



S A V A N N A H - C H A T H A M C O U N T Y
HISTORIC SITE & MONUMENT COMMISSION

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
October 25, 2011 1:30 PM
Meeting Minutes

October 25, 2011 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

I. Call to Order and Welcome

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes

1. [February 4, 2010 Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [February 4, 2010 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

III. Regular Agenda

2. [C-110811-32318-2 Revisions to the Master Plan: Mural Policy](#)

Attachment: [O.C.G.A. § 36-60-3 and O.C.G.A. § 16-12-80.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Public Comments on the Proposed Mural Policy.pdf](#)

Attachment: [DRAFT Mural Policy and Guidelines 10-06-11.pdf](#)

The meeting began at 1:35 p.m. Present: **Dr. Peggy Blood, Mr. Jerry Flemming, Ms. Sarah Ward, Ms. Undine Truedell, Mr. Daniel Carey, Ms. Ellen Harris, Mr. James Zaniewski, petitioner, and Mr. Matt Hebermehl, petitioner.**

BACKGROUND DATA

Ms. Harris said the purpose of the meeting today is for the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to provide their comments and feedback on the public comments regarding the Proposed Mural Policy received at the Special Called meeting held by the Site and Monument Commission held October 13, 2011. The Special Called meeting was held because the HSMC felt that not enough opportunity was given for public review and comments.

Ms. Harris stated that the Historic Site and Monument Commission asked staff to compile the public's comments and then review the comments with TAC to decide which ones warranted inclusion or incorporation into the mural policy and guidelines.

Public Comments

Why have murals anywhere in the City.

TAC stated we already have murals in the City.

During the staff's research they did not find any city that said "no" to having murals. If they

did not have a policy they decided the location where the mural would be placed.

Mr. Carey did not see how we could say that we would not have murals in this city.

Concern about additional visual clutter.

Dr. Blood said she is an artist, therefore, she does not see it as clutter.

Ms. Harris said each request is reviewed on a case-by-cases basis. If the TAC and HSMC found that an application would constitute visual clutter, it would not be approved.

TAC added additional language, "*Murals should be sited far enough away from other murals as to allow the visitor proper appreciation of each individually and not cause visual clutter to the block face.*"

Five percent (5%) signature area too large if the wall is large.

TAC discussed that an artist would not make his/her signature stand out more than the mural. They felt that the current language which states, "Sponsor and artist names may be incorporated but should be discreet and not exceed 5% of the design" was sufficient to ensure that "discreet" would not be too large provided that the signature area is a part of the application submittal.

Definitions should differentiate more between permanent and temporary.

TAC felt the criteria should be the same. The property owner could delegate the maintenance responsibility to the muralist, but from an enforcement standpoint, the property owner is responsible and, if needed, would be the person cited.

Mr. Carey said chalk murals are temporary by design. If it was something that was put up for preservation month (May) and then after 30 days, is the individual required to clean the temporary mural and take it back to the original surface. The digital billboard change about every month. Does this factor in and should there be a minimum period that it has to be up.

Ms. Ward said with reference to the chalk, the Property Maintenance Inspector will probably go to the owner and advise him/her that the paint is flaking off the mural. TAC agreed that the guidelines already cover this and state the kind of materials that should be used when painting a mural.

Under rotating murals, we shouldn't allow for anyone to request a public hearing for any reason - will result in chronic meetings.

TAC felt that the public's input should be allowed.

Establish a review committee to review rotating murals rather than leaving it up to staff.

TAC did not address this comment.

Concern about the definition of a mural (the work does not contain text, graphics, or symbols which specifically advertise or promote a business, product or service; nor does it promote a specific political candidate or party) preventing the use of contemporary pop cultural symbols (for example Andy Warhol's soup cans) if it is viewed as advertising.

TAC recommended removing the "specific" terms in the definitions as to allow the HSMC additional discretion in making determinations.

One mural per block face may be too limiting.

TAC felt this should be replaced with, *"murals should be sited far enough away from other murals as so allow the visitor proper appreciation of each individually and not cause visual clutter to the block face.*

25% of primary facade may be too limiting.

TAC felt this guideline should be eliminated.

The statement of purpose regarding political expression seems to be in contrast to the definition of a mural which "does not promote a specific political candidate or party."

TAC felt adding "social/political" would resolve this concern.

Include a strong educational outreach component for bodi kids and zoning enforcement.

TAC endorsed this approach without adding additional language.

Allow murals on unpainted historic buildings.

TAC did not address this comment

Include language to reinforce that this is on a case-by-case basis.

TAC added additional language in the Statement of Purpose.

Include more specificity as to what constitutes a community or neighborhood.

TAC felt current guidelines were sufficient to allow the HSMC latitude to define on a case-by-case basis.

Include what the appeals process is.

The appeal process follows the current appeals process of all HSMC applications which is that appeals go to City Council and then to Superior Court except where noted.

Concerns about what happens when property ownership changes.

When property ownership changes, the new property owner has the option of withdrawing consent for the mural, in which case he/she is responsible for the mural removal.

Include financial penalties for unsanctioned murals.

Unsanctioned murals are considered graffiti and are cited in accordance with the Property Maintenance Ordinance.

Include language on maintaining landscaping.

The Property Maintenance Ordinance addresses maintaining landscaping.

Include language about how percentages are measured.

TAC felt that the percentages should be eliminated, therefore negating this comment.

Have an outside attorney review policy.

This is not budgeted in the current budget.

Ms. Harris reported that they were to review the proposed rotating mural wall at Habersham and 33rd Streets, but it is on the November 3, 2011 HSMC agenda. She asked

TAC to take a second look at this proposed rotating mural wall and if they have comments to please get them to her.

3. [C-110822-34879-2 Rotating Mural Wall](#)

Attachment: [Supplemental information.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Artist Information.pdf](#)

This item will be discussed at the Historic Site and Monument Commission meeting on November 3, 2011 at 4:00 p.m.

IV. Other Business

V. Adjournment

4. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the TAC, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen Harris
Cultural Resource and Urban Planning Manager

EH:mem