



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
August 10, 2016 1:00 P.M.  
Meeting Minutes

**AUGUST 10, 2016 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair  
Justin Gunther, Vice-Chair  
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian  
Debra Caldwell  
Jennifer Deacon  
Dr. Betsy Dominguez  
Keith Howington  
Becky Lynch  
Andy McGarrity  
Tess Scheer

**HDRB Member Not Present:** Kellie Fletcher

**MPC Staff Present:** Tom Thomson, Executive Director  
Leah G. Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner  
Sara Farr, Historic Preservation Planner  
Alyson Smith, Historic Preservation Planner  
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

1. [Presentation for Certificates of Appreciation to Past Board Members](#)

**Mr. Merriman** called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. He outlined the role of the Historic District Board of Review and explained the process for hearing the various petitions. Staff will present each application with a recommendation. The petitioner will have the opportunity to respond to the recommendation. The petitioners are asked to limit their presentation to 10 minutes or less and only address the items identified as inconsistent with the ordinance and questions raised by the Board. The public will have the same allotted time, ten minutes, to comment. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments.

The Board will then go into Board discussion at which time no further testimony is received unless specifically requested by the Chairman. Each Board member will be given two minutes twice to provide comments, if they so desire.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Merriman**, on behalf of the Historic District Board of Review and staff, presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Ms. Ebony Simpson and Dr. Nicholas Henry for their years of services to the Review Board.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Michalak** introduced Ms. Alyson Smith, a new employee to the Preservation Department. Ms. Smith is no stranger as she worked in this department several years ago. Ms. Smith stated that she recently returned to Savannah from San Antonio, TX where she was doing preservation work. She was excited about being back in Savannah.

## II. SIGN POSTING

## III. CONSENT AGENDA

### 2. [Approval of Consent Agenda August 10, 2016](#)

#### Board Action:

Approve Consent Agenda August 10, 2016. - PASS

#### Vote Results

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Not Present

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

### 3. [Petition of Commonwealth Construction | 16-003917-COA | 100 West Liberty Lane | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Masonry Base Details.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the petition for the iron fence at 100 West Liberty Lane with the condition that material specifications for the masonry base are - PASS provided for staff approval, because otherwise the fence meets the standards and is visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

4. [Petition of JDR Construction and Design | 16-003985-COA | 225 East Huntingdon Street | Additions](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 225 East Huntingdon Street 16-003985-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Renovation Plans.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the installation of railings and decking at 225 East Huntingdon Street, because the work meets the standards and is visually - PASS compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

5. [Petition of Jasper Design Services | 16-004020-COA | 412 East Gaston Street | Fence and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the proposed work at 412 East Gaston Street with the condition that specifications and a color are provided for the privacy screen for staff approval, because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

6. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 16-004021-COA | 25 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve a projecting principal use sign and an under-awning sign at 25 East Broughton Street with the following conditions:

1. The under-awning sign is located not less than one foot from the outer edge of the awning; - PASS
2. A COA is submitted and approved for the

awning;

because otherwise the signs meet the standards and are visually compatible.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

7. [Adoption of Agenda for August 10, 2016 Meeting](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby adopt the August 10, 2016 Meeting Agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Keith Howington

Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

8. [Approval of July 13, 2016 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [07-13-2016 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review  
does hereby approve the meeting minutes of July 13, 2016. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer  
Second: Jennifer Deacon  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Jennifer Deacon - Aye  
Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Keith Howington - Abstain  
Becky Lynch - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Abstain  
Andy McGarrity - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain  
Tess Scheer - Aye

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

**VII. CONTINUED AGENDA**

9. [Continue All Items to Next Regular Meeting](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review  
does hereby continue all items as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer  
Second: Becky Lynch  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Jennifer Deacon - Aye  
Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Becky Lynch - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

10. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 15-001384-COA | 600 East Bay Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer  
Second: Becky Lynch  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Jennifer Deacon - Aye  
Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Becky Lynch - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Andy McGarrity - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain  
Tess Scheer - Aye

11. [Petition of Barnard Architects | 16-002725-COA | 202 East Gaston Street | Alterations and Addition](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer  
Second: Becky Lynch  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Jennifer Deacon - Aye  
Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Becky Lynch - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Andy McGarrity - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain  
Tess Scheer - Aye

12. [Petition of Lynch Associates Architects | 16-002753-COA | 606 Abercorn Street | Addition](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

13. [Petition of Gary Sanders | 16-003487-COA | 305 West Wayne Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye



14. [Petition of LS3P Dawson | 16-003490-COA | 10 East Broad Street | New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

15. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects |16-003492-COA | 607 Drayton Street | New Construction: Part II, Design Details](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

16. [Petition of Reardon Design | 16-004016-COA | 125 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | New Storefront](#)

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer

Second: Becky Lynch

Debra Caldwell - Aye

Jennifer Deacon - Aye

Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye

Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Becky Lynch - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Andy McGarrity - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Tess Scheer - Aye

**VIII. REGULAR AGENDA**

17. [Petition of Shauna Kucera | 16-003712-COA | 117 West Jones Street | Addition and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package 1.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Package 2.pdf](#)

**Ms. Shauna Kucera** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sara Farr** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to 117 West Jones Street. The work includes the addition of a porch structure on an existing wood frame deck. The existing decking will remain. The new elements include columns, railings, and a roof over the existing deck. Both sides of the porch will be enclosed with wood shutters. Additionally, the stairs will be relocated and reconfigured to include a new landing and the extension of the existing landing. Materials will include a standing seam metal roof, composite trim, refinished antique brackets, and wood columns with composite trim. Ms. Farr stated that a COA (H-20090319-4125-2) was approved to install the rear deck on June 10, 2009. Therefore, it is a non-historic addition.

**Ms. Farr** reported that staff recommends approval for the proposed porch alterations and roof with the following conditions to be approved by staff:

1. The balusters are spaced a maximum of 4 inches on center;
2. The railing height is lowered to 36 inches;
3. Revised brackets are provided for staff approval;

Because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Kucera** showed the board the brackets that they were proposing to use. She said regarding the balusters height and spacing is not a problem. They will ensure that they are lowered to 36 inches and that they have the four inches maximum between the balusters. Ms. Kucera confirmed that the rear deck was built in 2009 with the intention of putting a roof on it. They are now at the point where they are ready to do so. They have designed the columns, the wood shutters, and the ends of the deck to harmonize with what they believe is happening within the Savannah Landmark Historic District.

**Ms. Kucera** explained that they are hopeful that the brackets would be approved to be used in this contemporary addition to the house. They are proposing to use three of the brackets and align them with the large columns.

**Mr. Merriman** asked what materials were the brackets made out of.

**Ms. Kucera** answered that the brackets were made out of pine material. It is wood.

**Mr. Howington** asked about the height of the seam for the metal roof. Sometimes these roofs can be relatively tall.

**Ms. Kucera** stated that she would be comfortable working with an inch standing seam height. The slope is almost flat at a 1/12 inch pitch.

**Ms. Deacon** stated that the brackets are made of wood, but they are not historic.

**Ms. Kucera** said their understanding is the brackets are historic, but she does not have proof or documentation of where the brackets came from nor how old they are. However, they are not recently made; they are from an antique dealer.

**Mr. Howington** asked staff if the bracket that Ms. Kucera is showing is the revised bracket.

**Ms. Farr** stated she believes these are the revised brackets that Ms. Kucera is submitting now for approval.

**Mr. Merriman** explained that Ms. Kucera is in agreement with staff's recommendations one and two, and she does not agree with staff's 3rd recommendation and is making her case.

**Ms. McClain** stated she believes the brackets are painted. She asked Ms. Kucera if she painted it or whether it was purchased that way?

**Ms. Kucera** answered that it was purchased that way.

**Ms. Deacon** asked what would the Board be voting on with staff's recommendation number 3.

**Ms. Farr** explained that the petitioner wants to use the antique brackets, but staff believes the brackets create a false sense of history. Therefore, staff believes contemporary brackets would be better.

**Ms. Lynch** asked if brackets are on the front or back of the existing historic house.

**Mr. Paul Jaqua** answered that there is a parapet brick wall around the top of the structure. It runs from ground level to the top. It is four stories of brick. A four inch protruding dental molding goes around the top of the entire building. This is a duplex.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendations. They discussed that the proposed brackets create a false sense of history. The materials are the primary concern. They discussed the roof seams. It needs to be a maximum of one inch tall.

### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve the proposed porch alterations and roof with the following conditions to be approved by staff:

1. The balusters are spaced a maximum of 4 inches on center;
2. The railing height is lowered to 36 inches;
3. Revised brackets are provided for staff approval; - PASS
4. The roof has seams a maximum of 1 inch tall;

Because otherwise the work meets the standards and is visually compatible.

### **Vote Results**

Motion: Tess Scheer  
Second: Justin Gunther  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Jennifer Deacon - Aye  
Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye

Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

18. [Petition of Sottile & Sottile | 16-004018-COA | 419 West Congress Street | Roof Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 3-Dimensional Design Studies.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings, Photos, etc..pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Rendered Elevations.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Site Plans.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Variance Request.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Mezzanine Diagram.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a rooftop addition for the building located at 419 West Congress Street (also known as 36 MLK, Jr. Blvd.) The building is located on a highly visible corner site on the southeast corner of Congress at MLK. It is an historic brick 3-story commercial building. The roof addition is proposed to cover the majority of the roof area with projecting canopies that extend past the historic building's street-fronting facades.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that the petitioner is also requesting a variance from the design standard that states:

*Additions to roofs shall not be visible from the front elevation.*

She said more specifically, the petitioner is "requesting a variance from the common practice of evaluating this standard from the opposite side of the adjacent right-of-way, instead requesting that the standard be applied from the adjacent sidewalk as the primary pedestrian realm in this specific context."

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends that the petition for a rooftop addition for the building located at 419 West Congress Street be continued in order for the petitioner to redesign the roof top addition. Staff recommends that the following items be addressed in the redesign:

- a. Do not change the historic building's overall form, shape, or alter spatial relationships. Ensure that the addition is subordinate to the historic building and that it does not overpower the historic form.
- b. Reduce the height and the footprint of the addition and increase the setback of the addition from both the Congress and MLK facades at least one full architectural bay.
- c. Redesign the addition's canopy to not extend past or overhang the top of the historic building.
- d. Redesign the south façade of the addition to have a more visually compatible rhythm of solids to voids.
- e. Select a more visually compatible exterior wall material than the proposed painted flush wood horizontal siding.
- f. Ensure that the addition doesn't alter the inherent horizontal nature of the building; as

currently designed, the addition changes the building's overall directional expression to one that is vertical in nature.

- g. Clarify and/or ensure that the aggregate floor of the mezzanines proposed within each of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor units are not more than one-third of the area of the room or space in which it is located.
- h. Ensure that all addition windows are an operable type as permitted in the ordinance and ensure that all addition windows are inset not less than 3 inches.
- i. Provide a full size sample and a specification for review by the Board for the proposed "Kolbe, Vistaluxe Collection" windows as these windows have not been previously approved for use on additions or new construction.
- j. Revise the addition's roof design to meet the ordinance roof standards.
- k. Ensure that the addition is not visible from the front façade of the building; in this case, the front façade has been determined to be from the west side of MLK Blvd. in front of the Ships of the Sea Museum.

**Ms. Michalak** reported also that staff recommends denial of the request for a variance from the design standard that states:

*Additions to roofs shall not be visible from the front elevation.*

Because the variance criteria are not met.

**Mr. Gunther** asked staff if the rooftop addition was being considered a single story even though it has an expression of two stories.

**Ms. Michalak** answered "yes" because the mezzanine is less than one-third of the floor area which means it does not count as a story even, though, it is 15'-4".

**Ms. Lynch** asked staff is it their position that the standard is met, that it only appears as one story because of the overhang, although, it is taller than the other stories.

**Ms. Michalak** answered for example in looking at this you cannot see what is above the canopy. Therefore, staff felt the intent of the standard here was met. Once you get all the way down MLK to Bay Street you may be able to see what is above the canopy.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Sottile** came forward and thanked the staff for the review. He said it is a privilege to address the Board today and continue the conversation on the design the preservation communities are having at the intersection of historic preservation and urban evolution. Mr. Sottile introduced Mr. Craig Clements, architect; Attorney Harold Yellin; and Mr. Ben Tower, property owner, as the team accompanying him today.

**Mr. Sottile** began his presentation with a simple premise; Savannah is a living city. In a survey of the urban landscape reveals that every era of its evolution is represented. There are many examples of the buildings that bear the mark of multiple eras and the contribution of each of these are prized. He said that this really leads to an equally important premise which is historic preservation is a living discipline. The ordinance embraces the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. These ten concise statements seek to summarize principles that have been defined by the preservation movement for more than 50 years. However, the way that the standards are interpreted and apply continue to evolve as living cities emerge from the abandonment that they suffered in the 20th Century.

**Mr. Sottile** said the team put a great deal of thought into the thesis behind the project. It seems like a simple project on the surface, but it offers important questions about the city and how they think about architecture in the city. This structure is actually where he was reared (a photo was shown). This building was built during a period of significance in Savannah. After it was built, new owners took it over and had different ideas of about what new levels on this building might be. The building was remodeled and took on a new form with a new expression. He said they celebrate these kinds of moments in the city and they are a part of how they can tell their own story. In 2009, they were fortunate to present to the Review Board the SCAD Museum of Art which was a historic, single story freight warehouse which was transformed into a two-story museum of contemporary art through the addition of contrasting, but complimentary form. This, too, was controversial at the time. However, the Board took a forward looking stance with the understanding that Savannah is a living city. The design sparked much discussion, but when the museum was completed, it received recognition. Factually, it received one of the highest recognition from the preservation community - the National Preservation Honor Award.

**Mr. Sottile** explained that the project they are presenting today represents a similar, but a much smaller scale, opportunity. He said that 419 West Congress Street is a fine example of an ordinary working style building. Several years ago, they wouldn't have given thought about removing it and replacing it with another building for new development. However, they feel strongly that the building represents an important era of the city's development. The building deserves preservation and reinvestment. The proposed intervention in no way alters or compromises the historic materials or the defining features. It adds a complimentary form to it. The facades are expressed in smooth painted wood cladding referencing smooth painted wood of the building's first floor. The wood in this case, however, is organized with a framework of structural steel. So, the overall affect is respectful, but mutually engaged in conversation between two confident architectural expressions, each speaking of its own time.

**Mr. Sottile** was hopeful that the Board would support the petition and apply the principles of preservation that are embodied in the ordinance and help them with what could be a progressive and forward looking approach to this building; thereby respecting its past and evolving into a more vibrant future. The building is clearly differentiated from the historic form and shape in materials and expression. The historic building remains clearly dominant from every pedestrian vantage. The mass of the new form is not visible from the adjacent sidewalk as illustrated in the site line studies. The awning is not in this context considered a part of the mass of the building.

**Mr. Sottile** said they were asked in the staff's comments to reduce the height and footprint. But, he wanted to inform the Board that this a small site; the footprint that they have proposed is necessary to create a viable fourth level to the building that is permitted by the height map. The design is intentionally structured to screen all the mechanicals within the main volume of the addition. He said reducing the awning projection was brought up, but the awning was created to provide a visual cap to the building and create a visual break between the upper and lower levels. While the new form is offset from the historic structure, awnings are commonly added to buildings through the Landmark District that extend over the sidewalk. Mr. Sottile said regarding the question pertaining to solids and voids, the specific question related to the south façade, a party wall is here. Therefore, they are not permitted to add windows to this wall, but they designed the massing of the wall to be articulated in a series of vertical bays through the repetition of the structure. He said a

question came up about the painted wood. But, their thought here is that it is visually compatible. The first floor is expressed with smooth wood. The horizontal coursing references the brick below.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said their Architectural Review Committee met with the petitioner and reviewed the project. They agree and support the staff's recommendations. They believe that the staff report based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the ordinance are very defensible; also covered with what has been the HSF's opposition to rooftop additions. However, he believes this is a really important matter. They are supporting staff, but there is a lot to talk about. He agrees with the recommendation to continue this petition as the dialog on this matter needs to continue. He met with the petitioner last week and clearly they are thinking outside the box or in this case over and above the box. Mr. Carey said they must face reality about rooftop additions. They have opposed rooftops for several years and argued against them. Yet, he cannot think of an instance where they have denied a rooftop addition. They discussed them through the Secretary of Interior's Standards, the ordinance and the visual compatibility; and when they are finished they end up with something he supposes is satisfactory or acceptable. They end up with something, but is not inspiring or great. This is an important evolving issue. Mr. Carey believes they can "play it safe" and be justified in doing so. They can say no to this petition based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards and ordinance or they can encourage the dialog to go on. They have the opportunity with this talented architect and designer to look at something in a slightly different way.

**Mr. Carey** said he believes they should bear in mind that a risk reward situation is here in the hands of lesser designers and lesser architects; they could come up with some bad versions of rooftop additions. While they don't exist on precedent, but, nevertheless, there are glaring examples in the community that are often pointed to as either being something that was allowed, approved, etc., and say how could you deny "this" when "that" was allowed or approved. By the same token, when something is good they can point to those same examples. If they are going to come to reality on the entire notion of rooftop additions [he believes the urban environment is evolving] they are getting a denser community; more things are coming back downtown and they should probably try to set good examples and precedents for others to follow, even if just an illustrations because they do not rely on precedents. He believes this needs more evaluation; more conversation and maybe they can work together with the petitioner and find something that is not just in the middle of the road. Find something that meets the letter of the law and that executes their program for the building.

**Mr. Ben Tower** said the rooftop is not essential to the project as a whole. He met with Mr. Sottile who presented to him what he would consider a very interesting design. From that standpoint, he wanted to continue the conversation. He said from an owner's standpoint, he is interested in finding out how they can do something that will truly be a great addition.

**Mr. Sottile**, in response to public comments, thanked the Board, staff, and HSF for engaging in this conversation which is good to have. They believe this is a perfect building to have such a conversation. They realize that the fundamental question is whether the addition will be visible. It is a question that they will have to cross a threshold as a group. They have heard the comments and they are open to having a continuance. But, they do recognize that because of the small size of this building, an addition will be visible. As



he has stated, this is a threshold that they as a group will have to cross.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

The Board discussion centered on the following concerns regarding the overall proposed project:

- The proposed addition changes the historic building's overall form, shape, and alters spatial relationships. The addition should be subordinate to the historic building and should not overpower the historic form.
- The height and the footprint of the addition should be reduced and the setback of the addition from both the Congress and MLK facades should be increased to at least one full architectural bay.
- The addition's canopy should be redesigned to not extend past or overhang the top of the historic building.
- The south façade of the addition should be redesigned to have a more visually compatible rhythm of solids to voids.
- Consider selecting a more visually compatible exterior wall material than the proposed painted flush wood horizontal siding.
- The addition shouldn't alter the inherent horizontal nature of the building; as currently designed, the addition changes the building's overall directional expression to one that is vertical in nature.
- Clarify that the aggregate floor of the mezzanines proposed within each of the 4th floor units are not more than one-third of the area of the room or space in which it is located. *(The petitioner provided a diagram clarifying that this standard is met during the meeting.)*
- All addition windows should be an operable type as permitted in the ordinance and not be inset less than 3 inches.
- A full size sample and a specification should be provided for review by the Board for the proposed "Kolbe, Vistaluxe Collection" windows as these windows have not been previously approved for use on additions or new construction. *(The petitioner provided a full size window sample during the meeting.)*
- The addition's roof design should meet the ordinance roof standards.
- The addition should not be visible from the front façade of the building; in this case, the front façade has been determined to be from the west side of MLK Blvd. in front of the Ships of the Sea Museum.

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby continue the petition for a rooftop addition for the building located at 419 West Congress Street in order for the petitioner to PASS address comments made by the Board and the public during the meeting.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Tess Scheer	
Debra Caldwell	- Aye
Jennifer Deacon	- Aye
Dr. Betsy Dominguez	- Aye
Justin Gunther	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Becky Lynch	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Andy McGarrity	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Tess Scheer	- Aye

## IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

### 19. [Petition of Diversified Designs | 15-003896-COA | 714-718 Montgomery Street | 12-month extension](#)

Attachment: [Extension\\_316-320 West Gwinnett Street..pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve a 12 month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on December 9, 2015 for new construction at 316-320 West Gwinnett Street to expire on December 9, 2017. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington  
Second: Zena McClain, Esq.  
Andy McGarrity - Aye  
Tess Scheer - Aye  
Debra Caldwell - Aye  
Jennifer Deacon - Aye  
Dr. Betsy Dominguez - Aye  
Justin Gunther - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Becky Lynch - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

### 20. [Petition of Diversified Designs | 15-005576-COA | 316-310 West Gwinnett Street | 12-month extension](#)

Attachment: [Extension\\_316-320 West Gwinnett Street..pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review does hereby approve a 12 month extension of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued on December 9, 2015 for new construction at 316-320 West Gwinnett Street to expire on December 9, 2017. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington  
Second: Zena McClain, Esq.  
Debra Caldwell  
Jennifer Deacon  
Dr. Betsy Dominguez  
Justin Gunther  
Keith Howington  
Becky Lynch  
Zena McClain, Esq.  
Andy McGarrity  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.  
Tess Scheer

- Aye  
- Aye  
- Aye  
- Aye  
- Aye  
- Aye  
- Aye  
- Aye  
- Aye  
- Abstain  
- Aye

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

21. [Petition of Danielle Jarvis | 16-001809-COA | 505 and 507 East McDonough Street | Staff Approved - Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 505 and 507 East McDonough Street 16-001809-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 505 and 507 East McDonough Street 16-001809-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | 16-002754-COA | 518 Indian Street | Staff Approved - New Storefront Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 518 Indian Street 16-002754-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [HDBR 7\\_1\\_16 522 INDIAN STREET.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Sam Carroll for Carroll Construction | 16-003718-COA | 466 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - New Door](#)

Attachment: [COA - 466 Montgomery Street b16-003718-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Supplemental Information.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Scotty Snipes for Snipes Properties LLC - SHC | 16-003757-COA | 35 Houston Street |](#)

Staff Approved - Repairs

Attachment: [2016-06-30 13.54.pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 35 Houston Street 16-003757-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. Petition of John Post for Commonwealth Construction | 16-003850-COA | 100 West Liberty Lane | Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 100 West Liberty Lane 16-003850-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application & Submittal Packet 100 West Liberty Lane 16-003850-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. Amended Petition of Scott Cook for LS3P | 16-003879-COA | 512 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Amendments to New Construction

Attachment: [COA - 512 West Oglethorpe Ave - 16-003879-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aloft Hotel \\_amendment 7-6-16.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. Petition of Christian Sottile for Sottile and Sottile | 16-003918-COA | 200 West Harris Street | Staff Approved - Gates and Lighting

Attachment: [COA - 200 West Harris Street 16-003918-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 200 West Harris Street 16-003918-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. Petition of the Fitts Company, Inc. | 16-003922-COA | 151 West Bryan Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Changes

Attachment: [COA - 151 West Bryan Street 16-003922-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 151 West Bryan Street 16-003922-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. Petition of Doug Patten for City of Savannah | 16-003936 | 201 Habersham Street | Staff Approved - Roof

Attachment: [COA - 201 Habersham Street 16-003936-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 Habersham Street 16-003936-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. Petition of Russell Kueker | 16-003982-COA | 545 East Congress Street | Staff Approved - Existing Fence

Attachment: [COA - 545 East Congress Street 16-003982-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 1 - 545 East Congress Street 16-003982-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 2 - 545 East Congress Street 16-003982-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 3 - 545 East Congress Street 16-003982-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Dan Koebel for Selma Street Student Living, LLC | 16-004029-COA | 540 Selma Street | Staff Approved - Sign Face Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 540 Selma Street 16-004029-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 540 Selma Street 16-004029-COA Ext. Signage - Previously Approved Submittal - 11-12-14.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Jim Galvano | 16-004209-COA | 450 Bull Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 450 Bull Street 16-004209-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 450 Bull Street 16-004209-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Tim Donahue | 16-004214-COA | 506 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 506 East Broughton Street 16-002414-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Colors.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Donnie Rushing for Coastal Canvas Products | 16-004223-COA | 109 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 109 West Broughton Street 16-004223-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 109 West Broughton Street 16-0016-4223-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Clif Cooper, AIA | 16-004303-COA | 1 West Jones Street | Staff Approved - Replace Fence](#)

Attachment: [COA - 1 West Jones Street 16-004303-COA.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 1 West Jones Street 16-004303-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Amended Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson LS3P | 16-004370-COA | 12 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Balconies](#)

Attachment: [COA - 12 West Oglethorpe Avenue 16-004370-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 12 West Oglethorpe Avenue 16-004370-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Dennis J. Murphy | 16-004396-COA | 245 Lincoln Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 245 Lincoln Street 16-004396-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 245 Lincoln Street 16-004396-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | 16-004440-COA | 518 Indian Street | Staff Approved - Fence Replacement](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Info - 518 Indian Street 16-004440-COA AMERISTAR MONTAGE - GENESIS GATE - TYP.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Info - 518 Indian Street 16-004440-COA montageplus-flier \(002\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Info - 518 Indian Street 16-004440-COA AMERISTAR MONTAGE - GENESIS TECH DWG - TYP. \(002\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 518 Indian Street 16-004440-COA HRB Drawing Set - Hamilton-Adler Fence \(002\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [COA - 518 Indian Street 16-004440-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

## **XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 8-10-16.pdf](#)

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

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

### **Notices**

40. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, August 18, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in the Meyer Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

41. [Next Regular Meeting - Wednesday, September 14, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

## **XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Unfinished Business**

42. [Review Proposed Revisions to the Historic District Ordinance](#)

Attachment: [SHD Large Scale Development Archaeology Policy - DRAFT 5-9-16.pdf](#)

Attachment: [SHD Large Scale Development Public Art Policy - DRAFT 5-9-16.pdf](#)

Attachment: [5-11-16 HDBR Version- for discussion.pdf](#)

**Ms. Michalak** stated that the Board and staff have been working on the revisions to the Historic District Ordinance. They have focused on improving the Large Scale Development Standards, which has been in effect for nine years. These standards have been used primarily in the last few years since the economy has improved. They are now seeing the results and the effects of the large scale development. She said that they all agree that the large scale development standards need some improvement. This is the last section that the Board will review. Ms. Michalak stated that Ms. Harris, when she returns from maternity leave, will review all the changes that have been made to the Historic District Ordinance with the Board before it is presented to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

**Ms. Michalak** said the consensus was that more options need to be added to the Large Scale Development Standards to achieve a bonus story. They have proposed adding an Archaeology Policy and a Public Art Policy. She explained that as part of the Large Scale Development standards in Section 8-3030,(16), 2 of the Savannah Historic District ordinance, the Historic District Board of Review (the Board) adopts the Archaeology Policy for use as one possible criterion to qualify for an additional story. The goal of this policy is to promote archaeology in a consistent and predictable manner. The goals of archaeology in general are to understand history of past societies, to determine how people in these societies lived, to understand why the societies change through time, and the preservation of cultural resources. Likewise, as part of the Large Scale Development standards in Section 8-3030,(16), 2 of the Savannah Historic District ordinance, the Historic District Board of Review (the Board) adopts the Public Art Policy for use as one possible criterion to qualify for an additional story. The goal of the public art policy is to enhance Savannah's public spaces and create unique, engaging places. Public art can take on many forms. This policy will describe the public art policies, guidelines, and application process. It is meant to serve as a guide for developers who wish to gain a bonus story through adding public art to their development projects.

**Archaeology Policy**

**Ms. Michalak** gave the report on the Archaeology Policy. She said the first change that is being proposed to this policy is where it is stated that "one or more of the criteria below must be met," the change is a "minimum of two". The second change is "archaeology as outlined in the Savannah Historic District Archaeology Policy is performed on a 100 percent of the site with value of construction cost for the project up to a maximum of \$500,000."

**Ms. Michalak** explained that regarding site qualifications, little is known about

the archaeological resources of the Savannah Historic District; therefore, all sites within the boundaries of the Savannah Historic District qualify for this criterion. The minimum plan requirements include three parts. The first is the Archaeology Plan which addresses site research, site testing, intensive salvage archaeology, and site monitoring. The second part is the Curation Plan which addresses artifacts curation, conservation, cataloging and recording. The third part of the plan is Outreach and Education Plan which will detail the proposed public outreach components and how they will be incorporated into the overall Archaeology Plan.

**Ms. Michalak** said that the project funds, based on talking with people and looking at other ordinances, they initially decided that four percent of the developer's project cost with a cap of \$500,000 must be dedicated to archaeology and outreach and public education on the proposed site. Additionally, .01 percent of the four percent shall be put into the City of Savannah's Archaeology Fund to cover plan review and other administrative costs. The project cost is based on the estimate provided with the building permit application. She said that an important aspect is that in the unlikely event that research, archaeological survey and testing demonstrates that the project site lacks important or intact archaeological resources, the developer must allocate the remaining portion of the four percent to outreach and education. Therefore, regardless of the potential of the site, the four percent gets used.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that pertaining to ownership and curation of artifacts, all artifacts uncovered, recovered or discovered during the course of any testing, salvage archaeology or monitoring on private property shall belong to the owner of the property on which artifacts are found. However, it is strongly recommended that the archaeological artifacts be donated to recognized curatorial facilities. This allows for current and future researchers to gather new information from the collections that will add to our body of knowledge about Savannah.

**Ms. Michalak** said that regarding public property, no individual is permitted to excavate, search or remove artifacts on public property without the written permission of the City of Savannah. Ms. Michalak entertained questions from the Board.

**Ms. McClain** asked regarding the draft of the plan; outreach plan, the curation plan, the archaeology plan if staff has established the timeframes? She understood the plan must be made available for public review prior to its final review and approval.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that it would have to be before construction commences. If this is done prior to getting the money, then the developer cannot get a permit to build the extra story. This is not dissimilar from some of the other ones as staff does not "stamp" the drawings until they see that the developer has spaces on the ground floor properly allocated or that they have a certification from the city that a green roof is to be installed. The public will not review the plan, but it is reviewed by the staff.



**Ms. McClain** asked if the public makes comments on the plan before it is finalized.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no. This would not be open for public comment; it would be just like any other criterion. The staff would show this to the Board when the petitioner presents the project for new construction. Staff would inform the Board that the archaeology policy is met and if the petitioner is eligible for the bonus story.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes the archaeology policy is a great idea, but he does not know if there is a way that the Board can tighten this up. He does not know if he would pursue this option as the project could be held up for five years.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the project would not be held up because this is not federal. A lot of archaeology projects are stopped, but they are stopped because the archaeology is performed under federal requirements. Therefore, when someone finds something, the federal government has the individual wait. A part of the curation plan is they would not have to stop when they find something. This will be such as a typical Secretary of the Interior's archaeology plan. Presently, the city does not have an archaeology plan. There are a lot of advocates for it. This is where we got the .01 percent of the 4 percent. The city's archaeology fund will be helpful because the money will need to be used to hire consultants to certify the archaeology plans.

**Mr. McGarrity** asked what criteria was used to select the 4 percent?

**Ms. Michalak** explained that they looked at a lot of different archaeology ordinances. They also looked at what an average large scale development project would cost and how much money would actually be needed to do an archaeology plan or how much money would be needed to create public art. This is why they did a cap. Between all the sources, they came up with the 4 percent.

**Mr. McGarrity** said the wording of how a percentage is applied needs to be considered thoroughly as a lot of creativity maybe developed to possibly get around a project's true cost.

\*\*\*

### **Public Art Policy**

**Ms. Sara Farr** gave the staff report for the Public Art Policy. The goal of the public art policy is to enhance Savannah's public spaces and create unique, engaging places. Public art can take many forms. This policy will describe the public art policies, guidelines, and application process. It is meant to serve as a guide for developers who wish to gain a bonus story through adding public art to their development projects. The artist qualifications must meet the minimum required in the "Markers, Monuments, and Public Art Master Plan and Guidelines for the City of Savannah." The public art plan includes the type of

public art proposed, artist selection process, maintenance plan and budget.

**Ms. Farr** said the artwork criteria includes, but is not limited to, sculptures, murals, building elements, infrastructure (such as lights, bike racks, etc.) and landscaping. The art does not have to be physically accessible to the public, but it must be visually accessible. It cannot be located on the roof or on the interior of a building. The piece of art must also be permanent. The requirement can be fulfilled with multiple public art elements on the site; however, the art must respond to the site in which it is located. She explained that all public art, including building elements, must be completed by a qualified artist and be outside of the scope of the building design itself. The art cannot be building elements required under other standards. Public art off site may be considered, but it must be located within the context of the proposed building.

**Ms. Farr** said for the approval process, Part I approval must include a conceptual idea for public art. Part II approval must include the final public art designs. The Public Art Committee shall evaluate and approve the Public Art Plan. The Public Art Committee shall be comprised of one member from each of the following entities: Historic District Board of Review, Park and Tree Commission, Cultural Affairs Commission, and the Historic Site and Monument Commission. Additionally, the MPC Historic Preservation Director, Director of the Park and Tree Department, and the Director of Cultural Affairs shall serve on the Committee. The public art element must be complete prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy. In addition, a public art professional, shall supervise the process to ensure the public art plan is followed.

**Ms. Farr** stated that a minimum of 4 percent of the eligible construction costs, up to a maximum of \$500,000 must be spent on public art. The eligible costs include designing, building, and equipping the facility as well as the site work. The cost will be based on the estimate provided with the building permit application. The applicant must provide an estimated budget for the art including the project's fulfillment of the four percent criteria. If the applicant is unable to provide adequate public art to equal four percent of the eligible constructs cost, up to a maximum of \$500,000, the remainder of the funds shall be donated to the City Public Art Fund. This shall be maintained by the City specifically for implementing public art projects, maintenance, and related activities.

**Ms. Farr** explained that the building owner will be responsible for the maintenance and repair of all public art elements on private property. The art must be maintained in good condition and repaired when damaged. The City is not responsible for any upkeep, maintenance, or repair related to art on private property. If the artwork is located on public property, an escrow account must be set up to pay the cost of maintenance and repair. The amount shall be determined by the Park & Tree Department. The public art shall not be removed without an approved piece of public art of equal or greater value installed on the subject property. Public art shall not be altered without the approval of the Public Art Committee.

**Mr. Howington** said a minimum amount might need to be established instead of a maximum amount. He was not sure how a "qualifying artist" would be

defined.

**Ms. Farr** explained that there are a lot of different processes that they can go through. There is presently a process in the public art policy that is could be based on.

**Mr. McGarrity** said with a little work being done to this policy, he believes it will be good.

## **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

### 43. [Adjournment](#)

There being no further business to come to the Historic District Board of Review, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah G. Michalak  
Historic Preservation Planner

LGM:mem