



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
September 14, 2011 2:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**SEPTEMBER 14, 2011 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Brian Judson, Chair  
W. James Overton, Vice Chair  
Reed Engle  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Keith Howington  
Sidney J. Johnson  
Stephen G. Merriman, Jr.  
Linda Ramsay  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

**HDRB Members Not Present:** Ned Gay  
Ebony Simpson

**MPC Staff Present:** Tom Thomson, Executive Director  
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director  
Brittany Paige Bryant, 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 August 10, 2011](#)

Attachment: [08-10-2011 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve August 10, 2011 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: W James Overton

Second: Sidney J. Johnson	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

2. [Petition of Joanne Duran for SCAD | H-11-4503-2 | 228 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | Sign](#)

No action required. Petition withdrawn by petitioner.

**IV. SIGN POSTING**

**V. CONTINUED AGENDA**

3. [Petition of James Thompson | H-11-4496-2 | 109 West Broughton Street | Alterations and sign](#)

<b>Board Action:</b>	
Continue to October 12, 2011 at the petitioner's request.	- PASS
<b>Vote Results</b>	
Motion: Nicholas Henry	
Second: Robin Williams	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

4. [Amended Petition of Todd Naugle for Lott + Barber | H-11-4455-2 | 222 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Alterations and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval for the exterior alterations including three new openings on the existing stair stoops, the small addition on the York Lane façade, and the alterations to the oriel window at 222 West Oglethorpe Avenue - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4506-2 | 10 Whitaker Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval for the alteration to the existing opening on the north (Bay Lane) elevation of 10 Whitaker Street on the condition that paint samples for the proposed door be submitted to staff for final approval. -

**Vote Results**

Motion:

Second:

6. [Petition of James Lientz | H-11-4492-2 | 306 East Liberty Street | Repairs and demolition of an addition](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval to patch and repair the exterior stucco, cornice, brackets, and any rotten material in-kind to match the original design and demolish a non-historic one-story wood frame addition. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Sidney J. Johnson  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Ned Gay - Not Present  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye  
Brian Judson - Abstain  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
W James Overton - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

7. [Petition of John Largent and Lori Long | H-11-4507-2 | 225 West Broughton Street | Alteration to sign](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the neon lighting on the principal use projecting sign at 225 West Broughton Street upon the removal of the exterior down lights on the bracket. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Sidney J. Johnson  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Ned Gay - Not Present  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye  
Brian Judson - Abstain  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
W James Overton - Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

## VII. REGULAR AGENDA

### 8. Continued Petition of Chad Zittrouer for Kern-Coleman & Co. | H-11-4458-2 | 610 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. | New Construction Parts I and II

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial 2007.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Description and Plans.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)

**Mr. Chad Zittrouer and Mr. Jason Mathis** were present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Parts I and II, of a commercial building at 610 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. The building footprint is 8,320 square feet and is not large-scale development. Signs and goose neck lighting are indicated on the plans, but have not been fully developed for review. They will be submitted under a separate application. A model and samples of materials were exhibited for the Board's review. Ms. Ward stated Park and Tree has informed staff that an eight foot setback from the property line would allow for the preservation of the Live Oak tree. The Traffic Engineering Department is looking at the parking area. A retention pond has been brought to staff's attention. She does not believe the retention pond is an issue for the Board, but she does not believe that it is appropriate on MLK or in the Historic District. Therefore, she will ask that the staff be able to work with the petitioner through the site plan review process to come up with an alternate storm water management plan.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for new construction, Parts I and II, at 610 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. The storefront base must be between 18 and 24 inches in height to meet the design standards in the ordinance and not extend beyond the outer edge of the storefront openings. A base is not required on the side elevations but if it is incorporated, staff recommends incorporating the above stated modifications. Alignment of horizontal mullions with storefront features must be considered when the storefront base is modified to meet the standards;
2. The PR 60, 3M Prestige Series clear film be used in transparent glazing applications;
3. Incorporate casement or double-hung windows in the upper floor of the front facade to meet the design standards in the ordinance. Windows must be wood, wood clad, or metal as provided in the design standards; and
4. Provide material specifications for the standing seam metal roof.

**Mr. Engle** asked if samples were on file of the cast stone.

**Ms. Ward** confirmed that cast stone samples are on file.

**Dr. Williams** asked what were the two black bars.

**Ms. Ward** answered that this would be a question to address to the Engineer when they make their comments. However, she believes they are flush with the sidewalk. But, if she is incorrect, the Engineer could give the correct information.

**Mr. Johnson** said he knew Ms. Ward mentioned something about the parking. He wanted to know if Traffic Engineering has approved it.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the parking review is ongoing. The petitioner will continue to work with Traffic Engineering regarding their parking situation in order to be issued their building permit.

**Mr. Engle** stated that since retention bases are wet and soggy, trash cannot be cleaned out. He does not believe that this is in keeping with the character of MLK. He does not know where this stands on this Board's purview, but this is a strong element. Has a retention base ever been approved in the Historic District?

**Ms. Ward** answered that the Board has never approved a retention pond in the Historic District; one has never been submitted to her knowledge, but they do not get into issues of vegetation, landscape or site work unless they put in standards regarding paving materials. Ms. Ward agrees with Mr. Engle that this is not compatible in the Historic District. She believes that the petitioners need to revisit this. She wants to continue to work with the site plan review team and the petitioners to try to come up with an appropriate solution.

**Mr. Merriman** asked what was done across the street at Food Lion.

**Ms. Ward** stated she does not specialize in this area, but a retention pond is not at Food Lion. Her understanding is that the amount of water that is maintained on one's property cannot be increased. She believes, however, there are a lot of solutions to this. Therefore, she asks that the Engineer respond to this during his comments.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the retention is above ground or in ground.

**Mr. Judson** explained that the Board is digressing from its purview. But, he understood the concerns of the Board. They are fortunate that the site plan review has become more comprehensive and many of these questions are being raised. These are questions obviously the Board could not ignore. But, they are out of their purview at least now in the process it seems as if they are being addressed before they get to them. But, nonetheless, their focus is strictly the building.

#### **PETITIONERS COMMENTS**

**Mr. Zittrouer** explained that the bars Dr. Williams referred to at the drive aisle entrances are the set warning devices that are seen at the edge of the street. They are flush. In reference to the retention pond area, they have shown about a two foot deep retention area

that will be heavily vegetated on their plan. This is part of a new ordinance that the City of Savannah Stormwater Department is preparing to adopt within the next two or three months. They asked them to comply with the ordinance and this is what they have shown. Mr. Zittrouer said they can get away with this by doing some underground type retention and he believes they can revise this to address the Board's concerns. The ordinance is not adopted yet. Therefore, he urges the Board to look at the new ordinance before it is adopted and give their input. Typically, you can increase run-off, but they are going to require the run off to be decreased. This will have a major impact in this district.

The setback was a major concern of the Board at it's last meeting. They met with staff and the Park & Tree Department. They believe that what they have provided is as much as they can do possibly to meet the intent of the Historic Review Board and the Park & Tree Department. The continuity wall is flush with the building between the parking spaces and sidewalk. It is setback for hedges, but can be adjusted. This is not a major issue and he will be glad to take any recommendations pertaining to this. There will be hedges on one side of the wall and at the other location. However, on which side is really irrelevant.

They have reviewed the staff's report and agree with the recommendations. There are a few things they have to address and will work with staff and come into compliance.

**Dr. Williams** stated according to the plan, the wall of continuity for the parking lot, the hedge would be on the west side that aligned with the sidewalk.

**Mr. Zittrouer** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked the height of the hedges.

**Mr. Zittrouer** said they would start out as a two or three feet shrubbery. This is what is required in this type G-buffer.

**Dr. Williams** stated that flipping the relationship by having the wall align with the zero (0) lot line having the hedge on the inside is an equally, viable option.

**Mr. Zittrouer** stated yes.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that as she understood it, the petitioner is amenable to the double hung or casement windows.

**Mr. Zittrouer** said they would like to see the other windows. If the Board would allow them to do so other than going against staff's recommendation, then they would definitely be viable to that.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff if there was a public safety rule regarding a high hedge around parking lots because if violence occurred, it possibly would not be observed.

**Ms. Ward** said she does not know if the police gets involved in any of the plan reviews. But, she knows the fire marshal gets involved.

**Mr. Zittrouer** said the police receives a set of plans. They rarely get comments from the

police, but if they see something significant they will let them know.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the Zoning Inspector just told her that police department reviews the plan.

**Mr. Howington** asked that as far as the wall of continuity in front of the building is there room for a small planter.

**Mr. Zittrouer** said they discussed this and it is about eighteen (18) inches wide and they think it would look better with a cast stone on top, but at a major sidewalk it would almost be a litter box.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the cast stone below the store windows match the lintels.

**Mr. Zittrouer** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** asked if there was a reason that they are going with a blinding white cast stone when everything else is either red and traditional. It is a strong white. The mortar has been toned down to a pinkish red, but, yet, the entire cast stone masonry is bright white.

**Mr. Mathis** said they observed traditionally that on the other buildings were a lighter color. However, he believes they would be open to using a slightly darker color if this is the request of the Board.

**Mr. Engle** agreed that storefronts typically are lighter, but there is a big difference between light and bright white. When the bright mortar is added, it ties it together; but now that the mortar has been toned down it might be nice to have the cast stone match the mortar. It would still be lighter than the brick; therefore, there will still be a contrast.

**Dr. Williams** stated that just across MLK, St. Philip AME church has a lighter stone beneath their brick. May be they could take a cue from this as a basic for their stone at the bottom.

**Mr. Engle** said it is a creamy beige.

**Dr. Williams** stated the photo he was looking at shows that it is gray.

**Mr. Zittrouer** said they would prefer to do this on the staff level along with the other requests. They will be glad to do so.

**Mr. Engle** said he was also thinking about graffiti as it is everywhere in Savannah. When you have a white surface, this could be inviting. It would be tough to remove the graffiti from the white cast stone.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation** stated that they have a couple of comments, most of which are in support of staff's recommendations. Particularly, with the installation of the double hung windows on the second story. Mr. Carey said he is sympathetic to the petitioners' position that they are being held to a standard that was not



met across the street, but they don't want to perpetuate a mistake. He believes the execution of the Food Lion building, especially on the second floor windows, reveal that the window is not preferred to the true double hung. Therefore, the HSF supports this. They believe that the tall windows that have been downplayed by the incorporation of awnings on the primary facade is an improvement, but the storefront windows on the north and south elevations still appear too tall in proportion to the rest of the structure. They believe that if this could be reduced, it would be an improvement. Mr. Carey stated that he wants to go on record saying that the retention pond is a legitimate issue to look at as in effect it becomes a structure. He believes this is what Mr. Howington was pointing out. Is it above ground? Is it level or below ground? If it becomes an above ground structure in anyway, it becomes a design issue which he believes is within the purview of this Board. Therefore, he believes the recommendation that the petitioner made about this body or staff getting involved with storm water treatment regarding the ordinance and what is going to be required, is good advice. If these things come to pass, he believes they should fall within the review authority of this Board.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** stated that his preference would be to see the fence on the outside and the hedge on the inside since in an urban setting such as on MLK, the zero (0) lot line is a hard edge traditionally defined by buildings. The fence, therefore, will provide some of this. He stated that his concern is if this is recessed and planted with a hedge, it would begin to feel a little more suburban such as an urban landscape. Since the petitioners are amenable to doing it the other way, his advice is to take them up in this offer.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she does not remember the fence design, but knows there is a base requirement on a fence. They had a full discussion regarding the Food Lion parking lot. She asked if this is similar.

**Mr. Overton** asked staff to show the windows that Mr. Carey responded to as being out of proportion.

**Ms. Ward** showed the north and south elevations.

**Dr. Williams** asked staff if the first floor windows were the ones being preferred.

**Ms. Ward** answered she believes so.

**Dr. Williams** asked how high up behind the canopy to they rise. Because it is an elevation, the awnings block a part of the review of the windows. He asked staff if this is correct.

**Ms. Ward** said she did not want to confuse the Board, but the petitioners have shown the elevation behind the canopy with the height of the windows below, but the storefront does not look like this any more. The petitioners have introduced the brick pilasters and have put in the cast stone base.

**Dr. Williams** asked, therefore, if the windows come within a brick of the molding. It appears that the windows come up to the same height.

**Mr. Howington** said they appear to be approximately 13.2 above the finished floor lines.

**Dr. Williams** asked about the side windows.

**Mr. Howington** answered that he believes it would be the same.

**Board Action:**

Approval for new construction, Parts I and II, at 610 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. with the following conditions to be resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Restudy the color of the cast stone to be more compatible with the dark brick and mortar and reduce the amount of contrast;
2. Relocate the masonry and iron wall of continuity to be at the zero lot line on the west side of the property;
3. Preservation staff work with the applicant and the city to incorporate an alternative to the stormwater retention pond that is more appropriate for the historic district;
4. The storefront base must be between 18 and 24 inches in height to meet the design standards in the ordinance and not extend beyond the outer edge of the storefront openings. A base is not required on the side elevations but if it is incorporated, staff recommends incorporating the above stated modifications. Alignment of horizontal mullions with storefront features must be considered when the storefront bases is modified to meet the standards; - PASS
5. The PR 60, 3M Prestige Series clear film be used in transparent glazing applications;
6. Incorporate casement or double-hung windows in the upper floor of the front facade to meet the design standards in the ordinance. Windows must be wood, wood clad, or metal as provided in the design standards; and

7. Provide material specifications for the standing seam metal roof.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of David A. Levy & Assoc. | H-11-4493-2 | 319 West Broughton Street | Sign, Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Ms. Jacklynn Arndt** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and signs within the storefront at 319 West Broughton Street.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for the storefront alterations and signs provided that the following conditions are resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Restudy the paint application on the western brick column and consider moving the paint from the portion of the eastern column below their storefront cornice to provide a unified appearance for the storefront;
2. Provide a bronze color sample of the storefront;
3. Provide manufacturer information and specifications for lighting fixtures; and
4. Replace hand painted sign with a mounted fascia sign.

**Ms. Ward** reported that upon receipt of the staff's report, the petitioner sent an email that concurs that they agree with all of the staff's recommendations and are willing to move forward in this regard. They also provided a cut-sheet on the light fixture. This information has been provided to the Board in their yellow folder as an addendum.

**Mr. Judson** asked staff if the question about rebuilding the storefront raised prior to this or is it still a question.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the question of rebuilding the storefront is in the report, but it is not in the specific recommendation. She wanted to verbally add this into the staff's recommendation that if the petitioner is rebuilding the storefront that they come into compliance with the ordinance.

**Mr. Engle** asked if everything is being replaced.

**Ms. Ward** said she was not specifically sure if the petitioner is taking out the entire structure beneath the tile or whether they are only replacing the tiles. She believes, however, if the petitioner has the existing structure at the base, they should be allowed to reuse that, but if they are in fact rebuilding entirely, they should comply with the ordinance.

**Dr. Williams** asked, therefore, it is possible that the base under the windows is historic.

**Ms. Ward** explained that in the staff report, there is a historic photo which shows a storefront base that appears to have a lower base. This is shown on page 2 of the staff's report.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Arndt** stated that she was present representing Free People. She said in response to the staff recommendation, they are amenable to the signage recommendations and will apply the mounted sign directly to the fascia. They are also in agreement with the removal of the paint on the easternmost brick pier. With regards to the base, they have not previously responded to this. From their perspective and to note the design, they felt that the relatively to the neighboring storefronts was important to the design as well as the overall composition and the balance of the proportions. They understand the historic nature of the 18 to 24 inch dimensions and they are open to providing this.

**Mr. Judson** asked Ms. Arndt if they understood the staff's recommendation regarding the removal of the paint and before they proceed, provide a test patch.

**Ms. Arndt** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Arndt to clarify her point when she says the relationship of the base to the adjacent buildings that her concern is to have continuity with them.

**Ms. Arndt** stated mainly the storefront on the right. They want to maintain continuity as well as a general composition.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the storefront on the right also exceeds the 18 to 24 inch height.

**Ms. Arndt** answered that she does not know.

**Mr. Judson** stated a more pertinent question would be is the foundation going to be rebuilt?

**Ms. Arndt** said to answer this question the entire floor will need to be rebuilt.

**Mr. Overton** asked what is the purple color on the wall near the entrance.

**Ms. Arndt** answered that it is gypsy pink. It is a custom color. They are unable to get the tile that is shown in an one-by-one tile. It will be a half inch-by-half inch. It is the size that is shown on the sample board.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the tile is for the foundation wall and not the pavement.

**Ms. Arndt** answered that it is for both.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the western pier has the buff brick. It has a little sign attached to it. Will it be removed?

**Ms. Arndt** said they will remove it.

**Dr. Williams** said otherwise the bricks will be left as they are; they will not be cleaned. He said his advise is to retain the petina. Many storefronts retain the historic piers. He asked the petitioner if they are going to investigate the east pier to see what's under it and whether it can be cleaned to exposed the brick. Dr. Williams asked her if she had specific plans for the west pier. He wanted to be sure and understand what are the plans for this.

**Ms. Arndt** said the plan is to leave the west pier as is.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation** stated he had two questions. He asked if the bronze store treatment is common in the historic downtown in urban setting or is the bronze finish a little bit of departure. It was raised by their Architectural Review Committee that it seems like this is something more commonly seen in a suburban type-strip centers; and not so much in historic urban centers. This is simply a question for consideration. The second question concerns getting clarification as he was trying to follow the ultimate treatment of the bulkheads. As he understood, they are seeking continuity with the adjacent storefronts and the bulkheads along here. But, they are imposing the purple or pink hibiscus. Therefore, he is wondering where is the continuity.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said since the bulkheads will be removed, they should go in accordance with the ordinance; go back with an 18 to 20 foot. In reverence to Mr. Carey's question, copper storefronts were fairly common. In fact, one is being restored down the block on the other side of the street. But, he believes that Historic Savannah is absolutely correct the bronze tone aluminum or whatever it will be is strictly modern suburban.

**Dr. Williams** stated that there are all sorts of storefronts - metal, wood, cast iron. There is such a range of materials for storefronts.

**Dr. Henry** wanted more information on bronze being on the storefront.

**Ms. Ward** stated she believes the discussion that is going on now is just as good as anything that she can offer. Bronze aluminum will be used on the new Cay building which is on trust block.

**Dr. Williams** asked if it will be bronze.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes. Staff is recommending approval of it for the storefront.

**Dr. Henry** asked, therefore, is it accurate to say that it is a mixed bag downtown in terms of these kinds of storefronts.

**Ms. Ward** said she agrees with the discussion.

**Board Action:**

Approval for the storefront alterations and signs provided that the following conditions are resubmitted to staff for final approval:

1. Reduce the height of the storefront base to comply with the standards (between 18 to 24 inches).
2. Restudy the paint application on the western brick column and consider removing the paint from the portion of the eastern column below their storefront cornice to provide a unified appearance for the storefront; - PASS
3. Provide bronze color sample of the storefront;
4. Provide manufacturer information and specifications for lighting fixture; and
5. Replace hand painted sign with a mounted fascia sign.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Nay
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Keith Howington	- Aye

10. [Petition of Joseph M. Gannam | H-11-4494-2 | 235 East Gordon Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Joseph Gannam** was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the report. The petitioner is requesting approval to install an electric chair lift on the front stair to the residence at 235 East Gordon Street.

**Ms. Ward** reported that the staff recommends approval to install an electric chair lift on the front stair to the residence at 235 East Gordon Street because it does not impact any historic fabric, and it is reversible.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Gannam** said his mother lives here. He was reared in this house. His parents bought the house in 1953. The portico was already designed as such. Therefore, it has been here a very long time. Mr. Gannam said his mother is 84 years old and her handicap parking space is on the front street. He asked the Board to please consider strongly adopting the staff recommendation.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**None.**

**Board Action:**

**Approval** to install an electric chair lift on the front stair to the residence at 235 East Gordon Street because it does not impact any historic fabric, it is the most sensitive alternative to provide access to the property without damaging historic fabric, and it is reversible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Not Present

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

11. [Petition of Matt West for J.T.Turner Construction Co., Inc. | H-11-4495-2 | 101 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Rehabilitation and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Description and Plans.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs.pdf](#)

**Mr. Mark Fitzpatrick** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioners are requesting approval to replace the rear additions, construct a privacy wall, alterations, and a finding-of-fact for a three percent (3%) lot coverage variance for the property at 101 East Oglethorpe Avenue.

**Ms. Ward** reported that the staff recommends approval of the three percent (3%) lot coverage variance to the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals because it is consistent with the prior approvals, a large portion of the work that was initially included in the variance request has been completed, it is the minimal variance needed to complete the project, and will result in no change to the existing covered area based on the findings outlined in the staff report. Staff further recommends approval to replace the rear additions, construct a privacy wall, and alterations to the property at 101 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions:

1. Provide specifications for stucco and mortar. Clarify if stucco will be scored. Upon review and approval of the specifications prepare a four-by-four test patch of the repointing for staff review prior to repointing.
2. New window openings in the stucco facade must be inset three inches from the exterior wall.
3. Retain all brick and windows from the existing kitchen addition for reuse in future restoration efforts.

**Mr. Engle** stated that he read the letter from the Schultz, but it appears this is a stormwater issue.

**Ms. Ward** said it is a stormwater issue.

**Mr. Engle** said this Board cannot deal with that issue.

**Ms. Ward** stated that staff has already revealed this to the Schultz family and asked the



petitioner to go to a site plan review. Normally, a single or two-family would not have to do so, but staff did ask them to go and see whether the stormwater personnel had any concerns. The staff has been told that stormwater did not have any concerns.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the 75% rule applies and what is the logic? Are they talking about the air space, visuals, or the ground?

**Ms. Ward** explained that the 75% lot coverage applies to anything with a roof as it would be considered covering the parcel.

**Dr. Henry** asked, therefore, they are talking about space, not ground coverage.

**Ms. Ward** said it is ground coverage.

**Dr. Henry** explained that he built a carriage house with a three foot overhang and it became an interesting question of whether they were talking about the ground 75% or was it the air space.

**Ms. Ward** explained that it is not calculated at the overhang, but at the footprint.

**Dr. Henry** said it was calculated at the overhang. He was wondering what is the rule.

**Ms. Ward** deferred this question to Zoning as it is their rule. She asked Mr. Petrea, Zoning Inspector for the City of Savannah, that with the building coverage does it refer to the overhang of the roof or the footprint of the structure.

**Mr. Petrea** answered that it depends on how wide the overhang is.

**Dr. Henry** said the overhang was three feet.

**Mr. Petrea** stated that he was not sure how the inspector or administrator who reviewed this calculated it.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the kitchen building with the double hung window is the historic remains the three story rear addition.

**Ms. Ward** stated that all they have is the 1890's maps. She does not have anything prior to this period. But, the principal building is much older than that. In the 1890s, it was two-stories over raised basement. Then by 1916, it was three stories over raised basement and now there is only one-story over the basement.

**Dr. Williams** stated, therefore, as far as it is known, at least it is the 1890's fabric or probably older. The report is advocating the complete removal of the historic "L" portion and then reconstruction of a west wall that will be open to the courtyard. He asked if it will be a room or a porch.

**Ms. Ward** stated that it is enclosed space.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the windows are on the same line as the current brick wall. May be this is a question for the petitioner. He was wondering why staff supports the removal of

the historic fabric.

**Ms. Ward** explained that staff does not feel that the addition is historic. It does not appear in that form nor design until 1986.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he wanted to be sure he and Ms. Ward were talking about the same thing. It is shown on the Sanborn as 1898.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the bricks are shown as 1898, but not the design. The design did not appear until 1986. She does not believe it has the integrity left to warrant the preservation of the design. However, she believes it is valuable to salvage whatever materials that can be salvaged from the site, but the design of the room did not exist in that configuration until 1986. Therefore, preserving that form would not be doing it justice.

**Mr. Engle** asked if there is an indication that there were windows on this elevation at any time. The street elevation shows with the new addition two windows onto the street. The existing has no windows.

**Dr. Williams** stated that Sanborn does not show windows.

**Ms. Ward** stated that she does not have any evidence. The addition is new. According to the reports, it is influenced by historic documents, but she cannot attest to these because she could not find it in the painting.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** stated that this project was submitted for approval in 2003, and shortly thereafter the construction of the carriage house began. There has been no change to the plans since this time. Work on the carriage house was interrupted. Their firm came into the picture in 2008 and submitted for renewal of the Certificate of Appropriateness. It was received and they continued the work and completed the carriage as well as some minor work on the house. Mr. Fitzpatrick said unfortunately the project was interrupted again and this now brings them to this date. They are requesting renewal of the Certificate of Appropriateness in order to complete their permit application. The owner wishes to complete the project in its existing design and materials, including the restoration of the exterior of the facade. All the work will be done in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for the rehabilitation of structures. Routinely, they provide samples for approval of materials such as mortar and patch materials for stucco. They have agreed to notify staff to come and review the samples. Regarding the 78% lot coverage, he believes the calculations were done based on the shadow line. The new addition going to the back of the building expands from property line to property line east to west. However, it is fully open to the courtyard beneath. Therefore, if the area beneath the new addition was considered a part of the open space, he believes they would come under the 75%. Consequently, this needs to be clarified. The project is almost gaining historic status in its duration and they respectfully request the approval of the Board so that they can continue with the work.

**Dr. Henry** asked the petitioner what is the shadow line.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** explained that when the sun gets directly overhead, it casts a shadow on the lot.

**Dr. Henry** apologized for bringing up something personal, but he believes that in the future it needs to be clarified how the 75% lot coverage is calculated.

**Mr. Judson** said this is a zoning department purview, but this Board does fall into the receipt of receiving or recommending a variance approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** said as a part of their application process, they met with the Zoning Department and have received their approval.

**Mr. Engle** said initially when this request was approved, the Secretary of Interior Standards were not a part of the ordinance. What is being created now never existed. What bothers him is that they are exactly copying historic details from the original house, the lintels, shutters, and sash. Everything is being copied and it says so right on there "copy the existing." But this is not the existing; it is a new addition that never existed. It might be on the same footprint, but that is not three dimensional. This is not consistent with the Secretary Standards where they say a new addition will be contemporary compatible. It will not mimic exactly the original fabric. How do they justify this?

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** stated that the overall materiality is distinguished from the original structure. The original structure is brick and all of the new portions will be either stucco clad or wood framed walls with infill windows with wood pilasters. At the mid point where it transitions from one and one-half stories to three stories, everything to the right will be stucco and everything to the left will be brick.

**Mr. Engle** said he was talking about the lintels, the sash, and the shutters. It clearly states "copy the existing."

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** stated that the lintels for the window on the kitchen addition were at the time when the construction began on the carriage house addition and as the plan intended at that time, they do match the color and configuration of those on the original structure. If this becomes a defining issue, they can consult with the designing architect to see if there could be some distinguishing change.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board has insisted on past additions that modifications be made so that they are not exact replications of the historic fabric. The stucco on the new addition calls out to match the stucco on the base of the original.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the scoring could be different on the new addition. Is the lintel above the window actually the same material?

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** said it is not the same material. It is modern material and the scoring can differentiate between the two where they actually touch, both in pattern as well as in the configuration, joints, could be deeper, wider, shallower or in some way distinguished.

**Dr. Williams** asked the petitioner if his plan will remove all the fabric from the existing kitchen and build a new western wall, put a set of windows on the south or does it retain the existing western wall and putting in a window.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** explained that it will be the removal of the existing western wall, what doesn't show in the photo is actually that the entire structure is pulling away from the main structure. There is a lot of concern about the structural integrity of the wall as well as its ability to carry the new loads. Therefore, the intention is to take these down, salvage the materials for reuse, but build a new wall structurally sound to carry the new addition.

**Dr. Williams** stated that presently a historic window is on the south base of the one-story addition. He asked if this historic window will be reused.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** said a new window will be put on the west elevation. As a matter of course, they as a company and in particularly as project manager, they will retain and salvage for reuse all suitable materials, sometimes not on this project, but they keep them as available resource.

**Dr. Williams** asked the petitioner, therefore, why not use the historic window from this house on this house.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** answered that he believes the new window is patterned to match the window on the carriage house in size and configuration on the new elevation. He believes the window on the south elevation of the kitchen is smaller.

**Dr. Williams** stated that he has concerns about endorsing a plan that would demolish a part of the historic fabric especially since this aligns with Drayton Street, which is visible. It is a character defining part of the rear elevation of the building. He was not aware that it is detaching. He believes that some effort should be taken to try to keep at least some integrity.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** said they do not have a problem with doing this. They are planning on repairing the existing windows as necessary. He has no problem with restoring the window to functionality and putting it back in the location.

**Dr. Williams** stated that this might be a question for the homeowner, but if there was ever a consideration of retaining the south brick wall and extend the new room east from there rather than having the entire south side all glass.

**Ms. Ida George**, owner, stated that this has not been an easy project. The kitchen that this will replace is structurally in danger. It is literally pulling away. When you are inside the room, you can look on the outside. She believes if this is to be retained, it will have to be taken all the way down and then rebuilt. As it is, it cannot be retained.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. George if the openings she is talking about are where it meets the back wall of the house.

**Ms. George** answered yes and also where the window is.

**Dr. Williams** asked if it is the south face.

**Ms. George** answered yes. It has great deterioration.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** said water has been washing down the unglutted facade and the binder and mortar have washed out to the point that you can rake your finger halfway in the brick and pull the sand out.

**Dr. Henry** asked if there is a reason why one side of the wall will be curved and square on the other.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** said this is an aesthetic question; he was not there during the design.

**Ms. George** said it was their intention in 2003 to build the carriage house, move into the carriage house, then work on the main house. But, in between times, their first contractor became terminally ill. They got another contractor, but then her husband became ill. They cannot live in the carriage house, but their daughter lives here. Ms. George said her husband no longer can walk. This building as it exists will not accommodate an elevator. She does not believe that this Board would approve a stair lift on the front of the building. They cannot live in the house and this caused them to have to do another house which took much time. They did not intentionally stall work on this house.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of the Savannah Historic Foundation** said he was trying to reconcile Dr. Williams comments with Mr. Engle's comments. Respecting the Secretary Standards, it sounds as if Mr. Engle wants differentiation. Dr. Williams wants retention of the old window. This seemingly is in conflict. He guessed his point is they can meet the standards, but not every single element of the building has to be different or a new contemporary. They can achieve the whole without each part. This is how he is following this. Dr. Williams's comments are only a piece of it, yet, it seems a little bit in conflict with what Mr. Engle said.

**Dr. Williams** said his advocacy is for the preservation of as much of the rear element as possible.

**Mr. Carey** said he believes the petitioners are amenable to this.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** stated that he wanted to clarify his point. He agrees with Dr. Williams. He believes when this was designed, the Secretary Standards were irrelevant as they were not referenced in the ordinance. But, now they are. You can rebuild a wall and the mortar is bad, but you don't have to rip the entire wall down and build something entirely different. Mr. Engle said he believes an effort ought to be made to look at this in terms of keeping it and going from there. He believes, frankly, that this does not meet the standards from several standpoints. There is just too much historic fabric being ripped down.

**Dr. Williams** said he guesses it is complicated by the structural integrity issue. If it is in danger of collapsing due to degradation of mortar and gravity pulling the element away from the wall, there are other instances where historic buildings deemed structurally unstable were demolished.

**Mr. Merriman** said a part of what was here was removed in 1986. Therefore, they are left with a piece of what was there. This will certainly look a lot better.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she believes it will read as a better addition if all of it is stucco rather than having brick on top of the stucco.

**Dr. Williams** stated this was not what he was suggesting. The brick is located on the south elevation, not west elevation. The west elevation presently is stucco.

**Dr. Henry** said he believed it was the south elevation that was being spoken of.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Ramsay is she was talking about the south elevation or the west elevation.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she was talking about the west elevation.

**Dr. Williams** said he was speaking of the south elevation.

**Mr. Howington** stated that some times saving everything is not always the best way to go. He is a preservationist at heart and believes preservation is the key, but he does not know if the petitioner may consider just a portion of the west wall and leave this portion to show the historic of how it was connected to the building. It is a sensitive addition. Everything behind the wall is new, but if they leave a portion of the wall to be rebuilt and some of the brick will be reused here to show that this was a part of the original structure. Of course it will be stucco. Mr. Howington stated that he did not know if this is an option. As shown in the west elevation, the vertical west wall will be left as a part of the original and could be rebuilt.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** said to be clear about the existing construction, the west and south walls are brick. The joint where the two meet the main structure, there is no connection. Actually, there has been settling in the rear addition which is causing it to pull away to the south. If they go into the basement as well as on the south exterior elevation, the deterioration of the mortar is severe. Mr. Fitzpatrick said even if it was retained in exactly its existing condition, his recommendation as contractor, he believes an engineer would have the same feelings, that it needs to be fully taken down and then use the existing brick laying it back up. At this point, they would have a new structure, but just would be using the old pieces. The east wall is currently wood framed from the south wall back to the main structure, which is also in a severe state of deterioration. Therefore, he will not be comfortable building on those existing walls at they stand. Once they take it down to its component parts they are building a new structure. This needs to be taken under consideration with what they choose to retain and put back into the structure. The owner has given them instructions that they need to save, retain and reuse anything that is reusable. Therefore, he does not see anyway to safely build or rebuild anything here without total dismantling. This needs to be a part of the equation. They are open to guidance and suggestions of how much of the material is to be retained where, but the hope is that they get approval from this Board to put it back into this configuration whether it is stucco over existing brick or stucco over reused existing bricks or CMU.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the wall between the addition and the carriage house will also be brick.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** answered no, it will be stucco.

**Dr. Williams** asked stucco on what.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** stated that he suspects that it will be stucco on CMU.

**Dr. Williams** asked what will be on the inside face of the wall.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** said stucco.

**Dr. Williams** said Mr. Fitzpatrick might not be able to answer this question, but he was asking that the wall that was there, was it exposed brick or stucco on the inside.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** answered that there is no remaining evidence about a garden wall on that side of Drayton Street.

**Dr. Williams** stated that there was one at one time. He said given the structural circumstances, his advocacy would be which concurs with the staff recommendation that if the stump of the addition is removed, to retain the bricks on site to rebuild the wall. He also advocates using the south wall bricks in the wall rather than the CMU. Therefore, the material would still be there. Potentially, he does not know what the aesthetic plan is for the east face of the wall, but maybe leave the historic bricks exposed on the inside face of the courtyard. Instead of the CMU, which he can understand why the petitioner would stucco them, but theoretically they could be left open to the east side. The petitioner has stated that he is amenable to taking the south elevation historic window and putting in the place of the west side.

**Mr. Fitzpatrick** said he is amenable to this. But on a personal note concerning using the Savannah Gray bricks and plastering over them, are they really retaining the material and using it to its highest use. He has done many projects with the new imitations of Savannah Gray bricks and while some are more successful than others, nothing has the appearance of the Savannah Gray brick of an original hand-thrown Savannah Gray brick made here on the banks of the Savannah River. To put them in a load bearing structure and then cover them with plaster to him seems like an unfortunate loss. He understands that they have a history on the structure, but not as long as the original structure itself. Mr. Fitzpatrick said he would like to see a higher use for them and have them come back and be exposed to the beautiful material that they are.

**Dr. Williams** said this is the reason to use them on the wall exposed to the courtyard.

**Mr. Howington** clarified that what he was saying if the wall on the south is still in place, then reuse it, but if it is going to be taken down, then he would not want to see them replaced in the wall. He would want to see a new structure. He was saying not to reuse the bricks and cover them up, but only retain what is able to be retained in place. Once it is removed, he believes it should be new material.

**Mr. Engle** asked whether the issue was resolved. Will it be scored? The existing stucco on the addition that is proposed for demolition is to score it. If this has not been resolved,

they have a lot of aesthetic issues. If they are going to match the stucco, then there is no way to differentiate that it is a new addition. Particularly, since they will be using a historic window in a modern addition with stucco that matches the original building. How would you know that it not an original?

**Mr. Judson** stated he believes that the petitioner has expressed that they are amenable to differentiating the scoring. The Board has to decide in its motion whether or not they are comfortable with this coming back for staff review.

**Mr. Engle** said he would like to see the lintels simplified and the stucco scored differently. The petitioner has to put up a four-by-four test patch up anyway; therefore, the staff can go out and review that. He read that the drawings say stucco is to match existing lintels and sills. When you say to match existing, it means everything will be exactly the same.

**Mr. Judson** said they will have some design details that will match, but the scoring could be differentiated so that overall the building will read differently. The fact that the lintels will match the original, would not speak to them being the same, but will read well. If anything, they will appear more unified.

**Mr. Merriman** said looking at the overall picture, you would still be able to tell the old from the new as some of the details will be different.

**Mr. Judson** explained that if the Board is comfortable with staff being able to approve the test patch that differentiates the overall exterior of the building, then in his mind the fact of the lintels and some other details are identical does not mute the fact that the buildings are differentiated.

**Ms. Ramsay** said when you go by there, you will obviously notice that the carriage house is new and when this is carried through, it would further differentiate it from the existing building.

**Dr. Williams** stated the suggestion has been the removal of the historic material; not reuse the historic material at least for the addition possibly for the wall, which has not been decided by the Board. They have not talked about the little window below the other window. He said he suggested retaining the historic south facing window and moving it to the west elevation, but he has not heard any opposition to this idea.

**Mr. Judson** said he believed the petitioner was amenable to this idea. Therefore, when a motion is made this needed to be incorporated.

**Dr. Williams** said he suggested using the historic fabric on the garden wall, the Savannah Gray bricks that could be exposed into the courtyard. He did not hear any feedback from the Board on this idea.

**Mr. Judson** explained that he follows the project manager's thought that to retain historic materials, but conceal them on the inside of something does not serve a purpose.

**Dr. Williams** said on the wall, they do not need to be concealed. Are they exposed or not exposed? Will they be used? Will they not be use? What is the Board's advice regarding



the wall?

**Mr. Engle** said he could not see building a new wall and wasting Savannah Gray bricks inside and then covering them up. They are too valuable and are too rare. If they can be exposed on the interior face, but if they are making a CMU wall, it would add an additional layer of thickness which could or may not create problems. The entire carriage house will be stucco. Therefore, there will be one little small chunk of brick wall on the inside with everything else stucco.

**Mr. Howington** said they don't want to give the sense of false history that the wall may have been there and not use other techniques. He is all for reusing the material somewhere, but this may not be the best area to use the Savannah Gray bricks.

**Mr. Judson** explained that he senses the Board is in agreement with the staff's recommendation that the historic materials be retained, but not necessarily incorporated into this construction other than the proviso regarding the south face window.

**Mr. Engle** said if a window is going to be put in an elevation that had no window, why not make it look like a six-over-six or look proportionately like a real window.

**Ms. Ramsay** said as she understood what Mr. Fitzpatrick said the window is into an open area. It is not a real window.

**Mr. Engle** stated that if it is not a real window then what is it. He believes it is a little skinny window.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the window differentiates the living area.

**Mr. Johnson** asked if a window was here initially.

**Mr. Engle** said this is true with the window above it. There is no windows at all on this elevation.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff doesn't height and mass include fenestration.

**Ms. Ward** stated that this is not a two-part approval. They review it all at the same time. Therefore, the Board can consider whatever features they want.

**Dr. Henry** asked, therefore, this is unique.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the two-part approval, height and mass is Part I and Part II design detail is reserved for new construction from the ground up free-standing. They consider this as an addition.

**Mr. Judson** asked the Board if they had other concerns about the window. He is only trying to manage the time. If no other concerns, a motion would be in order.

**Board Action:**

Recommend approval of the three percent (3%) lot coverage variance to the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals because it is consistent with the prior approvals, a large portion of the work that was initially included in the variance request has been completed, it is the minimal variance needed to complete the project, and will result in no change to the existing covered area based on the findings outlined in the staff report. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay  
Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Ned Gay - Not Present  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye  
Brian Judson - Abstain  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
W James Overton - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Aye  
Robin Williams - Aye

**Board Action:**

Approval to replace the rear additions, construct a privacy wall, and alterations to the property at 101 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions:

1. Provide specifications for stucco and mortar. The stucco on the new addition must be scored in a different manner than the principal historic structure. Upon review and approval of the specifications, prepare a four-by-four test patch of the repointing for staff review prior to repointing. - PASS
2. New window openings in the stucco façade must be inset three inches from the exterior wall.
3. Retain all brick from the existing kitchen addition for reuse in future restoration efforts.
4. Retain and reuse the existing window from the kitchen addition on the west elevation.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye
Reed Engle	- Aye

12. [Petition of Congress Street Social Club | H-11-4497-2 | 411 West Congress Street | Alterations and addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval for decking and associated built-in furniture within the open courtyard. All elements are made of wood and will be stained. The benches and stage are not permanently attached to the building or site and are completely reversible.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends after-the-fact approval for decking and associated built-in furniture within the open courtyard provided that the final stain color is submitted to staff for final review.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

The petitioner was not present.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Overton** asked staff if the decking was recently built. How did this come about to be brought to the Historic Review Board's attention?

**Ms. Ward** explained that the City of Savannah has been doing regular inspections in this area. Since it is a new business that recently opened, they came to the Board for approval for courtyard modifications and signs. They were continually performing certificate of occupancy inspections and this was caught when the inspector went to the site.

**Mr. Overton** asked staff that if the Board disapproves this request what would be the outcome. Would it be torn down?

**Ms. Ward** stated that the Board's denial would need to be based on the ordinance that it does not meet one of the standards or visual compatibility criteria. Then the petitioner would need to remove the decking and then come back with a modified application.

**Mr. Overton** said obviously the staff believes the application meets the standards as set forth in the ordinance.

**Ms. Ward** believes it meets the ordinance if it is stained or painted.

**Mr. Overton** stated, therefore, the only violation is that the petitioner did the decking without a permit.

**Ms. Ward** answered correct.

**Mr. Overton** asked if there is a regulation regarding this.

**Ms. Ward** does not know if this requires a permit, but if a permit is needed, the petitioner will have to pay a double fee. However, she does not believe that this requires a permit. She believes that the preservation approval is the only approval that is required.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked staff what was the petitioner's response why they did not get the Board's approval prior to doing the decking.

**Ms. Ward** stated that the petitioner informed her that they did not know it required approval. They considered it furniture much like the iron furniture the Board saw in the pictures. However, Ms. Ward said she considers it decking and, therefore, would require approval. The petitioner could have contacted the staff to check, but did not.

**Board Action:**

After-the-fact approval for decking and associated built-in furniture within the open courtyard at 411 West Congress Street provided that the final stain color is submitted to staff for review. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: Keith Howington  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Ned Gay - Not Present  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye

Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Nay
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

13. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4498-2 | 111 West Congress Street | Rehabilitation/Alteration and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Ms. Sarah Ward recused from participation in this petition as her husband is associated with the petitioner.**

**Mr. Josh Ward** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Brittany Bryant** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitations and alterations to the building at 111 West Congress St.

**Ms. Bryant** reported that the staff recommends approval for the rehabilitations and alterations and the new addition in th side yard with the following conditions:

1. The door be inset a minimum of three inches from the building facade.
2. The windows be inset a minimum of three inches from the building facade.
3. Incorporation of a stucco lintel above the windows.
4. The stucco has a smooth sand finish.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Bryant if she said stucco lintels would be on the second floor.

**Ms. Bryant** answered that originally this was not recommended in the staff's report. However, as they were looking at the context photos, most of the buildings in the area have some kind of lintels above the windows. Therefore, staff was recommending the most simplest type of lintels, but the Board can recommend a different style of lintel.

**Mr. Overton** asked what was the sample for that was passed to the Board.

**Ms. Bryant** answered that it was the stucco. However, staff is recommending a different finish for the stucco as they believe the texture is too bumpy.

**Mr. Overton** said that was not stucco that was passed to the Board.

**Ms. Bryant** stated that it is a synthetic stucco by Sto and that is not the color that is being proposed.

**Mr. Engle** said the preservation standards and preservation briefs do not recommend stucco over historic fabric.

**Ms. Bryant** stated that this is a non-historic building.

**Mr. Engle** said the exterior is non-historic, but the building is historic, isn't it?

**Ms. Bryant** stated that the building is not rated as historic because of the extensive modifications that have occurred.

**Mr. Engle** stated that this does not mean that it is not old brick. This can damage old fabric.

**Ms. Bryant** stated this is true; however, because the building is not rated as historic, staff did not look at that.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ward** explained that they are proposing a three-coat stucco system to go over the existing walls with a smooth coat finish. They will apply real stucco to the building. Also, they agree with staff's recommendations of the lintels above the openings on the upper floors.

**Dr. Henry** asked what was the material that was passed to the Board and what would it be used for.

**Mr. Ward** said that is a sample that shows the finish of the stucco. It will be a coat stucco system with a smooth coat finish. This was passed to the Board to give an idea of the color as well as the finish. However, based on staff's recommendation, they will have a smooth finish.

**Mr. Engle** asked if it will be real stucco.

**Mr. Ward** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the lintels are stucco or something else.

**Mr. Ward** said they will go with the staff's recommendation for the stucco of the lintels.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Ward if they could use cast stone.

**Mr. Ward** said they could work with staff on this too.

**Mr. Engle** believed the Board would rather see cast stone than just stucco on the lintels. If so, this should be recommended in the motion.

**Ms. Ramsay** wanted to know if the west wall is on the property line.

**Mr. Ward** said the west wall of the existing building is on property line.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked, therefore, whether the new addition of west wall would also be on the property line.

**Mr. Ward** answered yes.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if all the windows one be one-hour rated assemblies for the new storefront and the windows above.

**Mr. Ward** said the windows above are existing on the two-story part. The only new window that they are putting on the property line of the storefront is on the one-story addition.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if these windows would be one-hour rated.

**Mr. Ward** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** asked how could they be on the property line if there is an awning. The awning is sticking out three feet.

**Mr. Dawson** said their client is in the process of buying the lot. Therefore, he is giving himself air rights and an easement to do this. They have done this on other buildings downtown as well.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**None.**

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** asked what is happening to the sign post that is where the addition is going.

**Mr. Dawson** said he could not find the sign.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated they were talking about the ice cream sign.

**Mr. Dawson** said the sign will be removed.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for the rehabilitation and alterations to 111 West Congress Street and the new addition in the side yard of 111 West Congress Street with the following conditions:

1. A real stucco with a smooth finish is used on the historic masonry and new addition;

- PASS

2. A cast stone or other compatible lintel is used on the upper floor windows.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: W James Overton

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4499-2 | 1 West Liberty Street | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Ms. Sarah Ward recused from participation in this petition as her husband is associated with the petitioner.**

**Ms. Brenda Pearson** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Brittany Bryant** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations to the facade of 1 West Liberty Street.

**Ms. Bryant** reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations with the following conditions:

1. The doors be inset no less than three inches from the building facade;
2. The replacement windows on 3 West Liberty Street, basement level, match the original double-hung windows and be no less inset three inches from the building facade;
3. The canvas gutter on the awning be eliminated.

**Ms. Bryant** reported also that the since the staff report was written, the petitioner has agreed to replace the double-hung windows on 3 West Liberty with the original design. This has been provided to the Board as an addendum.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board reviewed this five (5) months ago.

**Mr. Judson** stated that the Board reviewed the iron work above and the gate behind the property for the Knights of Columbus. This is the lower floor.

**Mr. Engle** said he was aware of that, but this is also the deck.



**Mr. Judson** said that the deck is not a part of this proposal.

**Mr. Engle** said the petitioner is putting a vegetative screen wall up there. Therefore, he assumes that the deck is a part of it.

**Ms. Bryant** stated that the petitioner is proposing a vegetative screen on the deck.

**Mr. Engle** said the gate is shown.

**Ms. Bryant** stated that she believes what is shown is the existing gate.

**Mr. Engle** said he remembers that the Board told the petitioner at that time they had to have the gate for fire code. What has happened with that?

**Ms. Bryant** answered that she does not know. This could be a question to ask the petitioner.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Pearson** said as stated in the staff's report, they originally submitted the awnings to be in double portion as shown on the current drawings. However, the staff recommended that they break it up into six to go over the bays that are existing and maintain the rhythm which they have done. They ask that the small canvas gutter be included between the awnings to assist in the awnings being functional as possible for outdoor seatings. Since this was submitted, they have agreed to change the windows that are on the adjacent property which are a part of this project. They are shown as fixed single light windows, but they will be done as one-over-one double hung to match the historic wood windows above.

Regarding the vegetation screen, there is an existing awning, but as can be seen in the picture, it is not compatible with how awnings should be in the Historic District. It was placed higher to provide some privacy for the Knights of Columbus who own the building and wanted to use the deck. Ms. Pearson said they could just recover that existing awning. However, they want to improve the look of the building and pay respect to what is seen in the historic photo with the six awning bays. This is why they pulled the awnings down more similar to how it was historically. They still want to offer some privacy for the people who will be occupying the deck which is why they proposed a simple vegetation screen.

**Dr. Williams** questioned the kind of vegetation.

**Ms. Pearson** said she does not believe they have decided what kind of vegetation would be here. An existing railing is here and she imagines that it will be a simple wire that they can grow vegetation on. However, if there is a recommendation by the Board, they will be happy to consider it.

**Mr. Howington** asked if the planters would be on the inside or outside of the railing.

**Ms. Pearson** said they do not have a detail to show this. However, she does not know if a bottom railing is here. Therefore, she does not know if it could be something simple under

the actual railing, but may be conceal what the vegetation is growing on.

**Mr. Engle** asked if a two pipe rail is here.

**Ms. Pearson** answered that she believes so.

**Mr. Engle** said it would be nice to see the awning under there as it was most atrocious.

**Ms. Pearson** said this was their belief also, especially when they saw the historic photo. They want to return it to something more in keeping with the Historic District.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation** stated that they would rather see less of the full light and more retail door at the front and more half light. This is not a retail operation; it is a bar and restaurant. He believes this would be similar to the corner entrance such as B. Matthews at East Bay and Habersham Streets. This entrance seems a little more suitable for the operation. Mr. Carey said as he reads this, an awning will be on the Bull Street side and Liberty Street, but nothing will be over the entrance. This might look somewhat odd to have this cutout. There might be room for some minimal entry awning. This could possibly help to bring the two sides of the building together. They have looked at the door and considered the awning treatment over the front door.

**Ms. Pearson** said regarding the corner, it is hard to tell from the elevations, but there is actually a corner piece above the entry. It is not chamfered at the corner. The small piece above the door meets at a corner. She believes, perhaps, that a line is missing in the drawing. However, they would prefer to have the awning wrap the corner, but it was their understanding that they could not do so in the Historic District. Regarding the corner doors, in keeping with the storefront look that is already in existence, they wanted to use a storefront look door and also match the new doors that they are replacing instead of one of the window bays. They want to maintain the same look. Since there are no half-light storefront doors, they are showing them as full. Ms. Pearson said for clarification, they are referring to this as Bar Food, however, this will be a new restaurant and will not be called Bar Food.

**Mr. Engle** pointed out that if they look at drawing two of four, it shows the plan and the lines show that the entry is covered.

**Mr. Judson** said, therefore, his understanding is a roof will be overhead at the corner.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if there is an example that shows the gutter system on the awnings.

**Ms. Pearson** explained that they spoke with a representative at Coastal Canvas who stated that it would not be a problem for them to do this. He said they could show an example of it. If there is a question about it, may be it could be done as a staff review onsite at a later date. The awnings are separate regardless of whether the small canvas gutter is installed or not.

**Ms. Bryant** said the staff discussed this and they have never seen this type of awning. They believe it is atypical for the Historic District.

**Mr. Engle** said if it is raining to the point that rain will be coming down between the awnings as they are only six to eight inches apart, it will be blowing under the front anyway and the people will get soaked.

**Board Action:**

Approval for the alterations to the facade of 1 West Liberty Street with the following conditions:

1. The doors be inset no less than three inches from the building facade;
2. The replacement windows on 3 West Liberty Street, basement level, match the original double-hung windows and be inset no less than three inches from the building facade; - PASS
3. The canvas gutter on the awning is eliminated.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-11-4500-2 | 126 West Bay Street | Rehabilitation and Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Ms. Sarah Ward recused from participation in this petition as her husband is associated with the petitioner.**

**Mr. Neil Dawson** was present on behalf of the petition along with other representatives.

**Ms. Brittany Bryant** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation to the upper three floors of 126 West Bay Street and a new rooftop. She said today, an addendum was submitted showing the doors would actually have glass. This drawing has been submitted to the Board in their addendum folder. This is not the fixed wood panel doors that were originally proposed, but will be glass.

**Ms. Bryant** reported staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation and the rooftop addition because the proposed rehabilitation and addition meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Historic District Ordinance (Sec. 8-3030) standards.

#### PETITIONER COMMENTS

**Mr. Dawson** stated that he had some historic photos with him that he does not believe were in the Board's packets. The photos were distributed to the Board.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if any of the walls are on the property lines.

**Mr. Dawson** answered yes; all the walls are on the property lines.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if all are fire rated.

**Mr. Dawson** said the one next to liquor store is somewhat problematic. They are eight feet away and there are no openings on the wall. This one is easy to handle, but the remaining openings about the public right-of-way.

**Dr. Williams** asked if any part of the rooftop terrace overlooks Bay Street, southward view.

**Mr. Dawson** answered no. All the views are on the River Street side.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the balconies on the north elevation will be usable.

**Mr. Dawson** said they initially submitted what he thought were traditional one door wide balconies. But, Ms. Bryant pointed out to them that the Sanborn Map showed a continuous balcony on the upper two levels. He wanted to admit that this is the only building that he has worked on downtown that has full height doors on the upper two levels. Typically, it is two windows with a door in the middle. They amended their petition.

**Mr. Engle** questioned why not have a continuous railing. Fourth and fifth floor of continuous balcony is unusual in this town. This is far better than single balconies, but even if they did not have flooring, if they just had the continuous band is an important feature.

**Mr. Dawson** said they can do this. He was concerned that it would look too heavy. He thought further by breaking it by bays, even though it is an interpretation and not certainly historical, it seems logical to him that this would probably be the way they construct it. Nevertheless, he would be happy to do a continuous balcony.

**Mr. Engle** stated that it was continuous and must have been heavy. There must be some

safety reason; now you don't want a continuous flowing, but just run the front.

**Mr. Dawson** said that they will certainly have to divide it up in some manner between the rooms. But, there is a way that they can do it.

**Dr. Williams** said he was not sure if it could be judged that it was a continuous balcony.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the Sanborn Map says it was a continuous balcony.

**Mr. Dawson** said they will be pleased to amend it to a continuous balcony.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation** said their Architectural Review Committee looked at this application very closely. He said the Architectural Review Committee gave him a statement to read, but he would modify the statement by using his discretion and his position to take a stronger stance: "We are concerned that the proposed rooftop addition would be very visible from across Bay Street as well as across the river." Mr. Carey said he believes the photos with all due respect to the petitioner, were taken from a low angle. It looks like it will be visible from Bay Street, but even if it is not visible from Bay Street, it is very visible from the river and Hutchinson Island. This is in the right-of-way as well and needs to be equally considered. It is a large addition. They do not think that it meets the visual compatibility test.

The master plan was mentioned which is incomplete and they have to take these on a case-by-case basis to him is evidence that they need to wait. Mr. Carey said he does not believe that these should be approved without the master plan. The fact that it is eligible or qualifies for an additional story, does not mean that it should automatically be granted. The rooftop addition rage that they are experiencing and will have more of, is problematic. He believes it alters these buildings. The national park service in the application of the tax credit review is taking a dim view towards these rooftop additions. They corrected their decisions that they made a long time ago and changed their approach to reviewing these. Mr. Carey said he believes the line in the sand needs to be drawn now. He said that the Historic Savannah Foundation opposes this rooftop addition.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** assumed that this is presently going through tax act review.

**Mr. Dawson** said no. This is actually a condominium. The lower two floors are owned by a separate party and the upper three floors are owned by his client. Therefore, they do not believe that it is eligible for tax credits as it is owned by two separate owners. He said in response to the Historic Savannah Foundation's comments, his client is in the process of purchasing this building and they have by right the ability to add a floor according to the zoning standards. Therefore, they relied on the Standards as a fact in terms of investing money on a project that would allow a floor to be added. While the Historic Savannah Foundation may not like the addition, it is by right allowed under the Zoning Ordinance and while they can talk about the architecture features of it and they have tried to do their best to make it as inconspicuous as possible, it is allowed. Mr. Dawson said they may differ on

what's visually appropriate, but they do intend to do a rooftop addition because it is allowed. However, they are willing to compromise the design in anyway that they think is more appropriate. He believes the renderings show a better view.

**Dr. Henry** asked the staff to explain the master plan.

**Ms. Bryant** explained that the reason a master plan is needed for the Factors Walk area is they believe that when the historic streets and lanes were drawn, Factors Walk was intentionally left out because there was not a master plan. But, they believe that the intent of the figure is that Factors Walk be included and the master plan needs to be done for Factors Walk. This has been talked about in past Historic Review Board meetings when the recovering of the Factors Walk on the east side of City Hall was talked about. Since there is presently not a master plan for this area, the applications are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. However, it has been recommended that they do need a master plan for the Factors Walk area.

**Mr. Thomson** explained that he and Ms. Ward have talked about this. They want to try to get a commitment from SCAD or someone to provide a resource to do it. They will make it a project for them. He believes this came up at last month's meeting.

**Dr. Henry** asked if it is accurate that the owners can build the rooftop anyway. This is what is seemingly being said.

**Mr. Thomson** said it would need to be found visually compatible. Under the ordinance, what staff is saying that because the Factors Walk restoration has occurred, this makes them eligible for another floor. This is the basis upon which the recommendation is made. He explained that under the ordinance there are three different requirements that make an applicant eligible for an additional height per floor level.

**Ms. Bryant** explained that the petitioner is eligible for an additional story because they qualify for the definition of large scale development. They are a five-story structure. In the definition, you also have to include the existing building footprint and the new addition. Therefore, this makes this six-stories on the River Street side. Consequently, the petitioner does qualify for large scale development. Under the Factors Walk Character Area of the Ordinance states that structures on Factors Walk that meet the definition for large scale development are eligible for an additional story and that will take you to the section in the Ordinance that lists the criteria for an additional story. **"One of the criteria is an historic street bar lane as identified on Figure 2. is restored and dedicated back to the City as a public right-of-way."**

**Ms. Bryant** explained again that they talked about how a master's plan of Factors Walk needs to be done. Staff believes it meets the intent of the Standards because it is a public area that was returned to the City, but it is not specifically indicated on figure 2.

**Mr. Engle** said the petitioner has the right to build, but the Historic Review Board still has the obligation to review this to ensure that the design is compatible. Even if there is a master plan, he assumes that they are not giving a way their right to review everything that is done in the future.

**Dr. Henry** said he was at a lost as to how the Board can approve the upper story.

**Mr. Engle** said he has some questions for the architect. He asked the petitioner if the material on the Bay Street level was standing seam.

**Mr. Dawson** said the curved roof portion is standing seam. The wall panel is actually a metal panel.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the entire section would be dull gray.

**Mr. Dawson** explained that their intent is to have a dull gray color that matches. He stated from a design standpoint, they have the right to do the addition, but how do they do it and make it look somewhat compatible and have some kind of precedent. Therefore they used the four-five light monitors that exist on Factors Walk. This is a kind of standard for the curved element that faces true north. This is why it is off the direction of the building. They tried to find some historic precedent in what they did. This is why they chose the roof shape, roof color and roof configuration in terms of saw indentation.

**Mr. Engle** said the renderings show the elevator shaft six feet above the level of the roof, but if they look at the elevations, the peak of the roof and the elevator shaft is almost level. Therefore, something is off.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that the elevator is required to be 12 feet above the floor level. The peak of the pitch is about nine feet. Therefore, it should be approximately three feet taller than the highest part of the roof.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if the elevator shaft will be three feet tall.

**Mr. Dawson** said the Code requires that there is a 12 foot override.

**Mr. Engle** asked if it will be white.

**Mr. Dawson** answered no. It was rendered white, but they changed this stucco to gray. They just want it to be kind of nondescript mechanical addition.

**Dr. Williams** stated that in reference to Mr. Carey's comments about usage of rooftop, he believes one thing the Board has to discuss, not just in this case but more broadly, is almost a philosophical question of where does the Board stand on the idea of the adaptive use of a historical structure that might have viability into the future. Should they in principle say once a historical building did not have people up on the roof, therefore they should not allow this to happen. Or should they be looking at it and saying it is a historic structure, but architectural evolves, uses evolve. Dr. Williams said a little of the parapet wall is seen from the north side of Bay Street. He believes a thick canopy of live oaks will make the view of it from the south side of Bay Street difficult. Therefore, this is where it is going to be most visible. They maybe will see two feet of the roof.

He believes it is worthwhile to think about this broadly. They may decide to take this on a case-by-case basis. Some times he is very sticky about preserving historic fabric, but on the other hand he is also a realist in terms of the evolution of urban form. Dr. Williams said being on the roof of the Bohemian is really a fantastic experience and having

another building that would provide this opportunity might be a special case where roof real estate is extremely valuable where as in the middle of a residential area, rooftop use has implications of being able to look into people's yards and privacy concerns. But with this over looking the river is very public space. However, he is not necessarily advocating this position, but believes as a Board they need to discuss this.

**Dr. Dawson** said the Zoning Ordinance in this specific case allows this story to be added. In fact, more than one-half million dollars have been spent for restoring Factors Walk, which if they remember was an old concrete parking lot. He believes the ordinance is probably appropriately written unless the Board decides that there never should be a rooftop addition. In this case, he believes they would have to live with Factors Walk as is. He believes further that it is a reasonable offset in the ordinance.

**Mr. Carey** said he believes an attorney needs to interpret the ordinance. Mr. Yellin is present. He believes there is a difference between "eligible," "qualify," and "automatically granted." There is a big difference between something being eligible or qualifying and rather it is actually granted. This Board has the discretion to say whether it is granted or not. Just because it is eligible does not mean therefore its a fact and that you get it. This is what he has been saying all along about not having legal counseling handy. They need to interpret this so that the public understands that an eligibility isn't a right.

**Mr. Judson** said he agrees that eligibility is just that. With all due respect to Attorney Yellin, he is not City staff and he would not defer at this point to an independent attorney's opinion. Thirdly, it is the charge of the Historic Review Board to adjudicate these decisions and they certainly are reviewable by court and the City Attorney. At this point, however, onerous is on this Board to move forward with an interpretation and a decision in this case; not regardless of the respective that Mr. Carey has stated as well as Mr. Dawson and staff with regards to what makes this eligible or what defines eligibility, but given that at this point there is no attorney on the Board nor do they have legal representation of the City present, he does not believe that this is an appropriate time to ask for an outside interpretation. Everything that this Board does is subject to legal review. This is the reality they live in and a part of this Board's charge is that they adjudicate decisions, but make defensible decisions that do not end up in court and don't end up wasting the court's time where this Board has gone way off track.

**Mr. Judson** admonished the Board members to listen real closely to the language that staff has enumerated the specific reasons for which this rooftop addition would be eligible and agree with Mr. Carey that this in no way mandates this Board to approve it just on that merit; and that they are in fact examining a petition that has been submitted to them on its architectural merits.

**Mr. Thomson** said the Board needs to be specific in their motion. The decision to allow or approve a rooftop addition, an extra floor, is related to the rehabilitation of Factors Walk in a historic way.

**Mr. Engle** said it could be argued that this is not an additional floor, it is a rooftop addition. This is not covering the full building.

**Mr. Johnson** said the petitioner is eligible for the rooftop and that's it.



**Board Action:**

Approval for the rehabilitation with the condition a continuous balcony be used on the fourth and fifth floor, and the rooftop addition to 126 West Bay Street because Factors Walk has been restored and returned to the public right-of-way. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle  
Second: Sidney J. Johnson  
Reed Engle - Aye  
Ned Gay - Not Present  
Nicholas Henry - Aye  
Keith Howington - Aye  
Sidney J. Johnson - Aye  
Brian Judson - Abstain  
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye  
W James Overton - Aye  
Linda Ramsay - Nay  
Robin Williams - Aye

16. [Petition of Brian Robin | H-11-4501-2 | 112 West Broughton Street | Rehabilitation and alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Brian Robin** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior and exploratory removal of the false facade at 112 West Broughton Street.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for the exterior alterations and exploratory removal of the false facade at 112 West Broughton Street with the following conditions:

1. Provide section through the storefront, base and top raised panels;
2. Provide manufacturer or shop drawing for new windows that meet the design standards;
3. Provide a section through a new window openings on upper floors showing materials and projection of sill, header, and inset of window frame to be three inches;
4. Align storefront base panels with vertical storefront divisions
5. Incorporate ribbon transom in upper portion of storefront in place of the proposed panels with a simple cornice projection similar to the historic photos.
6. Once the stucco panels are removed from the upper portion, document the condition and meet with staff to consult about any changes that are needed. Any changes should then

be resubmitted to the Board for approval.

**Ms. Ward** said the petitioner provided some of the information that was needed for the storefront after the packets were sent to the Board.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Robin** said as Ms. Ward reported they have answered the staff's additional questions regarding the materials. Basically, they have tried to recreate the picture. There will be a nice entry. It is hard to see from the pictures, but the windows on the top will be six foot by 10 foot double hung wooden windows. It is hard to see from the picture, but the infill block will be exact size. The cornice on top is actually replicating the cornices on the adjacent buildings. The building on the other side at 108 W. Broughton Street is actually three-stories and has a similar cornice. They want to determine the condition of the bricks. Everything else they will try to keep and will meet with staff to talk about any changes that are needed .

**Dr. Williams** stated that he had a question regarding the windows, picture three of the elevations. The band across the storefront seems to correspond with the drop ceiling inside the store. There is a window and the staff's recommendation is to try to recreate the upper floor windows.

**Mr. Robin** said this morning they submitted new renderings to the staff. On the second floor the window will be six foot by 10 foot.

**Mr. Engle** congratulated Mr. Robin on the exterior work being planned for the storefront.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation** said they realize the building is now two-stories versus three-stories. They wanted it to be kept in mind that the windows on the upper level that the sills and lintels should be more substantial because of the impression on the two-story façade. It appears that they are not proportionate now because the windows are very large.

**Mr. Robin** said the pictures do not reveal everything, but they will use cast stone and make everything look as it is supposed to be. Unfortunately, the picture does not show what will be done.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for exterior alterations and exploratory removal of the false façade at 112 West Broughton Street with the following conditions:

1. Provide section through the storefront, base, and top raised panels;
2. Provide manufacturer or shop drawing for new windows that meet the design standards;

3. Provide a section through new window openings on upper floors showing materials and projection of sill, header, and inset of window frame to be three inches; - PASS
4. Align storefront base panels with vertical storefront divisions;
5. Incorporate ribbon transom in upper portion of storefront in place of the proposed panels with a simple cornice projection similar to the historic photos.
6. Once the stucco panels are removed from the upper portion, document the condition and meet with staff to consult about any changes that are needed. Any changes should then be resubmitted to the Board for approval.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Mathew Deacon | H-11-4502-2 | 231 Houston Street | Alterations and Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Matthew Deacon** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Brittany Bryant** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for alterations at 231 Houston Street.

**Ms. Bryant** reported that staff recommends approval for the alterations, including a new oriel, dormer window, skylight, and new fence at 231 Houston Street with the following conditions:

1. The French doors meet the standards for permitted materials within the district;
2. The post and rails of the fence face into the property and not onto the street.

An encroachment agreement from the City of Savannah is needed for any projections into the public-right-of-way.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Bryant to clarify the statement about the dormer is to match the existing dormer on the west elevation.

**Ms. Bryant** explained that a new dormer window is being proposed for the east façade.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the east dormer window is a single window. Where they all built at the same time?

**Ms. Bryant** answered yes.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if they were built in the 1980s.

**Ms. Bryant** said they were built in 1981.

**Mr. Engle** said the dormer does not match. See sheet eight (8).

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if there are any triple dormers in the Historic District.

**Dr. Williams** believed triple dormers are in the district.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deacon** explained that the design of the fence is to keep what is in the neighborhood. They wanted to maintain the vertical board and sandwich the rails in so that it will look the same on the inside and the outside and then trim between the posts. They appreciate the staff's report.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked the Mr. Deacon if he was aware of any triple dormers in the Historic District.

**Mr. Deacon** answered no.

**Dr. Williams** said he could understand the dormer, but what is the motive behind the oriel.

**Mr. Deacon** stated that the motive behind the oriel is similar to the dormer. The kitchen is centered and the oriel is intended to extend the kitchen space and as a special feature make the space more usable. They also felt that it gave the south façade a little more character and broke up the flatness. This is a combination of a benefit to the interior and exterior.

**Mr. Howington** asked the petitioner if any thought was given to a shed roof.

**Mr. Deacon** answered that the shed roof was the first thing they thought of. He personally felt that the gable roof was more appropriate. He knows that the owners would appreciate whichever roof the Board agrees on. They would certainly be amenable.

**Mr. Engle** said the elevation on page nine (9) does not show brackets at all. He believes that the ordinance says there has to be support.

**Mr. Deacon** said they will use the corbel brackets. They kept the brackets within the alignment of the water table and featured them as support members, but actually the floor sits on the cantilever and everything below will conform to the exterior. The original design has a wide water table little lower than the floor level to create the raised basement. In fact, the floor is much higher than the way it looks from the outside.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation** said they believe that the triple dormer is inappropriate for the Historic District and, therefore, is inappropriate for this structure.

**Mr. Matthew Hallett** said with clarification on the fence, they went through the neighborhood and looked at similar fences with panels. This design will make the total fence look smaller than the existing fence. The existing fence is a Home Depot board-on-board fence painted white. The railings should match the railings of the main house which is a two-by-two.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said the oriel might look okay if this was a two-story addition. It bothers him as this is one-story. There are five windows, but he believes it would be better if this was two stories. There are too many windows.

**Mr. Deacon** said this is not designed anywhere in the district. As it is now, they have a plain canopy. The oriel window gives a little cover for the entrance. It provides light and provides a little shelter for the entrance to the bay. The other side is fixed the same way, but the middle unit, entry, is underneath the stoop.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the door could be centered under the oriel.

**Mr. Deacon** said it is possible, but it would be quite a bit more work to do so. They kept moving it so they could get the depth of the brackets, but they thought the design they came up with was appropriate, they did not want to do anything drastic.

**Mr. Merriman** said the oriel window is not typical for the Historic District, but if the petitioner is going to have the oriel window, having the door centered will look better and give the petitioner room to get the brackets.

**Mr. Deacon** said moving the HVAC to the right of the door will cause bigger problems. This is why they went with their chosen design. This is a very compact plan and the extra room by the door makes a substantial impact on the circulation of the kitchen which is actually centered in this space.

**Mr. Overton** asked the staff if two-story oriels are in this district.

**Ms. Ward** explained that this particular ward has very low row housing. There is a variety of bays and oriels throughout the district.

**Mr. Judson** informed Mr. Deacon that he sympathizes with the petitioner, but he is aware that the petition may be rejected. This means that Mr. Deacon and his client may come back with a complete and new proposal. Mr. Judson informed Mr. Deacon that he may ask for a continuance to comeback with design options.

**Mr. Deacon** stated one-story oriels are common; two-stories are common and there are oriels that are two-stories up all the way.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes if Mr. Deacon could resolve the relationship of the door to the dormer, would make it far better.

**Mr. Judson** asked Dr. Williams if he meant oriel instead of dormer.

**Dr. Williams** answered oriel.

**Mr. Judson** explained to Mr. Deacon that generally he does not vote, unless it is a tie. He is very sympathetic to the small bay window and has one in his bedroom which makes all the difference, but unless he was to see other examples of any units with that kind of articulation, his vote would be against oriel windows are any kind. An option would be to withdraw the oriel.

**Mr. Deacon** consulted with his clients and stated that they were withdrawing the oriel from this design packet with the possibility that later on they may re-evaluate it and bring it back in a separate proposal/ petition.

**Mr. Engle** said if the petitioner is reconsidering the oriel, he might want to consider making it a bay window. This will give enough room on the interior to get the brackets.

**Board Action:**

Approval for the alterations to 231 Houston Street  
with the following conditions:

- PASS

1. Elimination of the oriel window;
2. The west dormer has a shed roof instead of the proposed gable roof.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4504-2 | 236 Drayton Street | Rehabilitation, alterations, and sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Andrew Lynch** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to enclosed the existing porte-cochere, replace the garage door, modify the one-story structure to the south and construct an addition, and install signage on the building at 236 Drayton Street. Ms. Ward explained that requests to enclose the porte-cochere and construct the addition have been previously approved by the Savannah Historic District Board of Review. Certificates of Appropriateness were issued or the porte-cochere enclosure on September 10, 2008 (File No. H-08-4047-2) and the addition on December 9, 2009 (File No. H-09-4187-2). All past approvals have expired and new Certificates of Appropriateness are required.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approve to enclose the existing porte-cochere, replace the garage doors, modify the one-story structure to the south and construct an addition, and install signage on the building at 236 Drayton Street with the following conditions:

1. Eliminate the metal tubing and star logo which do not appear to be contemporary to this specific structure;
2. The final sign design on the addition be restudied to meet the size standards and resubmitted to the Board for approval when finalized;
3. Provide color samples (P1) for Motorini signage;
4. Provide dimensions for existing freestanding sign, canopy signs, and announcement signs;
5. Eliminate the poster signs from the exterior walls; and
6. Provide specifications for goose neck light fixtures.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff what is their opinion of restoring the chamfered bay design.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she would welcome this if the petitioner would entertain it.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lynch** said they do not have a problem eliminating the metal tubing and star logo.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Lynch if he would be willing to restore the chamfered corners in the bays.

**Mr. Lynch** stated he does not see that this would be an issue. He will be willing to discuss this further at the staff level or if the Board wants, will bring it back to them.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval to enclose the existing porte-cochere, replace the garage doors, modify the one-story structure to the south and construct an addition, and install signage on the building at 236 Drayton Street with the following conditions:

1. Study the restoration of the chamfered corners at the garage bays;
2. Eliminate the metal tubing and star logos which do not appear to be contemporary to this specific structure.
3. The final sign design on the addition be restudied - PASS to meet the size standard and resubmitted to the Board for approval when finalized;
4. Provide color samples (P1) for Motorini signage;
5. Provide dimensions for existing freestanding sign, canopy signs, and announcement signs;
6. Eliminate the poster signs from the exterior walls; and
7. Provide specifications for goose neck light fixtures.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Linda Ramsay

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4505-2 | 9 Lincoln Street | Rehabilitation, alterations, demolition of the addition, and an addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Andrew Lynch** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Sarah Ward** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for partial demolition, construction of a new addition, structural stabilization and rehabilitation of the



building at 9 Lincoln Street.

**Ms. Ward** reported that staff recommends approval for partial demolition, construction of a new addition, structural stabilization and rehabilitation of the building at 9 Lincoln Street with the following item to be submitted to staff for final approval:

1. Inventory siding and windows prior to removal so that they may be reinstalled in their original location;
2. Reduce the height of the solid panel wall and extending the glass railing around the top;
3. Study the use of wood for the exterior aluminum elements in the addition to correspond to the historic structure or incorporate a painted finish influenced from the historic structure;
4. Provide materials for new shutters. Match the existing flanking shutter style present on the building which is more typical of historic structures in the Savannah Historic District;
5. Provide specifications for gas light fixtures;
6. Provide details for decorative cast iron gate; and
7. Submit all colors and wood stain finishes for review.

**Mr. Engle** questioned the garbage and parking for this site.

**Ms. Ward** answered they don't have to look at the parking now because nothing is proposed at this time. The Board would have to review the curb cut and any kind of openings. Regarding the garbage, she does not know if a garbage dumpster is already in the lane.

**Mr. Engle** stated that nothing is in the lane now, except a backhoe.

**Dr. Williams** asked that on page four if what is shown is the exterior siding that can be seen from the inside.

**Ms. Ward** was not sure; this would be a question for the petitioner to address.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the original siding that was on the building is being preserved.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes; she believes the siding is still on site.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if they were saying that all the siding removed will be labeled and hopefully replaced after the building is jacked up six to eight inches.

**Mr. Engle** said when you have 5/8 inch sheathing to exterior frame your window sill, lintel, window pane will not set because they all will be 5/8 inch short. All of this will have to come off and be reinstalled so they will sit in correct relationship.

**Mr. Howington** asked the staff to explain their recommendation that says study the use of the wood for the exterior aluminum elements.

**Ms. Ward** explained that the two panels and the horizontal panel should correspond and keep the same design.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Lynch** stated that he had no exceptions to the staff's recommendation. He only wanted to make a couple of clarifications. They have already completed the staff's recommendation pertaining to reducing the height of the solid panel wall and extend the glass railing around the top. They thought this would be a better solution. They also thought that carrying a vertical panel from the horizontal siding, which is a kind of over-scale horizontal siding, would reinforce the connection.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Lynch about jacking up the building.

**Mr. Lynch** said basically there are two options they came up with. The jacking of the building was one option and the other was basically to build a new structure within what is here and extend the sidewalk. This would decrease the footprint on the interior on the bottom almost 18 inches. But by the time they determined the cost to do this; they thought maybe they could stabilize it from the exterior. There is no sheathing other than the siding. But this is directly to the studs.

**Dr. Williams** was concerned that removing the siding could be potentially harmful. Removing siding is a delicate operation trying not to break it.

**Mr. Lynch** said they thought about it a couple of different ways as to whether they could just take it off and make two of the faces of the building. Maybe they will just remove it from the east and west side and leave it on the north and south side. Sheath the east and west side and then put the siding back on and do the other two sides once they have been stabilized properly.

**Mr. Engle** said the petitioner will lose the bottom three to four inches no matter what is done. But once this is done, go ahead with the place behind.

**Mr. Johnson** asked what kind of siding is on the building now that will be removed.

**Mr. Lynch** said it is a ten inch lap siding.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Lynch to address the garbage question.

**Mr. Lynch** said he has to talk with the owner. However, he believes that an agreement has been made with the bar that is adjacent to the building. He believes that there is a dumpster in the lane that they share with other restaurants in the block. He will talk with the owner about this and bring it back to the staff.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for partial demolition, construction of a new addition, structural stabilization and rehabilitation of the building at 9 Lincoln Street with the following items to be submitted to staff for final approval:

1. Inventory siding and windows prior to removal so that they may be reinstalled in their original location.
2. Study the use of wood for the exterior aluminum elements in the addition to correspond to the historic structure or incorporate a painted finish influenced from the historic structure. - PASS
3. Provide materials for new shutters. Match the existing flanking shutter style present on the building which is more typical of historic structures in the Savannah Historic District.
4. Provide specifications for gas light fixture;
5. Provide details for decorative cast iron gate; and
6. Submit all colors and wood stain finishes for review.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

20. [Petition of Patrick Godley | H-11-4510-2 | 307 East President Street | Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Mr. Patrick Godley** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Brittany Bryant** gave the staff report. The petitioner is appealing a staff decision of denial (File No. H-110719-4471(S)-2) to the Board. The original request was for after-the-fact approval of two new vertical board doors on the garden level of 307 East President Street. One is located on the north facade fronting President Street; the other is on the west facade fronting Lincoln Street. The new doors are tongue and groove and feature a stained glass window in the upper portion approximately 12 inches by 16 inches. The doors have been painted with Pittsburgh Paint in "Factors Red."

**Ms. Bryant** reported that staff recommends denial for the replacement vertical board doors on 307 East President Street because it does not meet the preservation standards and it is visually incompatible with the period of the house and the surrounding historic

context.

**Ms. Bryant** reported that since the staff's earlier decision, the petitioner has provided an additional photo which was presented to the Board as an addendum.

**Mr. Merriman** said the staff has recommended denial of this petition and asked what the staff recommends that the petitioner do to rectify the problem.

**Ms. Bryant** said the staff recommends that a six to eight panel door match what is on the upper level would be more compatible.

**Mr. Judson** explained that the staff has recommended denial. Beyond that it is not on the Board or staff to recommend anything additional. But, the staff is always available to work with the petitioner to try to reach a solution.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Godley** said staff reported that the building was constructed in 1888. The address at 307 East President Street was built in 1888, but the property was originally separate homes and was a duplex at 130 and 132 Lincoln Street. If the Board notices, there is a line of bricks here. Some are Savannah Gray bricks and some are other bricks. This store actually sits on what was the 1920's portion of the house. The staircase leads up to the front of 307 East President. The original ground floor door is still here under the staircase which was bricked in by the previous owners. It is a six panel door. If the Board does not like this door, he can remove the vertical board. **Mr. Godley** said his insurance company is pressuring him to put up a door with a light in it. They put the door up to satisfy the insurance company.

**Mr. Engle** asked why the insurance company is concerned about that kind of particular door.

**Mr. Godley** said it is the main door.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Henry** asked **Mr. Engle** that because of the window design to him it sounds like the door is compatible to a 1920 structure.

**Mr. Engle** said the original doors are upstairs.

**Mr. Godley** said the doors at the top of the stairs are not original doors. They are metal. The bricks on this side are 1920, the bricks on the other side are not.

**Mr. Engle** said that when the property was enlarged, they probably changed everything. What is being said is only speculation.

**Mr. Godley** said he was basing this on the brick.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the door is compatible with an 1888 structure.

**Mr. Godley** said the structure at 323 Congress Street was built in the last 20 or 30 years

and matches the house across the square. It has a glass front door.

**Ms. Bryant** said it was built in 1991.

**Mr. Godley** said 140 Lincoln Street has a thick panel door at the top and a burglar door is down below.

**Mr. Johnson** asked Mr. Godley if he said metal doors are upstairs.

**Mr. Godley** said the current doors they have are metal doors.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Godley if he had a picture of the doors.

**Mr. Godley** said no. The insurance company wants this type of door. If the Board does not want this type of door he will take it off.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked what kind of door is on Lincoln Street.

**Mr. Godley** answered a matching door.

**Dr. Williams** asked that from the staff's point of view is the window or door equally problematic to the stained glass window or would the removal window be a compromised.

**Ms. Bryant** answered that the door at the Owens Thomas House is inside the courtyard and is not readily visible from the street and the public right-of-way. Staff believes the door is incompatible.

**Board Action:**

Denial the after-the-fact replacement vertical board doors on 307 East President Street because it does not meet the preservation standards and it is - PASS visually incompatible with the period of the house and the surrounding historic context.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Linda Ramsay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Not Present
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
W James Overton	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

**VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS**

**IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

21. [Amended Petition of Linda Ramsay for Ramsay Sherrill Architects | H-10-4307\(S\)-2 | 122 E. Taylor St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4307\(S\)-2 Amended.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4307\(S\)-2 Amended 8-17-11.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Amended Petition of Joe Stryker for Smallwood, Reynolds, Stewart, Stewart & Associates | H-11-4323\(S\)-2 | 22 Barnard St. | Service Entry Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4323\(S\)-2 Amended 9-2-11.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4323\(S\)-2 Amended 9-2-11.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Michael Schulz | H-11-4484\(S\)-2 | 212 W. Huntingdon St. | Porch Repair](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4484\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4484\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Susan D. Wagner | H-11-4485\(S\)-2 | 507 Tattnall St. | Repoint](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4485\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4485\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Mike Croley | H-11-4486\(S\)-2 | 141 Price St. | Steel Storm Door](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4486\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4486\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of Patricia A. Young | H-11-4487\(S\)-2 | 512 Nicoll St. | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4487\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4487\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Mike Kenny Roofing Company | H-11-4488\(S\)-2 | 543 E. Gordon St. | Replace Asphalt Roof](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4488\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4488\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Keehong Kim | H-11-4489\(S\)-2 | 215 W. Charlton St. | Re-open Original Window](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4489\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4489\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Alpha Graphics | H-4490\(S\)-2 | 513 E. Oglethorpe Ave. - Ste K | Non-illuminated Fascia Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4490\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4490\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Ashmore Gallery | H-11-4491\(S\)-2 | 412 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Recover Existing Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4491\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4491\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of L. Paulick Construction, LLC | H-11-4508\(S\)-2 | 212 W. Huntingdon St. | Re-stucco and Score](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4508\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4508\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Alexandro Santana | H-11-4509\(S\)-2 | 313 W. Hall St. | Repair In-kind Damaged Wood Siding](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4509\(S\)-2.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4509\(S\)-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**

## Notices

33. [2011 HDBR Retreat | Friday, September 23, 2011 | 9:00am to 4:00pm | Boiler Room of the Central of Georgia Railroad Complex at 301 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.](#)

Attachment: [Tentative HDBR Retreat Agenda 2011.pdf](#)

Mr. Judson reported that the Board retreat will be from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. A presentation will be given by the Coastal Heritage Society and City Manager Rochelle Small-Toney will be in attendance. They will try to address the question of fees. The latter part of the retreat will be open Board discussion. The earlier part of the retreat will be this presentation. Mr. Judson said if anyone feels uncomfortable about bringing up an issue and wants to raise it anonymously, feel free to let him know and he will raise the subject without referencing anyone's name.

## XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

## XIV. ADJOURNMENT

34. [Next Meeting - Wednesday October 12, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

The next meeting is Wednesday, October 12, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room.

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.*