



Historic Preservation Commission

Virtual Meeting
December 21, 2020 3:00 PM
Meeting Minutes

DECEMBER 21, 2020 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

A Pre-Meeting was held at 2:30 p.m. before this meeting. The Board asked questions pertaining to the items on the December 21, 2020 Regular Agenda. No testimony was received and no votes were taken.

Members Present: Chelsea Jackson-Greene, Vice-Chair
Kendra Clark
Rebecca Fenwick
Darren Bagley-Heath
Vernon Jones
T. Jerry Lominack
J. Haley Swindle
Dr. Robin Williams

Member Absent: Virginia Mobley, Chair

Staff Present: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director
Leah Michalak, Historic Preservation Director
Ryan Jarles, Cultural Resources Planner
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

[1. Call to Order and Welcome](#)

Ms. Jackson-Greene called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the role of the Historic Preservation Commission and explained that staff will present each application with a recommendation; and then the petitioner will present his/her comments. The public will make comments. The petitioner will be given the opportunity to respond to the public comments. Then the HPC will make its decision.

II. SIGN POSTING

III. CONSENT AGENDA

STREETCAR DISTRICT

[2. Petition of Tim Morneau | 20-004888-COA | 2602 Barnard Street | New Construction Accessory Structures and Fences](#)

- [☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 20-004888-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [☞ Previous Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
- [☞ Street Views - 2007-2019.pdf](#)
- [☞ Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)
- [☞ 1994 Survey Card.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the construction of two new accessory structures, a pool, multiple fences, and a driveway for the property located at 2602 Barnard Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Submit drawings indicating the locations of the electrical meter and refuse storage area.
2. Revise the driveway to a ribbon strip design with appropriate plantings between the strips.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Kendra Clark

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[3. Petition of Savannah Home Solutions, LLC. - Corey Griffin | 20-005863-COA | 412 East 40th Street | Rehabilitation](#)

- [☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 20-005863-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Narrative and Photos.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Inspection Report.pdf](#)
- [☞ Staff Research.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the rehabilitation work, including a roof replacement and window/door repairs at 412 East 40th Street with the following conditions to be

submitted to Staff for final review because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that all physical treatments are undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials, and that all repairs/replacements are made in-kind. Ensure that the character defining red brick porch piers on the front facade are preserved.
2. Ensure that any replacement glass is transparent with no dark tints or reflective effects and that all lights have a white light source only.
3. Submit specifications and drawings of the back stairwell and revise the fiberglass rear porch screens to a fine wire mesh.
4. Ensure that the metal drip edge covers all edges of the roof, and that the TPO membrane is not visible from any public right-of-way. Provide material specifications for the downspouts prior to installation.
5. Submit fence drawings and specifications.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Kendra Clark

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[4. Petition of Tyler Kopkas | 20-005866-COA | 102 East Victory Drive | Painted, Non-Illuminated, Sign](#)

[☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation - 20-005866-COA - 102 E Victory Drive.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - Project Description and Drawings.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the non-illuminated, painted sign on the front exterior wall of the building located at 102 East Victory Drive as requested because the sign is visually compatible and meets the standards.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Kendra Clark

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

[5. Adopt the December 21, 2020 Regular Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby adopt the December 21, 2020 Regular Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Jerry Lominack

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

[6. Approve the November 23, 2020 Meeting Minutes](#)

[11-23-2020 Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the approval of the November 23, 2020 Meeting Minutes to the meeting of January 27, 2021 to show that Vice-Chair Jackson-Greene voted instead of abstained on the motions.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Kendra Clark

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
-----------------	-------

Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

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

VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

[7. Petition of Felder & Associates | 20-005425-COA | 410 East 37th Street | Alterations and Additions \(with Special Exception Request and Variance Recommendation\)](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: J. Haley Swindle

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[8. Petition of Vanessa L. Walthour | 20-005437-COA | 1209 Barnard Street | Alterations and Sign Package](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: J. Haley Swindle

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye

Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

[9. Petition of CDH Construction Group | 20-005853-COA | 407 East Anderson Lane | New Construction, Small \(Parts I and II\) and Variance Recommendation](#)

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Kendra Clark

Second: J. Haley Swindle

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

VICTORIAN DISTRICT

[10. Petition of Stanley Knowles | 20-005060-COA | 1308 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | Alterations](#)

- [Victorian Staff Recommendation - 20-005060-COA.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Drawings 1308 MLK.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Property Survey.pdf](#)
- [Submittal Packet - Previous Drawings and Material Specifications.pdf](#)

Mr. Stanley Knowles was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the report. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations and a second story addition to the property located at 1308 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. The alterations include the complete demolition of the existing second story and construction of a new second story addition proposed to be the same footprint as the first story. The first story is to be heavily altered on the west facing façade to include alterations to all openings and new openings.

Mr. Jarles explained that on May 28, 2020, the Zoning Board of Appeals [ZBA] approved a two-space parking variance in conjunction with the conversion of the existing structure at 1308 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. [20-001620-ZBA].

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends approval for alterations and a second story addition to the property located at 1308 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd with the following conditions to be submitted to

Staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Remove all openings proposed on the north and east facades.
2. Provide material specifications for all doors, brick, mortar, make-up air grille, and lighting.
3. Ensure that all the CMU block is painted
4. If Fire-tec (1hr) single hung windows are proposed to be utilized on the west or south facade, revise the material specifications to be Jeld-Wren Site Series (Single-Hung).
5. Consult with the City of Savannah Development Services about redesigning the interior spaces to meet code after the north and east windows are removed prior to submitting final COA drawings to staff to stamp for permit.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams stated that he was curious why the petitioner wishes to demolish the second story. He said based on the photograph, it is the most intact part of the building.

Mr. Jarles explained that this part expands the second story to make it larger. He was not sure whether there are other portions that need to be demolished that would require them to do so. However, this is a question that the petitioner may be able to answer.

Dr. Williams asked if the second story does not cover the entire footprint.

Mr. Jarles answered that the 2nd floor does not currently cover the entire footprint. He explained that the petitioner's petition is to expand all the way to the rear.

Dr. Williams said not only would the second story, but all the historic roof features will be demolished as well.

Mr. Jarles explained that as he as foresaid, this is a noncontributing building. Therefore, staff looked at this as not being a contributing feature.

Dr. Williams said it is ironic that the second floor is the most contributing part of the building that is left.

Mr. Jarles explained that this is unfortunate, but staff had to review this as a noncontributing building.

Ms. Fenwick asked that the reason why the windows are not allowed is because the building is on the lot line. Is this correct?

Mr. Jarles answered correct. Therefore, it would be against fire code because the openings would be onto another property. If something were built there, there would be no way for you to essentially escape. Consequently, he believes the main reason is that it is against the fire code.

Ms. Fenwick stated that in the future a neighbor could be here.

Ms. Michalak explained that they should not comment on fire code, but she knows that the fire code does not allow openings or any kind of fenestration across property lines.

Ms. Fenwick said this building clearly had openings on the secondary façade historically. It seems to be a shame to limit this as well as potentially to limit a viable building to have some residential, mixed use density in this area as this is what is needed.

Ms. Michalak said the spaces would need to be redesigned. When this building was initially designed, there were no fire codes. At some later point, she believes the property was subdivided.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Knowles explained that if you were to go inside the building, the siding is the only thing that is holding this building up. The roof has already caved in.

Mr. Lominack asked the petitioner if a structural engineer has looked at the load bearing capacity of the first-floor walls to support a 2nd story.

Mr. Knowles answered that a structural engineer will look at the walls.

Mr. Lominack asked the petitioner if he felt it was more economically feasible to tear down the entire building and build back a new building.

Mr. Knowles replied that if this is done, they would have to meet the parking requirements. This means that the building would be cut down in size. The area is only 50 feet wide and, therefore, they would not be able to get two units here.

Ms. Fenwick thanked the petitioner for working on this building. The site has needed some work done to it for a long time. She believes this will be a “big boon” to the area. Ms. Fenwick advised the petitioner to work closely with the local building officials, especially with regards to the windows. Ms. Fenwick could not say for certain, but she knows that sometimes with historic buildings there can be some negotiations as far as other fire code exceptions and measures that you can add to offset other requirements.

Mr. Jones asked if this will be residential or commercial property.

Mr. Knowles answered that the property will be mixed-use. Two residential units will be on the top floor and two retail units will be on the bottom floor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said their Architectural Review Committee [ARC] reviewed the plans. The ARC initially had some of the same misgivings as the HPC members in terms of losing the historic fabric that is buried somewhere under this hodge-podge building. They also recognized that the MPC staff is limited as this is not a contributing structure, and, therefore a lot of the more sympathetic parts of the ordinance do not apply. To this end, the only real comment they have about the design as submitted, is that the tiny middle window that is in the staircase if the façade is approved as submitted in this elevation, it should be a standard size window. There should be enough room in this landing to allow for a window this size.

Mr. Arvay said they understood that the asymmetric nature of the façade is due to the constraints to the inside. He encouraged the petitioner to seek clarification from the building department regarding the north and west windows. Certainly, fire codes do put restrictions on what you can have on the elevations. However, if fire rated windows can be put on the north façade, obviously that would be much better for the long-term marketability and functionality of the building.

Mr. Knowles, in response to public comments, said they are trying to develop something that will help improve the neighborhood.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed the small middle window. They agreed with the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] that the small window needs to be larger. It should be the same size as the other windows on this side. The HPC thanked the petitioner for wanting to beautify the neighborhood.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve alterations and a second story addition to the property located at 1308 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Remove all openings proposed on the north and east facades.
2. Provide material specifications for all doors, brick, mortar, make-up air grille, and lighting.
3. Ensure that the CMU block is painted.
4. If Fire-tec (1hr) single hung windows are proposed to be utilized on the west or south façade revise the material specification to
be Jeld-Wen Siteline Series (Single-Hung).
5. Consult with the City of Savannah Development Services about redesigning the interior spaces to meet code after the north and
east windows are removed prior to submitting final COA drawings to Staff to stamp for permit.
6. Enlarge center window on the west façade to be the same size as the other windows located on the second
story of the same façade.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Rebecca Fenwick

Second: Vernon Jones

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Aye

CUYLER-BROWNVILLE DISTRICT

[11. Petition of City of Savannah Code Compliance | 20-002642-COA | 726 West Victory Drive | Contributing Building Demolition](#)

- 🔗 [Cuyler Brownville - Staff Recommendation - 20-002642-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Brittany Walker Ownership Documents.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Building Observation.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - HSF letter of Tax Sale Reschedule.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Submittal Packet - Court Order.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Research - Email correspondence with City of Savannah.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [June 2020 HPC Board Decision - 20-002642-COA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [September 2020 HPC Board Decision - 20-002642-COA.pdf](#)

Officer Joshua Downs of the City of Savannah Compliance Department was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of a contributing building in the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District located at 726 West Victory Drive. The City's

Inspection Worksheet states that there is wall rot as well as front roof rot and collapse. The Inspector states that he recommends demolition. The building's demolition was ordered in Recorder's Court on June 2, 2014.

Mr. Jarles gave the background data on this petition. The historic building was constructed in 1925 and is a contributing structure within the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District. It is a representative example of the bungalow-form house built in the southern portion of this district and it still possesses high historic integrity even though it has experienced deferred maintenance and neglect. There has been a significant amount of demolition in this district over the recent years and very few intact examples like this building remain.

Mr. Jarles explained that on June 25, 2019, the MPC made the decision to continue the petition for demolition of a contributing building in the Cuyler-Brownville Historic District located at 726 West Victory Drive [File No. 19-002821-COA]. The order for demolition made by the Recorder's Court of Chatham County was ordered in the name of the defendant and property owner Jesus Castillo (Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah v. Jesus Castillo). It appeared the City of Savannah had no legal standing to apply for the demolition based on this court order because the defendant named on the legal document is the property owner Jesus Castillo. The court ordered demolition did not vest ownership of the property to the City of Savannah. The applicant (The City of Savannah) was told to go to The Recorder's Court of Chatham County to retain a new order either vesting ownership of the property to the City of Savannah or go through the process of having the property deemed as a blighted property and the authority be given to the City for its demolition.

Mr. Jarles said that on May 14, 2020, Staff was provided a document via Attorney Lester B. Johnson, III, Assistant City Attorney explaining the legal standing of the City of Savannah allowing for heirs of a deceased property owner to act as personal representatives (executors) of a property in cases of demolition.

Mr. Jarles stated that on June 30, 2020, the Board made the decision to continue the petition to demolish the building located at 726 West Victory Drive to the September 23, 2020 Historic Preservation Commission Regular Meeting to allow for the building to be included at the September 8, 2020 Tax Sale. Staff was contacted by Historic Savannah Foundation on August 26, 2020 and were informed that the September Tax Sale was rescheduled for November 3, 2020 due to the ongoing global COVID-19 pandemic.

Mr. Jarles explained that on September 23, 2020, the Board made the decision to continue the petition to demolish the building located at 726 West Victory Drive to the December 21, 2020 Historic Preservation Commission Regular Meeting to allow for the building to be included at the November 3, 2020 Tax Sale. On November 3, 2020, the property was included within the Judicial In Rem Tax Foreclosure Sale and was purchased by a private citizen. The property is now in new ownership. Staff has spoken to the new owner and she intends to rehabilitate the property.

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends deny the petition to demolish the building located at 726 West Victory Drive because the property is under new ownership due to its sale during the November 3, 2020 Judicial In Rem Tax Foreclosure Sale, and the new owner intends to rehabilitate, instead of demolish the contributing building.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Officer Downs explained that a court order was issued to the previous owner to demolish the structure along with a building observation from the City's building official recommending that the structure be demolished. The Code Compliance Department is holding on to two reasons why they want to move forward with the demolition.

Ms. Fenwick asked Officer Downs if something such as this has happened before and if this is how the City operates if someone has come forward to purchase the property.

Officer Downs stated that there have been other instances where properties are purchased at tax

sales when the Code Compliance Department has already started moving through the demolition process. This is a lengthy process of notification, etc. Once they have the approval for a court order it is somewhat discontinued. As he has said, there has been times when people purchase the property and shortly thereafter the City demolishes the property because the process was already started.

Ms Fenwick asked if the Code Compliance Department had already contacted the new owner, would they still proceed with demolition?

Officer Downs explained in this case, the Code Compliance was contacted by a representative for the new owner. They discussed with the representative that the City's position would be to move forward in compliance with the recommendation of the building official as well as the court order from Recorder's Court to demolish the structure.

Ms. Fenwick asked if there was any variation in the process when this is happening in a local historic area.

Officer Downs answered not that he was aware of. He explained that the instances he is aware of this happening happened in the historic districts as well.

Ms. Fenwick said there ought to be a different process for properties in the historic districts as the goal here is to retain as many historic properties as possible.

Dr. Williams asked if the HPC denies the City's request for demolition, where does this leave the process?

Officer Downs explained that if the HPC denies the request, the Code Compliance Department has already initiated the process to the new owner for demolition of the building. The new owner will be given the same notice that has been provided on the property already. However, if the new owner chooses to rehabilitate the building, this must happen sooner rather than later. If the owner fails to conduct the demolition or do not make any repairs, the Code Compliance will keep its process of going to Recorder's Court and bring the case before the judge with the new owner.

Dr. Williams asked, for clarity, if the HPC denies the request, this would give the new owner the opportunity to make improvements to the property; and this would remove the property from the demolition list. Is this correct?

Officer Downs explained that this would give the new owner the opportunity to rehabilitate the property, but the allotted time for any unsafe structure is not a very wide window. This will need to be a fast pace process for the new owner. The rehabilitation process should begin immediately.

Dr. Williams asked if the new owner would have to have the title in hand before they begin rehabilitating the property.

Officer Downs said the question regarding the "title in hand" needs to be directed to the legal department.

Mr. Lominack asked if the title has already been transferred to the new owner.

Ms. Michalak explained that the HPC would need to ask Ms. Walker [the new owner] if she has received the title. The new owner has purchased the property.

Ms. Walker said she purchased the property on November 3, 2020. She has a 60-day redemption period from the purchase date, which is January 3, 2021. If no heirs come to claim ownership of the property during this time, the County will process the title to her. Consequently, as of today, she does not have the title.

Ms. Jackson-Greene asked Ms. Walker if once she receives the title if she can begin the rehabilitation work and whether she has met with structural engineers.

Ms. Walker said she is in a financial position to get started on rehabbing the property, but before she

does, she wants to ensure that no one can come to redeem the property. She believes she would first need to get the Certificate of Appropriateness [COA] and then get a permit from the City of Savannah. She asked Officer Downs how she would proceed to get the project started as Code Compliance is still pursuing demolition. Where does this put her?

Officer Downs said moving forward in the right direction, engineering drawings, going forward to MPC and Development Services would be the first steps. This lets Code Compliance know that things are moving in the right direction.

Ms. Walker asked for clarity, that if Code Compliance sees that she has started the process with submitting the drawings, etc., this would stop the proceeding of going forward with the demolition.

Officer Downs said that Code Compliance's goal is "compliance." They work with property owners to achieve that compliance by whatever means necessary. He explained to Ms. Walker that she would need to apply for the permit and COA. She needs to get the process started and Code Compliance would continue to work with her. As it stands now, the recommendation from the Code Compliance Department will still be demolition until the changes are made.

Ms. Swindle wanted to know if the goal is to approve or deny the petition for demolition.

Ms. Michalak explained that staff recommendation is to deny the demolition.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] expressed their support for the staff recommendation of denial. They are glad to know that Ms. Walker has purchased the building. In past conversations, the HSF was the organization who initiated the judicial In Rem to get it to tax sale. They were present at the tax sale and ready to make the purchase, but they were out bid by Ms. Walker. Nevertheless, the HSF is glad that Ms. Walker will be the steward of the building. They have talked with Ms. Walker regarding her intentions to rehabilitate the building. Therefore, the HSF believes she should be afforded every right to rehab the building.

Mr. Arvay stated as Mr. Downs said, Code Compliance's goal is compliance. Therefore, she must be given the opportunity and necessary time to do so as well. As a statement of fact, going forward, the HSF hopes that Code Compliance will be a little more conservative to sending contributing structures to Recorder's Court, especially when it comes to asking for demolition. Not only are these resources important historically, but in a city that is in such need of naturally affordable housing, it is a shame to waste and lose structures that could otherwise be reused to that end.

Ms. Walker, in response to public comments, asked Officer Downs that technically she does not have ownership until January 3, 2021 if the City would start the demolition prior to her getting the title. What is the City's plan?

Officer Downs explained that the City's plan will depend upon what the Commission decides today. If they vote to deny the demolition, they will go through the process with Ms. Walker giving her the amount of allotted time. After the notification process, this puts the date out past the January 3, 2021 date. Therefore, they will follow the process. Their goal is compliance and, therefore, Ms. Walker needs to stay in contact with him and let him know what is going on.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Ms. Fenwick believes that something needs to be put in place to better deal with protocols for how the demolition works in the local historic districts. A general understanding is needed between the City, the HPC, and staff pertaining to how this process works. She said she would be happy to work with staff to write up something pertaining to this.

Ms. Michalak explained that this is not something handled by the Building Department. This is handled by the City of Savannah Code Compliance Department. Therefore, working with MPC staff has nothing to do with it. Code Compliance is in charge when it comes to these kinds of issues. Our ordinances and overlays do not have any enforcement power nor control.

Ms. Everett, the Assistant MPC Director, explained that since there is a new owner, the City should provide the individual the opportunity to meet the code; despite what was going on before was with the other owner. The City's ordinances would overlay the historic districts.

Ms. Michalak explained that Ms. Fenwick offered to work with the MPC staff to change the ordinances, but this is not within the MPC staff purview. This falls within the jurisdiction of the City of Savannah Code Compliance Ordinance.

Ms. Everett concurred and explained that Ms. Fenwick would need to submit something to the City of Savannah.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

It was the consensus of the Commission that it is good to pursue and save buildings such as before them today. They are very satisfied that this structure will be saved. Ample time needs to be given for the rehabilitation of the structure. Ms. Jackson-Greene was concerned that a precedent is not set with Code Compliance by trying to save properties in the last minute when the owner has not demonstrated proper attention of taking care of their property. She said that Code Compliance is only trying to ensure that poorly taken care properties do not impact an area. Mr. Bagley-Heath explained that the entire reason this structure was held in abeyance so long was because the tax sale was held up repeatedly. Therefore, there was not an opportunity for anyone to get in there and rehab the property. He believed that COVID-19 presented a delay problem with this property also.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby deny the petition to demolish the building located at 726 West Victory Drive because the property is under new ownership due to its sale during the November 3, 2020 Judicial In Rem Tax Foreclosure Sale, and the new owner intends to rehabilitate, instead of demolish the contributing building.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

12. Petition of Eco-Friendly Contracting | 20-004891-COA | 520 West 39th Street | Alterations

[📎 Cuyler-Brownville Staff Recommendation - 20-004891-COA.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - Photos Prior to Work Being Undertaken.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - Photos During Work.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet - Application and Description](#)

Mr. Andre Gaston was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Ryan Jarles gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for an after-the-fact rehabilitation and alterations to the contributing building located at 520 West 39th Street. The property underwent several alterations without receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness or permits from the City of Savannah; the petitioner is proposing work to ensure that the items that were undertaken, without any approvals, meet the ordinance.

Mr. Jarles explained that the applicant is proposing to correct multiple items within the scope of work that occurred without a COA approval or permits. The items include:

1. Replacement of all doors with visually incompatible doors.
2. Replacement of all windows with prohibited vinyl windows.
3. Siding replacement.
4. Addition of a two-story covered front porch that does not meet the *Porches, Stoops, Balconies and Decks* standards.
5. Construction of a rear deck and stairs.

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends approval for after-the-fact rehabilitation and alterations to the contributing building located at 520 West 39th Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Revise the drawings to include existing and proposed building coverage.
2. Revised the site plan to show the accurate setbacks.
3. Repair, rather than replace, the existing concrete front porch stairs.
4. Revise the drawings and material specifications to show only wood for the siding, trim, and all porch features other than the brick bases of the front porch columns.
5. Ensure that all rear porch and stair materials are to be wood and either painted or stained.
6. Provide the material specifications for the brick and mortar, windows, and asphalt shingle.
7. Replace all non-wood siding with wood siding (painted).
8. Ensure that the horizontal wood boards are inset 3 inches from the foundation piers.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams asked if the original porch was one-story.

Mr. Jarles answered no, the original porch was two-stories.

Dr. Williams asked if the current siding is on top of the original siding.

Mr. Jarles replied that staff is unaware of this as the work was undertaken without staff's knowledge. He said from the photo, there could be wood underneath, but staff is unable to tell exactly whether wood is underneath or not.

Dr. Williams explained that he asked this question because if the original siding is underneath the vinyl siding, does the staff recommendation force the petitioner to replace the original wood siding with new wood siding?

Mr. Jarles explained that staff is only recommending that the materiality of the exterior be wood siding. If wood is underneath, it would meet the standard as well. They would only have to remove the vinyl siding.

Ms. Clark asked, for clarification, if this petition is for an after-the-fact approval where a new contractor took over the contract of prior work that was not done properly. Is this correct?

Mr. Jarles answered, yes.

Mr. Lominack said the handrail on the back of the house where the stairs have been added looks very tall. What are the dimensions?

Mr. Jarles explained that staff determined that the handrails meet the ordinance. Therefore, they are assuming that it is no more than 36 inches.

Ms. Michalak explained that this is multi-family. Therefore, the 36 standards maximum does not apply here.

Mr. Lominack said again that the handrails look high.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gaston said the siding is not vinyl or Hardi-board; it is wood siding. Therefore, they will not replace all the siding. This siding was probably installed 15 or 20 years ago.

Ms. Fenwick asked Mr. Gaston if he has a map showing all the local historic districts.

Mr. Gaston answered yes.

Ms. Fenwick explained to Mr. Gaston that she is aware that he inherited this contract from another contractor and that this is an after-the-fact application. But, nevertheless, she just wanted to be sure that he was aware of the local historic boundaries.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission agreed with the staff recommendations. But, throughout their discussion, a consensus was made that the columns as proposed were too slender by design and that they should be enlarged to be more in scale and in proportion with the neighboring properties on the same block face.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve the petition for an after-the-fact rehabilitation and alterations to the contributing building located at 520 West 39th Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff for review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Revise the drawings to include existing and proposed building coverage.
2. Revised the site plan to show the accurate setbacks.
3. Repair, rather than replace, the existing concrete front porch stairs.
4. Revise the drawings and material specifications to show only wood for the siding, trim, and all porch features other than the brick bases of the front porch columns.
5. Ensure that all rear porch and stair materials are to be wood and either painted or stained.
6. Provide the material specifications for the brick and mortar, windows, and asphalt shingle.
7. Replace all non-wood siding with wood siding (painted).
8. Ensure that the horizontal wood boards are inset 3 inches from the foundation piers.
9. Revise the column design to be round and of the same scale and proportions of the columns found on buildings on the same block face.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Vernon Jones

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

STREETCAR DISTRICT

[13. Petition of Eco-Friendly Contracting | 20-004890-COA | 301 West 33rd Street | Alterations](#)

- [☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation - 301 W 33rd - 20-004890-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Written Project Description.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)
- [☞ Staff Research - Photographs.pdf](#)

Mr. Andre Gaston was present on behalf of the petition.

Mr. Jarles gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for a rehabilitation and alterations to 301 West 33rd Street. And has provided the following scope of work within their submittal. "The exterior of the house will be painted a classic grey with white trim. All windows and doors precede Eco Friendly Contracting inheriting project. There are a few windows that will be changed out with like-kind windows because the windows were too small for the opening and need to be replaced with the right window size. The front handrails will also be repaired as needed with like-kind materials. Siding will also be replaced as needed and repaired with like-kind materials. A 5x5 landing will be built at the back door with stairs. The underpinning around the house will be done with in-kind wood materials. The block fence will be removed and replaced with a wooden fence. The fence is leaning due to the tree root intrusion. The roof of the main historic building will not be in the petitioner's scope of work. The garage will also be painted and repaired as needed. The metal roof will be removed to match the primary structure."

Mr. Jarles explained that when researching the property, staff determined that the existing state of the contributing historic structure includes several alterations that did not receive a Certificate of Appropriateness; therefore, the property did not receive any permits for the addition to the rear of the building, nor did they receive these approvals for the replacement of the historic windows. The windows on the first story of the contributing building were replaced sometime prior to 2007 as seen in the 2007 Google Maps Imagery. All windows on the second story of the contributing building were replaced, sometime after May of 2019, with prohibited vinyl windows. Furthermore a addition was constructed onto the existing rear addition sometime after May of 2019. The state of the building prior to this work being undertaken can be seen within the Google Maps May 2019 imagery included within the agenda.

Mr. Jarles reported that staff recommends approve the rehabilitation and alterations proposed for 301

West 33rd Street, including: siding repair to the main historic building as well as the garage, window replacements, front porch repair, fence replacement, and roof replacement on the garage with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Replace all second story windows with windows previously approved by the Board for use on contributing buildings and provide staff with the material specifications for review and approval.
2. Provide staff with specifications for the garage roof replacement for review and approval.
3. Provide staff with elevation and section drawings for the proposed fence for review and approval.
4. Apply for an after-the-fact Certificate of Appropriateness for the rear addition and include the proposed rear porch within the submittal for review by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Jarles entertained questions.

Dr. Williams stated that there is one historic window. Therefore, it would not need to be replaced. Is this correct?

Mr. Jarles answered, "correct."

Dr. Williams said the staff's recommendation is that all windows be replaced.

Mr. Jarles explained that they were not sure whether the window has been replaced at this time. Therefore, the recommendation is to provide that all the windows are to be replaced with the correct window. However, if the historic window is still existing, it is not being required that it be replaced.

Dr. Williams asked if the staff's recommendation should show this wording.

Mr. Jarles answered that the Commission can add the wording in their motion, but if the window is there, it would not be replaced. This window should just be disregarded.

Dr. Williams asked if the petitioner would be required to replace the standing seam metal roof on the garage with a like material or would they be able to replace it with asphalt shingles or something else.

Mr. Jarles explained that the garage is not labeled as "contributing" within the map. Therefore, the petitioner can use a different material.

Dr. Williams asked if the Building Map includes buildings consistently.

Ms. Michalak answered that since 2012, they are performing survey updates through staff or the State's Grant Program. The Streetcar District is currently on Ryan's and Olivia's list to resurvey. This has not been surveyed since the early 2000 when it became a local historic district. They have found in the other districts such as Cuyler-Brownville [which is the most recent survey] and the Victorian District that a lot of outbuildings are posted on the map as noncontributing. For example, downtown, the carriage houses were not added until 2010.

Dr. Williams asked if the metal roof could be rehabilitated. He said staff is asking for this roof to be replaced.

Mr. Jarles explained that staff is not asking for the metal roof to be replaced. The petitioner is requesting that it be replaced.

Dr. Williams explained that he was not a material specialist [probably Ms. Fenwick could assist with this] but he was asking if it was feasible for this roof to be made waterproof.

Ms. Fenwick stated that it is possible. It also depends upon the level of deterioration. Things can almost, always be saved. It depends upon the level of willingness.

Dr. Williams asked, therefore, since the building is not officially on the Contributing Building List, does the HPC have any authority over this building?

Ms. Michalak explained that the HPC cannot say that they are making the building into a contributing building, but if they do not feel that the roofing material that is being proposed is visually compatible, then they can make a decision for the petitioner to rehabilitate the roof instead of replace.

Dr. Williams asked; therefore, if this issue would not come up until the resubmission of this project at a future meeting. Is this correct?

Mr. Jarles answered "incorrect." The request for the new COA application is solely for the rear addition and porch. The Commission's approval of the petition at this point would include the replacement of the garage roof. This is what staff is recommending approval for. The condition to have a separate COA application came in solely for the rear addition and porch on the main historic building.

Dr. Williams wanted to know if the Commission does not know what the roof material is, how could they approve it?

Mr. Jarles explained that staff's condition includes that the petitioner provide the specifications.

Ms. Fenwick asked what things would go back to the staff before it comes to the Commission.

Mr. Jarles said that staff has been working on this petition for quite some time. They found that the rear addition was constructed prior to 2019. Therefore, staff decided it was best to bring what they had to the Commission at this point and then work with the remaining later with a new Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Michalak said the Commission could decide to continue this project if they believe it is not ready. Staff has been working with the petitioner for a long time and now just wanted to get the petition before the Commission.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gaston stated he heard that the Commission has concerns with the roof on the garage. They have stated that this will be an asphalt shingle roof. As everyone knows, they are taking over a project that was not previously handled correctly by getting a COA before the work was commenced. He said, however, they are trying now to get the project moving in the right direction. They will take care of all the required recommendations and complete the project.

Mr. Gaston said there are some other things now that they can begin doing while they wait to get approval for at the next meeting. The conditions that are being required for them to do is what they are petitioning now for. Mr. Gaston said he believes it would be a good thing if they are able to see some action on this property. It is on a corner.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Ryan Arvay of the Historic Savannah Foundation [HSF] said they not only wanted to go on record supporting the staff's recommendations on this petition, but to also express some frustrations

he was sure they share with staff and the Commission. It seems that there has been a lot of after-the-fact COA requests lately. Mr. Arvay said he was not sure exactly what could be done to avoid this. He does not believe that the MPC's requirements are a secret. Sometimes the requirements can be tedious and labeled intensive, but it is fairly understood what is required. He was not making a specific criticism of this property or this project, but preservation is somewhat an academic field and much of the best standards and practices are worked into the ordinance. Staff does a good job of trying to ensure that each project is in compliance. It is the Historic Preservation Commission's [HPC] general charge to make sure this happens.

Mr. Arvay said he appreciates the Commission's comments today because he believes they are trying to keep the projects on track. To do this right, it might require that the Commission continue this petition. There appears to be a lot of issues that need to be addressed. The windows on the second floor are probably one of the most important things and get them replaced properly with actual wood sash windows. He said he was also sympathetic to Dr. Williams' comments. The garage on the lane materiality did not come up in their Architectural Review Committee (ARC) meeting. Mr. Arvay encouraged the petitioner to investigate the Hydro Stop Product for the metal garage roof. One will be surprised as to what can be saved when it comes to these metal roofs. The HSF will be happy to talk with the petitioner about people they can recommend for this kind of work. He said it would be a shame to "water down" this property with an asphalt shingle roof on that building or some of the other cost-cutting measures. Mr. Arvay said he believes that staff has addressed it and the HSF supports it.

Mr. Gaston, in response to public comments, stated that the main structure has asphalt shingles. Therefore, they talked about putting asphalt shingles on the existing garage. He said he is a contractor and as has been said, they can save anything they want to save. This is a project that was started by a previous contractor and he does not know the whole inside story, but it was not done correctly, and they are now trying to clean it up. He is not trying to over exacerbate the owners and put them in a position where the property will just sit here not rehabbed for the next five years. The owners would not be able to complete the project if unnecessary costs that do not make sense are being tacked on. Mr. Gaston said everyone's goal here is to make this project compatible with the historic district and to make it visually compatible with what is in the neighborhood. Therefore, they can do what he has suggested, and he does not see why they have to detour from their initial goal pertaining to the garage and the main structure.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission expressed their concerns for the lack of information provided by the applicant within the submittal. A consensus was formed throughout the Commission that the items missing within the submittal shall be returned for their review along with the rear addition and porch; they determined it would be best for the Commission to continue the petition to allow for all items to be reviewed together as one petition.

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby continue the petition for the rehabilitation and alterations proposed for 301 West 33rd Street, to allow for the petitioner to revise their submittal to meet the following conditions.

1. Replace all second story windows with windows previously approved by the Board for use on contributing buildings and provide Staff with the material specifications for review and approval.
2. Provide Staff with specifications for the garage roof replacement for review and approval.
3. Provide Staff with elevation and section drawings for the proposed fence for review and approval.
4. Provide all necessary information for an after-the-fact review of the rear addition.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Darren Bagley-Heath

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Kendra Clark	- Aye
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

[14. Petition of Greenline Architecture | 20-005880-COA | 1815 Lincoln Street | Alterations and Installation of Entrance Canopy and ADA Ramp](#)

- [☞ Streetcar Staff Recommendation 20-005880-COA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Narrative and Renders.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal Packet - Photos and Drawings.pdf](#)
- [☞ Submittal- Existing Window Clarification Email.pdf](#)

Mr. Lominack left the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Mr. Eric O'Neil of Greenline Architecture was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Olivia Arfuso gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting approval for alterations and the installation of an entrance canopy and new ADA ramp at 1815 Lincoln Street. 1815 Lincoln Street is the City of Savannah owned *John S. Delaware Community Center, Gymnasium, and Pool*. All CMU wall surfaces, and wood trim will be painted. Existing metal window security grilles will be removed, and all aluminum windows and steel doors will be replaced with an aluminum storefront and new glass entry doors. The replacement will be made within existing openings. New concrete sidewalks, an ADA ramp, and stairs will be installed with a powder coated steel guardrail. The existing shed roof entry awning will be replaced with a new freestanding metal awning with a translucent panel roof. The awning will have a concrete base. The existing asphalt shingle roof, on the smaller structure along Lincoln Street, will be replaced with new asphalt shingles. New wood mechanical screens made of KDAT posts will, also, be installed to hide ground level HVAC equipment in their existing locations. New landscaping will complete the alterations.

Ms. Arfuso explained that the petitioner informed staff that existing windows were once operable, but they became a security risk. The windows are no longer operable and now, have metal security grilles. The applicant is proposing the removal of the windows and associated metal security grilles and the installation of a non-operable storefront system.

Ms. Arfuso reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations and the installation of an entrance canopy and new ADA ramp at 1815 Lincoln Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Reconsider the installation of a storefront system and choose an appropriate operable window type approved for use on "New Construction, Additions, and Non-Historic Buildings."

2. Ensure that the wood mechanical screens are painted to match the proposed exterior wall color.

Ms. Arfuso entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams asked if this is a contributing building.

Ms. Arfuso answered no, this is not a contributing building.

Dr. Williams said staff's recommendation is that the replacement windows match the previous windows. If this is a noncontributing building, how does this work?

Ms. Arfuso explained that the staff determined that the installation of a fixed aluminum storefront in the existing once operable window openings does not adhere because only accent windows can be fixed, but these are not.

Dr. Williams asked if this is a standard that applies to all buildings or just contributing buildings.

Mr. Jarles stated that this standard applies to all buildings, not just contributing buildings.

Dr. Williams said he was thinking back to the roof garage of the previous application, which was on a non-contributing building. Would a similar logic be applied, or is it in this case simply because there is a prohibition on fixed windows unless they are accent windows?

Mr. Jarles explained that it is not necessarily the materiality, but these are the regular windows openings which they do not usually see in a storefront window with material placed therein. So, staff's determination was that it would be required to still be some form of operable window that meets the materiality as well. The windows on a non-contributing building could be a clad material, but it would still be required to be operable.

Mr. Bagley-Heath said he passes by this community center on a regular basis. This is one of the most unwelcoming centers that he has seen in his life. He has no desire to go inside this building. Whatever is done will enhance this building but considering that it is a community center it will have a lot of wear and tear. The storefront should have a commercial storefront because of its nature. Presently, the door looks like it belongs to a prison; it is completely unwelcoming and anything that makes it more appealing would be great. Mr. Bagley-Heath explained that he was not sure if having operable windows would satisfy the issue. However, they need to look at the long-term maintenance and how it would affect this community building.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. O'Neil said he would go through the staff's recommendations. He began with recommendation #2 - Ensure that the wood mechanical screens are painted to match the proposed exterior wall color. He explained that they will paint the mechanical screens and the walls of the building.

Mr. O'Neil said pertaining to #1 - Reconsider the installation of a storefront system and choose an appropriate operable window type approved for use on "New Construction, Additions, and Non-Historic Buildings." He said in reading the Ordinance pertaining to windows in non-contributing structures, he did not see it mentioned anywhere that the windows need to be replaced in-kind. He read the section of the Ordinance pertaining to storefronts to the Commission.

Mr. O'Neil stated that the building needs to be safe and secured for the community members and it needs to be energy efficient. They believe the storefront is the best option that addresses this issue. They want to keep the storefront in the project if the Commission agrees. If the Commission approves the staff's recommendation, then they are asking them to consider an alternative.

Mr. O'Neil showed the Commission other buildings in the area that have been renovated in the Streetcar District last year with non-operable windows. He showed the Commission 1601 Abercorn Street; 200 East 31st Street; Bull Street Baptist Church on the corner of Anderson and Drayton Streets – non-operable windows; and 9 West Henry Street. He said non-operable windows were put into commercial buildings.

Mr. O'Neil entertained questions from the Commission.

Dr. Williams stated that on the elevation drawings [side view of the canopy with its angles] he wanted to verify if the north shorter arm of the canopy is meant to be parallel to the roof pitch.

Mr. O'Neil answered yes.

Dr. Williams explained that it was not depicted that way on the drawings.

Mr. O'Neil said this could be a drawing error.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Commission discussed that the function of the building aligns more with a non-residential, commercial purpose. The security concerns, and safety regarding the individuals that frequent the building, making storefront glazing more appropriate than an operable window type. Since the windows are no longer operable, a fixed window type shall be considered appropriate. The Commission recommended [and the petitioner agreed] that he will return with an amendment to the approved COA to request a special exception from the window standards that states, "Windows shall be single-hung, double-hung, triple-hung, awning, or casement, except for accent windows which may also be fixed or hopper."

Motion

The Savannah Historic Preservation Commission does hereby approve alterations and the installation of an entrance canopy and new ADA ramp at 1815 Lincoln Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff for final review because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Reconsider the installation of a storefront system and choose an appropriate operable window type approved for use on "New Construction, Additions, and non-Historic Buildings."
2. Ensure that the wood mechanical screens are painted to match the proposed exterior wall color.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Darren Bagley-Heath

Second: Rebecca Fenwick

Rebecca Fenwick	- Aye
Jerry Lominack	- Not Present
Kendra Clark	- Not Present
Vernon Jones	- Aye
Chelsea Jackson-Greene	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Darren Bagley-Heath	- Aye
J. Haley Swindle	- Not Present

X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

[15. Petition of Betty Mitchell / 20-005878-COA/ 526 East 35th Street/ Staff Denied - After the fact petition for siding and trim.](#)

[☞ Staff Signed Decision - Denial - 526 E 35th Street.pdf](#)

[16. Petition of Anthony Hampton | 20-005862-COA | 117 Brady St. | Staff Approved Roof Replacement](#)

[☞ Staff Signed Decision - 20-005862-COA.pdf](#)

[17. Petition of Celeste Cavert | 20-006170-COA | 1805 Whitaker Street | Staff Approved - In Kind repairs/replacements to front porch column bases.](#)

[☞ 20-006170-COA SIGNED Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[18. Petition of Nick Hitt | 20-006067-COA | 14 East 33rd St | Staff Approved - window replacement](#)

[☞ Staff SIGNED Decision - 20-006067-COA - 14 E 33rd St.pdf](#)

[19. Petition of Eric Darling | 20-006188-COA | 1201 Jefferson St Unit B | Staff Approved - Repair and Replace siding and wood porch.](#)

[☞ Victorian Staff SIGNED Decision - 20-006188-COA.pdf](#)

[20. Petition of South Shore Roofing | 20-006218-COA | 900 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. | Staff Approved - In kind roof replacement](#)

[☞ 20-006218-COA SIGNED Decision.pdf](#)

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

[21. Presentation of the 2021 HP Department Calendar](#)

[☞ 2020-12-07-Calendar.pdf](#)

Mr. Jarles explained that this year's calendar layout is chronically and shows the history of 1733 to 2021. The calendar's title is "Resilient Savannah." Mr. Jarles stated that the events are narrowed down showing only a few of the epidemic struggles. Namely, "Pandemics, Fires, Natural Disasters; and Economic Disasters."

Mr. Jarles explained the depiction of the calendar as follows:

January	-	The Epidemic of 1733
February	-	The Bread Fire of 1776
March	-	Midnight Fire of 1820
April	-	Yellow Fever of 1820
May	-	Second Wave of Yellow Fever 1854
June	-	Third Wave of Yellow Fever 1876
July	-	Hogan's Fire 1889
August	-	Sea Island Storm 1893
September	-	Spanish Flu 1918

- October - Savannah's Not-So-Roaring '20s
- November - The Great Decay
- December - COVID-19

The calendars will be mailed to the HPC members.

Mr. Jarles thanked all the MPC staff members who assisted with putting the 2021 calendar together.

Ms. Michalak said as the Historic Preservation Commission is coming to the end of the year [2020], she wanted to thank the Commission. She explained that through the third quarter, staff has made decisions/recommendations for 253 COA applications. This does not include the 201 applications that were completed this year for the Landmark District and the Historic Site and Monument Commission.

Ms. Michalak thanked the Historic Preservation staff. She explained that oftentimes it is not easy to work with folks who may not have done this before, may not be aware of the process and a lot of the time do not know what a floor plan is, etc. Staff does a great job of trying to get the applications completed and trying to get them before the Commission. Sometimes this takes months, but staff always ensure that they get before the HPC.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

[22. Next HPC Pre-Meeting: Wednesday, January 27, 2021 at 2:30pm](#)

[23. Next HPC Regular Meeting: Wednesday, January 27, 2021 at 3:00pm](#)

[24. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Ms. Jackson-Greene adjourned the HPC meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leah G. Michalak, Director
Historic Preservation

LGM:mem

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