street because it had a huge elevation and the neighbors were very upset.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Leon Quilloin stated that he was present on behalf of First Tabernacle Baptist Church. They want to be aware of what is exactly going on. The church is not concerned about how the buildings will be situated, but they are concerned about what goes on in the neighborhood. They do not want the housing to turn into a dormitory. Mr. Quilloin said they are aware that a house will be rented to four or five students and shortly thereafter you have a proliferation of too many people in the neighborhood.

Mr. Quilloin said there is only about four or five parking spaces in this block on the south side of the street. The church might disturb the residents more than they would disturb them because of the many activities that they have at their church five nights a week.

Mr. Quilloin said First Tabernacle wants to know what is going on from day one through the licensing processing and permitting. Today, this is just an exploratory interest to find out exactly what is being proposed in the area.

Mr. Eli Karatassos came forward and stated that he resides at 464 Montgomery Street. He said his neighbor who lives in the duplex next to him would have attended this meeting today, but is unable to due to being in court. Their concern is that they are a fence away from this new proposed development.

Mr. Karatassos asked if the site plan shows distances. He said [pointing to an area] that the duplex he lives in is right here. The fence that is shown is the fence that is between them and the property. He does not know how wide the property is. The Savannah Restoration is in this area and operates out a converted warehouse. A question was raised about whether this should be a row.

Mr. Karatassos said he works with staff as he is on a couple of Boards. But, it seems to him that if you search in the Downtown Historic District and finds only one example of three similar detached homes, then in fact, this is not a standard. It is an exception. He said that four individual units is an exception rather than the rule. The staff's report talks about the open space between the buildings and the other areas about compatibility. However, he said that he takes exception with the compatibility. There is virtually no open space; the only open space here is in the back. Traffic comes up Gaston Street because it is the first street that you can get through from east and west, but when you get here, you have to turn because you cannot go straight through to MLK.

Mr. Karatassos said he knows this is not within this Board's purview, but when you talk about massing and it effects what the parking circumstances are, it means that backing cars into Gaston Street is a recipe for a disaster. There are accidents here all the time. Therefore, he would say that if they were not trying to build so much on the property and there was more open space, there might be a better way for them to deal with their own parking circumstances.

Mr. Karatassos [pointing to an area of some pictures on the screen] said the fence is not shown, but the fence is an important part of this entire thing; it is the entire argument. He said everything here is a duplex or row. He loves this area as it is a good neighborhood. He pointed out the front of his building and there is a unit that has a driveway that goes through and the other unit has a driveway that goes behind it. This driveway runs along the side of the petitioner's property. He said these houses are right on top of them. When you look at the scale on the model and when you look at the pictures, it appears that there is plenty of room between their house and the fence, but when they get into as they all know that when you live downtown, these are the places [courtyard] that they live in like a living room. This is where they eat, sit talk and greet and meet. When you talk property line, which is the fence, and a building is five feet away from the property line, that is close.

Mr. Karatassos explained that he has 13 windows and a door staring at him. The proposed buildings have nothing to do with this neighborhood. He is for things and not usually against things, but he would like to see this property not take up the entire property so that it would give the neighbors some space. Mr. Karatassos pointed out his neighbors who live next door to him and their driveway. Looking at the site plan, he said that this line

represents the wall to their property. He said that this is how tight it is here. It is on top of them. He said privacy walls are here and the other walls are the ones with 13 windows and a door. He explained that this house overlooks the warehouse; these 13 windows will look onto a wall. The sun will not be able to get through five feet. He believes the hope of having detached buildings is to get more sunshine in. However, he has lived in rowhouses for many years. You get sunshine in the back. Mr. Karatassos said the petitioner is trying to do a lot here, but he believes too much is being done. The idea of literally having 13 windows on top of him frightens him. They will no longer have an outdoor living room.

Mr. Karatassos said he believes that there is a lot of room for compatibility for new construction and he is hopeful that the petitioner will come back with something that is more sensitive to the neighbors and not be on top of them. He said the windows will not get a lot of sunshine anyway; so put them on the other side.

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with staff's recommendations. Particularly, they agree with the recommendation to make a steeper pitch on the gable roof [this may be the intention of that recommendation], but they believe that the rest of the roof should be made a steeper pitch as well to create more verticality.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF has some hesitation about the style of the front door. They believe that the sidelights need to be restudied to be more in keeping with the window design and the rest of the style that is being implied by the rest of the buildings. She said of this relates to and may be addressed in Part II, but as it relates to the mass, the fascia as it appears now is very wide or deep. A lot of the neighboring buildings that this is drawing inspiration from do have a very deep fascia, but they have brackets, ornamentations or details. Therefore, the HSF wanted to emphasize for Part II that some sort of detailing be incorporated if this is going to remain wide on the fascia boards.

Ms. Meunier said that the HSF would be in favor of the buildings being joined in some form, either duplexes or study the buildings being different as there were some concerns raised about all them being identical. She believes that there are some options there; whether it is just orientation of the buildings if they remain separate along with some of the ideas that the Board has already pointed out regarding the porticos. Ms. Meunier said they are in favor of this being restudied.

Ms. Ramsay called for further public comments. No one else came forward. She asked Ms. Ward if she wanted to respond to the public's comments.

Ms. Ward stated that if the Board looks at the site plan in the right-hand corner, they are at 37% building coverage and 75% is allowed.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Ward why didn't they orient the houses to Gaston Street.

Ms. Ward answered that Alice Street has a wider sidewalk and Hollingsworth Auto is on Gaston Street. Therefore, they would be facing Hollingsworth Auto which has a 15 feet deep parking strip.

Ms. Ward said right around the corner there are contributing detached homes. Also, the

ward behind them [Gaston Ward] has a number of detached homes. Therefore, there are a number of detached homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Lominack said it appears that there are several different kinds of windows.

Ms. Ward explained that there are different width windows.

Mr. Lominack stated that there are different patterns to the glass as well.

Mr. Engle said this will be discussed in Phase II. He said personally, he believes there is just too many issues at this point.

Ms. Ramsay informed Ms. Ward that the Board cannot continue the petition unless she asks for a continuance. She asked her if she anticipates asking for a continuance.

Ms. Ward said she would consider asking the Board for a continuance if she could get a little more clarification from the Board. She asked if the detached homes would be compatible with the neighborhood if they were a little different or slightly different.

Mr. Engle stated that they need to be more compatible.

Dr. Williams said row houses would be more compatible with the neighborhood.

Ms. Ward said this is the reason they took cues from the surrounding buildings. They were trying to get the vernacular and architectural language of the neighboring buildings.

Mr. Howington said he believes unattached units would be better. However, if it is detached to him the massing seems a little suburban.

Ms. Ward [pointing to an area] said they were looking at this example with the gable fronting the street.

Mr. Lominack explained that this is a row and takes on different proportions when more units are obtained.

Mr. Howington stated that it also has a horizontal eve going through it instead of a double pediment.

Mr. Engle said the stoops also project onto the sidewalk. They are mimicking the design details, but they are missing the whole context. There are a lot of little details. The shingles do not project beyond the fascia. There are a lot of technical details that do not work here. However, this would probably be covered in the Part II Design Details.

Mr. Howington said he believes there are some massing concerns as well.

Ms. Ward said she needs to know before leaving the meeting today whether the detached characteristics of the building is compatible with the neighborhood before she start trying to change the design. She said in looking at the Perry Street example that the Board talked about, she realizes that the contractor made one roof overhang a little more; they made one of the pitches a little different and changed the stoops and added an addition to the back of

the building. Therefore, if it is something along the line of roof change in order to keep the detached homes, they will definitely be coming back with the detached submittal again.

Mr. Lominack stated that he believes that several of the Board members of having a problem with four detached homes. He said he personally would like to see the homes move towards contemporary.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board cannot design the homes.

Ms. Simpson said she agrees with Mr. Howington that the Perry Street example used by the petitioner is too much of the same; even though, they had a slight differentiation.

Dr. Henry said yes; there are stand-alone homes, but there is an awful lot of row houses in this neighborhood. He said he believes the row houses would look better for this site.

Ms. Simpson stated that the detached homes are in a different ward.

Ms. Ward asked for the continuance.

Board Action:

Continue the petition at the request of the petitioner. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

19. [Petition of Linda Jacobs | 13-002479-COA | 315 East York Street | Staff Approved - Color Change, Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 315 East York Street 13-002479-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 315 East York Street 13-002479-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. [Petition of Coastal Canvas Products | 13-002883-COA | 9 East River Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 9 East River Street 13-002883-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 9 East River Street 13-002883-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

21. [Petition of Chantal Gloor for Riverside Resorts, Inc. | 13-002903-COA | 125 West River Street, Unit 4 | Staff Approved - Window](#)

Attachment: [COA - 125 West River Street, Unit 4.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 125 West River Street, Unit 4.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Patrick L. Phelps for Hansen Architects, PC | 13-003038-COA | 23 East Charlton Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair/Repointing/Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 23 East Charlton Street 13-003038-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 23 East Charlton Street 13-003038-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Amended Petition of James Johnson for Marchese Construction, LLC | 13-003064-COA | 100 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 100 Bull Street 13-003064-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 100 Bull Street 13-003064-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Stephanie Weisensale | 13-003088-COA | 317 West River Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 317 W. River Street 13-003088-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 317 W. River Street 13-003088-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Tom Sharpe Properties, LLC | 13-003089-COA | 134 Lincoln Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 134 Lincoln Street 13-003089-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 134 Lincoln Street 13-003089-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Amended Petition of Sherryl Lang for Juliette Gordon Low Birthplace | 13-003150-COA | 10 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 10 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-003150-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 10 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-003150-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Eric O'Neill for Greenline Architecture | 13-003151-COA | 439 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Porch Railings Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 439 Habersham Street 13-003151-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 439 Habersham Street 13-003151-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Marshall Urstadt | 13-003193-COA | 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Suite H | Staff Approved - Entry Doors](#)

Attachment: [COA - 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue - Ste H 13-003193-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 513 East Oglethorpe Ave - Ste H 13-003193-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Amended Petition of South Coast Renovations, Inc. | 13-003194-COA | 101 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Screen HVAC Units](#)

Attachment: [COA - 101 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-003194-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 101 East Oglethorpe Ave 13-003194-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Amended Petition of South Coast Renovations, Inc. | 13-003195-COA | 101 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Existing Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 101 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-003195-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 101 East Oglethorpe Ave 13-003195-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Amended Petition of Richard and Theresa Feldstein | 13-003198-COA | 114 West Wayne Street | Staff Approved - Garage Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 114 Wayne Street 13-003198-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 114 Wayne Street 13-003198-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of David Maximilien Colas | 13-003291-COA | 9 West Bay Street | Staff Approved -](#)

Pressure Wash and Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 9 West Bay Street 13-003291-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 9 West Bay Street 13-003291-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. Petition of Sam Carroll for Concrete Interior Forms | 13-003292-COA | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement and Window Repair

Attachment: [COA - 115 East Jones Street 13-003292-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 115 East Jones Street 13-003292-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. Petition of Keith Woods for Commonwealth Construction of GA, LLC | 13-003299-COA | 214-222 Houston Street | Staff Approved - Window and Sill Repair/Replace

Attachment: [COA - 214-222 Houston Street 13-003299-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 214-222 Houston Street 13-003299-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. Petition of Michael Merrill and Joe Rogers | 13-003319-COA | 103A and 103B West Gordon Street | Staff Approved - Shutters and Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 103A and 103B West Gordon Street 13-003319-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 103A and 103B West Gordon Street 13-003319-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas | 13-003333-COA | 24 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Four Awnings

Attachment: [COA - 24 Drayton Street 13-003333-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 24 Drayton Street 13-003333-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. Petition of Barrow Koslosky for Cogdell & Mendrala Architects, PC | 13-003365-COA | 718 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard | Staff Approved - Rehabilitation and Alterations

Attachment: [COA - 718 MLK Jr. Blvd 13-003365-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 718 MLK Jr. Blvd 13-003365-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

38. [Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without COA 7-10-13.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay informed the Board that the staff has provided them a written report in their packet of the work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

39. [Report on Items Deferred to Staff](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 7-10-13.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay informed the Board that the staff has provided them a written report in their packet on the items deferred to staff.

XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

40. [Parliamentary Procedures Workshop | July 29, 2013 | 9:00-2:00 | 112 East State Street](#)

Ms. Harris stated that an email was sent to the Board regarding the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop to be held at the MPC Office July 29, 2013 from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. The workshop is not exclusive to certain boards as it is open to all Board members that the MPC staff serves. As the date gets a little closer, Ms. Harris informed the Board that she will ask for RSVP so that we can get a head count of the attendance.

Mr. Thomson said he attended a half-day training conducted by Ms. Sarah Merkle. She is an attorney. The training is well done and focuses on what this Board faces as Board members and how to deal with procedures. He said earlier an amended motion was made and the Board got into a discussion about the original motion person accepting this. This is informal, the formal way would have been the amended motion be seconded and voted on. The training will help the Board to focus on the procedural things that they bump into sometimes. Mr. Thomson encouraged the Board members to attend, even if it was just for the morning session. He said that a lot of the basics are covered in the morning session while in the afternoon it covers mostly case studies.

Ms. Ramsay encouraged all the members to attend the training.

41. [2013 Historic Preservation Commission Training, Thursday August 15, 2013 in Savannah, Georgia](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Burns HPC Training August 2013 in Savannah.pdf](#)

Ms. Harris stated that as the Board knows, the Historic Preservation Commission Training will be held in Savannah Thursday, August 15, 2013. Four members of the Historic Review Board have stated they will attend the training. She invited all of the Board members to attend, if possible.

Ms. Simpson asked if she was included in the four to attend.

Ms. Harris answered yes.

Ms. Michalak said the information regarding this training is attached to today's agenda.

Ms. McClain said she will attend the next training.

Ms. Simpson asked her if she minds attending the training in her spot.

Ms. McClain said this is two days after her birthday; therefore, she is not sure if she will be able to attend.

42. Next Meeting - Wednesday August 14, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

43. 2013 Board Retreat Discussion

Ms. Harris said it is her understand that the Board has its retreat traditionally in the second half of August every year. However, because the Historic Preservation Committee Training is on August 15, 2015, it was suggested that the Board discuss whether this training would replace or supplement the retreat. Does the Board want to move the retreat to September, 2013?

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked what does the retreat involve.

Ms. Harris explained that it is an all day retreat that is held outside of the MPC office. The location can vary. The first half of the day concern the chair items that have come up over the previous year; things of concern; things of discussion and other things that the Board needs to be improving on. There may be a variety of topics. This discussion is led by the Chair. Lunch is provided and in the afternoon, staff sets up a number of different activities including various speakers.

Ms. McClain said she believes that Ms. Harris was asking the Board if they would rather have the retreat in August or September. She said she would

prefer to have the retreat in August.

Ms. Ramsay said if a Board member has issues that they want to place on the agenda, please email her and send a copy to Ms. Harris and Ms. Michalak. She said maybe the Board could do a half day in August that they all could agree on, but if not move the date to September.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if the public has a time limit to speak when making their comments.

Ms. Ramsay said if they anticipate that there are going to be a large number of persons to speak, the Board can restrict them to each speaking no longer than five (5) minutes or each side speak no longer than 15 minutes.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked, therefore, it is not a general blanket time limit that a person as two minutes or five minutes to speak.

Ms. Ramsay answered that the Board has never done that.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she believes the Board needs to look into having time limits for the public comments.

Dr. Williams asked if this would be a By-law change if they did the time limit.

Mr. Howington said the Chair as the right to set the time limit.

Mr. Thomson explained that the Planning Commission has a procedure in their By-laws that gives minimum times for the pro and con. He believes it is ten or fifteen minutes for each person. However, the Chair can set the time limit per person. Mr. Thomson said where all the Boards that he sees getting into trouble is having a dialogue with people who come to provide comments. This is different from the applicant or staff.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

44. Adjourned

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem