



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
February 8, 2012 2:00 P.M.
Meeting Minutes

FEBRUARY 8, 2012 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Linda Ramsay, Chair
Ned Gay, Vice Chair
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Keith Howington
Brian Judson
Zena McClain, Esq.
Stephen G. Merriman, Jr.
Ebony Simpson
Robin Williams, Ph.D

HDRB Members Not Present: Reed Engle
Sidney J. Johnson

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

City of Savannah Staff Present: Mike Rose, Building Inspector
Tiras Petrea, Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Chair Ramsay called the Historic Review Board meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approve Minutes of January 11, 2012](#)

Attachment: [01-11-2012 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve January 11, 2012 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

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

3. [Petition of Margaret Wright | H-12-4581-2 | 415 East Taylor Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

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

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

4. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | H-11-4569-2 | 412 Williamson Street | New Construction, Part I - Continue to March 14, 2012 at the petitioner's request](#)

Board Action:

Continue to March 14, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Keith Howington

Keith Howington - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

5. [Petition of Rebecca Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-11-4544-2 | 327 Jefferson Street | Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the amended wall and elimination of the garage/carport at 327 Jefferson Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

Brian Judson - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

6. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | H-12-4579-2 | 209 West Congress Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

Attachment: [Submittal Packet II-Originally Approved Drawings.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the relocation of the paired doors, three feet closer to the Congress Street facade, on the west elevation of 209 West Congress Street. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects | H-12-4582-2 | 423 East River Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the new entry on 423 East River Street with the condition that the door is inset no less than three inches from the building facade. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye

Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

8. [Continued Petition of Jovencio Mercado for Signs for Minds | H-11-4568-2 | 125 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

The petitioner, **Jovencio Mercado** was not present.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petition was continued from the meeting of January 11, 2012 at the request of the petitioner to be able to restudy the sign to be more consist with the historic building. The petitioner is requesting approval for a new illuminated principal use projecting sign at 125 East Broughton Street for the new business Lime Grill. The original submittal was for a marquee sign. At the last meeting staff stated that the petitioner would probably not need a variance from the ordinance because of it being a marquee sign and would be going back to the historic precedent. However, when staff received the redesign, it was sent to the Zoning Administrator who determined that since the sign would no longer be attached to the marquee it becomes a projecting principal use sign and the standards apply. There are no design standards that need to be varied, but the petitioner would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) to seek a variance on the size of the sign.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends approval of the illuminated principal use projecting sign with the condition that a more uniform text is used because the sign seeks to restore the historic sign on 125 East Broughton Street.

Mr. Judson said neon banding along the perimeter edge of the sign is shown on the second submittal photo, but it is not shown on the other photos or mentioned. He wanted clarity on which version the petitioner is asking approval for.

Ms. Ward said the staff's report addresses that the petitioner is using a band on the outer edge and the orange on the outer edge. The staff has no problems with this and recommends approval. Historically, the sign that was here had a lot of illumination and neon banding. The petitioner is trying to recreate the Art Deco sign that was here.

Dr. Henry asked if the petitioner had plans to reinstall the old neon.

Ms. Ward answered no; the petitioner has not requested that at this time.

Mr. Merriman asked what happens if the variance is not approved by the ZBA. Would the petitioner have to come back to the Board with something new?

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Judson said in the staff's recommendation a uniform text is stated. He asked staff if they have discussed this with the petitioner and if so, are they in agreement?

Ms. Ward said staff has discussed this with the petitioner who is concerned about this. The petitioner is somewhat frustrated about the entire process as they are trying to do what staff has asked them to do, what the Review Board has asked them to do and now they are being asked to get a variance. Staff has asked petitioner if they could make the letter more uniform. Ms. Ward said she was hopeful that the petitioner would be present today to answer the concerns.

Ms. Bryant said she asked the petitioner if he would be willing to change the font size and the petitioner informed her that all the font sizes did not work.

Mr. Gay asked if this business is a franchise.

Ms. Ward said the font they have today is different than the font that was submitted at the last meeting.

Mr. Merriman said the font they are reviewing today is better than the font reviewed at the last meeting.

Mr. Howington stated he believes the petitioner said at the last meeting that there is no standardization yet.

Mr. Judson asked staff if the petitioner was aware that they were on today's agenda.

Ms. Ward answered that the petitioner was sent the notice of today's meeting. The petitioner has submitted the application to the ZBA. However, the applicant has had problems in the past with their emails. Posting signs were made which the applicant posted on the property. Staff is recommending approval of the sign with the condition that they look at a more uniform text.

Dr. Williams asked staff that when they say a uniform text, are saying without the little notches and consistency thickness of letters.

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Gay guessed the letters could be somewhat like the letters in AVON.

Dr. Williams said just as they saw on the postcard, they might want to tell the petitioner to use the Avon lettering or the boxy lettering.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

As stated above, the petitioner was not present.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that he was not

sure what type of cuisine would be served here. He guessed this had some bearing on the font that has been chosen. HSF leaves this to be resolved between the staff and the petitioner. Mr. Carey said on the front of the marquee, in the center, he believes Season's uses this as a part of their sign. The HSF's Architecture Review Committee questions if this is a part of the sign or would the petitioner be allowed to use the section where the word "LIME" is written. How would this be treated? He believes the petitioner already exceeds their allowable size. There is a potential for adding more signage on the marquee.

Ms. Ramsay asked staff if they could clarify the HSF's question.

Ms. Ward answered that staff is checking this.

Ms. Ardis Wood, a resident, believes the decision would only be on half of the story. Ms. Wood said it is not that the petitioner will use it now, but she would rather see the total package. What will be in the center of the marquee, how much, and what size lettering would be permitted?

Ms. Ward reported that the Zoning Inspector and she are looking at whether the petitioner could reestablish a sign on the face of the marquee. The petitioner has not proposed to do so. It is difficult to tell from the postcard whether historically a sign was here and if it was a blade sign. As far as the reader board for the marquee, the petitioner is allowed to have letters attached thereon and they are changeable copy. Therefore, the Board will not review this as it is allowed on the marquee in this area.

Ms. Ramsay stated she understood that the Board is only reviewing the application for the blade sign.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry asked if it is the Board's objective to have this sign look as much like the original sign as possible.

Ms. Ramsay answered not necessarily. But, it should be in the same spirit.

Mr. Gay said if the Board did not know that the original sign was a lot larger, this present sign might look alright. But he does not know if the Board can say the new sign needs to be the same size.

Mr. Merriman said this is a huge improvement than what the Board saw initially. He believes the petitioner has made a lot of effort to try to incorporate everything the Board suggested. The sign is not exactly like the postcard, but it is very similar.

Mr. Judson asked if the Board approves this sign, would they also need to make a motion for a recommendation for a finding fact and a variance to the ZBA.

Ms. Ward said the sign meets all the regulations in the historic overlay ordinance and no recommendation is needed.

Mr. Gay stated he believes that this Board's approval would influence the ZBA somewhat.

Mr. Judson said he would be reluctant to vote for approval without having the language to address the font. He would be in agreement to have staff work with the petitioner on this. He would also like to get an answer for the point that was raised by the HSF and Ms. Wood regarding the "Season's of Japan" sign on the front of it. While it may be frustrating to deal with this Board, it also frustrating for the Board to review an application without the petitioner being present to answer questions. In the past, it has been a precedent for the Board continuing items if they felt that they did not have enough information, but he was not suggesting that they do this now. He just want to go on record saying that he wished the petitioner was present.

Ms. McClain asked if the Board could continue this petition so the questions could be addressed by the petitioner.

Ms. Ramsay asked Ms. Ward to give clarification on whether this application could be continued.

Ms. Ward stated that when the petitioner is not present, the Board can continue the application to the next meeting. She was concerned because the petitioner is scheduled to go to the ZBA and the Historic Review Board will not meet again before they do so. She did not know why the petitioner is not present.

Dr. Henry said he shares Mr. Judson's view regarding the petitioner not being present; however, he believes that it would be fine if the Board approves the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Judson said he only mentioned the fact that this Board has a precedent for being allowed as Ms. Ward said to move for a continuance. He was not necessarily in favor of a motion to continue. Mr. Judson believes that if the Board can make a clear enough motion that hopefully would guide the ZBA with their decision.

Ms. Ward suggested that since the petitioner is not present, if this item could be tabled to the end of the agenda to give staff the time to call the petitioner to see if they can come to the hearing today.

NOTE: Unanimous consent was approved to move this item to the end of the agenda as suggested by Ms. Ward.

Ms. Ramsay reported at the end of the meeting that the petitioner was now present and that the Board would resume its hearing of this petition.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Ameir Mustafa was present on behalf of the petition. He said he has tried many different ways to make the text fit. The problem is most of the letters are narrow, making it hard to adjust the lettering and the width. What they have now is the closest he could get.

Dr. Williams asked staff to show Mr. Mustafa the picture of the Weiss theater that was shown to the Board earlier.

Mr. Gay said some letters are wider than others. For example, a "W."

Dr. Williams stated that an "M" would be as wide as a "W," but an "I" is here also.

Ms. Ramsay said she believes the Board was looking for the font to be as shown in "Weiss."

Mr. Mustafa stated that he was not disagreeing, but each letter has a box frame which gives the appearance that the entire sign is filled. He said when he met with his client and talked with them about the different proposals and they heard the new price, made it harder for them. Therefore, if more neon and details are added, the sign will cost more money to his clients. However, he is willing to do whatever pleases both sides.

Mr. Judson advised Mr. Mustafa that may be they were not being clear in articulating their concern, but the issue is the style. There is an Asian influence looking letters in the word "L-I-M-E," but the clean looking block print in the word "G-R-I-L-L." He explained that without changing the size or the dimension of the four letters in LIME, may be it needs to be in a more standard font and block print like the Weiss sign. This would make it more compatible with the word GRILL.

Mr. Mustafa stated that he understood what Mr. Judson was saying.

Mr. Gay said definitely the "M" would be wider than the other letters, but he did not believe this is the Board's concern. He believes the Board would like the letters to be more reminiscent of the square letters.

Dr. Henry stated that if the letters in the word "LIME" are the same as the word "GRILL," he believes the sign would be okay.

Mr. Mustafa asked if he could make the changes for staff review and go ahead with the job. He is open for any suggestions.

Mr. Judson stated that on the face of the marquee is the "Season's of Japan" sign. He understood that the marquee's temporary movable lettering is not a part of the Board's purview, but they are viewing the little badge on the front of the marquee as being a part of the signage that is in this Board's purview. He asked Mr. Mustafa what is the plan for the badge. Will it remain or be removed?

Mr. Mustafa asked if it was okay to keep this on temporarily until they get their permanent sign. The sign will take some time to build. The request is to have the temporary sign until they can get their large sign.

Mr. Howington asked if the petitioner was speaking of between the two marquees.

Mr. Mustafa answered yes. He was speaking of the old Season's of Japan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Ardis Wood asked if there is a regulation on color of letters on the marquee. She realized that this is not being approved by the Board today, but can lime green lettering be placed on the marquee and if so, how large will the lettering be?

Dr. Henry stated he believes the lettering size is grandfathered in.

Ms. Wood asked if the size of the lettering is predetermined. Will the color always be black or can the petitioner use fluorescent colors, lime colors, etc.?

Ms. Ward stated that they have not regulated this in the past. The Trustees Theater uses red and black letters sometimes.

Board Action:

Approval of the illuminated principal use projecting sign at 125 East Broughton Street with the condition a more uniform text is used because - PASS the sign seeks to restore the historic precedent of signage on 125 East Broughton Street.

Vote Results

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Nicholas Henry

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. Petition of Todd Huntington for GPD Group | H-12-4578-2 | 504 East River Street | New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial Map 2007.pdf](#)

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

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

Mr. Todd Huntingdon was present on behalf of the petition and **Mr. Shawn Ray** was present on behalf of the Ignite Restaurant Group.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for new construction, Part I, Height and Mass, of a one-and two-story commercial structure at 504 East River Street. The property is located on the north side of River Street along Savannah River within the Factors Walk Character area of the historic district. This site was before the Board at its December meeting to get the site elevated in preparation for new construction and approval for the demolition of the existing building that was on the site.

Ms. Ward stated that at the time the staff's report was prepared, the project did not have comments from the site plan review. But, now they have received comments. While there were not a lot of comments, a few comments focused on stormwater, utilities, and location of utility easements. Ms. Ward said her understanding is the petitioner will be required to shift the building because of some utility easements in front of the property. She believes the petitioner has a revised site plan and will speak to this issue. However, when the petitioner pushed the building back, it created what is being referred to as a "pinch." Therefore, the building had to be moved over in order to maintain a river walk on the north side of the property consistent with the adjacent development. Ms. Ward said this is something the Board needs to consider as they move forward. This was the only comment that was made that will change a major element of the design of the project.

Ms. Ward reported that staff recommends a continuance for new construction Part I, Height and Mass for consideration of the following:

1. Reduce the front entry recess and align the center portion of the building with the eastern segment to provide greater unity within the design. The two-story portions of the building should be on the same wall plane with the same roof and same materials. They could be differentiated from the western portion of the building in height, but it should also feature the same roof shape and materials.
2. Eliminate the center front facing gable and reduce the overall height of the one-story portion of the building.
3. Provide greater consistency in the proportion and placement of openings within all segments of the building to have a more unified appearance. On the two-story portion, window openings on the top and bottom floor should be more similar in dimension and meet the 5:3 ratio unless a true storefront design is introduced.
4. Provide more voids within the solid walls to be visually compatible and to meet the design standards. The distance between windows is greater than two times the width along all facades.
5. Relocate the entrance ramp to the side of the structure.
6. Restudy the veranda to be more compatible with the industrial nature of River Street.

For Part II, the design details, staff recommends elimination of shutters or use a more industrially inspired shutter design that must be operable and sized to fit the opening when closed. If paired openings are used, they should feature a more prominent center mullion. A side service yard is provided on the west end of the building. The gate should be similar to the vertical board gates found in the west elevation and chain-link.

Dr. Williams asked if the public right-of-way on the north side of the building, the walkway, are there any design requirements for the north elevation facing the public walkway.

Ms. Ward answered that this is not public property. There is a setback requirement to provide for a pedestrian setback, but this is the petitioner's private property and there is no requirement that this be given to the City. She explained that "right-of-way" is defined as a strip of land. Therefore, the water is not considered a right-of-way.

Mr. Howington asked staff if there was any discussion on the parking lot or the screening in front of the parking lot along River Street.

Ms. Ward said her understanding is that this is not to be developed as a parking lot; but is to be redeveloped for a future development. She believes, however, that the property owner is present and can speak to this. Presently, nothing has been approved.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Huntington said Ms. Ward has already touched on a lot of the points, but he just wanted to reiterate and clarify the site move. He explained that there is a 20-foot utility easement along the front of the property. The right-of-way is actually in the road and the curve is outside of the right-of-way. Therefore, taking the easement from the right-of-way and setting it back 20 feet is where they are restricted to have the face of their building. From the face of the building to the curve, they will have approximately a 17 to 18 feet sidewalk in the front. By shifting it back, created a pinch point. If they are going to provide a 15 foot wide river walk, it would get pinched on about six to seven feet wide. Therefore, to eliminate the pinch point, the building was shifted five feet to the west and 20 feet further to the east to allow future through access.

The razed building, since there is a flood plain requirement, is somewhat a challenge that they have been working on. Mr. Huntington said he understands the staff's concern regarding making this look like it is not just on a three foot razed platform and try to incorporate this in the design of the building to try to hide this in a sense. This is why they have tried to take the building materials down. They placed the ramp in the front with a type of industrial steel type railings to possibly hide the razed platform. Having the building razed three feet, they are providing access for pedestrians to enter into the building mainly focusing on having the ADA ramps. This is the elevation that faces River Street. Therefore, the pedestrians can come on River Street and have direct access into the building. They have the steps to access in the front and steps to access to the side patio.

Mr. Huntingdon said regarding the background on this project, they met with staff early December, 2011 and received feedback. They presented their concept design to have discussion with the staff. They made some modifications to the design and then made their formal submittal for the meeting today. Since that time, they have received the staff's comments and have met with the site plan review and have gotten their comments, which was more about building placement. They also have met with the Historic Savannah Foundation and received their feedback. They are here now showing the Board some of the design elements they are considering. He said taking this back to the historical nature of the site is difficult in a sense since there has been about three or four different things here at certain time. What do they go back to? Mr. Huntingdon said he believes on the eight page report, the first page shows a shack-style that was directly on the river. This is similar to what they are trying to reflect around the veranda and the patio with a shed style

roof with the piers that comes down on the actual three feet rized platform; carrying this around on the side and along the back; having the river here and putting the patio seating out. They are trying to have this rap all the way around. Everything on the south side of River Street is warehouse style, brick buildings, three stories high. Therefore, trying to emulate this on a portion of the building; have the warehouse-style look, along with the gable roof, pitch roof and the shed-style look and combining this with the warehouse style which is predominate along River Street and looking at some of the photos they found in the historic records. Mr. Huntingdon said the design process works with the site layout. With regard to the floor plan, the entrance faces the street. Obviously, a warehouse-style building and trying to make it function as a restaurant, they have the service yard, freezer coolers, kitchen and the restrooms and trying to contain this on the site, have the warehouse aspect look and utilize the tall parapet height and the flat roof at this location; and where to locate the HVAC and condenser units; expand the dining. As you walk into the building, the hostess stand, bar area in the front, the dining room goes out onto the patio on the north and east side and the view of the river from the patio on the east side of the property.

Mr. Huntingdon said they have received the staff's comments and a lot of them are things that they can work with as far as adding solids to voids ratio and redoing some windows. They do not have any issues with these. They can work with the height of the building. He understands the staff's concerns of a two-story to one-story and how they relate to each other. They accept the staff's comments and are willing to work with staff and the Historic Review Board. If there is a continuance to the next meeting for the Height and Mass, Part I, they ask that they be permitted to talk about the materials for Part II as well, rather than wait an additional month just to start talking about this. As Ms. Ward has reported, the materials of this building are an important aspect to the "look" of the building and how it all correlates since they are trying to mesh back the historical nature of the site. They will work with staff on some revised elements. They are only trying to be expeditious with requesting that the materials for Part II be held at the next meeting.

Dr. Henry stated that it appears to him that Mr. Huntingdon does not want to remove the ramp. Is this correct?

Mr. Huntingdon answered no; he was only giving the explanation as to why they put the ramp in that location. Pedestrians walk along the corridor and mainly they considered that a lot of the traffic would be coming from the west side of River Street; and anything passed this would be the park and the Marriott Hotel. With knowing where everybody is coming from, they could come in and get to the front of the building. This is the reason they put the ramp in this general location. If this is something that the staff has an issue with and does not want it in the front, they can come up with a different location for the ramp. Obviously, putting the ramp on the service side is not an option because they don't want to take it to the kitchen. As he stated, he was only explaining why they put the ramp where it is.

Mr. Judson said he appreciates Mr. Huntingdon's flexibility in working with the staff. As they all are aware, this is too much for them to try to resolve today.

Ms. Ramsay explained to Mr. Huntingdon that he needs to ask for the continuance, but before he does, the Board will hear comments from the public.

Mr. Huntingdon stated that he understood, but as he has aforesaid, it would be beneficial to him if Part II could be considered at the next meeting to get the dialog started on this instead of waiting to come another month later.

Ms. Ramsay informed Mr. Huntingdon that the Board could consider Part I and II at the same meeting.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Huntingdon if he would be looking at the area where some of the service and restroom areas are located.

Mr. Huntingdon stated that as he has said, they are taking a warehouse look and making it function as a restaurant. A lot of the buildings on the south side of River Street did not have the front and back facing the public right-of-way. Therefore, everything they have in the back of the building is just purely service and there are really no voids and openings. Since they have the restrooms back here, they are adding some voids.

Ms. Simpson stated she has not completely researched warehouse buildings, but she knows that there are buildings with higher windows. However, she does not know the compatibility in terms specifically for River Street and the warehouse buildings for these types of windows.

Mr. Huntingdon said he understood what was being said about getting something back here to clear up some of the void space. As he has said, this is something they will look into and discuss with staff. He said that Shawn Ray of the Ignite Restaurant Group is present also. Mr. Ray is representative for Joe's Crab Shack.

Mr. Ray stated that he is the vice-president of construction and development for Ignite Restaurant Group. The Board may not be familiar with this name as it is their parent name. They have two concepts-- Joe's Crab Shack which is the more prominent of the two concepts and then they have also created a new concept approximately four years ago called Brick House Tavern and Tap. They have approximately 17 of these units across the country. Joe's Crab Shack has approximately 120 restaurants across the U.S. They are privately held and spun-off from Landry's Restaurant Group in 2006. They are very excited about the opportunity to be in Savannah and more importantly, in this unique corridor. Obviously, being a seafood restaurant, they really strive to find locations on the water. They know the significance and history of the Savannah River and this is why this project intrigued them. But, they also realize that this is the historic district and this will be a very unique structure for them. As Mr. Huntingdon has said, they have been working with the staff for approximately three to four months trying to come up with what was presented today. They obviously fell short of expectations on some of the ideas, but as both Ms. Ward and Mr. Huntingdon has stated, they want to be flexible; want to be in this community; and be a part of the lifestyle in Savannah. They are willing to look at a couple of different options.

Mr. Ray said he wanted to present a few things today so that the Board will have an understanding of the direction that they might go based on the comments that staff has presented. He felt basically the two largest hang-ups as far as the overall design are the handicap ramp coming off of River Street obscuring a large portion of the front facade and the attempt to try to make this look like three separate structures. He said they

believed they were headed in a direction that staff could support and that it would also be approved internally, but given the size of the building as it relates to the number of structures they were trying to replicate, it appears to be too much. Therefore, they have discussed going to a more warehouse structure basically carrying this facade across and stopping it at the entry; create more punch-through windows and provide the proper ratios for these structures and then allow the shed-type roof which was seen in the historical photos, using the facade to maintain the second section of the building. Mr. Ray said they will greatly simplify the structure, create more uniformity with the warehouse and the shed structure. This would also allow them to go back and place the handicap ramp on the east side of the property. A door would be placed in the side of the warehouse structure to allow the handicap access. Based on the comments Mr. Huntingdon has gotten from some of the other groups and staff, he believes this would help to address some of the concerns. He appreciates the fact that this Board has approved for Phase I and Phase II to be combined so that they are able to continue moving this project forward.

Mr. Ray said he wanted to get some feedback from the Board that if these changes are made, would this be something that they could move forward with and try to gain consensus on the design so they could continue this process.

Ms. McClain asked if the handicap ramp would be in the back or a side entry.

Mr. Ray answered that it would be on the east side of the building. Instead of taking the front facade which is so prominent along River Street, they would actually allow it to become part of the side patio, but in a future time, another structure will be constructed here. They feel this would be a better use of the space because if another building is built here, the seating areas here do not become as important as the ones in the back by the river.

Ms. McClain asked Mr. Ray what prevents putting a smaller ramp in front of the entry door and why the ramp has to be so long.

Mr. Ray answered that a part of it is actually the slope that is required for the handicap ramp. There is a very minimal slope that you must have for wheelchair access. Because the building has to be built up approximately three feet to meet the flood plain codes, they will have a ramp of significant length. Originally, when they met with staff, they had the ramp switching back and forth in another area and it came off the street and switched back, then up and eventually came to the front door. But, this was too confusing and too complicated. Therefore, they opted for a long ramp with a landing and another landing at the top before getting into the entrance of the restaurant. However, this does cause some conflict with the elevations and with the service yard being on the west side, the only other opportunity for them to meet the ADA accessibility is to come on the east side.

Dr. Henry said he agrees with the solution about the ramp, but he does not see what is proposed for the roof on the right-hand side. Will this roof be flattened?

Mr. Ray answered yes; basically the warehouse structure would take over the entry and where there is a shed structure, the roof would flatten out and will basically blend into the warehouse portion at the end.

Dr. Henry questioned if it would be the same height as the one on the left.

Mr. Ray answered no; it will be lower.

Mr. Howington asked if the double gables would be eliminated on the end.

Mr. Ray said this is a possibility, but it is something they would have to look at further once they get deeper into the design. Since this is the east side of the building, they know eventually another structure will be constructed adjacent to them. Therefore, some of the architectural elements may lose some focus as the development goes further.

Mr. Judson said the Board has discussed that the petitioner could present Part I and II on the same date, but Mr. Ray said combine the two. He just wanted the petitioner to know, however, that this would still be two separate submissions. The Board considers Part I, Height and Mass, and Part II, Design Details.

Mr. Ray stated that as long as both are held on the same date, they will submit accordingly.

Dr. Williams said given that the east side outdoor seating, or at least a part of it, may be eliminated due to a building being constructed in the future, he was curious why the petitioner, who has characterized the north elevation as valuable river view frontage, is proposing that the restrooms take up approximately thirty-five percent (35%) of the frontage. He asked if the north/west corner of the building could be rotated especially since the entire building has been moved eastward 20 feet. Is there any room to play with the pinch point and move some of the restrooms on the right hand side of the elevation about ninety degrees (90⁰) and push them south along the west elevation to give more porch space over-looking the river?

Mr. Ray said they can look at some options, but the theory behind the floor plan obviously is that one of the requirements is that the building be perpendicular to the river and to the road. Therefore, since this is a restaurant, they will have a significant portion of the building that will be the back of house and the thought process was rather than take up additional space and limit the view through the balance of the dining room, to house the restrooms on the same side as the kitchen and service area. When they do this, they end up with a movie house theory. Mr. Ray said he believes they can come up with some ideas to create some openings and change the facade, but ultimately, the restrooms have to go somewhere and he would rather have them on the service side of the building so that they can continue to have the dining room somewhere else.

Mr. Ray said there are some options and they will address them.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Ardis Wood said if she goes into this restaurant, she wants a seat facing the water, but she heard that an area will be blocked.

Mr. Patrick Shay of Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay Architects stated that he was present on behalf of Ms. Ann West, an adjacent property owner. He believes the staff has done a great

job in pulling out all the things that relate specifically to the guidelines. However, he wanted to address some of the larger issues of appropriateness. The pedestrian level views of the Savannah River has been something that he has treated as sacred since the river walk was constructed in the 1970s. This alters the character of River Street forever; it was industrial before this, not even paved as it was a mud street. But, after this it became one of the most important tourist and pedestrian destinations in the southeastern United States. Approximately eleven and one-half million people visited Savannah and took a walk along River Street last year. One thing that concerns them about the proposed design is that it shows approximately 120 feet of unbroken building mass on that side of the river, which means for the pedestrians that are going by will lose sight of the fact that they are on the Savannah River. They will be between two buildings and will not be able to see the river. He had the opportunity as an architect and as a spectator in this hearing room to listen to great controversy over some of the buildings that have been allowed to be built on the north side of River Street. It has always been strongly encouraged to be longer on the north/south access than they are on the east/west and to be as transparent as possible so that the pedestrians walking along River Street will always remember and be reminded that they are on the Savannah River. Ordinarily, they don't have the providence over sidewalks and streetscapes per se because they are usually located within the rights-of-way of the City of Savannah. In this particular case, however, he believes it is good to note that all those pedestrian sidewalks and improvements will be on private property and in the easement area that has been described as being 10 or 20 feet deep.

Mr. Shay said he wanted to encourage this Board that as they look at all the buildings that are in the National Landmark District and in the Historic District Zoning Ordinance to ensure that they are very pedestrian friendly and pedestrian activated and that they give at least as much attention to this location as they do all the others, because this is the most important pedestrian passageway in our city and may be in the entire southeast. They have talked somewhat about the ramp, but a site plan has not been presented to the Historic Review Board that actually shows them in context how people move on both sides of River Street through this area. It has been presented as a building, perhaps as it should, but the context of how it meets the street and how pedestrians move, as he has said, has not been presented. Since most of the motion will be done on private property within the easement, he believes this Board has the right and responsibility to ensure that this is high performance just as was done with the buildings that are immediately to the west. There is really an important concept here of precedence.

Mr. Shay said there are two huge tracts of river front land that will come into play for development in the near future. Both are owned by Georgia Power. He believes they need to be careful because this is coming first, that it doesn't become the new low standard for what is allowed in these areas. He would not want the next architect to come before this Board and say (could be him) "you allowed a 120 feet of unbroken frontage in the middle of River Street, so why would you not allow this on either the east or west end?" Mr. Shay said he wants this Board to hold the same high standards for this development as they hold all the locals who come forward and present designs. His client, Ms. Ann West, went through a very rigorous process to decide what she could and could not do with her building on the other side of the street. Mr. Lee Meyer also went through several meetings trying to see what would be permitted to the west of this site. River Street is the most visited destination within our community.

Mr. Shay said he realizes that we have a mile and one-half long plaza that invites millions

of people to visit that says make it look somewhat industrial, but if this was an existing building this would be an interesting standard to hold this to, but for new construction he wonders if they want to allow what has been described as shack architecture on our River front. Although the Savannah River is not a right-of-way, he guessed sections of the Savannah River Walk are not rights-of-way as they are not over a strip of land, they have created a very interesting place that has become a postcard view.

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) thanked the petitioner for attending their Architectural Review Committee meeting on yesterday. Mr. Carey said the meeting was very constructive and they offered a number of comments to the petitioners and he believes they were amenable to them. The HSF is hopefully that the petitioners will come back and meet with them again for further discussion. He is happy to see the petitioners' recognition of the uniqueness of Savannah and that they want to be a part of our community. This is very important in terms of establishing the context for this restaurant. What the HSF sees more than anything else is somewhat a collision or clash of designs, themes, and shapes. The rectangular shape along River Street is the dominant shape and should remain so. While he understands that there are some gable shape structures nearby, including Market Place, he does not know if they are necessarily or should be the context as much as may be the more direct linear forms that are along River Street. However, he heard what the petitioner has said about perhaps changing this. Mr. Carey said this would be an improvement. However, generally, they would be more in favor of an industrial feel. There is certainly an opportunity for new, fresh design, but they have to struggle with the visual compatibility test. This is a very difficult line to walk, but he would not want to remove from consideration or remove from play the notion of really fresh, new designs. This is a lot to digest, but may be the petitioners can consider this. Mr. Carey said he knows the petitioners are on a timetable; but the petitioners have chosen to be in Savannah (they could probably put a restaurant of this type anywhere) and obviously this city appeals to them; to the extent that the petitioners can respect Savannah's designs, community, history and traditions would be welcomed.

Mr. Carey said the HSF is in agreement with the staff report and the comments that have been made. The HSF wants to provide as much constructive criticism as they can. As he has said, the HSF is pleased and willing to work off line with the architect of this project and try to come up with something that they believe will work better on this site and not result in a building that seems to be serving several masters and not really doing the proper service to anyone.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Simpson stated that because of the location of this project she thought that an individual would be able to see the river when on the inside of this restaurant.

Dr. Williams stated that one of the curious things about River Street is that historically it has been a somewhat schizophrenic street with the tall warehouse rectilinear box type warehouses five and six stories tall along the south side and significantly lower (usually wood), but even when brick as you can see in this historic photo some of the old structures were brick and had gable roofs. Gable roofs structures were more prevalent than box-type elements like the north side. Therefore, the two sheds that are to the immediate west when they were designed, were evoking the open sided sheds that were prevalent in

this area. He understands that the back side of a restaurant has to have some utilitarian component, but there is a great opportunity here to make this structure more transparent and more in keeping with the north section. Dr. Williams said he understood the history of the north side of River Street as being a series of open sided river sheds. If they review the Sanborn, this is the prevailing typology on this side of the street. Therefore, the south side should not be used as the model, but look at the history of the north side which could provide some of the needed transparency.

Mr. Howington stated that the gables he saw were on the brick and he believes there is a precedence for this. The variation is nice. But, he does not believe that the double gables are necessarily a precedent. The River Street side is important and the massing of the gable is important to the industrial straight line.

Dr. Williams said he believes that what Mr. Howington is saying is that the pairs of gables that are arranged on the east side are too much and are out of character of this area.

Mr. Howington said this applies to the front gable too. With all the glass, he does not think this is necessarily a detail for River Street.

Mr. Huntingdon stated that he appreciates the feedback. He understood what the Board said about the post going all the way to the ground. He said this is what they were trying to reflect with the posts, but not take them all the way to the ground, but to the platform because they are raised. In looking at the Market Place shops and trying to do something similar to this aspect on the front, but the understanding is this is just an open structure that is a market and not a restaurant use. Mr. Huntingdon stated he has the understanding that the Board prefers the gables and the wood on the north side.

Dr. Williams stated that the building on the left is an existing shed and would serve as a better model than the red brick bulky warehouse element that has been proposed to increase as the dominant element. This appears that there are two buildings lodged together as opposed to one harmonious building.

Mr. Huntingdon said there is a lot to consider on the north side as far as what actually is historic. In looking at what they have here and some of the other examples, this is outdated as it is 1960s with one story gable roof. A brick gable roof with some punched openings has been mentioned. Consequently, they have been trying to marry the two, but he guessed now they need to get to a point where they understand what they need to be coming back to the Board with. Should it be geared more towards everything on the south side of the street as squared warehouse style buildings and try to marry this with the veranda as what is here now; or should it be more pushing towards what is seen on the east side of the building?

Dr. Henry said he would be satisfied with a flat or peak roof. But, it should be a broad peak.

Mr. Huntingdon stated that as Mr. Ray mentioned, on the east side whether than having such a steep gable here they can flatten this out and at the same time address the other concern about having the one-story building too tall. The height of the roof could be dropped down and flatten it.

Dr. Henry said he believes it needs a general simplification.

Mr. Huntington requested a continuance to the March 14, 2012 meeting for Part I with the condition that they can also submit their request for Part II to be heard at this same meeting.

Board Action:

Continue to the meeting of March 14, 2012 at the petitioner's request. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Judson

Second: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

10. [Petition of Doug Bean for Doug Bean Signs Inc. | H-12-4580-2 | 309 West Congress Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Doug Bean was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Brittany Bryant gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a projecting principal sign for the new business "Allure" at 309 West Congress Street. Ms. Bryant stated that since the publication of the staff report, the petitioner has done some revisions to his initial request which have been provided to the Board in their packets today. Initially, the petitioner requested a sign bracket, but they are now asking for a style bracket as shown on the monitor.

Ms. Bryant reported that staff recommends approval for the principal use projecting sign with the condition that the sign is relocated to reduce crowding along the facade and any changes in the awning is submitted to staff for final approval.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bean stated he was in agreement with the staff report. He entertained questions from

the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approval for the principal use projecting sign at 309 West Congress Street with the condition that the sign is relocated to reduce crowding along the facade as amended at the meeting and any change in the awning is submitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Brian Judson

Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

11. [Amended Petition of Joe Stryker for Smallwood, Reynolds, Stewart & Associates | H-10-4323\(S\)-2 | 22 Barnard Street | Louvers](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4323\(S\)-2 Amended 1-9-12 22 Barnard St..pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

12. [Amended Petition of Keith Howington for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4424\(S\)-2 | 208 Bull Street | Louvered Shutters](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4424\(S\)-2 Amended 1-19-12.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4424\(S\)-2 Amended 1-19-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

13. [Petition of Newfield Construction | H-11-4561\(S\)-2 | 310 West Broughton Street Lane | Door](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4561\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4561\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

14. [Amended Petition of Brian Felder, AIA for Greenline Architecture | H-11-4463-2 | 26 E. Bay St. | Platform](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4463\(S\)-2 Amended 1-31-12.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4463\(S\)-2 Amended 1-31-12.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

15. [Petition of Tim Donahue | H-12-4574\(S\)-2 | 48 East Broad Street | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4574\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4574\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

16. [Petition of Brian Robin | H-12-4575\(S\)-2 | 15 East Taylor Street | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4575\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4575\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

17. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn, Meyerhoff, Shay Architects, PC | H-12-4583\(S\)-2 | 556 East Gordon Street | Repointing](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

18. [Petition of James F. Reardon | H-12-4584\(S\)-2 | 313 West River St. | Color Change, Windows/Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4584\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4584\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Mr. Howington questioned the new fixtures that will be placed here as they appear to be somewhat flimsy.

Ms. Ward explained that the petitioner requested a color change to the stucco area and replacing the storefront doors. They are also replacing some light fixtures. Staff will do a

final inspection on this and will bring a report back to the Board if this is their desire.

No action required. Staff approved.

19. [Petition of John Dodge Meyer | H-12-4585\(S\)-2 | 112 East Jones Street | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4585\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4585\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

20. [Petition of Alan R. Bodman | H-12-4588\(S\)-2 | 225 East President St. | Windows, Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4588\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4588\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

21. [Ventilation Duct](#)

Ms. Ward reported that one item was brought to staff's attention last month which was the ventilation duct that was installed behind the Subdog's on Broughton Street. The mechanical work was approved as a part of an environmental review that was done for Section 106. The documentation reviewed by staff revealed that nothing was being done on the exterior. Mike Rose, City Building Inspector, told staff that they did the final inspection on the mechanical and nothing was on the exterior. This was summer of 2011. The ventilation duct has been installed since this time. Mr. Rose has informed staff that they will look into this matter.

Mr. Merriman asked staff about the wooden fence.

Ms. Ward stated that she received a call this morning. She was told that an application will be submitted. Hopefully this issue will come to the Board in March. If staff does not receive the application by the deadline date, hopefully, the inspector will issue a citation.

Ms. Ward reported that the last couple of weeks have been bad concerning the awning at 144 Lincoln Street. She informed the Board that the Judge issued a grace period for the awning to remain up until August 6 for some sort of resolution to be attained.

Mr. Thomson said he attended the hearing regarding the Lincoln Street sign. The judge, with all due respect, should be saying comply with the rules. The judge listened to the argument of the other party. Mr. Thomson said his perspective is about complying with the

rules, but the judge's perspective is about compromising. Therefore, he believes this particular case was an arbitration hearing. This makes it difficult because the petitioner pointed out a couple other awnings in the area that did not meet the standards for the zoning in this area. However, staff has not had an opportunity to research this, but in this is the case, the judge questioned why deny this petitioner the letters and logo when there are other properties that have logos and letters in the same vicinity.

Mr. Thomson said he believes this makes the staff's and the City's job even more important to go out and cite everybody. Therefore, they may be put in a position that they may have to say that the petitioner may put his logo on the building because his neighbor has one down the street. He believes that this is how the others got there in the beginning. He said he does not know what to do about this situation. Maybe they need 1500 signatures on a petition that ends up in the newspaper to make a difference. He realizes this is frustrating for the staff in trying to implement the ordinance in a fair and consistent manner.

Mr. Gay asked if the judge said a compromise will be worked out.

Mr. Thomson said the judge is looking for a compromise. She put this off into the future, six months, to see if they could come up with something. However, he believes the compromise is please follow the rule. He said they offered options for the owner, but it costs more money. The owner wants an advertisement on his building. He wants people to see where he is and wants the awning with the logo and cross (this is a medical facility) on it. Ms. Ward has done the research and offered the sign that has been approved previously on the building for different offices. But, the owner does not want to spend the money for the sign.

Mr. Merriman asked why nothing has been done regarding the signs pointed out by the petitioner.

Ms. Ward explained that staff has to look into this. The signs may be so old that they are grandfathered in. The sign that Mr. Thomson spoke of is recent within the last five years. Staff and enforcement have changed. The enforcement now is much better than it was five years ago. She said in reviewing the permits a lot of times things will come to the Board or staff for review and they were not reviewing the sign ordinance, but only visual compatibility. Then it went to permitting and they assumed that since the Board reviewed it that it must be okay. Things such as this were happening in the past, but now we are really trying to close all of these gaps and be more effective in enforcing the ordinance. She believes that the petitioner is only throwing up "smoke" regarding the things that are in this area; this does not mean that the laws do not apply to him.

Mr. Judson saluted the staff for being proactive in trying to identify all the other offenders; and he should be making this argument in front of the judge, but basically the logic would follow is why should we prosecute this murderer we caught if these three other murderers managed to escape capture.

Ms. Ward said only the zoning administrator said this is an issue for another day as they were here to look at this. However, the petitioner really has the judge listening to him.

Dr. Henry asked which judge is hearing this.

Ms. Ward answered Judge Clara Cornwell Williams.

XI. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF

XII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

22. [Next Meeting - Wednesday March 14, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

23. [HDBR Filing Fees - Effective January 2012](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Fee Schedule - Updated January 2012.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Application-2012-updated fees.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay reported that the Board has been given the revised fee schedule.

24. [Spring 2012 Historic Preservation Commission Training, March 30-31 in Valdosta, Georgia](#)

Attachment: [March 2012 HPC Training Memo.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay reported that the Historic Preservation Commission training will be held in Valdosta, Georgia March 30-31, 2012.

Ms. Ward encouraged all the Board members to attend, if possible. MPC will pay for one Board member to attend the training. It would be good to send a Board member that has never attended the training. It is required that all members at some point attend the training. Therefore, through the course of the Board members service, they all would have received the training.

Ms. Ramsay stated that she has attended training.

Mr. Judson said he, too, has attended the training. He recommended that someone who has served on the Board for a while, nothing against the new members, might get more out of the training. He attended the training approximately three years ago and it was very beneficial.

Ms. Ward stated that Mr. Johnson and Mr. Engle attended the training last year.

Ms. Ramsay informed the Board members to notify Ms. Ward regarding attending the training.

Ms. Ward said if anyone is interested in attending the training, to let her know in advance as registration is not allowed on site. As soon as she receives

the brochure regarding the hotels, etc., she will send it to the Board.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

25. [Draft of amended HDBR Bylaws and Procedural Manual](#)

Attachment: [DRAFT PROCEDURAL MANUAL and BYLAWS-2012.pdf](#)

Ms. Ramsay said the Board has received a copy of the draft of amended HDBR Bylaws and Procedure Manual. She asked what does the Board need to do in order to adopt this.

Ms. Ward explained that according to the bylaws and procedures, the Board cannot vote on the document at this meeting. She asked the Board members to review the document and if they see something that needs to be corrected and so forth, to advise the staff so that a final draft could be presented at the next meeting to be voted on.

Ms. Ward stated that due to the quantity of work going on presently, she has not put together a proposal of new meeting dates if the Board wanted to go to the three weeks schedule. This will affect the bylaws. However, she did not get a lot of feedback from the Board if this is something that they really want to pursue. But, she was to draft a memo to the Board for them to look at the dates. Ms. Ward said she will try to have this for the Board at their March 14 meeting. She recommended that the Board go ahead without the three week meeting dates and if this something that they want to pursue, they can look at this later.

Ms. Ramsay reported that the house on the corner of Gaston and Drayton Streets has appealed the Board's decision. The Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) meeting is February 28, 2012 at 2:30 p.m. She encouraged the Board members who are able to attend the ZBA meeting, to please do so.

Ms. Ramsay stated as she understood, the petitioner can only appeal this Board on procedural errors or abuse of discretion. Therefore, in effect, the petitioner is saying that this Board either abused its discretion or made a procedure error.

Mr. Merriman said "abuse and discretion" sound vague.

Mr. Thomson explained that this has always been somewhat "cloudy" for them. Ms. Ward said it correctly, the petitioner has the right to appeal whether they are right or correct about appeal or not, it is up to the Zoning Board of Appeals

and staff to say this is the evidence they will hear or the decision they can make. The question he would ask between now and then in working with Jack Butler, if they appeal on the abuse of discretion -- let's face it; it is either a wall or a fence. The ZBA could find in favor of the person appealing. But, then the question becomes, "Who decides whether it is sent back to this Board with instructions to reconsider it or whether the ZBA can say whatever the petitioner is wanting is okay. Mr. Thomson said may be City Attorney Blackburn's help may be needed on this matter.

Mr. Merriman stated that this Board already approved one version of what they wanted which is waiting. The petitioner can go ahead with that approval.

Mr. Gay said the Board approved one request, but the petitioner came back and said they did not like that request.

Mr. Merriman said the petitioner has been before this Board three times.

New Business

26. [Petition of Clay Branson for Costal Canvas Product | H-12-4587\(S\)-2 | 300 West Bay Street | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Site Visit Photographs.pdf](#)

Ms. Ward stated that staff received two petitions for awnings in the Historic District. As the Board knows, awnings are usually reviewed by staff. However, the staff was not comfortable with approving the two awnings as presented. Staff asked the petitioner to modify their submittal. The petitioner, however, asked that this petition be heard by the Board. When the petitioner asked this, the public notice requirement had already past.

Ms. Ward said the Board can only discuss the items today, but not vote on them. Staff is ready to act on the petitions tomorrow. If the Board is okay with the requests as submitted, the staff can uphold and approve them, but the staff is not comfortable with approving them as submitted without the support of the Board. There are a few modifications that staff would like to see in order to meet the standards and be compatible. Ms. Ward stated that Ms. Bryant would give the report to the Board.

Ms. Bryant reported the petitioner is requesting approval for a new ground supported awning at 300 West Bay Street. Typically, staff does not approve ground support awnings. This type of awning is brought before the Board. This is staff's initial issue of this awning. The proposed awning is 14 feet-eight and

half inches long and maintain a vertical clearance of nine feet-two inches at its lowest point. The other issue staff has with this proposal is that the awning will feature a three color fabric scheme of Coastline Plus fabric "Dawn, Gull Gray and Bone." The awning will be minimally visible from Bay Street elevation; however, it will be visible from the Montgomery Street elevation.

Ms. Ward clarified that staff does not have a problem with the ground supported awning at this location, but normally this is more substantial and staff brings this to the Board. She explained that the staff concern is really with the striped awning fabric and staff would like for the petitioner to use one solid color as oppose to the multi-colors.

Ms. Simpson asked if there was an example that the Board could see.

Ms. Ward said the building is not historic; therefore, there is not a lot of examples of this building type. The only exterior stair like this would be like a metal fire escape stairs. Therefore, this is why she says the staff does not have a concern with the awning, itself, because the building is not historic it is in the courtyard. But, the staff's concern is the fabric. The awning company is present and if the Board had a question regarding this, they could provide answers.

Ms. Simpson said she could not think of this being at another hotel in another city.

Mr. Gay said they are talking about ten or twelve feet going up. May be it would be a hardship on persons getting rained on or the sun.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes what she is hearing is that all ground supported awnings should come to the Board for review and consideration. Therefore, what she would like to do if the petitioner wants to move forward with the ground supported awning, put it on the agenda for the next month's hearing so that the Board can have a discussion and open it up for public comment.

Ms. Ramsay stated this would be appropriate and would allow the Board the opportunity to go by the site and see how visible the awning would be.

27. [Petition of Clay Branson for Coastal Canvas | H-12-4586-2 | 211 West River Street | Awning](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Ms. Bryant reported that the proposal for this awning is to extent across the storefront and provide coverage to the principle entry and the two punched openings. The proposed awning will project thirty-six inches from the building facade and be one hundred and sixteen inches wide. It will be covered in Coastline Plus fabric powered black and feature a twelve inch gold line of

lettering. There was some confusion as this is Savannah Gifts, which is the applicant. But, they actually want the awning to read, "Land and Sea." Typically, staff no longer approves this style of awning that expands across multi-bays since the adoption of the Preservation Standards which recommends that awnings be used in the bays that they are covering and not expand across the storefront. This is why staff is bringing this to the Board. Ms. Bryant reported, however, that the owner of the business would like to move forward with this style of awning.

Mr. Gay said the name is so long. Therefore, they could not get it over the door.

Dr. Williams said he was looking at an awning that covers just the door where the neighboring property is located. He asked how old is the photo.

Ms. Bryant answered that staff got the photo off of SAGIS and there was no date on it.

Dr. Williams said it appears that an awning is only over the door of the neighboring property which suggests that this would be the best solution.

Ms. Ward said the staff's recommendation is if the petitioner wanted to pursue this at staff level, staff would deny it; then the petitioner to appeal this to the Board. Staff has to take action within forty-five days. If the petitioner wishes to bring this forward for public hearing, they can do so or amend their application to do two individual awnings over the window and door as the staff has recommended.

Dr. Henry stated that he has been reading about the mausoleum in Bonaventure Cemetery. He asked if the passing of the Unified Zoning Ordinance would stop this.

Mr. Thomson answered no. After listening, watching and hearing, he decided that perhaps they should act. He brought a memo directing Ms. Ellen Harris since she is in charge of the Chatham County Resource Protection Commission and the Chatham County Historic Preservation Commission to engage the membership of these commissions and others to look at what they can make to the ordinance to address this type situation in the future. Mr. Thomson believes it will be some type of overlay. He said that Ms. Harris gave him the following example: If there was a national historic designation on Bonaventure and they created a local designation on Bonaventure and extended it outside to some area and had visual compatibility standards, then the person coming in with the mausoleum proposal would trigger the review and then it would be evaluated. However, would someone be allowed to build a mausoleum in exactly the same place, he was guessing "yes" even with visual compatibility standards. But, at least there would have been a dialog where the public would have had an opportunity to make comments. He has asked the staff to work with the interested people to see what options we have. Maybe

six months from now, they will have something to talk about.

Dr. Henry said he had a neighbor that tried to cut down a significant live oak in their back yard. He assumed that they can do this.

Mr. Thomson explained that if the tree is on private property, they can do so. However, they looked at the Savannah Tree Foundation approximately four or five years ago about having a "grand tree ordinance" where species could be identified. He comes from an area that had a live oak grand tree ordinance. There were certain dimensions and so forth that when a private property had this kind of tree, they could not do anything to it without a permit.

Mr. Tiras Petrea, City Zoning Inspector, stated that he has seen several cases where the judge has fined parties for the cost of the removal, if they killed it and pay for the replacement value as determined by the Park & Tree Department or a third party consultant. Unfortunately, this is something that has gone through the court system if it is in the right-of-way.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

28. [Adjourned](#)

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Historic Preservation Director

SPW:mem

which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.