



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
June 8, 2011 2:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

JUNE 8, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Brian Judson, Chair
W. James Overton, Vice Chair
Ned Gay
Reed Engle
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Linda Ramsay
Ebony Simpson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Member Not Present: Sidney J. Johnson

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. [Approve Minutes of May 11, 2011](#)

Attachment: [05-11-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve May 11, 2011 Meeting Minutes - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Not Present

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

2. [Petition of Eric W. Hommel | H-11-4436-2 | 545 East Gordon Street | Exterior alterations and shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Remove the item from the final agenda at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Not Present

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

3. [Continued Petition of Kathy Ledvina | H-11-4407-2 | 323 East Jones Street | Exterior Alterations](#)

Board Action:

Continue to July 13, 2011 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay	
Second: Nicholas Henry	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

4. [Petition of LukeJohn Dickson | H-11-4440-2 | 11 East Gordon Street | Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Continue to July 13, 2011 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry	
Second: Ebony Simpson	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

5. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa for Signs for Minds | H-11-4434-2 | 13 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the principal use internally illuminated sign at 13 East Broughton Street. An encroachment agreement from the City of Savannah may be required. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Linda Ramsay
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present
Brian Judson - Abstain
W James Overton - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

6. [Petition of Kim Bennett for American Commercial Developers | H-11-4437-2 | 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Signs](#)

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

Board Action:

Approval for three additional principal use fascia signs for a total of 19 signs on the cornice of the structure at 513 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the condition that the individual designs for each sign be submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay
Second: Linda Ramsay
Reed Engle - Aye
Ned Gay - Aye
Nicholas Henry - Aye
Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present
Brian Judson - Abstain
W James Overton - Aye
Linda Ramsay - Aye
Ebony Simpson - Aye
Robin Williams - Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

7. [Amended Petition of Bill Coggins for Taylor Berrien LLC | H-07-3836-2 | 315-321 Berrien Street | New Construction modifications](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Shonka Ward 315-321 Berrien Street 082410.pdf](#)

Attachment: [2007 Part I HRB Approval and Submittal.pdf](#)

Mr. Bill Coggins was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for exterior modifications to the new construction of three row houses at 315-321 Berrien Street. Original plans submitted and approved by the Board were for townhouses with raised brick portico entries. Porticos were to be placed on an elevated brick foundation with side entry stairs. The petitioner is requesting approval for exposed concrete slab on-grade foundations for both the portico and the principal structure, with the elimination of the portico railing and side entry stairs.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends denial of after-the-fact entry portico as constructed because they do not meet the visual compatibility factors or the design standards. Staff further recommends that mitigation modification be undertaken within 60 days of this hearing, August 8, 2011, to be more compatible with the surrounding structures. The concrete foundations for both entry porticos should be clad in brick match the material of the building.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if she had discussion with the petitioner about the mitigation plans.

Ms. Ward answered that she and the petitioner met and discussed if there was a possible solution that they could come up with. It is somewhat hard as this element does not have a solution.

Mr. Judson explained that this Board has a clear set of rules/standards that it follows to approve a design. The project that is now before the Board was not constructed as originally submitted and approved.

Ms. Ward stated that Mr. Peter Shonka, Director of Development Services for the City of Savannah, was present today and wanted to address the Board regarding this matter.

Mr. Engle believed this was the third time that the Board has reviewed this project.

Ms. Ward stated that the Board reviewed the Taylor Street project. All of the projects originally came to the Board. But, today they are talking about the Berrien Street side of the same project.

Mr. Shonka explained that the Building and Zoning departments are under his purview. He stated that it is not unusual for construction within the City to have changes made to the approved plans; whether it is economic reasons, personal change or whatever. Whenever there are changes, they ensure that they meet the code compliance. The building inspectors and the trade inspectors work within building safety rules and are primarily trained in building safety. Therefore, they are looking at how do they make the project code compliant. It is very difficult for the inspectors to visualize and Taylor Street is a good example where there is a difference in the site elevation, the garage and the living space.

As he recalls, the contractor or owner made a decision to pour the foundation all as one elevation. There was no code issue, but a change was made in how the driveway connected to the sidewalk and then to the street. At the time this was made, it was impossible for the building inspector to see how this would affect the overall project. This was not a building safety issue. The inspector noted the change, checked the code and there was no problem and he, therefore, approved the change as far as the building section. These projects brought to his attention and Ms. Ward's attention the need for the two departments to communicate and work more closely together. Inspector Mike Rose, Building Inspector, is primarily charged with doing all the inspections in the Historic District. Mr. Rose is in the street a lot and if he sees anything that should come before this Board he advises Ms. Ward. Mr. Shonka stated that he does not believe that they can entirely close the loop, but he they are working in this direction.

Mr. Judson explained that he has been a part of this Board for the past five years and has seen them be more integrated in the bigger picture. It is not out of some sense of power that they are looking for enforcement, but the fact is that the public can trust the Board with certain decisions regarding the aesthetics downtown. When something is not in compliance, the Board is somewhat at a loss of doing something about it.

Mr. Gay stated the real point is the developer knew he was not in compliance with the change, but he built it anyway.

Mr. Shonka explained that the developer is held accountable.

Dr. Henry asked Mr. Shonka what can be done when a developer does not get permission to do a change.

Mr. Shonka said he believes it is unrealistic to think that the buildings be demolished. He supports the staff's recommendation that changes be made to the present structure in order to conform to the original plan as much as possible. The original developer suggested changes to his group and they approved the changes by passing the inspection. This did not come before this Board as it was not a high level change.

Dr. Henry said the developer did not bring the changes to this Board.

Mr. Shonka said he does not know if the developer knew how the plan would be affected from the Historic Review Board perspective.

Mr. Gay stated that this Board has lots of persons that come before the Board with changes.

Mr. Shonka did not believe that the person who made the decision is present today to answer their questions.

Dr. Henry wanted to know what the Historic Review Board could do if this happens again.

Mr. Judson explained that the permitting process of the Historic Review Board is to handle every request on a case-by-case basis. The reality is they cannot predicate all of their decisions based on a past failure to comply.

Mr. Gay stated what can be done regarding every time a request is made and then the individual changes it to whatever they want.

Mr. Judson explained this would encourage the Board to have a greater level of scrutiny in the process, but he could not say if this petitioner came before this Board again that they could alter their decisions based on how this turns out.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Shonka or staff if they had a solution for the fact for the threshold elevation of the doors.

Ms. Ward answered that she was aware of what Mr. Overton was referring to. However, it is not what was approved on the original plan. She is recommending that they finish cladding the concrete that was visible on the original plan.

Mr. Overton stated technically this is incorrect.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Coggins stated that Mr. Applegate is no longer involved and he apologized to the Board in the delay of getting the changes to them. He was not going to blame it on being new to Savannah. He has worked in Beaufort, South Carolina and they have a historic review board there. He has been in contact with Ms. Ward on matters such as window materials, bricks and other items. However, when the stoop change came up, there was no conversation about it. He stated that the stoop change baffled all of them. The architectural drawings were drawn not matching the civil drawings.

Dr. Williams asked what are the civil drawings.

Mr. Coggins explained that this is the grading, safety plans, and floor elevations. All of this was dropped six inches. He calls the civil drawings the water, sewer, drainage, roads, sidewalks, etc. If the Board looks at the elevations on the civil drawings, they do not match the elevations on the architectural drawings. He said ultimately who would be responsible for this is the developer. But, when you are laying out a site, you start with the civil such as grading everything, the slabs are four inches below what the finished boards called for to allow the sides to properly drain. He was not here when the site was built and does not know if a raised elevated slab is here or whether it has crawl space. But from his standpoint, this is what governs the height of the porch. They have the living area at 42 and one-half inches that was called for and everything properly drained away from the lot. They don't want the entry porch to be at the same elevation as the finished floor, so he believes the entry pad is approximately three or four inches below the finished floor. He could only tell the Board as he has already that the civil and architectural drawings do not match. The civil drawings govern the property.

Mr. Coggins stated from the photos he took while riding around town, they see a variety of entries such as stoop, side, and front. The owner and he would certainly like to see the Board, based on the other stuff downtown and the pictures he has presented, accept the changes as they are. He believes if the Board goes in this area and talks with any of the neighbors in these neighborhoods, they all believe this is a huge improvement to what was there at one time. In his opinion, this flows nicely with Historic Savannah although it does

not match the plan exactly. Mr. Coggins asked the Board for forgiveness. He has another project next door at 313 Berrien Street that the Board has already approved. It is a single-family house and one day will be built. He has talked with Ms. Ward about this and they will have day-to-day contact. Should he see anything that does not work that is on the plan, he will address it immediately as to whether it could be approved at the staff level or should he go back to the Historic Review Board.

Mr. Overton asked who is the owner of the property.

Ms. Melinda Motlagh is the owner of the entire block.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that their Architectural Review Committee agrees with staff in recommending denial of after-the-fact approval of the entry porticos as constructed. However, HSF also believes that stronger measurements need to be made to enforce the ordinance. They believe further that some sort of consequences beyond the recommended modifications towards what has been done needs to be implemented. This would be a greater fine for the petitioner thereby sending a message that this is not acceptable.

Mr. Judson asked the public to make their comments on the specifics of the architecture. He believes that there is a great deal of support from the Board regarding the comments relative to the procedures and fines, but it is not this Board's purview to set those policies and procedures.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Judson reminded the Board that it is not their charge to design what should be done to remedy it, but the petitioner is simply asking for after-the-fact approval of entry porticos as constructed.

Ms. Simpson asked if the Board denies the petition, "what happens?"

Ms. Ward explained that there are a couple of things that could happen. The petitioner could appeal the decision and the City could choose to take the petitioner to court if they do not comply with the approved the plans.

Mr. Judson stated that the petitioner could come back before the Board with an amended application. The Board could motion to deny the after-the-fact approval for the entry portico and the other modifications would have to come back before the Board in the form of another petition.

Ms. Simpson said her question concerns what has already been done.

Mr. Overton asked Mr. Shonka if a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) was issued on this project.

Mr. Shonka stated that he does not believe that a CO was issued.

Mr. Overton asked if a CO could be rescinded.

Mr. Shonka stated that a CO for them would be building code compliance.

Dr. Henry asked also if the CO could be rescinded.

Ms. Motlagh wanted to address the Board. **Mr. Judson** explained that the Board was now in its deliberation, but he would allow her to speak.

Ms. Motlagh stated that she did not come to speak, but she heard the Board discussing whether a Certificate of Occupancy could be denied. She said when they started building the project, they had no idea it would go this way. If they knew, they would not have gone forward with it. Mr. Coggins has been working to get everything right and they are trying to save the project. They are disappointed that everyone wants to demolish them. Do they want to deny them when they have them fully leased since they were built? They are wonderful buildings and she apologized that they are not what they were supposed to be. It is somewhat extreme to hear this when they have done their best to save the project and make it look historic.

Dr. Williams asked, for clarity, if the Board votes to the deny this petition, does the petitioner have the option of coming back with a plan of remedy that the Board could consider.

Mr. Judson explained that the petitioner could come back with another petition.

Board Action:

Denial of the request for after-the-fact approval of the entry porticos as constructed because they do not meet the Visual Compatibility Factors and Designs Standards in the Historic District section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah zoning ordinance and are not consistent with the originally approved design.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye

Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Amended Petition of William Bridges for Gateway Restorations | H-10-4311-2 | 521 East Gaston Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. William Bridges was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for a new wooden fence at 521 East Gaston Street. A new six foot pedestrian gate will also be installed on the primary facade.

Ms. Bryant reported that the staff recommends after-the-fact approval for the new wooden fence.

Dr. Williams asked if a reason was given why the petitioner did not request prior approval.

Ms. Ward said this would be a question for the petitioner. This is a testament to the new system that Mr. Shonka spoke of. She received a call from Mr. Rose that they needed a final Certificate of Occupancy. The staff visited the site and discovered that the fence was installed.

Mr. Overton asked Ms. Ward if she believed this would have been something that the Board would have approved.

Ms. Ward stated she believed the staff would have recommended approval for the fence.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bill Bridges stated once he finished the house, he just went ahead and installed the fence.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Bridges if he in the past has come before the Board.

Mr. Bridges answered yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams asked if the fence is made of bare wood.

Mr. Bridges answered yes.

Board Action:

Approve the request for after-the-fact approval for the fencing at 521 East Gaston Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Nay

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Nay

Robin Williams - Aye

9. [Amended Petition of Christina Swenson | H-11-4406-2 | 433 Tattnell Street | Repointing](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Mortar Specifications.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Preservation Brief 2 - Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings.pdf](#)

Ms. Christina Swenson was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting to amend the approval for repointing of the exterior brick walls on the historic building at 433 Tattnell Street. Additional information has been submitted regarding the composition of the previously installed mortar. The architect and engineer for the project have provided signed statements that the mortar installed is a Type N mortar, buff in color. They are requesting approval to retain the portions of the mortar already installed while providing a four-by-four test patch of the newly cleaned and retooled joints.

Ms. Ward stated that the product to the building is Lafarge Masonry and Mortar Cement. The mix contains 0-20 percent by weight calcium hydroxide (hydrated lime). The petitioner has stated that the engineer tested the mortar mix which revealed a mixture of 1 part Type N and 5 parts sand. Type N mortar was approved by the Board for any future repointing as appropriate on the brick. The engineer further recommends that "the mortar installed in previous repointing be left in place and cleaned to look as close as possible to the original mortar. To attempt to remove it would likely damage the brick beyond repair." Staff feels that the chosen buff color is appropriate and closely matches the lighter color.

Ms. Ward said the test patch has been done. She was hopeful that the Board visited this site. Staff feels that the area could be cleaned more. She pointed out the areas on the test area that the staff still has concerns with. They believe that the line of the mortar, profile, joint and shape be a flushed recessed joint and needs to be worked out more. The test patch was not sufficiently done for approval. Therefore, staff is not comfortable approving it at this time.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the exterior repointing at 433 Tattnell Street with the same conditions as stipulated at the last meeting (May 11, 2011).

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward the names of the engineers.

Ms. Ward answered that Mark Boyles is the engineer.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if the staff would be comfortable working with the petitioner on the additional cleaning specifications if the Board votes for the staff to do so.

Ms. Ward answered yes; but the patch that has been done thus far does not meet the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Engle asked what is the petitioner asking for.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner does not want to remove all the repointed areas. They have said that they are replacing the areas with the same type of mortar. It is not portland cement mortar as had been discussed at the previous meetings.

Mr. Engle said the staff was requesting recessed joints. There is no way to do this without removing the mortar that is there.

Ms. Ward stated that she does not believe that all the mortar needs to be removed, but the staff's recommendation is that it be removed enough to reveal the edge of the brick.

Mr. Judson explained that the Board's previous motion stated that "all" as they believed that incorrect material was used. But, if he understood Ms. Ward correctly, she still needs more remediation on the work that has done to further expose the brick and remove the sloppy work that was done on the joints, but they don't need to remove more material than what is needed.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward if she was speaking about all the areas.

Ms. Ward answered no. Staff needs to work with the petitioner to decide what to do on the upper level. When she speaks of cleaning and redoing what has been done, she is talking about the work that was done in April 2011 on the first level.

Dr. Henry stated, therefore, they are not saying that the mortar has to be removed 100 percent.

Mr. Judson explained that 100 percent of removal of the mortar is not the goal as they are not trying to achieve one uniform match.

Mr. Gay asked if they were calling flushed bricks recessed bricks.

Dr. Williams said "flushed" would suggest that it be leveled with the face of the brick. He said they need to be careful as flushed could be interpreted as being leveled with the face of the brick and not recessed.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Swenson said they don't want to remove the mortar completely. They are trying to get it cleaned.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams stated they should be clear about what constitutes a recessed joint.

Ms. Simpson said that the staff suggested as long as the entire brick is visible.

Mr. Judson said the Board must remember that every brick has chips, crevices, etc.

Ms. Ramsay said it would be difficult to say that every brick be visible.

Board Action:

Approval for the exterior repointing at 433 Tattnall Street with the following conditions: 1. Clean mortar off bricks with the gentlest means possible; 2. The excess mortar over the edges and faces of the bricks in the previously repointed area be carefully removed with hand tools; 3. Provide a four foot tall by four foot wide test patch with type N mortar, in area previously repointed, for staff approval; 4. The mortar color, composition, and joint width and profile must match the prior condition. The Savannah Gray bricks should read as the dominant exterior material and brick edges should be clearly defined and not obscured by the joint material. 5. Repointing the entire façade to achieve a uniform appearance should not be the goal, but rather only repointing to repair damaged or deteriorated mortar to match the existing as

- PASS

needed. The petitioner must work with staff in the field to determine the scope or repointing on the upper floors where needed.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

10. [Petition of Ryan Broadwater for BW Signs | H-11-4419-2 | 63 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Sign and Paint](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report from May 8, 2011.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet from May 8, 2011.pdf](#)

Mr. Ryan Broadwater was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward stated that this item was continued from the May 11, 2011 meeting due to the petitioner not being present to answer the Board's questions. The staff did not hear from the petitioner until late yesterday afternoon, but he definitely wanted the Board to hear their petition today. There is no new information and no new recommendation from the staff has been submitted. The petitioner is present today to answer the Board's questions.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior paint color changes and to replace two non-illuminated principal use signs and a supplemental identification sign. The petitioner is also requesting approval for a paint color change on the service bay. A two color scheme is proposed.

Ms. Ward said that the staff is supportive of the replacement signage for this property if the petitioner can comply with the sign ordinance of 40 square feet. Some discussion was held at the last meeting about the historic integrity of the sign as to whether it had historic character. The staff has done as much research as possible. The building was constructed in 1965. The building suffered a great fire damage in 1991. She was unable to find a photo, but the records stated that the building was completely remodeled. At that time, the Historic District Review Board approved the signs that are there today. The present letters are flat, but she speculated that the prior letters were curvature. She found a picture of the older building that was there prior to 1965. It was originally a car dealership and was purchased by Firestone in 1933 when they remodeled the building. Firestone actually used the signs and frames that were there for the car dealership

only placing their letters on the top of the building.

Ms. Ward reported that staff is recommending approval of the principal use sign and supplemental identification signs and exterior painting for Firestone with the condition that the signs be reduced in size to be no more than 40 square feet each in accordance with the ordinance.

Mr. Judson asked staff that when they say 40 square feet or 96 square feet or are they talking about a sum total or per each sign.

Ms. Ward answered per each sign for each street frontage. The petitioner has frontage on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Orange Street.

Dr. Williams asked if the new proposed sign basically needs to be reduced by one-half.

Ms. Ward was not sure which type of sign the petitioner wanted. The petitioner is present and could provide this information.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Broadwater apologized for not being present at the last meeting. The cabinet sign is actually a backer panel that the sign is mounted to. From a permitting standpoint, some cities do it this way by spreading the entire square to the signage. Some will take the one inch signage with letters and do them as individual letters. The backer panel was designed simply for installation purposes. The new signs require three or four penetrations per letter even though they are not illuminated. Steel bands are on the building and you would not be able to see them very well, but the panel design is to be mounted to a vertical steel band and eliminate all the penetration to the brick. Therefore, he believes that when they are considering how large the sign is, they are squaring the panel and everything else.

Ms. Ward believes said that the City's Zoning Inspector, Mr. Petrea, could speak to this also, but she believes the backer board is calculated also.

Mr. Broadwater asked if they were to use letters that are not on a backer panel, would they be allowed significantly more signage versus the backer panel with lettering mounted thereon.

Dr. Williams stated that no matter what is done, the word "firestone" would be smaller. He said the raised letters in the photos show a long shadow coming from the word firestone. He asked Mr. Broadwater if they have considered new signage over the bays on the right and not touch the graphic signs on the brick coverage. He asked if keeping the old word firestone an option.

Mr. Broadwater answered that the big problem is the old word "firestone" is in bad shape. The logo on the left has to be the exact percentage, about 18 percentage and this is nationwide.

Dr. Williams stated in keeping with the historic character of the building, the letters should cast a shadow.

Mr. Broadwater explained that the new letters would be set off from the building. They are not flat. The old style was illuminated four inch letters. The new panel of wood extends further out.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Overton asked if the size of the signs would not be left to the discretion of Zoning.

Ms. Ward answered that when the petitioner applies for their sign permit, Zoning will look at the size of the sign. The staff typically reviews the ordinance.

Mr. Overton asked, therefore, why is the Board discussing the size of the sign.

Ms. Ward answered that she believes they would be irresponsible if they don't consider the other ordinances that apply to the project. This is why staff recommends approval of the sign providing it meets the ordinance.

Board Action:

Approval of the principal use signs, supplemental identification sign, and exterior painting for Firestone at 63 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. with the condition that the backer panel be eliminated and the design resubmitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Not Present

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

11. [Petition of Gonzalez Architects | H-11-4438-2 | 13 East Perry Street | Rehabilitation, alterations, awning, and sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Jose Gonzalez was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations, a sign, and awnings for the new business, Fire Bistro at 13 East Perry Street.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff is recommending approval for the exterior alterations with the following conditions: 1. The front entry doors on either side of the storefront should be retained and preserved; 2. Provide specifications on cleaning method and product information on sealer; the splitface stone be cleaned with the gentlest means possible and Preservation Brief 1: Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Building be consulted; 3. The awning color and rear stucco color choices be restudied to be compatible with neighboring historic structures and resubmitted to staff for approval with a color rendering of all components (trim, awnings, sign); 4. Elimination of the lighting in the awning and 5. Denial of the principal use projecting sign because it does not meet the standards in the Historic District Sign Ordinance (Sec. 8-3121). Redesign and resubmit the sign to the Board to meet the standards.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff report did not address the refuse location. Therefore, staff wants the petitioner to address the location of the trash receptacle during his comments the Board.

Mr. Gay asked if any discussion was held regarding bringing the two windows up on the lane to match the same level as windows on the door.

Ms. Bryant answered she thought that they were already matched. This would be a question to pose to the petitioner.

Dr. Henry questioned the colors and sign.

Ms. Bryant stated that staff is recommending a restudy of the color. The sign meets the vertical clearance requirements, but projects over the parapet wall. Therefore, staff is recommending that the petitioner redesign the sign to meet with the ordinance.

Dr. Williams asked for clarification regarding what the ordinance says about the signs rising or not rising above the parapet.

Ms. Bryant clarified that the Historic District Sign Ordinance (Sec. 8-3121), Sign clearance and height states that "Adequate sign clearance shall be provided to assure that pedestrian or vehicular traffic movements and safety are not adversely affected. Minimum clearance shall not be less than ten feet above pedestrianways. Fascia and projecting signs shall be erected only on the signable area of the structure and shall not project over the roofline or the parapet wall elevation."

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Gonzalez stated that they will wash and clean the splitface with soap and water. The doors that are here are not original. These doors have been altered many times. He pointed out that the transom line is the original transom line. They suggested that the new door be placed to basically match the original transom as they believe it would be more appropriate. The sill shown at the bottom is an original stone sill and was framed that way, but all has been altered. Mr. Gonzalez said they have no objection to maintaining the line as they have drawn it. They matched the bottom rail of the door with the rail and then put a window on the other side. Therefore, they kept the same rail line. They have not altered any of the structural components of the building and they are actually cleaning it up and restoring more of the original geometry of the storefront.

He said they felt it is important that in front of the building that the storefront be constructed in wood, not in aluminum as they want to retain the character of the building. All they are doing with regard to color is to clean the sill and painting all the wood white. With reference to the signage of the structure at the parapet or top of the roofline, in this building, the front is actually a parapet. There is no structure behind it and they felt that keeping with the spirit of not just the specific language of the ordinance, but they were complying because a parapet is in front of the structure. For example, Mr. Gonzalez said he moved the sign and centered it on here, technically at this point they would be in compliance because it is a parapet and they do not exceed the top of it. Therefore, they feel it would be appropriate. The street is covered with trees and a variety of signs are along this street painted with many different shapes and sizes. All the signs project in many different manners. Therefore, they felt this is an elegant and clean way not to alter the building, but simply touch the building and project the name of the restaurant.

Mr. Gonzalez said basically the colors are the logo or trademark colors of the restaurant. Therefore, they recommend that if the color is changed that it be white. He said regarding the awnings, many different colors of awnings are throughout this town. From an architectural standpoint they are not asking to alter any of the original historic character. The awning is an appliqué that can be removed at a later date.

Ms. Ramsay asked where are the trash receptacles located.

Mr. Gonzalez said presently the trash is under contract with the City of Savannah. He stated that he does not have any control of the trash. If the Board has a specific direction that they don't want a dumpster, he guessed that he could pass this along to the City.

Ms. Ramsay stated that there is no dumpster here.

Mr. Gonzalez said they don't have a specific dumpster because the alley is owned by the City. For example, his office is on Bay Street and basically their dumpster is two blocks away. They have to take their trash there.

Mr. Engle said the ordinance specifically states that quarter round awnings are definitely inappropriate.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if the language is specifically written this way regarding awnings.

Mr. Engle answered yes and read from the preservation report that "generally traditional shed awnings are appropriate for most historic windows, doors and storefronts; quarter round awnings, modern mastered awnings and temporary commercial design have no precedent in traditional design and are usually inappropriate for historic buildings."

Mr. Gonzalez asked Mr. Engle if he was familiar with the old balloon awnings that were quarter round which were popular in the late 1950s or early 1960s. He stated that he has worked throughout districts around the country and awning laws are written somewhat the same manner. He does not know what prompted that kind of language, but he does not believe that this was intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Engle stated that he does not believe it is appropriate in a historic district.

Mr. Gonzalez said there is no question that the geometry is a portion of the circle. Therefore, as the Board sees it is just a curve. He asked is the Board interpreting this as a curved awning. Is this their interpretation of the ordinance. Mr. Gonzalez said, however, he has never interpreted it this way.

Mr. Engle said if this was 1960, then it would not.

Dr. Williams asked Mr. Gonzalez to reiterate his comment about the door.

Mr. Gonzalez said they were suggesting that the door be replaced with a new wood door to rise to the height of the existing transom.

Mr. Judson explained that currently there are two doors and the petitioner is asking that the lefthand door be eliminated. The staff's recommendation is to replace with wood doors.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that they do not have a significant objection to the exact symmetry of the door as it will be a fixed panel and will not be operable. But, it could be made to have the same profile as a door. He is more concerned with the integrity of the line of the building which is where the transom line is located.

Ms. Bryant stated that the staff did not address the transom line issue. However, staff is recommending based on lack of historical evidence retention of the two doors that currently exist.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that the way staff's report is written says replacement of the doors to keep them as is. However, they are saying two issues: 1. does the Board allow them to have a new door? If so, this is no longer an issue; 2. however, his question is that they would like from an aesthetic standpoint to be sure the door that they will install matches up with the transom line, which has not been discussed by staff.

Ms. Ramsay said staff mentioned that the logo is a part of a chain.

Mr. Gonzalez said the logo is not a part of a chain. It is a part of their trademark. He said in order to speed up the process on behalf of his client, he recommends the elimination of

the awning; allow the doors to be restored in accordance with their recommendation with the transom line; all the paint will be white; he will remove the sign at this time and either move it to the center (which in their opinion complies fully with the code) or eliminate it and the color at the discretion of the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Williams stated that it has been said that the doors are not original. He asked the staff if they know how old the doors are.

Ms. Ward stated that staff has gone to the site and there is an odd piece of plywood that appears to be blocking down below the transom. Their research did not reveal anything. Therefore, in the absence of the information, the staff recommends that the doors that are here be retained. If the petitioner desires to change the doors, they would have to comply with the code. If the staff had more historic documentation to show what was here, they could recommend something else.

Mr. Engle said he had no problem with the awning. He would not motion that the awnings be eliminated.

Dr. Williams stated that the petitioner stated that he would eliminate the awnings. He believed it is not the awning, but the color.

Mr. Engle stated that the color purview is left to staff, not the Board.

Mr. Gonzalez said the tangerine (orange) could be white. The only color issue that was problematic for them was strictly the signage, not the awnings.

Mr. Judson stated that Mr. Gonzalez has indicated that he is amenable to removing the awnings from his petition. However, he is not sure whether it is Board's position to redesign them, make them a part of the petition; or that it come back as a part of a supplementary decision.

Dr. Henry stated that a lot has been presented to the Board. Maybe the petitioner might want to ask for a continuance.

Mr. Judson explained to Mr. Gonzalez that the Board could not ask for a continuance, but if he wanted too, he could do so.

Mr. Gonzalez said he believes the items that he eliminated are the ones causing the contention. However, if he has eliminated them, there should not be a problem.

Mr. Engle said he was somewhat a little confused. He said the lefthand side is the transom bar and is restored halfway.

Mr. Judson said the petitioner has indicated that he is willing to leave the doors on both

sides.

Mr. Gonzalez said basically they will paint all the wood white; they are now going to install two doors. If the Board agrees to his concept, the two doors will match the transom line as shown; and he will come back at a later date regarding the sign. The awning on the front has been removed; the paint in the back will be white and if they can keep the awnings in the back is fine, but if not, he will remove them.

Mr. Judson stated also the petitioner needs to specify the base height of the glass on the rear.

Dr. Williams asked for clarification on staff's interpretation of the sign standard to be below the parapet or pediment.

Ms. Bryant said based on the location of the sign, staff is recommending not to approve it because it is projecting over the parapet wall. But, if it was located inside the pediment, it would not project over the parapet wall; then the staff would recommend approval.

Board Action:

Approved the exterior alterations on 13 Perry Street with the following conditions: 1. The front entry doors on either side of the storefront be replaced with wood doors that extend to the transom frame with the retention of the current doors on-site for future restoration; 2. All newly painted surfaces to be brilliant white; 3. Omit the sign, awnings on the north wall, and tangerine color from south wall; and 4. The rear storefront openings must incorporate a base to align with the door light panel. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

12. [Petition of Jan de Voest for Kim Malphrus | H-11-4439-2 | 14 Price Street | Addition](#)

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

Mr. Jan de Voest was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of a two-story wood frame addition on the area of the building and minor modifications to the fenestration of the existing structure.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval for the two-story wood frame rear addition and window relocation as proposed with the following to be resubmitted to staff for final approval: Provide specifications for standing seam roof indicating panel width and ridge height and color sample.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. de Voest stated that he has informed the staff about the type of roofing they will use.

Ms. Ramsay asked about the south elevation of the window on the new construction. The window on the left appears to be on the property line.

Mr. de Voest said this will be addressed when they deal with the permitting. The petitioner wants a window in this area.

Mr. Engle said the pan is showing 12 inch, but typically the pan is 22 inches.

Mr. de Voest said it will be 12, 16, or 18 inches.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the two-story wood frame rear addition at 14 Price Street and window relocation as proposed provided the specifications for standing seam roof indicating panel width and ridge height be resubmitted to staff for approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Ned Gay
Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

13. [Amended Petition of Kent Harrington | H-10-4319-2 | 518 E. Bryan St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4319 \(amended\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4319 \(amended\).pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

14. [Amended Petition of Peter A. Giusti | H-11-4422-2 | 222 E. Gwinnett St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4422-2 Amended.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4422-2 Amended.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

15. [Petition of Lee Toraya | H-11-4430\(S\)-2 | 222 E. Jones St. | Existing Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4430\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4430\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

16. [Petition of Heriberto J. Brito | H-11-4431\(S\)-2 | 124 W. Taylor St. | Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4431\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4431\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

17. [Petition of Ann Palmer | H-11-4432\(S\)-2 | 615 Price St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4432\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4432\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

18. [Petition of Gil Navon | H-11-4433\(S\)-2 | 205 W. River St. | Sign Face/Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4433\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4433\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

19. [Petition of Allison and John Morgan | H-11-4435\(S\)-2 | 22 Habersham St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4435\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4435\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

20. [Petition of Matthew Allan | H-11-4441\(S\)-2 | 521 E. Charlton St. | Color Change/Stucco](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4441\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4441\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

21. [Petition of Neil Dawson | H-11-4442\(S\)-2 | 337 Bull St. | Louver Panels](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4442\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4442\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

22. [Proposed procedure for masonry repointing submittals](#)

Attachment: [Proposed Repointing Policy May 2011.pdf](#)

Mr. Judson asked the Board if they had any revisions or addendums to the proposed procedure.

Mr. Engle said after this, they should not have to do this again.

Mr. Judson explained what the Board was confronted with was an after-the-fact approval. If someone presents a proposal to repoint, it should be done following the guidelines.

Dr. Williams stated he was wondering how many people know that repointing is something that would have to come before the Historic Review Board. He did not know how it would be done to make the public aware of this.

Ms. Ramsay stated she believes the best way is to contact the companies that would be doing the repointing.

Mr. Judson said because of his occupation and through his database, he could probably come up with a list of masonry and stonework personnel more easily and draft a letter to them. He would be happy to do so.

Mr. Engle said the Board found out about the repointing of the Tattnall Street project because they went by there, but they did not review the repointing prior to commencement of the work.

Mr. Judson said the Board tries to be proactive and Historic Savannah Foundation talks about the educational aspect of the entire matter. As a community, they need to be diligent in this situation with the realtors, zoning personnel and so forth. Everyone needs to know what it means to own a home in the Historic District.

Mr. Gay said a home was repointed on York Street and he does not believe that it came before the Historic Review Board. However, the job was done well. Therefore, if the job is done well, the Board will not know about it.

Ms. Ward explained that normally this is a staff level review and is not something that would come before the Board. This was an item that was already on the agenda and this is why the Board saw it. She said normally the staff works with the petitioner.

Dr. Williams said that would be okay if the petitioner is only repointing a small area.

Ms. Ward said unless the petitioner is repointing less than a 4 x 4 test patch, she will talk with them regarding what is needed. However, she probably will not know about it unless the repointing is bad. Ms. Ward said she was hesitant to cite people. There is a provision in the ordinance that allows for general maintenance to be conducted on a building without coming before the Board to correct repairs for consideration, but not for the repointing of an entire building.

Mr. Judson stated that he has had conversation with Mopper-Stapen and Cora Bett Thomas.

Mr. Engle said a part of the problem is the people that are moving in Savannah and do not know anything about the Savannah Historic Board of Review.

Mr. Judson stated this is why he believes that the realtors are great point persons.

Dr. Henry was wondering if it would be useful for City Council to come up with an ordinance that informs the new persons about the Board's role.

Mr. Judson said the way it should be done is for the Board to report to City Council. Maybe a letter needs to be drafted to City Council suggesting that something be done regarding this.

Ms. Ward said she believes that the Board should take some action relative to whether they want to approve the proposed procedures as a policy. She believes that one of the best ways to let the public know about this is to include it in the application submittal package as a checklist.

The Board approved that the proposed procedures for masonry repointing be included in the application submittal package upon motion of Dr. Williams, seconded by Dr. Henry and unanimously carried.

Board Action:

Review proposed procedure and provide comments for incorporation into final document to be signed - PASS by the Chairman.

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Not Present
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

[23. Next Meeting - Wednesday July 13, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

Mr. Judson thanked the members for their service on the Historic Review Board. The Board is short two members. Therefore, in order to have a quorum, it is important that every member be present at all the meetings. He asked that if any members will not be present in July to please advise. Mr. Judson informed the Board that he will be out of town in August.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Judson adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

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