



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
May 8, 2013 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

MAY 8, 2013 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

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

HDRB Member Not Present: Reed Engle

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

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Approval of Agenda](#)

Board Action:

Approve Agenda for the Meeting of May 8, 2013. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Keith Howington
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

2. [Called to Order](#)

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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3. [Approve Minutes of April 10, 2013](#)

Attachment: [04-10-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve April 10, 2013 Meeting Minutes - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Marjorie W Reed

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

III. SIGN POSTING

IV. CONTINUED AGENDA

4. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-12-4727-2 | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction, Hotel 1: Part I and Part II](#)

Board Action:

Continue to June 12, 2013 at the applicant's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Keith Howington

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

5. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa for Signs for Minds | 13-001723-COA | 102 East Broughton Street | Fascia Sign](#)

Board Action:

Continue to June 12, 2013 due to an incomplete application. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Keith Howington
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

V. CONSENT AGENDA

6. [Petition of John Harkins | 13-000595-COA | 141 Lincoln Street | Fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the six foot tall wooden privacy fence at the rear of the property at 141 Lincoln Street because it meets the preservation and design standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Keith Howington
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

7. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa for Signs for Minds | 13-001457-COA | 4 West Broughton Street | Fascia Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use fascia sign as requested because it meets the standards and is compatible. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Keith Howington
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

8. [Petition of Brian Felder | 13-001791-COA | 27 Bull Street | ATM](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval to install an ATM with signage on the west façade below the drive-through canopy for the property located at 27 Bull Street because it is visually compatible and meets the design standards. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Keith Howington

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

9. [Petition of Satisfied Cuisine & Sports | 13-001837-COA | 301 West Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the projecting principal use sign for "Sweet Potatoes," at 301 West Broughton Street as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Keith Howington

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

10. [Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs | 13-001841-COA | 10C Whitaker Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawing and Photo.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use projecting sign because it is visually compatible, meets the preservation standards, and sign standards in the ordinances. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Keith Howington
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

11. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-001856-COA | 115 East Bay Street | Addition, alteration, and fence](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for the courtyard bar, alterations to the privacy wall and gate, and to relocate the stair at the rear of the property at 115 East Bay Street as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Keith Howington
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Abstain
Marjorie W Reed - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Not Present

12. [Petition of Signs for Minds | 13-001857-COA | 117 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use projecting sign and a supplemental identification sign for the "Oglethorpe Lodge" at 117 East Bay Street provided that the projecting sign maintain a minimum vertical clearance of 10 feet above the sidewalk. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Keith Howington
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

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

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

[13. Petition of Lominack Kolman Smith Architects | 13-001383-COA | 533 East Congress Street | New Construction Residence: Part II, Design Details](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Looking South.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Note: Mr. Lominack recused from participating in this petition. He is a partner of the Lominack Kolman Smith Architects firm.

Ms. Anne Smith was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction, Part II Design Details, of a three-story single-family residence and garage on the corner property at 533 East Congress Street. A variance to allow for a zero setback for structured parking within the ground floor of the proposed carriage house is requested. Ms. Ward passed the material boards to the Board for their review.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction, Part II Design Details, of a three-story single-family residence and garage on the corner property at 533 East Congress Street with the condition that a sloped apron to the garage not be erected in the public right-of-way. Staff also recommends that the Board recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the 30 foot structured parking setback variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n) (14)b to allow a zero setback along the north-south connecting street for the carriage house because the variance and the design is consistent with the development pattern of carriage houses on corner lots and the intent of this ordinance.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ward: where will the dark purple color be used?

Ms. Ward answered that the dark color will be in the metal finishes; therefore, it will be in the balcony perforated panels. It will also be in the downspouts; the metal post; fencing materials and gates. A lighter purple is also being proposed which is shown as #2. Ms. Ward said if the Board looks at the elevations, they will see where the colors will go. She said that #1 is the dark purple which is almost black and #2 is the lighter plum color which is being used as an accent color.

Mr. Merriman, for clarity, asked if the perforated metal will be the light purple as well.

Ms. Ward answered no. The perforated metal will be the dark purple. The windows and garage doors will be painted white.

Ms. Simpson asked if some of the bricks will be painted.

Ms. Ward answered no. The parapet course and all the cast stones elements are the cast stone sample that was passed around to the Board. The stucco is to be an Argo Khaki to match the mortar, and the brick will be light brown.

Dr. Henry asked if trees are shown on the corner of the lot.

Ms. Ward, pointing to a section, said there are a few trees shown in the tree lawn along here.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ward what is meant by sloped apron.

Ms. Ward explained that the ordinance does not allow aprons to garages to be within the right-of-way. This means where you have to drive through the lane because it blocks service vehicles from getting into the lane if needed. Therefore, any sloping that needs to be done to gain access should be done within the building or within their private property.

Ms. Simpson asked if the center elevation on the top is an inoperable window.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes all the windows are casement windows and operable. However, this is a question that the petitioner can answer. The plan indicates that a swing door is here.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Smith said they agree with the staff's comments. She entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Howington asked there will be steps on the third floor on top of the roof. A big drop is here in front of the mechanical fence.

Ms. Smith answered that they will probably have some sort of step here. But, it is really for utility purposes to be able to get to it for service. They will ensure that this is safe.

Mr. Howington asked if they might slide the fence behind the step.

Ms. Smith stated that it will be difficult to see the view from the right-of-way. There is a section between the carriage house and the main house. You may be able to see it from the lane, but she is not sure.

Mr. Howington said he realizes that the fencing goes around the mechanical units, but he did not know the reason for putting it back so far.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said that they believe that the transoms above the doors and windows on the second level seem to be unnecessary. They are adding to the height of the windows and making them seem to be too tall and somewhat appears to be disproportionate with the ground level windows. They also think the porticos should have a more substantial presence so that it will appear more like a traditional portico. Ms. Meunier explained that she means more in terms of structure as opposed to style. The HSF believes that it should be read as a portico entry and, therefore, suggests possibly adding railings that connect on both sides of the door that connect to the steel columns.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF also feels that the proposed front door seems to be a little out of place. It looks too traditional in styling and, therefore, they believe it should have a more contemporary design.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Meunier to pinpoint where she is talking about the railings.

Ms. Meunier, pointing to a section, explained that where the tall structural columns that are suppose to be identifying the portico, the HSF is suggesting adding some sort of railing. She said she believes that it comes out a little further, but adding some sort of railing here creates a sort of horizontal that identifies this as the stoop and entry to the building.

Ms. Ramsay invited Ms. Smith to response to the public comments.

Ms. Smith explained that regarding the side railing on the structure columns for the portico, if they look at the site plan there is a planting strip adjacent to the building. Therefore, when they look at this from the side, there will be planting here. They don't think this will be necessary as the planting will be here. As far as the transoms, they believe that they are appropriate for the plan. They have the balcony going around them and when you look up, you really just see the upper portion.

Ms. Smith explained that regarding the front door, they feel it is appropriate for their design. They have a nice mix of traditional and contemporary features on the building. They believe this will be a nice touch here.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howington said he does not know how the rest of the Board feels about the steps coming out. He believes that the steps will be seen from the lane. Mr. Howington said he does not know if the petitioner can move the fence over. But, it looks like a utilitarian entrance from the side. He believes the steps should be screened.

Mr. Merriman asked if the steps would come up higher than the fence.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Howington if he was speaking about the door he questioned.

Mr. Howington said yes. He believes that from the streets, you will see the steps. It will feel utilitarian. They will end up with railings or something here. Mr. Howington said he would vote for this to be screened better.

Ms. Simpson questioned the front door.

Mr. Merriman said a good point was made about incorporating a lot of traditional and contemporary design in the building. Therefore, the front door is just a traditional aspect that is on a contemporary building.

Ms. Simpson asked what else is traditional about the building.

Mr. Merriman explained that brick will be here, the massing, and has the stone lintels.

Mr. Howington said normally he is not in favor of having transoms over windows, but he does not know how to resolve the problem here without making really tall windows.

Ms. Simpson said maybe just not have transom windows. This is how it could be resolved. What does the Board think about this?

Ms. Ramsay said if you wanted to have that same amount of light in the interior, the doors would have to be tall.

Mr. Howington said there are only two windows; the rest are doors.

Ms. Simpson said potentially the purpose of the transom windows is for more light.

Mr. Howington said his concern is the space between the top of the door and the windows above that would be really tall. Five of those doors are actual doors out to the balcony. Therefore, they are doors and not windows. There are really two that are windows with transoms above them, which is somewhat odd, but it is a contemporary mix.

Board Action:

Approve the New Construction, Part II Design Details, of a three-story single-family residence and garage on the corner property at 533 East Congress Street with the condition that a sloped apron to the garage not be erected in the public right-of-way and the third floor utilitarian stairs be screened.

The Historic District Board of Review recommends that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the 30 foot structured setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow a zero setback along the north-south connecting street for the carriage house because the variance and the design is consistent with the development pattern of carriage houses on corner lots and the intent of this ordinance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington
Second: Nicholas Henry

Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Abstain
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye

14. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 13-001406-COA | 535 East Congress Street | New Construction Residence: Part I and Part II](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Aerial - Looking South.pdf](#)

NOTE: Dr. Williams arrived at 2:00 p.m.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass and Part II, Design Details of a two-story single-family residence and garage apartment on the property at 535 East Congress Street. Part I was approved at last month's meeting, but the petitioner has submitted a few changes. Therefore, the staff report covers these changes.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval of the amended New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass because it meets the standards and is visually compatible. She further reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part II, Design Details for a two-story single-family residence and garage apartment on the property at 535 East Congress Street with the following conditions be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

- a. Provide a sample of the proposed stucco texture and a color selection for the metal coping to staff for review and approval.
- b. Provide a dimension on the door section indicating that the proposed inset meets the standard.
- c. Provide the proposed garage door material. Staff recommends that the four-lite windows proposed at the top be two-lite windows designed to appear more like the panels below to be more compatible with historic structures.
- d. Reduce the depth for the extension of both the headers and the sills to be more compatible with historic structures of the same material.
- e. The shutters must be sized to fit the opening and have horizontal meeting rails that correspond to the location of the meeting rails of the windows. When closed (including the faux window), the shutters should be flush with the face of the building.
- f. The front stoop eave projection dimension is not indicated on the drawings, but appears too shallow. Staff recommends a deeper projecting eave detail to be more compatible with historic structures.
- g. Staff recommends the following for the front stoop:
 - increase the size of the posts to be more prominent and to be more compatible with historic structures.
 - provide simple square balusters instead of the proposed spindle balusters to be more compatible with historic structures.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked if there is any other stucco buildings in this area. The photos she was looking at showed that the buildings are brick.

Ms. Michalak said she did not add photos of other stucco buildings in the area because she thought some were already added in the packets. Maybe the petitioner has some photos of the surrounding buildings that are stucco.

Mr. Lominack said he was looking at the elevation of the entrance to the low stoop and the roof. He was not sure whether this is drawn right. From looking at the elevation as it appears, that it is a three-sided half of a hexagon.

Ms. Michalak stated that she believes this is a drawing error. She said staff has recommended a change in the pitch. Staff will ensure that this is corrected.

Mr. Howington asked Ms. Michalak to clarify what is meant by the depth of the sills and headers.

Ms. Michalak said it is not the dimensions, but the overhang from the edge of the windows. She believes it is approximately six inches (6") presently.

Ms. Simpson asked if the elevation changed from the last submission.

Ms. Michalak said just the height of the windows was changed.

Ms. Simpson asked if the Board approved the blank window.

Ms. Michalak answered yes.

Dr. Henry asked if cast stone would be better looking than the stucco.

Mr. Merriman said the Board asked recently that others be changed.

Ms. Michalak said that was a commercial building. This was not recommended by staff, but the Board's recommendation.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. M. Ward stated that the stucco will be a finish consistent with the neighborhood. The color of the metal coping will match the roof. The dimension on the door section will meet the standards. The four-lite windows over the garage is not a problem, they will provide the materials. She said that the depth for the extensions over both the header and the sills will be adjusted to be more compatible. The shutters will be sized and fit. Ms. Ward said they agree with all the staff's comments.

Ms. M. Ward said a building around the corner on Broughton Street shows that stucco is between the eave details. She pointed out the brick carriage house that she used as an example for their parapet wall. Another example of a stucco building is on the square. It also has a stucco sill. The profile of the water table projection is on page nine (9).

Mr. Merriman said a header is not here.

Ms. M. Ward said a header is not here; to be consistent they kept it stucco as well.

Dr. Henry said he noticed that the first photo showed iron.

Ms. M. Ward stated that this image was strictly for the eave detail showing that there is no wood behind the eave detail and keeping the stucco behind it.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward to explain the portico roof.

Ms. M. Ward stated that this is a drawing error on the seam of the metal for the stoop projection. They will correct this. She said believes this covers everything, but entertained additional questions from the Board.

Ms. M. Ward pointed out that the drawing that is presently before the Board and to meet all of the staff's recommendation is what they will be voting on. She just wanted to ensure that the Board understood all of the differences.

Mr. Merriman recapped that this reflects the change in the shutters and the columns.

Ms. M. Ward said this covers the depth of the extensions, the shutters fit the opening and have a horizontal meeting rail and are flush with the face of the building; the front stoop eave projection be increased; increase the size of the post; and it has the simple square balusters as well.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Ms. Ward if she increased the size of the newel posts as well.

Ms. M. Ward answered no. She kept the 4 x 4. Ms. Ward said she talked with staff and they agreed for them not to be smaller than the columns on the stoop.

Mr. Howington said the beam above should match the width of the column.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry motioned for approval of the petition with conditions. This was seconded by Mr. Howington. Ms. Ramsay called for discussion on the motion.

Mr. Merriman said there is something about the lintels and the sills being stucco. He would like to see these be cast stone.

Dr. Henry said he agrees. If they are going to reduce the depth which they have done, something needs to be done to make them stand out. Therefore, he believes that cast stone would be better.

Mr. Merriman said as has been pointed out, there were some that just had sills and those lintels were stucco, but it is not a nice looking building.

Ms. Weibe-Reid said she would like to see the water table be a cast stone band as well.

Mr. Merriman asked if the Board wanted to include this in their motion, would it need to be amended or is a new motion needed.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board if they had any further discussion on the motion as presented.

Mr. Howington said cast stone would be more appropriate, but there are examples of stucco sills in the area. Mr. Howington said, however, the Board would be changing the design and he is not sure they are allowed to do this. It was not presented this way.

Dr. Henry amended his motion to include that cast stone sills and headers be added to the windows.

Ms. Ramsay asked Dr. Henry if he was adding the water table in the motion also.

Dr. Henry said yes; the water table band also be cast stone.

Mr. Howington said the Board was changing the design and he was not sure they are allowed to do that. It was not presented that way.

Dr. Henry said Mr. Howington was correct. However, it is not 26 points.

Ms. Simpson asked how is the Board changing the design by changing the material.

Mr. Howington answered that it was not proposed as a cast stone water table and cast stone headers and sills. He was not saying that this is not more appropriate, but this is an expense. Therefore, he is not sure how the Board can change that.

Ms. Simpson said the Board could deny the project.

Mr. Howington said that the Board could, but he is not sure they can request this at this time.

Dr. Henry asked staff if what Mr. Howington is saying is correct.

Ms. S. Ward explained that she believes Mr. Howington is correct; especially since the public comments section has closed. The time to have the dialog with the petitioner is over. Therefore, the Board cannot talk with the petitioner about it.

Mr. Howington explained that he was not saying that he would not like it better, but there are other examples of stucco that were presented.

Mr. Merriman asked is it compatible with what is in the area.

Ms. Ramsay explained that the Board did not ask the petitioner about this during their presentation time.

Mr. Howington said this is his concern. The petitioner did not present it this way. This is an expense and a huge change.

Mr. Lominack asked if the Board could ask the petitioner now.

Ms. Ramsay explained that after the Board makes a motion, the public can not be involved.

Ms. McClain said the motion could be voted down, then call the petitioner back up and then another motion could be made.

Mr. Howington said then they would have denied the project because of the cast stone water table.

Ms. McClain explained that the Board would have denied the motion, not the project. The motion would fail. But, another motion could always be made.

Mr. Howington said he was not against the cast stone, but he was saying it would be a big change to put a cast stone water table on the bottom of a building, sills and everything. This is not what was presented and the Board would be changing the design.

Ms. Simpson said the Board has asked for material changes in the past.

Mr. Merriman said if the changes are done on the basis of visual compatibility, then why can they not do so? They would not be redesigning the building.

Ms. S. Ward explained that the Board would be redesigning the building because they would be saying that the petitioner has to use cast stone. What if the petitioner wanted to use metal, brick or something else? Now, if the Board is saying that it does not meet the ordinance, would be one thing, but if the Board is saying that it has to be this specific material, would be something different.

Ms. Simpson said again that the Board has done this in the past.

Ms. S. Ward answered that she believes if it is something that meets a specific measurable standard in the ordinance, it is a lot easier to do.

Dr. Henry said if the Board wanted to do this, they cannot because they did not do so at the appropriate time in their discussion.

Ms. S. Ward said if the Board had discussed this when the petitioner was making their presentation and they agreed to it, the Board would be more on solid ground than to now require a material change. As Mr. Howington pointed out, a material change is fairly expensive, but not that this is the Board's purview.

Mr. Lominack asked if the motion is withdrawn, can the Board then ask the petitioner.

Ms. S. Ward said the Board could ask the petitioner this according to what the parliamentarian has said.

Dr. Henry withdrew his motion.

Mr. Howington withdrew his seconded motion.

Ms. McClain explained that the petitioner would be called to come back up and then reopen the public comment period.

Ms. M. Ward came forward and said they will use cast stone on both the sill and the header; it is not a problem.

Ms. McClain asked Ms. Ward if the water table will also be cast stone.

Ms. M. Ward answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS REOPENED

None.

Board Action:

Approval of the amended petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass because it meets the standards and is visually compatible. Approve the petition for New Construction: Design Details for a two-story single-family residence and garage apartment on the property at 535 East Congress Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

- a. Provide a sample of the proposed stucco texture and a color selection for the metal coping to staff for review and approval.
- b. Provide a dimension on the door section indicating that the proposed inset meets the standard.
- c. Provide the proposed garage door material and alter the garage door design to be two-lite windows a the top to appear more like the panels below and to be more compatible with historic structures.
- d. Reduce the depth for the extension of both the headers and the sills to be more compatible with historic structures of the same material. - PASS
- e. Change the material of the headers, sills, and water table projection from stucco to cast stone to be more compatible with historic structures.
- f. Size the shutters to fit the window openings and add horizontal meeting rails that correspond to the location of the meeting rails of the windows. When closed (including the faux window), the shutters shall be flushed with the face of the building.
- g. Alter the front stoop eave projection dimension to be deeper and to be more compatible with historic structure.
- h. For the front stoop: increase the size of the posts to be more prominent and provide simple square balusters instead of the proposed spindle balusters to be more compatible with historic structures.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

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

15. [Petition of Anthony D. Hampton | 13-001767-COA | 532 East Taylor Street | Alterations and addition/new construction](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Contributing Building Map - Davis Ward.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Mr. Anthony D. Hampton was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and to add a second story to the one-story structure at 532 East Taylor Street and clad the entire building in Hard-plank siding. No changes to the footprint are proposed, with the exception of the front stoop. This is a non-historic building.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of Part I, Height and Mass of the new two-story addition (reviewed as new construction due to its size) with the condition that the number of voids be increased and aligned on the rear façade and the roof shapes of the main residence and porticos are revised to be compatible with neighboring contributing structures.

Ms. Ward additionally reported that staff recommends to continue Part II, Design Details, to address the following:

- a. Provide a stucco finish over the foundation material for the main residence and portico and confirm the color;
- b. Provide details on the door design including the new trim to be incorporated with the wood frame exterior;
- c. Provide a window sample and specifications that meet the design standards and confirm that casement windows are being replaced;
- d. Provide the materials, design (louvered/paneled showing placement of center rail to align with center rail of window) and confirm operability of shutters;
- e. Incorporate larger columns and newel post to be compatible with proportions of historic stoops in the block;
- f. Consider relocating the electric meters to a secondary façade to meet the standards and identify the location for trash and recycling receptacles.

Mr. Lominack said he wonders why the Board is reviewing this application as it is incomplete. The drawings do not describe what is going to be done. There are so many discrepancies, the roof shapes, distances above windows and the sizes.

Ms. Ward explained that staff has been working with the petitioner for more than a month on this project. They missed the deadline for last month's meeting. The petitioner has resubmitted plans to get to this point. The staff is at the point to where they have to take it to the Board to get some discussion started about the project. This is a decision that the Board can make regarding the application.

Dr. Henry said this may be a question for the petitioner, but in looking at the upper floor plan, he does not see how three windows can be there.

Ms. Ward said maybe the petitioner can revise the floor plan.

Dr. Henry said he was not sure if the floor plan could be revised as the rooms are small.

Dr. Williams said on page eight (8) of ten (10), there is an inconsistency. The porch shows four steps on the main elevation and on page one (1), three steps are shown. Therefore, he concurs with Mr. Lominack. On page two (2), the 21 foot height reference on then the left-hand side is to the under-side of the soffit and 21 feet on the right-hand side, assuming that it is a one foot thick floor. But in the staff's report, it was called nine (9) feet.

Ms. Ward explained that this is the floor to ceiling height. They do floor-to-floor in the ordinance. Therefore, it is nine (9) feet.

Dr. Williams said the arrows on the right go to some point in the roof, not above the soffit. This is another inconsistency. He said if they look at the top bar on the right, it is in line with the graph paper and the one on the left is halfway some inches lower. Is the height of the ceiling actually below the soffit? In some of the cross-sections on page 6 on the right, what is the datum? Is the interior height to the bottom of the installation of the drawing or is it at the bottom of the soffit as shown on page 2.

Ms. Ward said she does not know if this is the ceiling. It may be that the petitioner is calling it sheetrock.

Dr. Williams said there are some problems with the drawings. Beyond the lack of details, these are some of the inconsistencies, but he was not sure that these inconsistencies affect height and mass.

Ms. Ward stated that in defense of the petitioner, this level of detail sections is not required for Part I, Height and Mass. But, they do help to understand how a building works.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said that pages six (6) and seven (7) show inconsistencies in the overhang. She said she was unsure which is correct. One shows one (1) foot and the other shows an undetermined. As they move forward to the next phase, Part II, this needs to be corrected.

Ms. Ward said she would like for the petitioner to revise the roof entirely. Staff is recommending that there be a fascia board that is parallel to the building wall and not in an angle to the building wall.

Dr. Henry asked staff if the Board is to vote on this for the Height and Mass, Part I.

Ms. Ward explained that the Board needs to go in their Board Discussion to vote on this. However, if the Board has more questions for staff, she will be happy to answer them. Afterward, it would be a good opportunity for the petitioner to come forward with his comments and address the Board.

Ms. Ramsay asked the Board if they had more questions for the staff.

Ms. McClain explained as there are many discrepancies, the Board will have many questions and may end up denying the project. She believes it would be better for the petitioner to ask for a continuance. The application appears to be very incomplete.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Hampton explained that some of the issues as was noticed on the floor plan, the void on the center window on the back side would not be able to be in line with the back door as a wall is in the center of the building. They will need to address this. Mr. Hampton said he will come back with some stronger details.

Dr. Henry said he believes that the Board is in full agreement with the staff's recommendations.

Ms. Ramsay explained to Mr. Hampton that the Board could not ask for a continuance, but he can request a continuance. Based on the comments from the Board, she does not believe that they are ready to vote on Part I and Part II.

Mr. Hampton said if they could get Part I approval, they will work on Part II.

Ms. Ramsay said she does not believe that the Board is ready to vote on Part I. There are too many things that the Board members still have questions about along with not seeing how the roof will be changed. Ms. Ramsay said staff recommends changing the roof, but until they see what it will actually look like, what she is hearing from the Board is that there are too many questions to vote favorably for Part I.

Dr. Williams said another inconsistency is the window aperture location. The size of windows, place of windows, etc. is a part of Part I.

Mr. Hampton stated that they have already made some changes on the front elevation. He asked for a continuance so they will be able to address the issues. The City's Development Department instructed them to get this Board's approval before they could proceed. They don't want to stand out in the neighborhood, but blend in. They want everything they are doing to be consistent with everything in the neighborhood. He said the continuance will allow them to do this.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they agree with all of staff's comments and recommendations. She said that the HSF believes that because a significant level of changes will be taking place on this building, it may make sense to realign some of the windows on the first level to make them more symmetrical on the façade and have better portions. In doing so, the new windows on the second level could also match that. This would be more in keeping with the building form that is now being proposed. Ms. Meunier said she does not believe that it was addressed as to whether the windows on the first level are going to remain casement windows or whether they will be replaced. She said that the HSF feels they need to match on the first and second levels. If they remain casement, then the second-story windows should be casement and likewise if they are going to be replaced as double hung.

Ms. Meunier said the drawings of the windows on the second level appear to be too close to the eave.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Meunier to clarify her comment about the windows as this is not what staff said. It is not two rooms, but sort of like a double shotgun in a way as you just enter into the living room. This is not a symmetrical façade as the door is off-center.

Ms. Meunier said particularly, the larger window on the ground level. The window on the top level that is above the door should be centered above the door, but not in the center as it is not a central hall plan. But, the window on the ground level of the original opening is much larger.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Hampton that he may come forward and respond to the public comments.

Mr. Hampton said that with the floor plan being as it is submitted, he asked that on the rear elevation will they be required to put another window in the middle. As he has said, a wall is here.

Dr. Henry told Mr. Hampton that he was the person who pointed this out and as was said to him, a fake window may be put in here.

Mr. Howington commented that there is enough room in the rooms to put windows in one of those rooms. He said it may not be symmetrical on the rear elevation, but another window could still be put in here.

Mr. Hampton said they were planning to put a double window here.

Mr. Howington said that would be a better solution instead of a fake window.

Mr. Lominack said this is not a symmetrical window. Why try to make it look symmetrical?

Ms. Ramsay said another window is needed, but it does not have to be symmetrical. She informed Mr. Hampton that what she hears the Board saying is that they want to see three windows on the rear, but one does not have to be centered.

Mr. Hampton clarified that Ms. Ramsay was saying that the window does not need to be over the door.

Ms. Ramsay said this is her understanding.

Dr. Williams said he was hearing comments about having a third window on the second floor rear; but he was not sure why.

Mr. Hampton explained that this is the side of the building that is land-locked and faces the lane. It is not on the right-of-way.

Ms. Ramsay said this is the staff's comment that address the solids versus voids.

Dr. Williams said on the front elevation, it appears that two windows could be close together. There is no need to feel that you are locked into an even space in the windows as a wall is here.

Mr. Hampton said on the front no wall is here, but a wall is on the back.

Dr. Williams said nevertheless as the ground floor will not be seen due to the fence, the fenestration pattern does not have anything directly below it that will be visible. Therefore, freedom can be used in placing the window depending on the interior needs.

Mr. Lominack said he believes there is a great opportunity here to really do something a little more imaginative with it than trying to make it look like a historic building.

Ms. Ramsay said this is the petitioner's decision. The Board is not to design the building for the petitioner, but to vote on what is presented to them.

Board Action:

Continue the petition for the two-story addition and alterations at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

16. [Petition of Mark A. Bradley | 13-001840-COA | 18 East State Street | Windows](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Chatham County Board of Assessors - Photo.pdf](#)

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

Mr. Mark A. Bradley was not present.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval to install four vinyl windows on the west façade of the building located at 18 East State Street. This building has been on the staff's report of "Work Performed Without A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)" in the past. Ms. Ward showed the Board a picture of the windows that were installed. This building is a rated structure in the district and the preservation standards apply and the visual compatibility factors and the design standards. Staff found that a number of the preservation standards were not met. She explained that the new windows were installed, but it is really not apparent what was there before as the windows have been boarded for some time. Ms. Ward showed the Board a picture from the Tax Assessor's office. She said even if the windows had been there, the window frames are in bad condition and are deteriorated. Therefore, it is uncertain whether they ripped out the old and destroyed the fabric. However, she believes that the windows just deteriorated over time. Nevertheless, the new windows are not compatible with the original and do not match the original design that would have existed in an early 20th century structure.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends denial of the request to install four vinyl windows on the west façade of the building located at 18 State Street because the request does not meet the preservation standards, visual compatibility factors, or design standards.

Ms. Ward said she spoke with the petitioner who declined to come to the meeting today. They realize that their request will probably not be approved. They did not want to appear rude, but they will consent to the Board's decision should their request be denied and will return the openings to their former state.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Ward if staff has any idea why this is an after-the-fact request. Did the petitioner not know that they needed to seek prior approval?

Ms. Ward answered that she cannot speak for the petitioner, but she did inform the petitioner that when he presented his comments to the Board, he might want to tell them the circumstances surrounding what happened. But, the petitioner said the windows were boarded and they just wanted to get some light up there. This is not usable space; therefore, it is not occupied.

Dr. Henry asked if boards will replace the windows.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Absent.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Denial of the request to install four vinyl windows on the west façade of the building located at 18 East State Street because the request does not meet the preservation standards, visual compatibility factors, or design standards identified in the findings above. - PASS

Vote Results

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

17. [Petition of James Johnson for Marchese Construction | 13-001844-COA | 100 Bull Street | Alterations and Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Mr. James Johnson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for storefront, door, and windows alterations and a new awning to the property located at 100 Bull Street.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for storefront, door, and windows alterations, and a new awning for the property located at 100 Bull Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final

review and approval prior to the commencement of construction.

1. The proposed windows on the lane are to be inset not less than three inches (3") from the exterior façade of the building or match the inset of the existing windows above.
2. The proposed storefront door glazing is to be inset a minimum of four inches (4") from the face of the building or match the inset of the existing storefront on the building.
3. The brick infill at the lane is to be setback from the face of the building to maintain a proportionate level of solids to voids, the brick courses for the infill are to align with the brick courses on the existing building, and the new windows are to be lowered to allow for a header that matches the existing windows.

Mr. Lominack asked, for clarity, if staff was saying that where the infill occurs, that it be on the same plane as the existing or set back.

Ms. Michalak answered that staff recommends that it be set back. Currently, it is on the same plane.

Mr. Lominack wanted to know that with the header lintel that is being referred to, how will setting it back and lowering the brick work together?

Ms. Michalak explained that it will be the same. The entire area will just set back and then the windows would just move down in the wall to allow for the top portion above it. Consequently, it will not be chopped off by the existing stone garage lintel.

Mr. Howington asked that with the header above, will a space be needed between as it might look odd to have a header and a lintel for the garage?

Ms. Michalak said she recommends at least a couple of courses of brick between.

Mr. Merriman explained that, therefore, there will be a stone header that is already here; then some bricks, and a new header for the windows. All of this will be set back into the wall.

Ms. Michalak answered yes. She said, just to give a review, since the proposal indicates that the stone lintel for the garage door remain, it would differentiate it. Her point is, this way it will look like an infill. The petitioner called her after he read the staff's report and advised her that he has another idea.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked staff to explain sections 1-6 and sections 7-14.

Ms. Michalak explained that the petitioner will be doing the work in two phases. Therefore, she has presented this as one phase. She included all the drawings. However, she believes that the relocation of the window [the applicant can explain this further] is the first six drawings. The second set of drawings are for the remainder of the work. Therefore, she put them all together into one proposal for the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Johnson explained that he submitted the project in two different phases. The owner of the building is not sure about the tenant. The tenant that is supposed to be here wanted to use the existing windows to be placed on the second bay to be used as a display if they needed to. This is somewhat an option, but there is no guarantee that they will do this. The new storefront entrance as well as the alley side infill will happen, The header that the Board saw above the two garage openings are actually stucco which is the same as on the second and third floors around the windows.

Mr. Johnson said they can propose to tooth-in to the existing to blend in the infill. They can remove the header and infill it with brick as well. Therefore, they can basically make the header and sides go around the new set of windows to mimic the top. They will not have the large header going straight across.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked Mr. Johnson if he was saying that they will mimic the header over the garage door.

Mr. Johnson answered yes. This is a possibility; it is not supporting the brick, but is just for aesthetics and is somewhat like a foam stucco that can be removed.

Mr. Lominack asked if the brick would be flush with the existing brick.

Mr. Johnson said this what they are proposing.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Johnson what was his reason for not submitting the drawings this way in the beginning.

Mr. Johnson answered that initially he thought it was a concrete header and could not be removed easily. He could not send pictures; but after talking with Ms. Michalak, he went back to ensure whether they could make any more adjustments. He found out that maybe they can do it the way it is on the second floor. It will be the same material.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman stated that the staff's recommendations would be irrelevant if the petitioner makes the changes as he has stated. It appears that the petitioner has changed what was originally proposed after he submitted his request.

Ms. Ramsay explained that the maker of the motion could incorporate the changes that the petitioner has outlined.

Mr. Merriman said it is an improvement; this is not an historic building.

Board Action:

Approval of the petition for storefront, door, and windows alterations, and a new awning for the property located at 100 Bull Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval prior to the commencement of construction.

1. The proposed windows on the lane are to be inset not less than three inches (3") from the exterior façade of the building or match the inset of the existing windows above. - PASS
2. The proposed storefront door glazing is to be inset a minimum of four inches (4") from the face of the building or match the inset of the existing storefront on the building.
3. Remove the stucco garage door headers, tooth in the brick infill to be flush with and match the existing, and include a header on the new windows within the infill to match the existing windows above.

Vote Results

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Nicholas Henry

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Keith Howington

- Aye

T. Jerry Lominack

- Aye

Zena McClain, Esq.

- Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

- Aye

Linda Ramsay

-

Abstain

Marjorie W Reed

- Aye

Ebony Simpson

- Aye

Robin Williams

- Aye

18. [Petition of Eric O'Neill for Greenline Architecture | 13-001853-COA | 222 East Jones Street | Addition and alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 2011-12-14 Board Decision.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Public Comment - Shultz - 050113.pdf](#)

NOTE: Mr. Howington recused from participation in this this petition. He is an employee of Greenline Architecture.

Mr. Josh Bull was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and new construction of a three-story addition on the north (rear) and west facades of the building at 222 East Jones Street. She explained that the project was originally approved by the Board on December 14, 2011. The work did not commence and the Certificate of Appropriateness expired on December 14, 2012. No changes to the design, context or ordinance have occurred since the initial approval. The General Development Plan was originally submitted for site plan review at the November 30, 2011 meeting and no comments were made or concerns identified with the proposed project.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the three-story addition and exterior alterations on the north (rear) and west facades of the building at 222 East Jones Street with the following conditions consistent with the prior approval because the project complies with the preservation standards and design standards:

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

Dr. Williams asked staff that when they say the top floor are they saying the second floor.

Ms. Ward answered yes. The project never moved forward and the final plans were not submitted. These are the same plans that came to the Board the last time.

Dr. Williams asked staff if this is what they recommended the last time.

Ms. Ward said this was a recommendation of the Board, but she is now recommending it because it is consistent with the previous decision.

Dr. Williams said the drawing does not show this.

Ms. Ward answered right.

Dr. Williams said this would be a question the Board would need to ask the petitioner or might they infer that the removal of the wall is their response.

Ms. Ward said she would not infer this as she does not know whether the petitioner got to the construction documents before. Therefore, this might have not been developed. She said she struggled with this a little and had it in the staff's recommendation the last time. They have the standards about reversibility and retaining fabric, but ultimately that wall no longer is visible from the public right-of-way. Therefore, she struggled with how much of it is even within the purview of the Board.

Ms. Ramsay said she had the minutes of that prior meeting and Mr. Deering was representing Greenline. He said they could leave the third floor openings as they are and not change it with the exception of taking out the masonry material below the window sills. Ms. Ramsay explained they were to leave the openings and just remove the masonry.

Mr. Lominack said from a construction standpoint, he believes this will be problematic.

Ms. Ramsay explained that the problem has been that when they remove that much of the exterior fabric from the building, the entire wall collapsed.

Mr. Lominack said what Ms. Ramsay stated is exactly what he is talking about.

Ms. Ramsay said the petitioner would have to reinforce it above the opening to keep the rear wall as shown on the drawings.

Mr. Lominack said that on the parlor floor where they have approximately a sixteen foot span below a brick wall.

Ms. Ramsay said what she read was agreed to at the prior meeting. The petitioner will certainly have to structurally support that opening.

Mr. Lominack said he believes the petitioner will have to construct something to hold it up also.

Ms. Ramsay said the petitioner has showed a parapet wall above that in their previous drawing. Some sort of structural support is needed for that too. She said since she has been on this Board, they have had too many exterior walls completely collapse.

Ms. Ward reported staff received a letter in opposition to the project that was included in the Board's packet. Dr. Alexander and Catherine Shultz, the owners of the property at 218 East Jones Street, which is directly west and adjacent to the proposed addition. In their opinion, it is aesthetically unpleasing and is definitely not in keeping with the historic character of that house.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bull came forward and introduced himself and entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Bull to respond to the comments about the removal of the rear wall.

Mr. Bull, pointing to a section, said that since the last discussion, Mr. Deering mentioned that the middle of the opening showing here and here are actually the existing window openings. Therefore, they will only be removing the portion underneath the windows to allow the two openings to exist. He said this is an existing wall as well as the end wall. On the parlor level, they want to open between the existing wall. Therefore, a span will be here.

Mr. Lominack said the petitioner will have to use structural support.

Mr. Bull confirmed that they will use structural support.

Ms. Ramsay said this is what the Board agreed to the last time.

Mr. Bull replied correct.

Dr. Williams asked if the island will be built on either side of the brick wall.

Mr. Bull, pointing to a section, answered yes. He explained that the existing wall will be there and then you would go through two openings and the hall will be on the other side.

Mr. Lominack asked if this will be a dressing room.

Mr. Bull replied yes.

Ms. Ramsay said to Mr. Deering that at the meeting he said that then they would get a sense of opening on the third floor and the architectural evolution of the building.

Mr. Deering said that is correct and they are also trying to maintain as much as the client will allow them of the existing structure. Therefore, they are making every opportunity to do that.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation said they were in favor the last time they saw this project making sure that everything above the windows still remains and it was only what was below the window openings. HSF's comment today is that on the addition on the exterior that the window sashes actually be green to blend in with the rest of the addition. The white color of the sashes make them stand out. Therefore, as she has stated, the HSF recommends that they be green to blend in with the rest of the addition.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Bull if he wanted to respond to the public comment.

Mr. Bull said he believes they can make those changes.

Board Action:

Approve the three-story addition and exterior alterations on the north (rear) and west façades of the building at 222 East Jones Street with the following conditions consistent with the prior

approval because the project complies with the preservation standards and design standards:

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

Vote Results

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

19. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 13-001854-COA | 4 East Jones Street | Rehabilitation/Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

NOTE: Dr. Williams recused from participation in this discussion. He is an employee of SCAD who owns the property.

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations and paint color changes for the property located at 4 East Jones Street which is Savannah College of Art & Design's "Morris Hall."

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends approval for replacing the west door on the south façade, replacing the gas-lamp light fixtures, removing existing security bars from all windows and doors, and painting the ground floor stucco, wood window trim, and window sashes with the following conditions:

1. All paint color selections be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to commencement of the work.
2. The new west door inset is not less than three inches (3") from the exterior surface of the façade of the building or match the inset of the other existing doors on this building.

Ms. Michalak reported that staff recommends denial for replacing the centrally located door on the south (primary) façade at 4 East Jones Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards: the door is an historic, distinctive architectural feature and is not deteriorated beyond repair.

Dr. Henry said that he believes in one of the Board's earlier considerations, that staff made a recommendation for the doors to be four inches (4") recessed.

Ms. Michalak said the four inch recess was for the storefront.

Ms. Simpson asked staff if they had a photo of the west door.

Ms. Michalak answered that she pulled up the picture from SAGIS to get a better review of the door, but she

apologized for not including it in the presentation. She showed the Board a photo of the door.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson said he would like to focus his comments primarily on the south door as it appears that all the other comments were in favor of the petition. He said as many of the Board members know, SCAD has obtained a strong reputation for preservation over the years in Savannah. They now have an enrollment of more than 8,000 students, risk management is obviously a key consideration for them. This is the only reason they are replacing this door. It is not for visual compatibility reasons. It does create a considerable, security, life safety and accessibility risk for the college.

Mr. Dawson said as for the security of the door, because it is a historic door in order to meet the ADA requirements, it has a power actuated operator at the top. Therefore, both door leafs have to open at the same time in order to get a chair through. This creates a system where they have to have magnetic locks at the head of the door. They are very fragile historic doors and as someone pulls on them, they get off base at the top as they are magnetized at the top. This creates an ongoing wear problem with the doors being operated. In addition, the doors cannot be retrofitted for electronic hardware because every building at SCAD is card access. Additionally, since they are doing renovation inside, they do a thorough life safety review. These doors are 26 inches wide. The minimum standard for life safety is 28 inches wide. This, therefore, creates more liability for SCAD to retain these doors at 26 inches.

Mr. Dawson said in terms of accessibility, the ADA language is fairly clear in terms of the exception to historic properties. It recommends that any modification be made to the maximum extent feasible. It also states that the petition has to be approved by the State Preservation Office. Their intent is to petition this to the State Preservation Office and to the ADA coordinator at the State of Georgia for a determination on this issue. He said that the ADA language further states that all changes will be made except that they will not threaten or destroy the historic significance of the building. He said that they maintain this change, although it is certainly not recommended under the preservation standards, would not threaten to destroy the character of building. Mr. Dawson said for an example, the SCAD student center on Montgomery Street has the same doors and is a contributing structure in the district. Their intent is to reuse this door on the interior so there could be a reversible treatment.

Mr. Dawson said he wanted to point to the Board's standards for appeals of decisions and variance criteria which are in item six (6) and sub-item b. He read that a literal interpretation of the regulations would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the district and would create an unreasonable hardship on the applicant. Mr. Dawson stated they maintain that by not meeting life safety; not meeting the security requirements of SCAD and nor providing accessible entrance, that this would create a hardship on SCAD and create a significant risk where they will be forced to endure a possible litigation liability.

Mr. Dawson said they are requesting a finding of fact, although this is not consistent with the visual compatibility standards, that a denial of this petition would create an unreasonable hardship on SCAD.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Dawson why can't they have handicapped accessible doors elsewhere.

Mr. Dawson answered that there is a door on the backside.

Dr. Henry said they saw side doors.

Mr. Dawson said the two new doors go into classroom spaces. He believes that to have a handicap student enter through this way would interrupt the class.

Dr. Henry answered that he knows it would interrupt the class; he used to teach. But, a design could be found. He has been told that the interior is being redesigned.

Mr. Merriman said that he went by this site earlier and saw the doors. They are not in bad shape at all. They are not rotten.

Mr. Dawson stated that they are not saying that the doors are rotten, but they do create a liability issue for SCAD in terms of life safety and security. The accessibility could probably be addressed, but it would still not solve their security problem and would not correct the life safety issue as well.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Dawson to explain the life safety issue.

Mr. Dawson explained that the door is only 26 inches wide and life safety requires a 28 inch wide opening minimum.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Dawson if the present doors are "grandfathered" in.

Mr. Dawson said depending on the extent of the renovations, when you cross a certain threshold, they can require that the building be brought up to code.

Mr. Lominack said he does not know how many exits out of the building are there.

Mr. Dawson explained that it is somewhat complicated. He said that the upper floor exits out onto Bull Street. Pointing to a section, he said the lower level exits here and then into a parking lot.

Mr. Lominack asked if this is the only way out of the building.

Mr. Dawson stated that there are two exits.

Mr. Lominack asked if this is from the ground level.

Mr. Dawson replied yes.

Dr. Henry asked if these are 28 inch doors.

Mr. Dawson answered no. They are full sized doors.

Dr. Henry said, therefore, they are more than 28 inches.

Mr. Dawson said yes. The other door is fine.

Mr. Lominack said he believes the door is protected under the ordinance as far as egress.

Mr. Dawson said they still have the issues with security. They cannot retrofit the door.

Ms. Ramsay explained that the door could not be retrofitted at the Maritime Hospital on York Street, but they quit using that center door, but maintained it, and changed the major entrance.

Dr. Henry said he was not trying to design anything here, but for internal security, why not put a glass door behind that door and have a double door system.

Mr. Dawson said this would not change their situation with the door.

Dr. Henry asked why not.

Mr. Dawson questioned by putting another glass door behind it?

Dr. Henry explained that in other words you create a foyer.

Mr. Dawson said you would still have to exit through that second foyer door. He could put the security on the second door if this is what Dr. Henry means.

Dr. Henry said to him there are a lot of options here for all of Mr. Dawson's concerns.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Dawson that the doors he referenced on the building on Montgomery Street whether they face Montgomery Street.

Mr. Dawson answered yes.

Mr. Lominack said these doors are not accessible because you go upstairs to get to them.

Mr. Dawson said correct. But they have added an elevator on the back of the building.

Mr. Lominack said, therefore, this is not the accessible route.

Mr. Dawson answered that it is not.

Mr. Lominack asked Mr. Dawson what is the reason for replacing the existing gas-lights.

Mr. Dawson said the style of them.

Ms. Simpson asked if they would still use a gas light.

Mr. Dawson answered yes. It would still be a gas light. He said again that they are requesting a finding of fact since the door obviously did not make the building noncontributing. They feel it would create some undue hardships for SCAD. Therefore, they believe that is worthy of a finding of fact petition to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation said obviously this is a challenging issue and a respected great tradition and record of SCAD. However, they agree with the staff's recommendations in this case. Mr. Carey said that the HSF would like to offer some assistance to the petitioner in trying to resolve their safety and security liability issues. He said that the HSF is offering their assistance to the petitioner to possibly get a more preservation - oriented solution.

Board Action:

Approve the petition to replace the west door on the south façade, replace the gas-lamp light fixtures, remove existing security bars from all windows and doors, and paint the ground floor stucco, wood window trim, and wood window sashes with the following conditions:

1. All paint color selections be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to commencement of the work.
2. The new west door inset is not less than three inches (3") from the exterior surface of the façade of the building or match the inset of the other existing doors on this building. - PASS

Denial of the petition to replace the centrally located door on the south (primary) façade at 4 East Jones Street because the proposed work does not meet the preservation standards: the door is an historic, distinctive architectural feature and is not deteriorated beyond repair.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

20. [Petition of Dawson Architects | 13-001855-COA | 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Rehabilitation/Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

Ms. Leah Michalak gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to rehabilitate and alter the façade of the building located at 114 East Oglethorpe Ave. Most recently an office building; it will be converted back to its original use as a residence.

Ms. Michalak reported that the staff recommends approval to rehabilitate and alter the façade of the building located at 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval:

1. Provide additional information for the proposed windows and doors regarding the muntin size and profile. The windows must be single-paned glass and true divided lite instead of the proposed applied mulls.
2. Reduce the balcony railing height to 36 inches.
3. Increase the depth of the third floor balcony to 36 inches.

Dr. Williams asked for clarity if staff was saying replace the windows, but not change the apertures.

Ms. Michalak said the petitioner is lowering the sill height by 30 inches on the second and third levels.

Dr. Williams asked Ms. Michalak if she said the building was listed as contributing to the National Historic Landmark District in 1972.

Ms. Michalak said according to the survey it is a contributing structure. The façade was done in 1963.

Dr. Williams said the façade design stands on its own merit, although it may not be currently on the historic map on its own merits as an historic contributing modernistic design. But, it is 50 years old and the standards apply to this structure.

Ms. Michalak explained that a determination has not been made that the façade is contributing to the building. They do not know when it was listed as contributing, whether it had to do with the plan, the height and mass as it did not specifically say that the façade was contributing. Ms. Michalak said, therefore, there is a little gray area there.

Dr. Williams said even if it has not been determined yet as contributing, if the Board approves the change, they will never get that.

Ms. Michalak explained that she reviewed it as if it was a contributing façade under the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Dr. Williams said for an example let's apply that standard. He asked Ms. Michalak to pull up the photo of the McIntosh House next to this property and apply the standard she applied to this request. He asked Ms. Michalak if she would approve lowering those sill heights down to that level.

Ms. Michalak answered that she would have to see the proposal.

Dr. Williams said he believes the answer would be no.

Ms. Michalak said this is a different situation. It is not a modern design; this property is a modern design and whether they are taller or narrower, a determination would need to be made whether a larger window could be handled here.

Dr. Williams said staff is proposing to endorse changing Meyerhoff's design.

Ms. Michalak said no; she is not proposing that. She is recommending approval, but not proposing it.

Dr. Henry asked why can't the fabric be removed and go back to the original.

Ms. Michalak said this was discussed with the petitioner. But, they do not have any photos showing how it looked.

Dr. Henry said it would look like the other property.

Ms. Michalak said they do not know that. She believes this is even less acceptable under the Secretary of Interior's Standards without any proof.

Mr. Merriman asked that in order to apply the standards that deals with historical significance, is just a portion of a building considered historical significant based solely on the merit of its age? What criteria applies to it?

Ms. Michalak answered "whether that element is believed to be contributing to the historical significance of that building."

Mr. Merriman asked regardless of how old it is.

Ms. Michalak answered yes. She said that we have plenty of buildings in the district that are more than 50 years old, but are not contributing because they do not have the architectural merit or integrity. They need to be considered contributing to the district.

Mr. Howington said they have newer buildings that are contributing, but they are not as old as well.

Ms. Michalak explained that because of their architectural significance, the buildings that are less than 50 years old can be listed as contributing.

Mr. Merriman said Dr. Williams spoke of whether the windows could be lowered. He said that he is not necessarily for or against it, but he wanted to be fair about whether the standard applies and whether it is a historically significant building. If they are significant, then why are they significant?

Ms. Michalak stated that this is the decision that the Board needs to make. The Board needs to decide whether they feel that the façade is contributing.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Dawson said they struggled with this. In fact, his client prefers to restore the appearance of their building to the appearance of the building next door as Dr. Henry pointed out. But, staff and he prevailed with the owner to try to restore and maintain the appearance of 1963 building. They believe that the building now has a significant and desirable appearance in the district. He said, therefore, in their design approach they are trying to maintain the key character and defining features: the copper clad vertical fins, proportion of the openings, and the materials.

Mr. Dawson said they are proposing a glass and stainless rail system that has copper fins that are in line with the other fins so that they do not obstruct or visually change the appearance of the building. They propose the glass railings although it is not balusters. But, they feel it is consistent with the modern design theme of the building. He said regarding the staff's comments about the mulls they are proposing applied mulls. He said this is a building where he believes that the standards are written for historic buildings not from the mid-century. The standard requires true divided lights on single paned glass. To get the narrow profile, which they think is a key character defining feature, the mulls presently are about one and one-half inch (1 1/2") wide. The windows are literally cedar 2x4's that have been cut and the glass directly set. They want to keep the edge profile of the narrow style which is critically important to maintain the character of the building. Mr. Dawson said to do this, the doors are actually the glass structure; the frame is not the structure. Therefore, true divided light actually is not possible in this situation without making a wider style and rail where the perimeter supports the door. He said they feel that is more important to keep the edge profile very narrow, let the glass do the work and apply it more on top of this to retain that same one and one-half inch (1 1/2") profile that exist currently in the windows. This is their rationale for doing the applied mull.

Mr. Dawson said it would not be traditional putty because they believe it needs to be consistent with the look that is here now. This is a part of the issue with the standard being tailored towards older historic buildings rather than modern historic buildings. Another issue that they take an issue with is the requirement for a bracket under all balconies. He feels this would be totally appropriate if they were talking about the house next door, although it seems like an afterthought on a modern building. Therefore, they have tried to minimize those brackets, but frankly it would be their preference to not have brackets because they don't feel it is consistent with modern buildings. Both of these are variations; the ordinance is very specific about balconies having brackets and you cannot have a flat mull. The standards are really not written for this type of architecture. This is the reason they are proposing the design as they have.

Mr. Dawson explained that with regards to the second floor balcony, obviously the windows originally were this height. They feel, therefore, that making that modification to create the balcony here is consistent with some form of

history that certainly existed. He said that they are willing to not do the balcony on the upper level if the Board feels that maintaining the scale and proportion is critical. They feel the staff's recommendations are a good compromise and they are willing to accept them.

Dr. Williams said that Mr. Dawson answered one of his questions regarding: is the third floor balcony negotiable? He said he applauded Mr. Dawson's defense about the original retention of the modernistic design. It is predicated on the assumption that this is a fairly rare example of early 1960s modern designs in the downtown. Dr. Williams extended compliments to Mr. Dawson in working with his client to save it. He asked Mr. Dawson if they are willing to make the second floor canopy into a functional six feet deep balcony.

Mr. Dawson answered correct.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Dawson if it would be possible to keep Meyerhoff's design two-thirds (2/3) in tact and that the center bay be functional with the door. He said maybe even divide it so that it is white opaque or something in the lower part of the door and above be clear so that it evokes some distance.

Mr. Dawson asked Dr. Williams if he saying retain the sills on the two side windows and create a full height door in the middle that have a similar profile.

Dr. Williams said "yes" and alter one-third of Meyerhoff's design. He said that Mr. Dawson has offered to remove the third floor balcony.

Ms. Ramsay said the Board is getting close to designing the project which is not their purview.

Dr. Williams said they had an issue the last time where they were asking the petitioner about the cast stone sills when he appeared before them. Therefore, this is what he is doing now. He said, therefore, he was proposing an option. He said treating this ideally as historic as possible and being sensitive to the existing fabric.

Mr. Dawson said he agrees and in fact they were a bit challenged when they found that it was listed as contributing in 1972. He said clearly the building was only nine (9) years old. He loves the building, but does not believe that any architect who has done a building nine (9) years would say that it is contributing. Therefore, maybe it is as staff has said that it may have been because of the general mass and scale or the viability that the design was reversible at that time. He said he agrees that it certainly is. But, it is hard to determine why it was listed as contributing in 1972. However, it is a handsome building.

Dr. Williams asked if the canopy on the first floor entrance is cantilevered in such away that it does not meet structurally.

Mr. Dawson answered no.

Mr. Howington said he wanted clarification on what the petitioner suggested. He believes a full height window was requested, but may be there is a compromise to do the other. Mr. Howington said he would like to know what the petitioner is suggesting.

Mr. Dawson answered that his only concern with retaining the sill height at 30 inches is that he does not know what they would look like without studying it. If they did go this direction, he would at least want to have this reviewed with staff or come possibly back before the Board. He knows that this looks right and is consistent; therefore, he prefers the full height.

Mr. Lominack said the comments that Dr. Williams made are not necessarily the feelings of all the members of the Board.

Mr. Dawson said obviously his client's preference is the design as submitted with the recommendations of the staff.

Mr. Lominack said, personally, he believes it is a nice solution which is retaining what he believes is an important evolution of that building. He does not have a problem with it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation said they have a couple of things. Firstly, he commended the petitioner for encouraging the owner to really go to a more faithful continuation of the existing building, which

they have learned is contributing. Mr. Carey said he agrees with the petitioner that the brackets are not necessary on any balcony there. Secondly, he feels this is an important building "as is" and he believes this was recognized in 1972. Also, he believes further that this was probably understood, as the ordinance was enacted in 1973 and came from these inventories and surveys. It was probably recognized that this was going to be a contributing building. The 50 year rule was in place from 1966 on. Therefore, people understood when they were doing survey work that they were going to be able to forecast, to an extent, what buildings would become contributing and important.

Mr. Carey said they did this a couple of years ago when they added some 50 year old and less than 50 years old buildings to the district and inventory based on the importance of the building. Therefore, he likes to say that they are constantly collecting and contemporary collecting for future recollecting. He also believes that this is a benchmark building. It is a building that helps them to read and understand the streetscape; and understand the difference between its neighboring building. He believes also that this is as important way for them to understand the evolution of construction and building in the district.

Mr. Carey said, but, his concern [all due respect to Mr. Dawson and what he is accomplishing here and his willingness to compromise and even to try and make this design work] is that he worries in the end if this would look like just 2013 infill or will it look like some appropriate adaptation of a 1963 rehabilitation. Therefore, Mr. Carey cautioned against something that will end up looking very 2013. If this is done, the average passerby will say "look at that brand new infill that they allowed under their ordinance." Or, will they be able to say, "that looks like an adaptation of the 1963 building or the 1870 building. He said he knows that there is room for confusion, but they should do their honest best to present as "true to form" as possible. Mr. Carey said maybe there is room for further refinement. The building should not be changed so dramatically that it loses its history and the architectural character that it has and was recognized for when they added it to the list.

Mr. Tim Burt resides at 413 Whitaker Street and owns property near this building said he needed some clarification. He said he has applied for permits in the past and is going through the process now. Mr. Burt said he is hearing confusing information. He wanted clarification on the reason why the balcony can be built as he believes what he is hearing is that the balcony can be built because it can be taken down without affecting the building and will be cantilevered into the building.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Burt what specifically is his question.

Mr. Burt said his question is: why the balcony can be approved?

Ms. Michalak asked Mr. Burt which balcony was he referring to.

Mr. Burt answered either balcony.

Ms. Michalak said staff recommends approval because they believe the balconies are reversible based on the designs and the second floor balcony depths because the canopy exists.

Mr. Burt said he has been a member of the Washington, DC review board and also a member of the review board in Birmingham, AL. He owns property in Savannah and he is trying to find out what is the purview of the Board here in Savannah. The Boards' responsibilities in each city works differently. However, he agrees with Mr. Carey that it may start looking like something from 2013. Therefore, he believes that the building should be taken back to its originality. Mr. Burt said if an original photograph cannot be found, then make it look like something from the 1960s and mid-century modern as this is what it was meant to be. He said don't make it look like something from 2013.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Dawson that as he is aware, the petitioner has to ask for a continuance. She asked him if he was comfortable with the Board voting on his proposal today.

Mr. Dawson said yes.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams said there are very few mid-century modern buildings intact in pristine condition; and this is one of them. He believes that if they allow modification to these buildings just as they are hitting the historical appreciation such as Drayton Tower has recently been appreciated. If they allow too many changes to these kind of modest buildings [there are so few of these buildings] they will not have any. He said one of the key features of this building is its verticality. The vertical fins and the third floor balcony sets the verticality. Dr. Williams said the petitioner is willing to remove that detail. He said that they put a lot of emphasis in their design standards; in portion to solids to

voids and if they permit the changing of these apertures to be dropped down to the floor level so that they all can function as doors, they will be significantly altering the relationship. Although it is brick, it is basically reading as the white solids of a modernist building picking up on the modernistic vocabulary of the early 20 century modernism which is why the building is painted white. Presently, the height of the windows relative to what they would call spandrel panel white area below them, if they allow the white areas to be removed, it would be like dropping windows down. The windows are reading as an abbreviated ribbon window. Dr. Williams said based on the fact that the canopy is existing on the second floor above the first floor, he was inquiring of the petitioner if there is some way to reach a compromise. However, he said, the purist in him is struggling to find a way to articulate it, starting as a proposal for a motion. He said certainly as the oath the doctors take, do as a little harm as possible. Therefore, he believes the second floor balcony would harm the building.

Dr. Williams said he believes they should treat this design with all the integrity and respect that they would treat the 220 year old McIntosh House next door.

Dr. Henry said he stands corrected. He does not believe they should peel off the front anymore. He is told that this is a sensitive modernist building and it looks so to him. If this building was built on its own, he would feel differently about it. But, he believes they need to preserve the 1960s.

Mr. Lominack said he believes that Dr. Williams made a compelling argument which probably changed his mind. He said he shares Dr. Williams concern about the lack of existing examples of 1960s architecture in the Historic District and even later. This does become somewhat sacred.

Dr. Williams said this building is one of the few that is not new construction from the 1960s, but is probably "the most sensitive" downtown. It is clearly an old brick building that has been adapted as a new building from this vintage.

Ms. McClain said this building stands out on Oglethorpe Avenue. When you drive down this street as a first-time visitor, you notice it. Therefore, she appreciates the comments.

Mr. Howington said he, too, believes that Dr. Williams presents a compelling argument. He said he does understand keeping the 1960s architecture as a pure example, but he has walked by this building numerous times and he thought how dark and horrible it must be to be on the inside there. The idea of the letting more light in windows would only make the interior more usable. He said to him, the proportions of the windows seem not as compatible to the adjoining structure. Therefore, this is a tough situation. Mr. Howington said he believes the architect has done a great job in keeping what was pure of the 1960s. They are talking about lowering some window heights to door. He believes this is a great compromise. He believes that it has been said that when things are built, they should be built to last forever, but obviously this building was not built to last forever and while it is an example of a modification of a 19th Century building in the 1960s, in his opinion it is not a great example. But, on the "pure" side it is. He said this is a tough situation.

Dr. Williams said square footage wise, the neighboring building has two windows that are each individually larger, but he wonders if there is actually more square footage of glass permitting light into the second and third floor. Therefore, he does not know how dark it is on the inside of the building.

Mr. Howington stated what if there was a compromise; the building just to the west of this building obviously has a balcony with windows to the floor.

Ms. McClain explained that the Board can not design this for the petitioner. The petitioner can always come back if this is denied by the Board.

Mr. Lominack said he does not want to try to get into designing this because that is not appropriate, but it was mentioned earlier about retaining the proportions of the windows on the upper floor. He said looking at the building [he knows why the architect wants to do the glass rail], he wonders if something more solid on top of that existing canopy might not help to preserve the visual relationship of the original windows on the second floor, rather than a transparent rail system.

Mr. Howington said buildings should have an opportunity to evolve. This is not a "stand alone" in his opinion. He respects the architect and the building, but it should have an opportunity to evolve in some way. This is not to say that the design submitted may be the best solution.

Board Action:

Denial of the petition to rehabilitate and alter the façade of the building at 114 East Oglethorpe Avenue because it does not meet the preservation standards and is not visually compatible with the existing 1963 façade design. - PASS

Vote Results

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

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

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Crawford Ward.pdf](#)
Attachment: [235-239 E. Broad St..pdf](#)
Attachment: [241-243 E. Broad St..pdf](#)
Attachment: [517-523 E. Perry St..pdf](#)
Attachment: [548-550 E. McDonough St..pdf](#)
Attachment: [Aerial - Facing North.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Context Photographs.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.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 I, Height and Mass of five (5), three and three and one-half story residential townhouses at 545 East McDonough Street. She said the Board has seen this site before, but this is a new proposal for the site.

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

- a. All First level floor-to-floor heights must be reduced to a maximum of nine feet-six inches (9'-6") and the Third Level (for the East Building) increased to a minimum of ten feet to meet the standards.
- b. For the East Building, meet the "distance between windows" standard by adding another bay of windows or altering the windows dimensions.
- c. Provide walls of continuity along all street fronts adjacent to opening parking areas and driveways entrances to the garages.

Ms. Michalak reported further that staff recommends approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) of the 30 foot structured setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow for structure parking at the zero lot line along both East McDonough Street and East Perry Street, and a variance to allow for structured parking setback 11 feet from Houston Street within the ground floor of the West Building in this Trust Lot condition.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ogletree came forward and stated that he is the petitioner for this proposal. He said as Ms. Michalak has reported, this is a redesign that the Board saw at an earlier time. They actually took all of the comments of the Board, the Historic Savannah Foundation, and the neighbors and reestablished a new design for this property.

Mr. Ogletree said as the Board may recall, initially they had eight (8) units, but now they have reduced it to five (5) units. He feels they have addressed the comments that were given to them during the previous meeting. Mr. Ogletree entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Ogletree to respond to the staff's comments.

Mr. Ogletree said they do have variance request as staff has mentioned. The variance is to provide off-street parking underneath the two units facing Houston Street frontage. This is a mirror image from what the original design had in the two existing units facing East Broad Street. This was successful as all of the neighbors were in support of this at that time. They feel this is a good design to get the cars off the street, out of sight and at the same time does not give the illusion or the impression that the ground floor is not occupied. He said that it looks like an occupied floor. It is partially occupied with a bedroom and a bath, while it also accommodates two off-street parking spaces.

Mr. Ogletree explained that he believes there is some confusion with the floor-to-floor heights. He said as shown of the drawings, the floor-to-floor heights meet the standards.

Ms. Michalak asked Mr. Ogletree if he was talking about the third level.

Mr. Ogletree stated that the third level was called out as though it was not tall enough floor-to-floor. He said that the ceiling height is what is called out at nine feet, but it is ten feet floor-to-floor height.

Dr. Henry asked if it was being said that the interior of the room is nine feet or ten feet.

Mr. Ogletree explained that the interior of the room is nine (9) feet, but the standard is actually set up as floor-to-floor height. Therefore, when you add the structure back in, it is ten feet floor-to-floor. Therefore, this is actually meeting the standards. He said that on the first floor [pointing to a section] what you see here on this floor where it says 10 feet-1 inch (10'-1") is a typographical error. It is actually nine feet-one inch (9'-1"). This meets the standards, but in this one elevation it was not correctly noted. It is an eight foot ceiling.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Ogletree to show the view of the side of this same building. He explained that this would be the Perry Street row. He said in reviewing the floor-to-floor heights, it appears that you go up the stoop and once you get on the stoop, you have to go up to the floor of the house. It looks as if a railing is coming out of the front door. Is this correct?

Mr. Ogletree replied that's correct. He explained that the reason for this is because they have the standards that they are meeting for the stoop, itself, to stay within the nine feet-6 inches (9'-6") stoop height.

Mr. Howington stated that he does not believe that he has ever seen this.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said this is not safe.

Mr. Ogletree said he could not say that it is or isn't in the Historic District, but the intent is to conform to the lower image of the stoop and still be able to have the eight foot (8') finished ceiling and not have a basement condition.

Mr. Howington asked that on this same elevation, just for clarification as this will be covered in Part II, is that a transom over the window or is it a triple-hung window.

Mr. Ogletree answered that it is a transom. He said that the floor-to-floor heights were really a clarification of how to read the drawings. Mr. Ogletree said he believes they do comply with the standards, but it is just not being read going with the floor-to-floor is how the standards are to be read, but in one case, they were reading off the floor-to-ceiling and in the other case, it was a typographical area which was not correctly notated. In the wall sections, it is correctly noted.

Mr. Howington said as far as floor-to-floor, it might help if the cornice on the top was not so heavy. However, this is a design detail that will be covered later on.

Mr. Ogletree explained if it is required, they will adjust the windows on the side elevation. However, he did not interpret that the side elevations had to have that spacing of windows. Therefore, this is something in the details that they can address, but at the same time they are trying to accommodate a usable floor plate; and to completely fill the wall with windows will be difficult. But, if it is required as he has said, they will look at it.

Ms. Weibe-Reed stated that she believes that what the petitioner has come back with shows that he has done lot work and has really taken the comments into consideration with the redesign.

Mr. Ogletree thanked Ms. Weibe-Reed for her comment and stated that the question of the wall of continuity along Perry Street, they don't have a range of what they can do on the existing building and driveway. They do not own this. Therefore, they cannot add any more walls on that portion of the property, which is from the end of the east building going east. But, from the end of the east building going back toward the square, they have done everything that they can to make a wall of continuity on Perry Street. They have walls flanking each side of the one curb cut that goes into the property from Perry Street. All they have is the curb cut that breaks up that line of continuity there.

Mr. Ogletree said on the opposite side on McDonough Street, they have extended courtyard walls for the parking areas as much as possible and still get the two off-street parking spaces. Consequently, they are making an attempt to get as much of a wall of continuity as possible. But, without gates [he has discussed this before], they cannot do more than this and still get the off-street parking. The gates would not be functional on a trust lot such as this. If you have the gates and they are opened, they will be across the sidewalk and will become a hazard on the sidewalk. Therefore, they feel that it is just not a practical application to put gates on these parking spaces.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said that the floor plan is a little confusing to her. She said that after Ms. Michalak explained what they were looking at, it appears that the townhouses on Houston Street are showing the ground level plan, but the three on Perry Street are showing the second level plan. Is this correct? The reason she is saying this confuses her is because the petitioner is showing the balcony of the second floor in the middle. The trash cans are under it and the door opens onto that.

Mr. Ogletree said he could understand the confusion, but he explained that the reason this is because they were indicating the parking on the Houston Street units. If they showed the parlor or the upper levels, you would not see that there is parking. On the east units, they chose to show that middle level, the parlor which is the main level that you enter in off the stoops.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said if you are going to show ground level, add another sheet if you have to because as is, it is really confusing.

Mr. Ogletree said he understood the confusion, but all of the information is in the package. The floor plans are complete. As far as a point of clarification, they have balconies on the parlor level of all five (5) units. They are purely balconies off of the living space. The mechanical and the trash cans are on the ground level. He said that on the three east units, they are not specifically screened because they are in front of the vehicles and are within the actual parking courtyard. He guesses they could take them back a step further and screen it again, but he feels it is redundant to do that.

Dr. Williams said on the two elevations showing the raised stoops, it looks like the floor level of the top of the stoop is adequate for entering into the building. Or, is the floor level actually higher?

Mr. Ogletree explained that the stoop line that is seen is the stoop and then there is that single step up to the floor.

Dr. Williams asked why not just make the stoop [as the other houses in downtown Savannah] just rise to the appropriate level.

Mr. Ogletree said the standards would not be met. He explained that you cannot exceed nine feet-six inches (9'-6").

Dr. Williams said the Board has never encountered this. This is new construction; therefore, why not come up with a plan that meets the standards and has a stoop at the floor level, rather than needing this curious extra step up.

Mr. Ogletree said he understood what Dr. Williams was saying, but you can not physically do that if you do not do a sub-basement. There are plenty examples in Savannah.

Dr. Williams said he realizes that there are a lot of basements that have one or two steps down. But this seems curious to him and may be they will discuss this later as an issue. He was wondering why the petitioner did it this way.

Mr. Ogletree explained that this was done so that they do not have a step down into the lower level.

Mr. Lominack asked how high is the ceiling on the first floor.

Mr. Ogletree answered that the ceiling is eight (8) feet.

Mr. Lominack explained that eight feet plus the structure is nine feet.

Mr. Ogletree answered correct, but they are not doing it for the structure. They are doing open well joists for mechanical and it is more than a foot of structure. He said that there are other ways to do this. They can beef up the structure. This is something they can address.

Dr. Williams said if the petitioner wants to be compatible with this raised townhouse form, but he cannot think of a single example downtown that turns the corner and you have a step down staircase with one light beam, one step long and the rest of it.

Mr. Ogletree said he knows of an example at the corner of Drayton and Taylor Streets. He said that his brother's in-law brother, Robert Tucker, lives in this house. It has a step up like this. The only difference is they did not pull the steps out as they did for more safety. They have it actually at the threshold of the door. In other words, they have a very large step at the door. Mr. Ogletree said they could do this, but it will not meet the code. Consequently, they had the stoop at a lower height and the finished floor at a much higher height. They just accommodated it at the door.

Mr. Howington said the windows seem to be very tall. He said he is unsure if there are other examples of such tall windows in this neighborhood. Mr. Howington said the windows seem large proportionately.

Dr. Williams said there are double-hung windows in this district, but the windows are very high style.

Mr. Howington stated that even the double-hung window seems very tall for that building.

Mr. Ogletree said in their package, they showed some examples of buildings that have the very long window heights.

Mr. Howington said the petitioner's windows are above the portico. The windows seem long and tall.

Mr. Ogletree said they can adjust the windows. They were working with the eleven (11) foot ceiling height.

Dr. Williams said may be it the windows were dropped down lower on the façade as a photo he was looking at may help address this.

Mr. Howington asked the windows on the second level are double-hung?

Mr. Ogletree answered yes.

Mr. Howington, pointing to a section, said the windows here are below the portico. The ones on the triple townhouse are above the porch. Therefore, to him, they are very large. He believes the transom adds to this portion.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she believes that what is being said is something like a head stone line, visually.

Mr. Ogletree said they can shorten the proportions of the windows or lower them similar to the one across. He said he believes these are the finer details that need studying more.

Mr. Howington said the porticos are taller because of the odd step going into the doorway. This makes it taller than normal.

Dr. Henry said he believes lowering the windows would be the answer.

Mr. Howington said he realizes that they are not in the Board's discussion, but he feels that transoms are a compromise to what use to be a triple hung. This happens all over. This does not happen that much downtown, but when it does he believes that it is incorrect to put a transom above a window unless it is an industrial building on the river, a contemporary design, or a commercial building. But, on a residential building, it is not historically accurate. There are examples in the Historic District where it has happened, but in his opinion, it is not appropriate.

Dr. Williams asked if this is a case that these are fixed transoms with operable double hung windows. Are functional triple hung windows an option?

Mr. Ogletree explained that he was not sure if they are still available by many manufactures. He has not researched

this as they were not looking to use triple hung windows.

Mr. Michalak said that what goes in the openings will come up in Part II. Therefore, if the Board's concern is the height of the openings because of the transom above it, then that's one thing. She said, however, triple-hung versus double-hung or something else is a part of Part II, Design Details.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes that Ms. Michalak if she said that the windows are aligned on the first and second floor, but she does not believe that the windows appear to be aligned.

Ms. Michalak said now that she sees the windows enlarged, Ms. Ramsay is correct. They do not align over the door.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes that the closeness of the shutters will make this even more visually incompatible.

Mr. Merriman said the shutters have to fit the windows.

Ms. Ramsay explained that they do, but if the window is moved over so that it aligns, then the two shutters would not be right.

Dr. Williams asked if the hall is narrow and this is the reason the door is placed where it is.

Mr. Ogletree answered no. He explained that they had this condition on a building they designed in another area of town, but it was not in the Landmark District. But, it was a similar condition. The reason it is this way is because the lot width here are 21'-6". To get the riser run on the stair to meet code compliant, they cannot actually move the stoop over far enough to center the door under the window and still have an adequate landing at the bottom. This is driven by what they have on their footprint. If the Board remembers, he believes they discussed in the last meeting that at one time, some of the designs had stairs come down and kick out towards the street, but this was not received well. He said in other words, it came down to a landing and then turned out. This would have allowed them to bring the stoop further over.

Mr. Ogletree said, however, they have eliminated that lower landing in lieu of going with a straight stair which is what is appropriate for the building.

Dr. Williams said he does not believe that there is anything in the code that requires it to be a straight stair.

Mr. Ogletree said that the code does not require it to be a straight stair, but requires the rise and run to meet within parameters. The site defines this; they did not have room on this site to curve the stairs because it would be into the sidewalk. Therefore, they do not have the option of curving the sidewalk to relieve the distance. They do not have the option of just sliding it over as it will run into the next stoop. Mr. Ogletree said basically, they are just trying to work within the options that they have.

Mr. Howington said if it was a lower floor height, this might save a step or two.

Mr. Ogletree stated that it would, but then they would have less than an eight feet ceiling.

Mr. Lominack said they could come down and land on a step height platform and then step from here down onto the sidewalk.

Mr. Ogletree stated that they tried this earlier in one of the previous meetings, but it was rejected.

Ms. Ramsay said this was not done in this Board's meetings.

Mr. Ogletree stated that he stands corrected. It was the MPC and not this Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) said they believe the proposal today is an improvement of the last project with the arrangement of the units on the lot. The HSF agrees with staff's comments. They believe that the walls of continuity are important with the open parking in the area. There is a suggestion about the units that face Houston Street about adding an additional bay or altering the dimensions of the window. Ms. Meunier said the HSF suggests adding another bay. She said that they believe if the dimensions are changed, the portions of windows would be involved. The height, particularly, of the ground level is a concern for the HSF as they

would like to see it remain as low as possible to accommodate everything that needs to happen.

Ms. Meunier said the HSF believes also that the windows are a bit tall on the Perry Street end. They believe, too, that the double-hung windows on the top level are a little tall. She said particularly when you look at the rear elevation.

Dr. Ted Moore came forward and stated that he and his wife, Linda, live at 229 East Broad Street [corner of East Broad and Perry Streets] in the Crawford Ward. Dr. Moore said they voice their support for the project. They are confident that the design enhances Crawford Square. He wanted it noted that the developer has walked throughout their house [every floor and every room] in order to gain detailed knowledge to ensure consistency of the construction. They believe that the property owner, Mr. Ogletree, as well as the developer have shown a very sincere interest in collaborating with the residents of the neighborhood.

Dr. Moore said as an illustration of this, they note that the developer's willingness to grant an easement of some of the additional footage adjacent to their back yard for landscaping as they desire. He said that this will improve the appearance of their home as well as the new units that are in the plan. They appreciate the opportunity to support the plan.

Mr. Tim Buck along with his neighbor, Ms. Carmen Redman, were present. Mr. Buck said they live across the street from the proposed development. The last time, they had a lot to say in opposing to the plan, but today they want to say "thank you." They really like the plan being presented today. He said that Crawford square as always been treated like the "step-sister" of the squares. They think the two townhouses that Mr. Ogletree is building that will face the Crawford Square will mirror the townhouses he has already built where Dr. Moore lives on East Broad Street will be a good testament to the square.

Mr. Buck said they appreciate the new parking concept down to five (5) units. They have polled the neighbors; they are in support of this. He asked the Board to support the proposal.

Dr. Henry stated that he believed it was reported by staff that the driveways would be exactly the same proximity to the existing buildings as the old ones. He said according to what Dr. Moore said, the new buildings will apparently be further away from the edges of those driveways than the old ones. He believed Ms. Michalak said they were the same.

Ms. Michalak said she thought they were the same. She asked Mr. Ogletree if the distance is larger this time.

Mr. Ogletree said he believes that Dr. Henry was referring to what Dr. Moore said about the additional landscape strip. He explained that when they went back to the "drawing board" on this, they talked to the developer, the neighbors and next door property owners. He said that they understand that there has been a concern for some time about the distance for getting in and out of the garages. He stated that this is the existing edge of driveway which was built and approved in 2006. A part of the design was to pull the buildings back and additional four (4) feet so that low landscaping could be done. Therefore, the building does not get built right on the property line.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Lominack said his concern is the big gaps between buildings. The gaps are wider than the lanes. For all visual purposes, they have created a "through street." The little wall between those driveways will not be seen. He said he believes that the rhythm of the entire strip along this façade is totally unlike the Historic District.

Ms. Ramsay said she agrees with Mr. Lominack and believes this is addressed elsewhere in the Historic District with either horizontal moving gates or wooden gates that open.

Mr. Lominack said he believes that Mr. Engle [who is not present today] said at the Board's last meeting suggested looking at a less conventional approach to designing a building for this site because of the unique situation of the site. He said apparently this has not been done.

Mr. Lominack said he believes that too many things have been forced to try to make it conform with an interpretation of the design criteria. He believes this is what has led to the funny stairs, height problems and some of the other things trying to make a traditional building out of a nontraditional condition.

Dr. Williams asked if the nontraditional condition is to accommodate parking.

Mr. Lominack said it is putting a group of residential buildings on trust lots do not occur much in the Historic District. But, in all cases where he could think of where it occurs, is in a continuous row of buildings. He said this is

true in Cohen Row and Troup Row.

Mr. Howington asked Mr. Lominack if he was saying that on Troup Row with reference to Dr. Williams's comment that the parking should be underneath the building.

Mr. Lominack said he was not really saying that, but he guesses what he is saying is that it needs to be a continuous row of buildings in order to be consistent with the Historic District.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Lominack if this would preclude the construction of a carriage house or some sort of parking facility in the back. He said as he recalls, the rule is you have to go into a lane.

Mr. Lominack explained that he was thinking of Troup Row where the end house on Troup Square faces the square and then the houses that continue on down between Macon and Harris Streets, the parking is off of Harris Street. But, it is a continuous row of buildings. Somehow all of this seems to work both visually and functionally.

Dr. Henry said the fairly new buildings near Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard have garages that go right out into the street. He said that personally, he finds these not too great.

Dr. Williams said one of the problems already existing on this block is they already have the precedent for the existing driveway breaking up. He said even if they built a row of five houses such as on Troup Square and he believes the same thing happens on one of the other squares where they have a continuous row that faces south with the garages on the street that faces north. Therefore, they have two rows of townhouses facing the south on the trust lots.

Mr. Lominack said if a mistake was made on the eastern end it does not mean that they should duplicate it on the western end.

Dr. Henry said he was positive that if you want a garage it has to face a lane, not a street.

Ms. Michalak clarified that the petitioner is requesting a variance from this standard for the two garages in the units facing Houston Street.

Board Action:

1. Approve the petition for New Construction: Part 1, Height and Mass at 545 East McDonough Street with the following conditions to be submitted with Part II, Design Details for review and approval:
 - a. All First Level floor-to-floor height must be reduced to a maximum of nine feet-six inches (9'-6") and the Third Level (for the East building) increased to a minimum of 10 feet to meet the standards.
 - b. For the East building, meet the "distance between windows" standard by adding another bay of windows or altering the window dimensions on the side elevations.
 - c. Provide walls of continuity along all street fronts adjacent to opening parking areas and driveway entrances to the garages. - PASS
 - d. Redesign the window opening sizes and proportions to be more compatible with adjacent historic structures.
 - e. Redesign the porticos' height and proportions to be more compatible with adjacent historic structures.
2. Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the 30 foot structured setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow for structured parking at the zero lot line along both East McDonough Street and East Perry Street, and a variance to allow for structured parking setback 11 feet from Houston Street within the ground floor of the West Building in this Trust Lot condition.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

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

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

22. [Amended Petition of Maggie Ward for Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay Architects | H-120621-4702 | 201 West Bay St. | Staff Approved - Exterior Courtyard Improvement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 West Bay Street H-120621-4702-2 Amended 4-9-13.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 West Bay Street H-120621-4702.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-001517-COA | 19-21 East River Street | Staff Approved - Mechanical Screening](#)

Attachment: [COA - 19-21 East River Street 13-001517-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 19-21 East River Street - 13-001517-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of David Rock | 13-001519-COA | 108 East Jones St. | Staff Approved - Stucco Repair/Repointing](#)

Attachment: [COA - 108 East Jones Street 13-001519-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 108 East Jones Street 13-001519-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Amended Petition of Brian Felder | 13-001597-COA | 27 Bull St. | Staff Approved - Existing Teller Window](#)

Attachment: [COA - 27 Bull Street 13-001597-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 27 Bull St. 13-001597-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Jason Varnadoe | 13-001724-COA | 201 West Bay St. | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 W. Bay Street 13-001724-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 W. Bay Street 13-001724-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Boyd Schalnat for Coastal Products, LLC | 13-001731-COA | 126 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 126 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-001731-COA.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 126 E. Oglethorpe Avenue 13-001731-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Amended Petition of Boyd Schalnat for Coastal Products, LLC | 13-001772-COA | 4 West Broughton St. | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 4 West Broughton Street 13-001772-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 4 West Broughton Street 13-001772-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Lawrence A. Roberts | 13-001797-COA | 245 Lincoln St. | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 245 Lincoln Street 13-001797-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 245 Lincoln Street 13-001797-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

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

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Work Without COA 5-8-13.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay stated that the report was included in the packets sent to the Board.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

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

Attachment: [HDBR Ward Items Deferred to Staff 5-8-13.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Levy's Letter.swb.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay stated that the report is included in the packets sent to the Board.

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

32. [Next Meeting - Wednesday June 12, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

Ms. Ramsay said it is an unpleasant issue, but Ms. Sarah Ward, is resigning.

Ms. Ward explained that she will be leaving the MPC to pursue other preservation efforts in Savannah. She said she has really enjoyed her time spent working here and has enjoyed working with the various Board members. Her last day will be Friday, June 7.

The Board members congratulated Ms. Ward and advised her that she will be surely missed.

Mr. Thomson said the entire MPC and staff will miss Ms. Ward. He said that Ms. Ward came here as second to Ms. Beth Reiter. During the first year, they had to deal with the rewrite of the ordinance. Ms. Ward took it by the horn and rode it all the way to the finish line. He believes that the current ordinance has been working well, especially for large-scale development. This is a big resume builder for her along with the day-to-day work. He said as the Board knows, the last two years have been 30 to 40 Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) a month. Mr. Thomson informed the Board that he will be working to find a good replacement.

33. [HSF Savannah Preservation Festival, May 2013](#)

Attachment: [Historic Savannah Foundation, Re; 2013 Savannah Preservation Festival 021113.pdf](#)

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

34. [Proposed amendment to the By-laws, Article VI, Section G](#)

Attachment: [Proposed Bylaw amendment - Conflict of Interest.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HDBR MINUTES 03-12-08.pdf](#)

Attachment: [GA Trust and Reap input - 041713.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Thomson Stillwell HDBR Conflict 032913.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Thomson ltr -Historic Review Board Recusal 3-13-13.pdf](#)

Attachment: [GAPC Chair input 031113.pdf](#)

Attachment: [CLG Coordinator input 031113.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Ward Hughes AIA Savannah HDBR Bylaws 050213.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Engle Bylaws Amendment 050713.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay said a motion is needed on the change to the By-laws.

Mr. Thomson said he understood from the last meeting during his absence that some of the Board members had questions regarding the proposed amendment to the By-laws.

Mr. Thomson said he believes the By-laws should be kept as they are. In several different sources and his experience with the MPC dealing with this same issue, it is not appropriate for a member of the Board to get up and represent a client. Then under any conditions leaving the room after a discussion or whatever, it is not a good perception to give people who are here for approval. Mr. Thomson said especially this Board tends to have more complicated items, technically, in terms of the reviews and often the public is either seeing, hearing or being involved in other cases; maybe fully understanding perspective of the other members of this Board and going away with a clear picture. What the public will go away with when they see a member of the Board step down from the dais; go to the microphone; represent the client and then walk out of the room, is that the Board member has their co-Board members making a decision.

Mr. Thomson said he strongly recommends not doing this. He is aware that there are members on the Board who have small firms that want to provide the best representation for their clients, but this is his recommendation and an answer to Mr. Engle's question at the last meeting.

Ms. Simpson asked if the Board needs to make a motion to keep everything as it is now.

Mr. Lominack said when the amendment was introduced, wasn't it introduced to be acted on at this meeting.

Ms. Ramsay said yes. They need a motion.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked that the proposed change be read.

Ms. Ramsay said as the By-laws now read "no Board member can take part in the hearings consideration or the determination of any petition which he or she is a party to or has a financial interest." She said "this includes members of the Board presenting an application to the Board on which he/she serves. In case of conflict of interest, the Board member shall complete a conflict of interest disclosure form and submit it for the record."

Ms. Ramsay said the above will be replaced in its entirety with "Conflict of Interest: No Board member shall take part in the deliberations and decisions of any petition in which he/she has a conflict of interest consistent with the "National Alliance of Preservation Commissions Code of Ethics for Commission and Staff." See "Appendix A." In the case of a conflict of interest, the Board member shall complete a conflict of interest disclosure form and submit it for the record. See "Appendix B." "

Ms. Simpson said basically, they are still saying that a Board member should not be a part of the deliberations.

Ms. McClain explained that this is saying the Board member can present.

Ms. Ramsay said they can present, but not be a part of the deliberations and decisions.

Ms. Simpson again asked for clarity if this is saying that the Board member can present.

Ms. Ramsay answered yes.

Mr. Thomson said if this particular wording is going to be supported by the Board in the By-law change, he suggested that the Board make it clear because anyone who reads this would believe the person would have to recuse his or herself and basically leave the room. But, this is not the intent of this. He explained that it should read "a Board member representing a client may step down from the dais and represent that client's case, but shall not take part in the deliberations and decisions." If this is not spelled out correctly, someone will see that happening, go to the Board's By-laws and say it says the Board member cannot do that. Mr. Thomson said in fact he read it and he thought that the Board was doing the recommendation that he thought they should be doing. He said he asked Ms. Ward if he was understanding this correctly.

Ms. McClain explained if that is the case, then the Board is changing the proposed By-laws. If the wording is going to be changed, then the Board needs to restate it again as the public must have to know in advance of the revision. It is not the same proposal that they put forth. Consequently, it would have to be rescheduled for the next Board meeting.

Ms. McClain said she is totally against the By-laws amendment. She believes it is a clear conflict of interest.

Dr. Williams asked if the Board needs a motion on the By-laws.

Ms. Ramsay said they have it presented and this is what they are hearing today. If they want to change it, if the person who made the By-laws amendment wants to adopt Mr. Thomson's language, a motion is needed.

Ms. McClain said this needs to be discussed.

Mr. Howington said the Board needs to discuss this thoroughly before a motion is made.

Dr. Henry said he believes that Mr. Thomson and Ms. McClain are correct. He believes that this needs to be clarified. When he read it, he did not understand it the way as it is being presented now. This has to be clarified and warrants more discussion.

Mr. Lominack said the dictionary defines "recusal" as not participating in the deliberations and the voting. He said that the conflict of interest form this Board uses ties the conflict of interest specifically to an ownership or financial interest. He believes it applies to real property which is real estate.

Ms. Ward pointed out that the Board received three correspondences after the agenda was released. These correspondences were printed and distributed to each Board member. Ms. Ward wanted to be sure that the Board members received this information.

Ms. Ward explained that Mr. Engle, Board member, could not be present today, but he sent a letter pertaining to this subject. A letter was received from AIA Savannah and Board member Weibe-Reed submitted a conflict of interest form from a prior board that she served on in a different state and, therefore, has different rules.

Ms. McClain said before the Board goes into further discussion a motion is in order.

Ms. Ramsay said a motion is in order.

Ms. McClain moved that the Board not amend their By-laws to delete Article VI, Paragraph G - Conflict of Interest in its entirety by substituting conflict of interest no Board member shall take part in the deliberations and decisions of any petition.

Ms. Simpson seconded the motion.

Dr. Williams asked if the motion is not approved, where does this leave the Board.

Ms. Ramsay said another motion would be needed.

Ms. McClain said if the motion fails, then it means that it has not been approved. If he wants to impose another By-law amendment, then it would have to go through the same process which means that it would have to be publicized.

Dr. Williams said if the motion fails, he was somewhat confused why the proposal some how would have to wait a month.

Dr. Henry explained that if they want to rewrite the By-laws for clarity, they would have to wait a month.

Ms. McClain said she believes that Mr. Engle did an excellent job in outlining the majority of the reasons why the Board should not amend their By-laws. She expressed at the last meeting that she took issue with the fact that Mr. Lominack proposed the By-law amendment because in proposing it, he has a conflict of interest. It is to his benefit.

Mr. Lominack said it is to Ms. McClain's benefit, too.

Ms. McClain stated that it is not to her benefit. She is not an architect. She will never present a petition before this Board. But, Mr. Lominack will clearly have potential conflicts.

Mr. Lominack said he does not consider it a conflict.

Ms. McClain explained that Mr. Lominack may not see it as a conflict, but technically it is. As she has said, she believes it was clearly a conflict of interest for Mr. Lominack to propose the By-law amendment. If the Board reads the points that Mr. Engle has expressed, she believes that he has clearly outlined the major points of contention that she has; she believes the points are great. Ms. McClain asked the Board members to please read Mr. Engle's letter and give it some consideration.

Ms. McClain believes that the Board would be doing a disservice to their community if they pass this amendment because it does not have a good appearance. It would not be a good look for this Board.

Mr. Lominack said he believes the Board would be doing a disservice to the community if they discourage those people who have probably the best qualifications to judge architecture.

Ms. McClain said Mr. Lominack cannot be fair in making that statement.

Mr. Howington said he sees both sides of it. He said he understands how the public can see it as a conflict of interest, but also he understands that as a presenter and a Board member that you can look at things objectively. In the past, a Board member was able to step down from the dais and present. He does not believe it was an issue in the past. Mr. Howington said this is an issue for the smaller firms.

Ms. Simpson said there had to be an issue in the past if the By-laws were changed.

Dr. Henry said he does not remember any Board members making any presentations. He has been on this Board five (5) years.

Mr. Lominack said when he was previously on the Board, he made presentations.

Ms. Simpson said, however, the Board saw a reason to change this.

Mr. Lominack said again that when he was on the Board, he made presentations. He said Mr. Dawson has told him that when he was on the Board, he made presentations.

Mr. Howington said he is aware that other persons on the Board in the past made presentations.

Ms. Ward explained that the amendment to the By-laws specifically stated the intent, as it was previously vague and the Board members were presenting. This amendment was added in 2008. A copy of the minutes showing when the By-laws was changed is attached. Questions were received about conflict of

interest from the public. This is why the By-laws became more specific.

Mr. Lominack said he believes that to expect people to serve on the Board and sacrifice their business for no pay is asking a lot.

Dr. Henry said serving on the Board is the life they chose.

Mr. Merriman said Dr. Henry made a good point. If it was between him getting a major job and being able to present it, he probably would present as bad as business has been since 2009. But, there are ways around it and it is important to stay beyond reproach.

Mr. Lominack said he will keep himself beyond reproach. He said he probably will resign. He is more interested in producing good architecture than he is trying to prevent bad architects.

Ms. McClain said getting back to the point she made, the newly revised rules of Robert's Rules of Order says in regard to abstaining from voting on a question of direct personal interest, "no member shall vote on a question in which he has a direct or personal or pecuniary interest not common to other members of the organization. For example if a motion proposes that the organization enters into a contract with a commercial firm of which a member of the organization is an officer and from which contract he will derive personal pecuniary profit, the member should abstain from voting on the motion."

Ms. McClain said potentially Mr. Lominack has a pecuniary interest in matters that are going to come before this Board. First, proposing the By-law amendment is a conflict of interest and he should not do it. He cannot vote on the By-law amendment; neither can any other member who may have a possible pecuniary interest in matters that will possibly come before this Board.

Mr. Lominack said it is possible that Ms. McClain may have one to come before this Board.

Dr. Williams said he was not discussing whether it constitutes a conflict of interest for Mr. Lominack to propose the amendment change, but what Ms. McClain read from Robert's Rules of Order, the wording was about voting which is less eliminating than what they currently have in their By-laws. He said that their current By-laws states that the Board member shall not take place in hearing consideration or determination.

Ms. Simpson said Ms. McClain was explaining his vote on the current motion.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, Ms. McClain was talking about this motion, not on the issue at hand.

Mr. Lominack said there is no specificity stated as to what Board members can present. Anybody on the Board can present if this is removed.

Dr. Williams said this is what he was saying. He said if he was interpreting what Ms. McClain read, a Board member cannot vote on anything that he or she has pecuniary interest. Did I hear that correctly?

Ms. McClain said she read a clause in Robert's Rules of Order some time in the past that when you bring a motion you should not have an interest in the motion. This is in Robert's Rules, but it will take some time for her to find it.

Mr. Lominack said they all have an interest in the By-laws.

Dr. Henry said, however, they all do not have a pecuniary interest.

Mr. Howington asked if he could make a motion to table the By-laws issue until they get further clarification of what they will actually be voting on.

Ms. McClain said a motion is on the floor that must be carried.

Ms. Weibe-Reed asked that as it stands now, the architect could vote on this. Right? There are four architects on the Board.

Mr. Merriman said he could not vote on the motion either.

Ms. McClain said this Board is heavily filled with architects.

Dr. Williams said Ms. McClain's concern is that an architect made the motion initially. He said hypothetically had he made the motion as an architectural historian, [he would not get a pecuniary interest as he does not design buildings] as he would not likely present a petition before this Board.

Ms. McClain said Dr. Williams would not have an interest. She asked Dr. Williams if he does consulting work.

Mr. Merriman said that is according to Robert's Rules of Order, but according to their By-laws as they stand now, each Board member has a vote. Do they not?

Ms. McClain said there is a conflict of interest.

Dr. Williams said his understanding is if he had proposed the amendment instead of Mr. Lominack, then Ms. McClain's current concern would not be an issue.

Ms. McClain said she is against the amendment, itself, but that is an additional concern.

Dr. Williams asked what is the Board voting on.

Ms. McClain explained that the Board is voting on not to amend their By-laws. This is the motion that is on the floor.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. McCain that according to Robert's Rules, Mr. Lominack would not be able to vote.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes it was said that no architect can vote on the motion.

Ms. McClain explained that if an individual has a pecuniary interest in the amendment, itself.

Mr. Howington stated that if even Dr. Williams made the motion, he (Howington) should not vote because there are times where he would present.

Ms. McClain said just about at every Board meeting, Mr. Howington recuses himself. He has a conflict. Ms. McClain said they just have to respect this for what it is. They are not saying that the individual should not get the business, but just have someone in the firm make the presentation.

Mr. Lominack said there is a relationship that develops between the architect and the client that you cannot transfer to someone else.

Ms. Simpson said Anne did just fine today in making the presentation. The project was approved.

Mr. Lominack said in all honesty, they have never had anything to be turned down by the Review Board. He is not so concerned about that as he is about in part because of people who do not any other staff member.

Ms. Simpson said there are other ways; there are contractors, sub-contractors, etc.

Dr. Henry said he asked a question at the last meeting that no one answered. Why would not a compromise be achievable if they could do essentially what they are talking about which is the architect sit in another room or in the audience and answer any questions that the presenter might have. This strikes him as a reasonable compromise. Either ways works for him.

Dr. Williams stated that the special relationship that develops between the architect and the client allows the architect uniquely to know how to response to issue that may come up. He asked Mr. Lominack if his position is that an issue may arise tin the deliberations that only he as the designer may be able to address appropriately.

Mr. Lominack said this is one of his concerns. His other concern is that if you tell a potential client that you cannot represent them, it is not good.

Ms. McClain said this is Mr. Lominack's personal opinion.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she does not have anybody that can present for her clients.

Ms. McClain asked Ms. Weibe-Reed if she works with other people.

Ms. Weibe-Reed answered no.

Ms. McClain said that Ms. Weibe-Reed recused herself on a petition for Dawson Architects. She said, therefore, Ms. Weibe-Reed works for Dawson and he can present for her.

Ms. Weibe-Reed said she would have to hire someone to present for her who would not know the client.

Ms. McClain said however Ms. Weibe-Reed is able to work it out. She explains that it is the same thing with attorneys. If they need someone to step in for them, they pay that person for the time they spend in court on their behalf.

Dr. Williams said if an architect is the sole proprietor for the sake of presentation finds someone rather they have to pay the person or whatever, Mr. Lominack would not have to do this because he has someone in his firm who can do it. He would obviously have to recuse himself from the deliberations, but if an issue came up that the presenter knew he was the person that could be consulted, [he does not know whether Mr. Lominack would be in the room or not] but have the freedom to come up and answer questions.

Ms. McClain said no; Mr. Lominack could not present before the Board.

Ms. Simpson said what the Board said at the last meeting, is that the presenter may go and ask that person and then come back with the answer to the question.

Dr. Williams said, therefore, Mr. Lominack as the principal designer or Ms. Weibe-Reed as the only person knows what is going on, if she is recusing whether sitting there or outside of the room, the presenter would say I am not in a position to answer that question, but will consult with someone who knows the answer. Is Mr. Lominack or Ms. Weibe-Reed in or in another room?

Ms. McClain said they should be outside.

Mr. Lominack said he did not leave the room.

Ms. Ramsay said she was the individual who said that she did not believe that Mr. Lominack should leave the room. She believes it is the person's project and they should be able to hear the comments people are making and you need to be able to answer that question in the context that it is asked. They had an example of Ann today. She does not know if Ann really knew about the utilitarian step-down, but she had to answer it. But, then the presenter has to repeat the Board's question exactly.

Ms. McClain said she believes that you have to consider these things before you consider yourself up to be appointed to this Board.

Ms. Ramsay said the architects who are sitting on this Board now did not know that this was a rule before they agreed to serve. They made their petition to serve and now they are going to restrict the pool of architects who are willing to serve on this Board.

Mr. Thomson said a few years ago, Ms. Ramsay presented a client which generated the By-law change.

Ms. Ramsay said they can go into the history of it. She said she represented a neighbor who had a conflict of interest with somebody. The individual and their attorney raised a lot of hell about it.

Mr. Thomson said Ms. Ramsay was at the microphone representing the person.

Ms. Ramsay said it was a neighbor. It is grossly unfair that this came up.

Mr. Thomson said he knows this is emotional, but it is unfortunate because what they are debating is how

to let a sole practitioner be on this Board. But this is not what they need to be debating. He said what they should be debating is maintaining the quality of perception of fairness to the public by having a member step-down from the dais, go to the microphone, represent his/her client; and even if he/she leaves the room at this point, the damage has been done in terms of the perception.

Dr. Henry said he is in full agreement with what Mr. Thomson said.

Mr. Thomson said it is unfortunate and "yes" there are some firms, but there are a lot of architects who never touch downtown.

Mr. Lominack said these are the ones that they don't need.

Mr. Thomson said he does not agree with that. He believes that the individual will have a learning curve just like anybody else that gets appointed, but as a professional engineer, he will pick it up a lot faster than a lawyer, etc.

Ms. Ramsay said she could not agree with Mr. Thomson more, but she believes the issue is getting the most qualified person to serve on this Board. By narrowing the pool of qualified persons, you are not going to get the most qualified people. If you look back to the decisions that have been made, even today, it is the architects who can read the drawings who pick up the inconsistencies.

Dr. Henry said essentially two-thirds of this Board are architects and the other professions are closely related. They have talent.

Ms. Ramsay said again that none of the architects who sit on this Board knew this was a part of their agreement when they became a member of this Board.

Dr. Williams said it appears that Mr. Thomson has put special emphasis on the wording "step-down from the dais" and go to the microphone and present the project. He asked if one of the architects recuses him or herself and sits over there and someone else from their firm or if they don't have someone from their firm, some other person presents it, but the architect is available to be a resource to that presenter. Is this a conflict of interest?

Mr. Howington said not as long as the architect does not come to the podium.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Lominack if this would be a solution for him since he proposed this motion.

Mr. Thomson said this would be better and he advised him to sit in the Jerry Surrency room. He said technically you are suppose to leave the room and not be present during the deliberations.

Mr. Thomson said he has been through this with the Planning Commission and they decided that even if you had a relationship with someone or if they are your next door neighborhood or a friend, they let it be known and say that they can be objective with their vote. The financial interest errs on the side of perception. He explained that an issue arose with Mr. Doug Bean if he had let it be known that he had done work with the individual before, but at the moment that he did not have any work for them, it would not have been an issue. But, this was not disclosed. It was after the fact that people started complaining about it.

Ms. McClain called for the question.

Dr. Henry said as a Board they have to look pure or they are in trouble.

Dr. Williams said he knows that the question has been called, but what if Mr. Lominack or one of the other architects said as a compromise, my By-laws do not allow me to be consulted if need be wherever they are sitting in the room or outside of the room; but hypothetically if this was amiable to the architects, would this entail a revision of this language?

Ms. McClain said yes; at the next meeting.

Dr. Williams said the motion gets voted down, then someone else could propose a revision.

Ms. McClain said if this is done, the Board would have to wait and the meeting after next, the Board would

be able to vote on it.

Dr. Williams said if the motion is voted down now, can something be done now or do they need the wording first.

Ms. McClain said they would need the new wording.

Dr. Williams asked if this would be presented that the next meeting.

Ms. McClain answered yes.

Mr. Howington said, however, to clarify that, it would be even the architect technically should not be the one to make the new motion.

Dr. Williams said the Board obviously does not want Mr. Lominack to resign. He has heard the concerns.

Mr. Lominack said he was present today and Ann made the presentation. He briefed her on the project, but he happens to be the architect of record on this project. Ann and he communicated well on the project, but there were a couple of issues that came up that Anne did not know the answer. It was obvious to him that she not know the answer. He would have answered the questions easily and his client was sitting there. In fact when he found out that he could not present the project, the client told him that she expected him to present the project.

Dr. Williams said he was not sure that the current wording allows the presenter to feel empowered that they do have the architect as a resource.

Mr. Lominack said the amendment does not specifically say an architect. It is any member of the Board.

Mr. Howington said in the case of today, what they are saying that it would have been perfectly okay when Ann did not know the answer to the question, she could have walked over to Mr. Lominack and consulted with him. Then come back to the podium.

Dr. Henry said his preference is that Mr. Lominack would be in another room.

Dr. Williams said again that he is not really sure if the wording in the By-laws make this specifically clear. He prefers transparency to the public that when they see Mr. Lominack being consulted, the wording in their By-laws will show that it is not a conflict. He said he understands the concerns that Mr. Thomson has stated about perception, but he also sympathizes with the situation.

Ms. McClain said if the Board needs more clarification on what the conflict of interest is, may be they should get the City Attorney in on this and have him give a lesson to a lot of folks. She believes the City Attorney will be in agreement with her as well. Ms. McClain believes this will save them a lot of time.

Dr. Williams said this would allow the City Attorney the opportunity to address his question. Maybe this needs to be tabled until such time.

Mr. Lominack said he wants to serve on this Board and he also wants to continue practicing architecture.

Dr. Williams said maybe the City Attorney can look at the existing By-laws and hear their argument. Can they table this?

Mr. Lominack said he was not sure the motion on the floor could be voted on if four of the persons present could not vote.

Ms. McClain withdrew her motion.

Ms. Simpson withdrew her second.

Ms. McClain moved that the discussion of the amendment to the By-laws be tabled until the Board has had a chance to talk with the City Attorney.

Dr. Henry seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Board Action:

Approve to table the proposed amendment to the By-laws,
Article VI, Section G to meet with City Attorney. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Ebony Simpson

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

35. [Adjourned.](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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