

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW
REGULAR MEETING
112 EAST STATE STREET**

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

June 11, 2008

2:00 P.M.

MINUTES

HDRB Members Present:

**Dr. Malik Watkins, Chairman
Brian Judson, Vice-Chairman
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Gene Hutchinson
Richard Law, Sr.
Linda Ramsay
Joseph Steffen**

HDRB Members Not Present:

**Sidney J. Johnson
Eric Meyerhoff
Swann Seiler**

HDRB/MPC Staff Members Present:

**Thomas L. Thomson, P.E./AICP, Exec. Director
Beth Reiter, Historic Preservation Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Planner
Janine N. Person, Administrative Assistant**

City of Savannah Members Present:

Mr. Randolph Scott, Zoning Administrator

RE: CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

RE: REFLECTION

RE: SIGN POSTING

All signs were properly posted.

RE: CONTINUED AGENDA

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3784-2
PIN No. 2-0016-04-003
501 West Bay Street
New Construction Part I Height and Mass –
Hotel/Condominium**

Continue to July 9, 2008, at the petitioner’s request.

**RE: Continued Petition of Houston & Oglethorpe, LLC
Richard Guerard
H-07-3832-2
PIN No. 2-0005-30-002
143 Houston Street
New Construction/Rehabilitation/Addition Part I, Height &
Mass, Three-Story Condominium**

Continue to July 9, 2008, at the petitioner’s request.

**RE: Continued Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-07-3916-2
PIN No. 2-0015-01-001
225 East President Street
New Construction, Part I Height and Mass for a Five-Story
Condominium**

Continue to July 9, 2008, at the petitioner’s request.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Continued Agenda items with the date being corrected to read July 9, 2008, and not July 22, 2008. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: CONSENT AGENDA

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.
Donna Swanson
H-08-3991-2
108 West Congress Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

**RE: Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-08-3993-2
PIN No. 2-0015-08-003
11 – 21 West York Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the Consent Agenda items as submitted. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: REGULAR AGENDA

**RE: Amended Petition of Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay
Patrick Shay
H-06-3523-2
PIN No. 2-0031-20-015
320 Montgomery Street
Addition of a Screen Fence**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the Petition was Mr. Patrick Shay.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to amend the application for New Construction at 320 Montgomery Street. The request is to install screening over an area of ventilation piping within the courtyard off the Charlton Street facade (east wall), and to install a pedestrian gate on the Harris Street facade (north). The designs are consistent with the previously approved fencing and gate on Harris Street.

Screen: The screen is proposed to be located behind the approved gate and fence on Charlton Street. It is comprised of 3” square metal tube posts with an ornamental cap with 5/8” solid metal pickets, 5” on center. It is 9’ tall on a 6” concrete base. It projects 2’ from the face of the east elevation and extends 10’ down the side of the exterior wall. The screen is to serve as a trellis on which vegetation will grow to further screen the ventilation pipes within the metal fencing. The existing brick pavers are to be removed and vegetation will be planted on the outside of the concrete base. The vent pipes are to be painted to match the exterior wall behind them.

Gate: The proposed gate on Harris Street matches the previously approved gate on Charlton Street and the materials are the same as noted above. It is 8’ in height and spans 5’-8” between this and the neighboring property. It is setback from the sidewalk approximately 6’-8”.

FINDINGS:

The ventilation pipes on the east elevation were added to be in compliance with the City’s requirements during the inspection process. As such, they are now before the Board requesting to screen these appendages. Typically Staff recommends that all piping and utility appendages be placed on the rear or secondary facades of buildings. While these pipes are on a secondary facade, they are located immediately adjacent to Charlton Street. In addition, some of the pipes have awkward caps projecting over a foot from the building.

Light fixtures have been installed on the east elevation that were not approved by the Historic Board of Review but are shown on the revised drawings at the City’s Development Services Department. Staff is working with the City, the property owner, and the architect to resolve this issue and once developed, a revised plan to include the fixtures will be resubmitted to the Board.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the exterior light fixture within the ventilation pipes on the east elevation is removed. Clarify the need for the excessive protrusion of the pipes.

Mr. Judson stated that he could see where the one light was a problem. He said the drawings show eight symmetric standing pipes but there is a ninth and tenth pipe; one small and one large in diameter with a horrendous snout sticking out. He asked if it was something that Engineering required and if it would remain the way it was.

Ms. Ward said to ask Mr. Shay. She said that she met with the property owner and he said that it was a requirement for it to project from the face of the building, but that they may be able to turn it parallel to the building. When the drawings were submitted to Staff there were only eight pipes and the protruding one was not in the photograph.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Patrick Shay (Gunn, Meyerhoff & Shay Architects) stated that the pipe would have the same kind of snout that the other ones did. He said the inspector required that the pipes extend up to approximately ten feet above the finished grade. They filled it in and there were two other pipes that had to be added, but the intent was that one light fixture would be removed and a cover placed over it. They would clean them up to make them as nice looking as they can.

Mr. Shay stated that the first light would be removed and the other lights would remain, but that they would cut back on the amount of lumens by changing the lamps or reducing the number of lamps. He said moving the gate closer to Harris Street was acceptable as long as the power company goes along with it.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mark Marshalok stated that he resided in the adjacent property to the right, and came to inform Staff that what was originally structured was a nice stone wall consistent with the existing stone on the base of the building. He said for some reason the contractor was not aware that he had to make a submission, but he thought it was an exquisitely well thought-out plan to encase the cumbersome structure. He did not know if enclosing the structure with a trellis or gate would get away from the piping being seen behind it. His impression of venting and fumes coming up from the garage would not be particularly complimentary to some biological solution. He proposed going back to the same stone casing that the contractor was going to put around the structure that would be a clean enclosure. He was also going to put on a small sloping metal-type roof consistent with the rest of the building on the Montgomery Street side. He wondered why it was being abandoned. He said the example of the metal gate, if it was going to be upheld, was not doing the job they wanted to conceal the pipes. It would be an open gate consistent with the gate on the front façade of the building.

Ms. Kari Schuler (314 West Charlton Street) stated that she lived directly beside the building. She said that the lights weren't approved and were shining into her house like stadium lighting. She would like some specific restrictions be put on the wattage of the lights since they weren't approved and added lighting without coming before the Board. When the drawings were submitted, their photographs showed all of the piping that was there now. There was a stub on the ground and she wanted to know what they would do about it to keep the public from tripping. The drawings did not include all of the elements that were present to give a correct judgment on what needed to be done. The first thing they would have to do was submit drawings that reflected what was there to judge whether it should be approved or not. They were asked by Zoning to keep the lights off until it had been resolved. She went over yesterday to ask them to turn them off because they weren't supposed to be on. She said they weren't complying with anything if they weren't forced to do it. She would like to see a solid raised

courtyard wall to help screen the pipes, and place a vent cover on top of the pipes that go down to the bracketing. There are all types of caps made and painted to match the building. When there was a solid courtyard wall on the Charlton Street side, then there would be a nice little wrought iron gate and it would solve a lot of issues. There was not much room to pull up pavers to grow any type of vegetation, and if you measure it, what was existing was barely three feet of pavers. She did not know what pavers they were pulling up to plant vegetation.

Part of the issue was that the architect who had the seal on the approved set of plans was not present to discuss the plans and the seal she had seen on the approved plans did not have Mr. Patrick Shay's name on it. The Board needed to speak to the architect that had their seal on the plans. She asked the Board to deny it and said there were not enough conditions to go any further at this time.

Mr. Gay asked if there were any entrances or egresses along the side of the building because he did not see any, and if not, then why were the lights there.

Mr. Judson stated that there was one exit from the building that was approximately between the third and fourth light. He said the alley forms an "L" and then stubs off against a wall. He did not know if it was a fire code or if it was not a functional exit, but there was a door along the wall to the left.

Mr. Gay stated that they needed to find out from Mr. Shay how many lights were required.

Mr. Steffen stated that he wondered about the same thing and was confused as to why it was there. He asked what the purpose of the whole area was and why it was there.

Mr. Shay stated that it was there for a fire exit because there were two meeting rooms in the area that needed a second egress. He said from a security standpoint they don't have to keep street level doors open. The second reason was to be courteous to the adjacent property. They decided to set the design of the building back as far as possible but with structural considerations because of the excavation associated with it, there were lower levels of parking. It was less intrusive from a structural standpoint. Once they created the space it seemed like a place that someone might want to go and take a break if they were in the meeting room.

Mr. Gay asked in the middle of the night? He said that he was still wondering what purpose the lights served; especially that many.

Mr. Shay stated that they did not want to create an attractive hazard where someone could slip in there and do mischief. He said it was more for security than anything else and asked if the Board wanted to make a rule that says the lights had to be off at night. He did not know whether it was visual compatibility or not but the developers wanted to do what they could to be neighborly. It was a commercial hotel and they had a responsibility to the guest. It was not a public area but was for guests of the hotel or those invited to visit who walk through the lobby to get to this space; it was not a right-of-way.

Mr. Gay stated that once it was closed off it would not be accessible to the public.

Mr. Shay stated that it would have to be set up with hardware that was activated to be released if the building smelled smoke.

Mr. Steffen stated that it might be out of the Board's purview but in trying to answer Ms. Schuler's concern, he asked if Mr. Shay could make the lights motion-activated as a security precaution if someone entered or left the area. He said the area was not going to be used 99 percent of the time.

Mr. Shay stated that he could ask the developer. He said that he and the Board could not do it but it seemed like a reasonable suggestion. The idea was so the area would not be completely dark. When you live in the city you have to have sensitivity to the fact that if you create an attractive hazard that it was likely bad things would start happening. He did not pick out the lights but they must be overly bright because he had heard about the complaints.

Mr. Scott stated... (inaudible).

Mr. Shay stated that they were willing to do what they had to reduce the brightness with the number of lumens that the light puts out.

Ms. Ramsay asked what Mr. Shay's response was to having the block wall instead of the cover on the vent pipes.

Mr. Shay stated that from a visual standpoint he was opposed to it. He said the façade on the building that was approved was rigidly symmetrical and had a mass. He displayed a photograph showing what the contractor did before being stopped. It was unresolved and if it was shielded off, the pipes had to be vented. It looked great at the stage where they covered up the pipes, the protrusions would still have to happen, and they would have to be more than ten feet above the ground. It seemed like a wart being added to the side of the building without much visual affect. It was approved with a gate in a certain area, they wanted to honor it as much as possible, the idea of the fence would create a visual distraction, and the idea of the planting was not that the plants would be rooted in the dirt but in a pot or a planter.

Mr. Scott stated that for the lighting the City did not have an ordinance with regard to candles and the lighting strength. He said the ordinance mentioned lighting being beyond a certain horizontal plane. He asked if there was lighting around the second floor of the building on the level above or if it was mainly the base.

Mr. Shay stated that the lighting was on the lower story of the building.

Mr. Scott stated that on the one above that there were objects protruding from the building.

Mr. Shay stated that they were uplights.

Mr. Scott stated that there were base lights and a second level of lights. He said the ordinance did not specifically cover the brightness. When the light come on and shines beyond the horizontal then it violates the ordinance. If you take the plane and put it to the vertical, because normally light shines down and not upward, he gathered that the light was not shining toward the building but upward. Since he did not live in the area and could not go into the person's home, he asked if it was a problem.

Dr. Watkins stated that what had to be considered at this particular moment was the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness which dealt with the screen and the gate. To make sure that the Board stuck to their process they had to close it down and get back to deliberations on the screen and gate, and the consideration of Staff's recommendation focusing on the removal of one light.

Mr. Gay stated that they were not in the first submission and had never been approved.

Dr. Watkins stated that it would come up under a different process than what the Board had to consider at this moment.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was not within the Board's purview because if he understood what was being described that it was something hidden behind the gutter, that the light projected upwards, and the Board did not have jurisdiction over... (interrupted).

Mr. Judson said that with the existing lights that Staff was recommending taking one away, but the other four were not part of the original... (interrupted).

Mr. Gay stated they weren't approved to begin with.

Dr. Watkins stated that it would still have to be considered a different process and at this particular time they needed to move into deliberation on the screen and the gate.

Mr. Shay stated that his understanding of Staff's recommendation was that Staff would accept the fact that the light in conflict with the pipes was the root cause of the discussion. He said there was no objection to the lights provided that the amount of light coming from them was ramped down to an acceptable level.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Henry asked that if the Board voted against this could Mr. Shay come back with a new proposal, and if the Board voted for it that it goes forward as recommended by Staff.

Mr. Marshalok asked if he could have the floor for a moment.

Dr. Watkins stated that they had moved into Board deliberation and that the conversation had gone too far away from the specifics of the Certificate of Appropriateness. He said that they needed to focus on the screen and the gate.

Mr. Marshalok stated that it was about the gate and not about lighting. He said it was a question he wanted to pose to Mr. Shay.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board had moved away from that and if Mr. Marshalok wanted to get with Mr. Shay afterward that it was appropriate. He said they had moved into Board deliberations and the conversation had gone out of their process. He asked for a motion or more deliberations.

Mr. Judson stated that earlier, one of the questions in the procedure was work noted without proper petition and was brought to the Board's attention by a member of the public that lights were attached to the building that were not part of the original certificate or approval. He asked if they had discovered work that was performed without a certificate.

Mr. Gay stated that it was part of what the Board was considering.

Dr. Watkins stated that when they get to that part of the agenda where the Board considers work done without a Certificate of Appropriateness then it can be brought up. He said at this particular time they were specifically focusing on the screen and the gate.

Mr. Steffen stated that one of the things the Board and Staff didn't have was an enforcement mechanism, or Staff that routinely checks on projects to make sure they were in compliance with the rulings. He said that sometimes the builder doesn't read the plans right or things get taken away or added. The ultimate answer to these things not coming up was to have some type of enforcement inspection mechanism and hoped the City would eventually give that to the Board or Staff. The Board was frequently presented with situations like this with relatively minor things being added or disappearing. Staff has the responsibility to decide whether those things were historically compatible or not. With regard to the light, Staff presented to the Board that they didn't have a problem with the lights except for the one nearest the street which they recommend removal. There was much discussion about the brightness of the lights that was not within the Board's purview, but thought they offered some suggestions that

weren't made before. It appeared that it would be addressed. He was sure it would come back to the appropriate officials under Zoning if it wasn't addressed properly.

He was comfortable with Staff's recommendation with the lights. Whether it was a gate or a wall, he was inclined to ask the same question as to why the wall wasn't being reconsidered. He understood that Mr. Shay's answer was that the wall next to it would look odd between the two structures and in order to disguise the piping it had to be at least ten feet tall or more. It was something serious that would be added and would change the character to the front of the building. Mr. Shay's suggestion was that the gate was the least intrusive way of doing it and he did not know if it was less or more expensive.

Mr. Judson stated there needed to be an egress from that area. He said there was a fire egress from the building into the courtyard and to put up a solid wall would defeat the purpose.

Mr. Steffen stated that there would have to be a door or a gate in it. He said that the area had to be screened in some way and the remaining question was whether the gate was the best way to do it with the screening of the piping, or whether it was better to have them come back with a wall and a door in it. They had heard from two residents who had opinions on it and he asked Mr. Shay to clarify it.

Ms. Schuler asked out-of-order why Mr. Shay could speak.

Dr. Watkins stated that a Board member had a question for a specific person and in that particular instance they did give latitude to a Board member to ask someone a specific question.

Mr. Shay stated that what was originally approved was a fence and a gate, and they did not come today to ask permission to change that at all. What they asked permission to do was to take the same motif from the fence and the gate and use it as a fence or a trellis to screen the piping that was less desirable. The fence and the gate was not something new or different but was approved originally.

Mr. Steffen asked Mr. Shay where the wall came from and if they had been in the drawings before because he did not recall it.

Mr. Shay stated that he was called out to look at the situation because of a report or complaint. He said he saw where it had already been framed in with a yellow sheeting substance... (interrupted).

Mr. Steffen stated framing the pipes alone.

Mr. Shay stated that it was covering just the pipes from the outside only. He said he was asked to evaluate whether it was a reasonable solution, and he rejected it.

Mr. Steffen asked the neighbors where the concept of the wall came from and if there were previous drawings.

Mr. Marshalok stated that the wall came in with the same picture. He said they might need to revisit it because they rejected the wall on the basis of aesthetics and that it did impact the building and the symmetry. He would propose that Mr. Shay come up with a better solution for a tighter grid like a mesh or something that would be much more like a lattice where it could not be seen through, rather than hoping that the gate would be consistent with another gate that would ultimately be covered up with vines. He did not care if they put up chicken wire as long as it hid the pipes, and his contention was that what was being proposed would not. He asked Mr. Shay to consider a tighter lattice or a metal structure to circumvent the aesthetic problem of the solid wall.

Mr. Steffen stated that cleared up some of the confusion because he thought that someone had proposed a wall. He said that they got off on a wrong tangent and it was not part of the picture. It seemed to him that with a little more information they found out that the real issue was whether the ornamental screen and fence was the best solution to the problem or the preferred solution, and that a wall was in the mix.

Dr. Henry asked if it was possible to take the proposal and make a second motion to ask the neighbors to get together and work something out.

Dr. Watkins stated that it was up to them and that the Board did not have the discretion to tell them to get together.

Dr. Henry stated that it would be kind of a sense of the good.

Dr. Watkins stated that the Board would have to consider whether they wanted to approve the recommendation, and what the applicant decided after that was up to them.

Mr. Judson stated that another point would be a motion to deny based on compatibility. He said he could not argue that the fence would be incompatible with design standards of the Historic Review Board, but with being sensitive to the neighbors and listening to the issue he would be inclined to vote to deny it or come up with a different solution and not specifically say it was an incompatible design. He did not know if that was within the Board's purview to make a motion that way. He wanted to see another solution, but the verbage of the motion to deny says it was not compatible and he would not make the motion because of the wording. He wanted to see a different solution.

Mr. Steffen asked Ms. Ward if she stated that the recommendation to the fence was that the final drawings come back to staff.

Ms. Ward stated that Staff was recommending approval of the screening, which was the tall portion in the back. She said the fence and the gate had been approved, they were not looking at it, and that they were not reviewing it today. On the Harris Street side on the other side of the block they were proposing a gate to match what was approved on the Charlton Street side. They need a revised site plan because they were showing it setback and would prefer it be up on the street to screen the utilities.

Mr. Steffen stated that they had been talking for 20 minutes about something that was already approved. He said they had been listening to neighbors' comments about an issue that the Board did not have authority on which was a shame for them and the Board.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the final site plan of the small gate to be submitted to Staff for further review and remove the outermost ornamental light. Mr. Gay seconded the motion

Dr. Henry asked if the motion did anything for the bank of lights.

Mr. Gay answered no.

Mr. Steffen stated that the Board could say to take all lights out and they had the authority to do that because it was not submitted initially.

Dr. Henry stated that they should take out all of the lights.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was not the motion.

Dr. Watkins stated that the motion had to specifically consider the file number and whether this particular request was compatible. He said if you want to address the light issue then you have to bring it up under Work Done Without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Steffen stated that in order to make things clear for a new member he would withdraw his motion and let Dr. Henry make his motion.

Dr. Henry stated that he wasn't sure if it would clarify it but he would be happy to make a motion.

Mr. Steffen stated that he hated to be the Parliamentarian and the one that made the motion. He said a second motion cannot be made while there was a motion on the floor. **Mr. Steffen withdrew his motion.**

Mr. Gay stated that he was making a motion that was not under consideration right now. He said later in the meeting they would consider the fact that the lights were put up and shouldn't have because they did not get approval. At that point the Board could tell them to take them down, but right now they were not talking about them. They were only asked to consider screening.

Dr. Watkins stated that they would consider the lighting issue later on in the agenda. He said now they were dealing specifically with the issues Mr. Gay just raised.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Steffen if he did not think it was right.

Mr. Steffen answered no. He said that Staff recommended approval with the condition that the exterior light fixture with the ventilation pipes on the east elevation be removed. He said he took it as Staff wanting the Board to approve the lights that were there other than the one toward the outer part.

Ms. Ward stated that in the Staff report she mentioned that there were lights installed without approval. She said after the Staff report was written and prior to the meeting they were to meet with the Engineering Department, Development Services, Ms. Reiter, the property owner, and herself to discuss the lighting and come up with a proper solution. They were going to resubmit it to the Review Board. After the meeting they wanted to keep the lighting, they would remove the ballast that controls the wattage for the lights, take it down to 35 watts maximum, and remove the fixture closest to Charlton Street. They said they would comply and that Staff was fine with the remaining lighting beyond the first one because the illumination would be kept down. The existing lighting was consistent with other lighting on the building and was visually compatible.

Mr. Gay stated regarding the idea that Mr. Steffen had of the lights being controlled by motion, that they don't ever come on unless someone was moving around. It would take care of it at night and would not be on all of the time; even at 35 watts.

Ms. Ward stated that Staff could take the items back and that it was not a Review Board issue, but Staff would be happy to talk with them.

Mr. Steffen stated that he could remake his motion.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the pipes be screened and the small gate with final drawings being submitted to Staff for review, and that the outermost ornamental light be removed. Mr. Gay seconded the motion. Ms Ramsay was opposed. The motion passed 6 to 1.**

Mr. Steffen stated that normally Staff reports were so incredibly thorough and there would be information than what was needed. He said in this particular instance it would have been good to have more information and background about the project because the Board was confused for the first 20 minutes as to what they were talking about.

**RE: Petition of Doug Bean Signs, Inc.
Donna Swanson
H-08-3995-2
PIN No. 2-0031-20-015
320 Montgomery Street
Sign**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval.

Present for the petition was Mr. Doug Bean.

Ms. Ward gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a principal use fascia sign on the exterior of the building at 320 Montgomery Street. The proposed sign is as follows:

- Location:** South Façade on the upper coping of the brick portion to the west.
- Size:** Individual letters 20.5 inches tall spanning a distance of 30 feet. The total is 39.6 square feet.
- Material:** PVC letters ¾” thick stud mounted ¾” from the face of the building.
- Lighting:** Non-illuminated. Existing flood lights provide up lighting on the exterior.
- Text:** White letters for “Country Inn & Suites”

FINDINGS:

The building at 320 Montgomery Street was constructed from 2007 to 2008 and is not historic. The property is zoned B-C (Community-Business). Two projecting principal use signs (each 36.12 square feet) were approved by the Historic Review Board and installed on the north (Harris Street) and west (Montgomery Street) facades. The following standards from the Historic Sign District ordinance (Section 8-3121) apply:

(B) Requirements:

(2) Sign Clearance and Height (a) Fascia and projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the structure and shall not project over the roofline or parapet wall elevation of the structure.

Staff recommends reducing the height of the sign to fit within the area of brick stretchers so as not to obscure the brick string course on the parapet.

(11) Principal Use Sign Requirements. For each non-residential use, one principal use sign shall be permitted. Such sign shall not exceed a size of more than one-square-foot of sign area per linear foot of frontage along a given street or shall meet the following [40*]...whichever is the most restrictive.

The standard is met. The City Zoning Administrator has previously determined that one principal use sign per street frontage is permitted. The building maintains 68 linear feet of frontage on Charlton Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the reduction of the height of the letters to fit within the band of brick stretchers at the top of the parapet.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Mr. Doug Bean asked that the sign be approved as designed. He said its their primary function was for the I-16 off-ramp and was hardly visible without a severe neck ache from Charlton or Montgomery Streets. He understood Staff's desire to keep the letters within the soldier course of brick and suggested that they would be rendered ineffective because they would have to be smaller to be within the smooth, flat area of brick without them looking cramped. If they maximized the size to go in the flat area then the functionality could be retained, but for a balanced look they need to be 20.5 inches tall.

Mr. Steffen asked how much bigger it was because it looked like they fit squarely within the lines on the drawing.

Mr. Bean stated that the photograph was a little deceiving and the best he could calculate was...he was confused because his calculations didn't hold up when looking at the proportions in the drawings. He was working from a set of to-scale plans and said that he had not been up on the building. He thought they would be just over half of the proposed size and agreed that the proportions depicted in the photo didn't lend themselves to it.

Mr. Gay stated that if they were 20.5 that Mr. Bean might be talking about 19 inches instead. He said that there were five bricks and a little mortar and did not know how tall the bricks were.

Mr. Bean stated about three inches.

Mr. Gay stated that with 15 inches and the mortar between them that it was somewhere around 18 or 19 inches as opposed to 20.5. He said there was not a whole lot of difference.

Mr. Bean stated that the photo depiction did illustrate that it would be extraordinarily detrimental.

Ms. Ramsay asked if Mr. Bean would be comfortable having the letters fit between the two soldier courses and if he was withdrawing his objection to the half sizing.

Mr. Bean stated that it would be detrimental to the functionality of the sign, but did not think that it would be so detrimental that they would be useless. He said he hoped the Board would approve the letters as submitted, but if the Board said he could have them and make them fit between the bricks, and then he thought the client would be satisfied.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Kari Schuler stated that she lived directly next door and said if they reduce the size that they were not putting enough parameters on how they would be placed. She said when you reduce the size of the character there would be more spacing in between the letters and asked if they would center it on that section of brick or move it toward the corner to be able to see it from the I-16 down ramp. The material they were proposing to use was the cheapest material that could be used because the letters were flat and had no dimension. Savannah was

trying to get away from billboards and this was actually a live area larger than most billboards. If they reduced the height of the letter they should resubmit the spacing and tracking of the characters because it was just as important as to being consistent with other signage. She asked the Board to deny it and said that the petitioner should resubmit.

Mr. Mark Marshalok stated that he agreed with Ms. Schuler about the compatibility which was a big component of what the Board was present to discuss. He said to be consistent with the anodized window that the metallic lettering might be more aesthetically pleasing because, as Ms. Schuler said, it looked cheap. He petitioned the Board to contain the signage within the courses of the brick because it was important and was not as arbitrary as 19 to 20.5 inches. It needed to be done.

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that she agreed with the neighbors that it looked like a billboard and the sign needed to be consistent with the rest of the signs on the building.

Mr. Steffen asked if there were other signs that Ms. Dolecki wanted to see it be consistent with on the building.

Ms. Dolecki stated that the fonts on the lower portion of the building look off and it might be because of the size but they did not look the same to her. She assumed that Mr. Bean could tell if it was the same font. When you make a letter larger it could look out-of-proportion with the smaller font and there was probably a better material and smaller font that they could use.

Mr. Steffen asked if Mr. Marshalok's comment about having the lettering match the metallic part of the window frames and casings was something that Historic Savannah would look favorably on or not.

Ms. Dolecki asked if Mr. Steffen was asking if it should match the window casings.

Mr. Gay stated that wrought iron would be a solution to match.

Ms. Dolecki stated that they would not look favorably on matching the window casings because she imagined that they were aluminum. She said that wrought iron would be more... (interrupted).

Mr. Steffen stated that Ms. Dolecki was more concerned about making sure that it matches the font.

Ms. Dolecki stated that it should have the country look that the wooden signs did and that would be more appropriate.

Mr. Steffen stated that he wanted to make sure Mr. Bean heard all of the comments and knew exactly what they were wanting.

Mr. Bean stated that no one could not tell the difference between that material and cast metal without knocking or beating his fist against it. He said he wanted to remind everyone that it was five stories in the air, that the material was very durable, was sold very frequently in the industry as an alternative to a more expensive cast metal. Particularly when matching a custom letter style which they have done and it was exactly the same letter style. Additionally, it was the exact same material as the sign and you cannot tell what the sign was made from. He said there were soft and matte finishes and as far as compatibility with the graphic standards or fonts that he suggested and it would not hold water. He would be happy to allow the client to resubmit the letter spacing for Staff approval.

Mr. Steffen stated that when you look at the two pictures side-by-side it looked like the letters on the building were a soft yellow and the letters on the street level were white. He asked if they were two different colors or the same color.

Mr. Bean stated that they were the same but that it was a computer generated drawing. He said he thought the window mullions were white and that was what they were matching with the letters.

Mr. Scott stated that Staff suggested the lighting would illuminate the signage. He asked if the upright would illuminate four stories above and not protrude into the neighboring property.

Mr. Bean stated he had no idea whether the light would reach the letters. He said it wasn't a consideration that he discussed with the client, but they did not want illuminated letters.

Mr. Hutchinson asked about the material, finish of the sign, and if it was painted.

Mr. Bean answered yes. He stated that they use an automotive quality urethane finish.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that his concern was how the sign would stand up to weathering.

Mr. Bean stated that it was just as durable as any material with the exception of cast bronze. He said that even cast bronze tarnishes and had to be polished and maintained. These letters will be just as durable as anything on the face of the building with the exception of the bricks.

Mr. Law asked if Mr. Bean wanted to bring it back to Staff.

Mr. Bean stated that if the Board would allow him to do it with the Staff's caveat that they fit between the brick, and then he would be happy to resubmit the drawings as far as spacing and whether they go flush left of the tower sections or centered, and submit it to Staff for Staff approval. He was comfortable with bringing back a new layout with smaller letters for Staff's approval.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the height of the letters be reduced to fit within the band of brick stretchers at the top of the parapet, and that final plans be resubmitted to Staff for approval. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Barnard Architects
John Clegg
H-08-3994-2
PIN No. 2-0032-36-001
PIN No. 2-0032-36-003
421 & 429 Abercorn Street
113 Taylor Street
Rehabilitation/Alteration/Shutters/Fence/Addition**

The Preservation Officer recommends approval with conditions.

Present for the petition was Mr. John Clegg.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval of the following alterations to structures adjacent to the Wesley Monumental Methodist Church on Calhoun Square.

429 Abercorn Street (Education building behind church)

1. Add an exit door to ground floor Drayton street elevation. An existing window will be shortened and the opening extended to the ground to accommodate a new emergency exit door, solid wood, or wood clad with aluminum door with three panels and 8” wide side panels. Paint trim (window and door) dark gray to match color of existing windows.
2. Replace existing entry doors and sidelight on the north and south elevations with solid wood or wood clad with aluminum door painted 3W6-6 Ruby Red to match main church doors. Remove light fixture and install aluminum brackets and tube supports with curved polycarbonate or glass roofed transparent awning. All aluminum components to be painted dark bronze.

421 Abercorn (Espy Building)

1. Replace rear two-story porch addition with one-story office addition. Install 6/6 wood clad with aluminum and insulated glass windows (approved Weathershield or Marvin) on the south elevation of the addition, and install a dark green fabric shed awning. Open an original window opening and install 6/6 window to match existing. Add sign to parapet of new addition 8” and 6” bronze finish letters “Wesley Monumental Administration offices.”

113 East Taylor

1. Replace shutters on front elevation with Atlantic louvered shutters.
2. Replace ground level Taylor Street door with window to match existing historic window.
3. Replace casement window behind stairs with 6/6 window to match existing historic window.
4. Replace existing rear concrete block and wood fence with 4’ decorative iron picket fence on stuccoed CMU base and gate similar to existing historic fence.

FINDINGS:

1. The existing number of meters and conduit will be reduced and moved to the south wall of 113 East Taylor Street inside the courtyard area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the condition that the new window make and model number be approved by Staff prior to purchase. If the shutters are changed from the specified Atlantic, Staff will need to approve the replacement shutters prior to purchase.

Dr. Watkins stated that Mr. Reiter mentioned that the window was submitted, but on the report there were some conditions.

Ms. Reiter stated that Mr. Clegg met the condition and understood that he needed to know which window he was going to use. She said he understood that if they change their minds on the shutters that they will bring them back.

PETITIONER’S COMMENTS:

Mr. John Clegg (Barnard Architects) stated that the conditions that were offered by Staff were acceptable.

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Judson made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Gay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**RE: Petition of Virginia Rahn
Inman Park Properties
H-08-3997-2
321 Montgomery Street
Demolition**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

Present for the petition was Ms. Virginia Rahn.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish 321 Montgomery Street.

FINDINGS:

The 1916 Sanborn map indicates that this site included a wood yard, wood shed, one-story brick store at the corner of Montgomery and Harris Streets, and a number of other small one-story brick, wood, and metal structures probably associated with the wood yard. According to the City Directories the brick building on the corner served as a grocery store. By 1925 it was vacant and by 1930 there was no listing for this site in the directory. Between 1930 and 1955 a service garage and gasoline pumps were erected on the site. The structure has been vacant for at least ten years. There has been a fire and the roof has caved in. It has been condemned by the City. It is not listed on the Historic Buildings list and is not eligible due to physical condition and loss of historic fabric.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval to demolish.

PETITIONER'S COMMENTS:

Ms. Virginia Rahn (Inman Park Properties) stated that there was a fire a number of years back with a fatality and the building was deemed unsafe by Property Maintenance. She said that she applied for a demolition permit in October of 2007 and Property Maintenance came, said the building was condemned and that it was a hazard. She has been trying to get the demolition permit since October 2007 but had arrived at this point a few weeks ago. The building was unsafe, she was constantly trying to keep people out, and it was not historically significant. She wanted to demolish the building.

Mr. Judson asked if they had plans for recycling all of the brick because the north and south walls were predominately brick. He asked what were the development prospects.

Ms. Rahn stated that they were planning on recycling materials from the building. She said she had been working with a company in Charleston that would come in and help with that aspect of the demolition. She was not aware of any future plans right now.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Cassie Dolecki (Historic Savannah Foundation) stated that they hated to see another historic building in the Landmark District lost to demolition by neglect. She said that the site reflected the mid-century automobile

industry in Savannah and there was very little of this type of architecture left to remember the Montgomery Street Corridor as past automobile related area. HSF did not see anything in the ordinance that could deny the demolition of the structure. If it was a rated structure, the ordinance would require plans to be submitted for such a large site and the Architectural Review Committee would request that plans be submitted for the site because they would hate to see it sit as a large parking lot.

Mr. Gay stated that he hated to see anything demolished by neglect but they were there with this building. He said whatever was left was not historic and the only thing there at one point was the grocery store.

Ms. Reiter stated that the grocery store was torn down.

HDRB ACTION: **Mr. Gay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition as submitted. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. Ms. Ramsay was opposed. The motion passed 6 to 1.**

Mr. Steffen stated that he wanted to make sure that the Board appreciated the comments Ms. Dolecki and HSF made because it was deeper than what was heard. He said the building that was on the premises was greater than 50 years old and even though it was not a rated structure it was still worthy of being preserved in a better circumstance. He was particularly interested in the comment made about preserving the early automotive industry in the tradition of certain streets in Savannah, and that they had lost one property on Drayton Street. The Board needed to be vigilant of these situations that when an opportunity did arrive that the Board could take extraordinary measures to preserve the culture. When his daughter becomes an adult he wants her to see what service stations used to be like because they won't be there when she becomes an adult. It was an extremely and important comment and he wanted the Board to be vigilant of it in the future.

Mr. Hutchinson asked Ms. Dolecki what they had in place to help properties like this not be demolished.

Ms. Dolecki stated that the property was far gone and was one of the worse in the city at this scale. She said they have a revolving fund that works with property owners and a program called MASHH, the Mayor's Alliance to Save Historic Houses. They were currently working with the City to save some of the houses that were on the top 100 demolition list that the City had because 44 of them were historic. There were different programs that Ms. Melissa Jest, the Neighborhood Coordinator, worked with at the City as well as other groups in town.

RE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

**RE: Petition of Alexandro Santana
H-07-3824-2
219 East Charlton Street
One-Year Extension of Approval for New Construction
Carriage House and Rear Alterations**

The Preservation Officer recommends **approval**.

No one was present for the petition.

Ms. Reiter gave the Staff report.

NATURE OF REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for an addition, rear porch, covered parking, and a shed at 339 Tattnell Street.

FINDINGS:

The historic residence at 339 Tattnell Street was constructed in 1895 as part of an Italiante Revival style double-house. The building is a rated structure within Savannah’s National Historic Landmark District. The property is zoned RIP-A (Residential, Medium-Density). The following standards from the Historic District Ordinance (Section 8-3030) apply:

Standard	Proposed	Comment
Lot Coverage: 75 percent maximum in RIP-A.	50 percent lot coverage is proposed on a double lot.	The standard is met.
Additions: Shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Where possible, the addition shall be sited such that it is clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main structure.	The addition is located on the south elevation (side) toward the rear of the building. A rear porch addition is proposed on the back of the main building. The parking pergola is attached to the additions and is at the rear of the property facing Jefferson Street. Currently, a masonry wall with iron gates creates a wall of continuity at Jefferson Street and at Tattnell Street.	The standard is met. While the proposed style of the additions mimics the original house, their siting is such that they are distinguished as additions.
Additions: Shall be constructed with the least possible loss of historic building material and without damaging or obscuring character-defining features of the building, including, but not limited to, rooflines, cornices, eaves, and brackets. Additions shall be designed to be reversible with the least amount of damage to the historic building.	A two-story addition is proposed for the side/rear with a rooftop garden above. The addition appears to extend to the full height of the existing building covering window openings and obscuring the decorative brackets in the eaves.	Staff recommends reducing the height of the addition to expose the original eaves and brackets of the main house and to make the addition subordinate to the existing structure.
Additions: Including multiple additions to structures, shall be subordinate in mass and height to the main structure.	See Above.	See Above.

Additions: Designs may be either contemporary or reference design motifs of the historic building. However, the addition shall be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible.	The design of the addition is meant to blend seamlessly with the original house, matching historic stylistic detailing of the period. The addition will be faced in brick to match the main house with a stucco dogtrot extension to the south.	Staff recommends reducing the height as stated above in order to further distinguish the addition from the main building.
---	---	---

<p>Covered Parking:</p>	<p>An open wooden pergola is proposed at the rear of the property off the existing vehicular iron gate fronting Jefferson Street. It is comprised of 8-inch square wood columns with a trellis above.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Shed:</p>	<p>A 7 feet wide by 12 feet deep wooden shed with a sloped roof surfaced in standing seam metal is proposed at the southwest corner of the property. It will be minimally visible, if at all, from view.</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval.</p>
<p>Side Porches: Wood portico posts shall have cap and base molding. The column capital shall extend outward of the porch architrave. Balusters shall be placed between upper and lower rails, and the distances between shall not exceed 4 inches. For one- and two-family dwellings the height of the railing shall not exceed 36 inches.</p>	<p>Side Porch: Two-story side porch with 6-inch turned Victorian wood columns with a decorative bracket above, and 2.75-inch wood turned balusters with a top rail and bottom rail to match the historic columns and railing on the building are proposed. The railing is 3 feet tall. Fixed wood louvers are proposed on the south end of the side porch to screen a spiral stair providing access to the roof. A parapet with a protruding cornice and decorative wooden brackets to match the main house are proposed.</p> <p>Rear Porch: One-story rear porch with a shed roof surfaced in standing seam metal. 8-inch square wood columns on a low brick lattice foundation.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Windows and doors: Residential windows facing a street shall be double- or triple-hung, casement or Palladian. Double-glazed windows are permitted on non-historic facades and on new construction, provided, however, that the windows meet the following standards: the muntin shall be no wider than 7/8-inch; the muntin profile</p>	<p>3-foot by 6-foot Anderson window 400 series, double-hung sash, wood clad windows with two-over-two simulated divided lites are proposed in the new addition. Sashes to be white to match main house.</p> <p>3 feet and 4 feet wide by 2 feet tall, Anderson window 400 series awning windows are proposed on the rear of the addition facing</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval upon submittal of window specifications. The muntins should be no wider than 7/8 inches and feature a spacer bar. Windows and doors should be inset no less than 3 inches from façade.</p> <p>Staff recommends that the windows on the ground floor addition have a 5:3 ratio or be eliminated as they face Jefferson Street, which is visible through the iron gate.</p>

<p>shall simulated traditional putty glazing; the lower sash shall be wider than the meeting and top rails; extrusions shall be covered with appropriate molding. All windows facing a street, exclusive of storefronts, basement, and top-story windows, shall be rectangular and shall have a vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3...Window sashes shall be inset not less than 3 inches from the façade of a masonry building...windows shall be constructed of wood or wood clad.</p>	<p>Jefferson Street and over the French doors. They are wood clad with simulated divided lites in white.</p> <p>4-foot by 7-foot Anderson Door 400 Series single-light French doors.</p> <p>Surrounds will feature segmental arch brick headers to match the main residence.</p>	
<p>HVAC: units shall be screened from the public right-of-way</p>	<p>The HVAC will be relocated to the rear porch area and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.</p>	<p>The standard is met.</p>
<p>Color:</p>	<p>Trim: Benjamin Moore White 00 Accent: BM Black Forest Green 46 Stucco on side bay: Benjamin Moore Richmond Bisque 54</p>	<p>Staff approval.</p>

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with the following conditions to be resubmitted to Staff for final approval:

1. Reduce height of addition to expose original cornice and bracket detail on historic residence and to make the addition subordinate in height.
2. Provide window specifications and note that windows will meet the aforementioned standards for muntins and placement within wall.
3. Enlarge or delete 3-foot by 2-foot window on ground floor of addition fronting Jefferson Street.

HDRB ACTION: Ms. Ramsay made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve a one-year extension of the previous approval with the condition that the glazing be reviewed by Staff for proper fire rating to ensure it meets code. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: STAFF REVIEWS

1. Petition of Wassaw Construction Co., LLC
 H-08-3986(S)-2
 10 Whitaker Street
 Existing Windows/Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

2. Petition of Frank K. Peeples, Jr.
H-08-3987(S)-2
21 East Broad Street
Existing Windows
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

3. Petition of Elizabeth K. Cramlee
H-08-3988(S)-2
308 East Jones Street
Existing Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

4. Petition of Michael Volen
H-08-3989(S)-2
416 West Liberty Street
Color Change/Existing Windows, Doors
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

5. Petition of J. T. Turner Construction Co.
Mark Fitzpatrick
H-08-3990(S)-2
111 West Charlton Street
Awning
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

6. Petition of Coastal Canvas Products
Jennifer Wall
H-08-3996(S)-2
206 East Broughton Street
Awning Color Change
STAFF DECISION: APPROVED

RE: WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- Southeast Corner of Hall and Habersham Streets

Ms. Reiter stated that Ms. Ward had a picture of a house on the corner of Hall and Habersham Streets that the Board may be familiar with that was next to Kroger’s with a fence around it. She said they had removed most of the historic fabric and that there were sticks holding up the roof that didn’t look too stable. She talked with Inspections Department and they were going to bring the property owner to an Administrative Hearing. She talked with Mr. Keith Shipman earlier this week and they had been unable to contact the owner who had been out of the country. Mr. Randolph Scott could advise them further because it was like the buildings at Montgomery and Hall Streets that were demolition by rehabilitation.

Mr. Gay stated that the building had been dismantled and it was a cute little building that was completely taken apart.

Ms. Reiter stated that it was extremely frustrating to Staff that they were losing historic properties. She said they had a building permit to repair the footing of the building, had met with them years ago. They were going to put

two or three boards up, remove some, fix the footings and put them back, and this was what happened to the building.

Mr. Steffen asked who the owner was.

Ms. Reiter stated that she did not remember the name. She said that Commonwealth Construction was the contractor and if they cannot find the owner to bring in the contractor.

Mr. Scott suggested that they could issue a stop work order on the property.

Mr. Gay stated that they had stopped because there was not much left to do.

Mr. Scott stated that they wanted to place a stop work order on it because if they don't and work begins then you would be stuck with them working. He said first they would do a stop work order then when they cannot find people they usually employ the Savannah-Chatham Police Department to give them a hand for finding the responsible party. Mr. Clay Smith was the inspector and when he visited the site someone was at the property but they would not come to the door. He said that they were not done yet.

Mr. Law asked if they had gotten a permit.

Ms. Scott answered no.

Mr. Gay stated that they received a permit to make repairs to the bottom and then went wild.

Dr. Henry stated that they received permission from the MPC to turn it into a coffee house with the zoning.

Mr. Scott stated that they did not have a building permit.

Mr. Steffen asked who it was.

Dr. Henry stated that it was a commune and they owned the big red frame building on Gwinnett Street not far from Kroger's. He said they own the house that was next to the building under question. The only way to describe it was as a commune.

Mr. Steffen asked what kind of commune it was.

Dr. Henry stated that it was a Christian commune.

Mr. Scott stated that since it had been pointed out he remembered meeting the person when Mr. Tom Todaro was the Zoning Administrator.

Mr. Steffen stated that his patience was thinner than the rest of the Board having been on the Board the longest. He said if it was a commune that implied there was more than one individual and he would like to see all of them brought to the Board. If nothing more, than to sit through the whole meeting from start to finish until the Board got to their issue because the Board had the authority to ask people to come. If they did not show up then the Board could let someone else deal with getting them here. If their property was being torn down then the Board needed to hear from them.

Mr. Judson asked what was the procedure and purview of the Board and what could they do.

Ms. Reiter stated that this was an alteration to the building and it had been reported on several occasions to inspections but the people needed to stop the work and come in.

Mr. Judson stated that Mr. Scott suggested that they move forward with a stop work order. He asked if it was a motion that the Board could make.

Ms. Reiter answered no.

Mr. Gay stated that it was something they should have done a year ago because it had been going on for a long time. At first they did not have the board wall around it and you could see what they were doing and they were taking everything apart.

Mr. Scott stated that he did not know the man and was not privy to it when he came in. He asked if it was a possibility that the person or people there were part of it.

Dr. Henry stated that they had at least two properties or more that they live in.

Mr. Scott asked if they were members of the group that were actually staying there.

Dr. Henry stated that the address would be 403.

Mr. Scott asked if it was like a church.

Dr. Henry stated that it was its own church as he understood it.

Mr. Scott asked when he was dealing with the commune and he takes action if the members were the persons staying there. He said he thought it was simply rental property and not an actual part of the body.

Dr. Henry stated that was his understanding.

Mr. Scott stated that when the City goes to take action it was as if they were taking action on First African Baptist Church and he needed to review it when they did take action.

Mr. Steffen stated that he appreciated Mr. Scott being present and that it was good to have his office working with the Board on some of the items. He said it was sometimes frustrating not to have the enforcement powers. This was the first he had heard of it and dealing with an entity like a commune there was a tendency in those organizations to be secretive about who owns what and who was in charge. His experience as an attorney was to haul them all in to get their attention because they would hide behind this one or that one being the owner, or he was not the guy because the guy was out of the country. It was a shell game and they should get them all in; anyone that you could find.

Ms. Reiter stated that SAGIS did not list a church or a commune but they listed a person.

Mr. Scott stated that he would get with his Staff and could see that he needed to bring in the City Attorney, but that they would move forward.

**RE: NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

RE: OTHER BUSINESS

a. Unfinished Business

Dr. Henry asked if it was appropriate for him to talk about the lighting on the project now. He said that he had made a motion ... (inaudible due to rattling papers).

Dr. Watkins stated that Mr. Steffen's motion covered the lights.

Mr. Steffen stated that the situation with Dr. Henry's motion was that the rest of the lights would have further discussions on how to deal with the issue and that they would come back to the Board if necessary, with a recommendation regarding the rest of the lights. He asked if he misunderstood it.

Mr. Gay stated that they were going to dim them down and have to try to ... (interrupted).

Mr. Steffen stated that they were going to try to find a solution to it, and if they could not find a solution he assumed they would bring it back to the Board and say they had to get rid of it.

Ms. Ward stated that she did not think they would ever make the neighbors happy, but if that was what the requirement was then they would come back.

Mr. Judson stated that as a point-of-order if the topic of discussion was Worked Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness then under the heading ... (interrupted).

Dr. Henry stated that as he understood it the lights were put up without asking anyone. He asked if it was correct.

Mr. Judson stated that it was his understanding as well. He said the issue with one light being part of the motion was structural because the screen would dissect the light and the light had to come down in order to allow for the screen. Then there was the situation of work being performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Steffen stated that under the subject of Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness that any Board member could bring an issue to the Board where they believed there was work performed without a certificate. He said the Board was all aware that there was worked performed. It was in order to have a motion to ask someone to take something down that was performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. From a procedural standpoint the right was there to make the motion. He was offering that Staff had provided information and the issue was still being digested. It may or may not change whether the Board made a motion but he was not saying that a motion could not be made.

Dr. Henry asked if the Board members remembered the one light on the corner of Jones Street, that no one asked the Board about whether they could put it up, and it made the papers all of the time. He said half a dozen lights went up without anyone being asked and it seemed to him that the Board should ... (inaudible). so moved.

Mr. Scott stated that what he was attempting to do was effectively come in the back door. He said when the Board made a motion that in a perfect world it would have gone through Site Plan Review and it was suggested that with a lighting issue MPC would have reviewed it. In the old ways of the Historic District, Staff would not have reviewed it and they would not have looked at the lighting in regard to it being a problem; not from just the aesthetic. He was looking for one particular ordinance that directed it back to Staff. Since this was done without a Certificate of Appropriateness, if the Board could make a motion that the petitioner would have to make the correction according to Staff and bring in the MPC staff that normally reviews the lighting, then he thought the City would have done due diligence. Hopefully, that would give them the opportunity to satisfy but he had a personal problem with the street lights to have the light shining outward from the building was a bit much. He believed that under normal circumstances if Staff had an opportunity to review it like they do with the parking lots

and the lighting coming down, they would have had an opinion to help the developer fix the light where it was shining more toward the building.

Mr. Gay stated that they needed lighting for safety purposes since it was an exit but thought the suggestion about lighting coming on when someone was out there was a nice solution. He said the lamps weren't ugly and looked okay to him.

Mr. Thomson stated that with commercial property there was a standard for lighting spilling onto adjacent properties for the luminaires. He asked if there was a code for residential lighting like sound. He was somewhat familiar with the noise ordinance that at the property line it was 65 decibels. He asked if there was an equivalent.

Mr. Gay stated that it was a hotel that was commercial and the lights were on.

Dr. Watkins asked if they were discussing the hotel or the earlier issue.

Mr. Scott stated that he was hoping the Board would make a motion.

Mr. Steffen stated that it was not the Board's issue. He said they were getting really confused and he almost wished he hadn't made the recommendation about dimming the lights because it was not within the Board's purview. Nor was the amount of lumens coming out of the light or the direction that the light was posed. The Board had no control over any of those things. All of the issues that were raised were totally appropriate issues for the process of reviewing the whole plan, and under the new standards they would hopefully have a better way of doing it cohesively. The only thing the Board could decide was whether or not the lights were there and whether they were historically compatible. There was a motion to have them removed if there was a second to the motion, and then they could vote.

Dr. Watkins stated that they were referring specifically to the issue ... (inaudible due to interruption).

Mr. Gay stated just having lights or not having the lights.

Dr. Henry stated that he did not understand because the Board was stiffed, which it sounded like it was, and asked if the Board had a right to correct it.

Mr. Steffen stated that sometimes they did and sometimes they let things go because the realistic thing was it happened through no ill intent. He said that sometimes it actually ends up being something good and the Board doesn't always say no, but they have the right to say no.

Dr. Watkins stated that in this particular instance that what the Board was considering was whether or not the issue was adequately addressed by Mr. Steffen's motion to have them come back to Staff and deal with the lighting, or follow up on the motion to pursue it further.

HDRB ACTION: **Dr. Henry made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the petition with the condition that the light be removed and the builder go back to Staff to consider an alternative in conjunction with the neighbors. There was no second. The motion failed.**

Dr. Watkins asked if that was a restatement of what was passed earlier.

Mr. Gay stated that it didn't matter unless they were moving the lights.

Dr. Henry stated that the only part of it was removing the lights.

Mr. Gay asked if Dr. Henry wanted them to remove the lights.

Dr. Henry stated that was what he wanted and it was the starting point for the discussion.

Dr. Watkins stated that the motion had died.

b. New Business

- HDRB Board Retreat

Dr. Watkins asked Staff if they had any comments on the Board retreat and if they were waiting for a date in August.

Ms. Ward stated that August was too soon and that Staff had not heard from City Council. She said they wanted to make sure that the new members were on board they were thinking about September.

Dr. Watkins stated that they would delay the discussion.

Mr. Judson stated that in the year he has been on the Board he has seen a greater effort to clarify the process, they were taking a lot of good steps, and he thanked Mr. Scott for being present today. He said that in the past they have had the sense of working in a vacuum and making decisions where they felt ineffective or uninformed. The more they integrate the master planning into the process with accessibility to Zoning that they were positive steps in making a more affective Board.

Dr. Watkins stated that today was a good step and one of the things the Board needed to move toward was having more substance toward Board discussions. He said the comments that Board members engaged into today did a lot of good for the public in helping to understand the issues they were considering.

**RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING –
May 14, 2008**

HDRB ACTION: Mr. Steffen made a motion that the Savannah Historic District Board of Review approve the minutes as submitted. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Historic District Board of Review the meeting was adjourned approximately 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Reiter,
Preservation Officer

BR/jnp