



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
August 14, 2013, 1:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**AUGUST 14, 2013 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Linda Ramsay, Chair  
Zena McClain, Esq., Parliamentarian  
Reed Engle  
Dr. Nicholas Henry  
Keith Howington  
T. Jerry Lominack  
Stephen Merriman, Jr.  
Marjorie Weibe-Reed  
Robin Williams, Ph.D

**HDRB Member Not Present:** Ebony Simpson, Vice-Chair

**MPC Staff Present:** Tom Thomson, Executive Director  
Ellen Harris, Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation  
Leah G. Michalak, Historic Preservation Planner  
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant  
Jessica Archer, Preservation Intern  
Alyson Smith, Preservation Intern

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

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

**Ms. Ramsay** called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and welcomed every one in attendance.

**II. SIGN POSTING**

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

2. [Petition of Trey and Deanne Skinner | 13-003253-COA | 318 East Broughton Street | Fence/Wall Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval for alteration to the previously approved wall at 318 East Broughton Street as submitted because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

3. [Petition of Bill Norton for Sign Mart | 13-003729-COA | 2 West Broughton Street | After-the-Fact Fascia Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use fascia sign as requested and approval of the under awning sign with the condition that it be raised six inches to meet the eight foot minimum height clearance required. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain

4. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa - Signs for Minds | 13-003763-COA | 303 West River Street | Projecting Sign](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use projecting sign as requested because it meets the preservation, design, and sign standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

5. [Petition of John Neely | 13-003844-COA | 545 East York Street | Fascia Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use fascia sign as requested because it meets the sign standards, and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
------------	-------

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 13-003847-COA | 19 East River Street | Projecting Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use projecting sign as requested because it meets the preservation, design, and sign standards and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

7. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 13-003848-COA | 10 East Broughton Street | Projecting Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use projecting sign as requested because it meets the design and sign standards, and is visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

8. [Petition of Doug Beans Signs | 13-003851-COA | 125 West River Street | Fascia Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use fascia sign with the condition that the sign be relocated to be not less than one foot (1') from the western edge of the building. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: T. Jerry Lominack	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

9. [Approve Agenda](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve August 14, 2013 Meeting Agenda. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

10. [Approve Minutes of July 10, 2013](#)

Attachment: [07-10-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

The minutes of July 10, 2013 were continued to the September 11, 2013 meeting. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

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

**VII. CONTINUED AGENDA**

11. [Petition of Megan Nelson | 13-003576-COA | 301 Williamson Street | After-the-Fact Fence/Wall](#)

**Board Action:**

Continue to September 11, 2013. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

12. [Petition of Hill / Gray Seven, LLC | 13-003840-COA | 540 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Alterations, Addition, Fence, and Signs](#)

**Board Action:**

Continue to the Meeting of September 11, 2013. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: Reed Engle

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Aye

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Not Present

Robin Williams - Aye

**VIII. REGULAR AGENDA**

13. [Petition of Anthony D. Hampton | 13-001767-COA | 532 East Taylor Street | Alterations and Additions](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Contributing Building Map - Davis Ward.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Looking North.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- application and description.pdf](#)

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

**Mr. Hampton** was present on behalf of the petition. Mr. Cowart along with the members of the Young Architects Forum accompanied Mr. Hampton.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations and to add a second story to the one-story structure at 532 East Taylor Street.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommend approval of Part I, Height and Mass of the new two-story addition (reviewed as new construction due to its size) as submitted. Staff further recommends approval of Part II, Design Details, with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final approval with the construction drawings:

1. Extend the siding to the foundation and maintain the stucco foundation.
2. Replace the brick stairs with poured concrete or wooden stairs.

**Ms. Harris** entertained questions from the Board.

**Dr. Williams** asked how would leaving the hardiplank be a true reflection of the evolution of the building in the same way that raised historic buildings that were originally covered in wood, and upon being raised had some other material below.

**Ms. Harris** answered that she asked herself this same question which led to another question which was then would it not also be true to leave the concrete block un-stuccoed to reflect the original appearance of the building. She said, however, at that point she thought if they are going to recommend stucco over the concrete to be more visually compatible, then siding is the most visually compatible to the other existing buildings.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Hampton** came forward and informed the Board that Mr. Cowart and the young architects would be representing him in this petition.

**Mr. Cowart** introduced the following young architects who worked on this project: Shawn Key, Ryan Claus; M. J. Gurett; and Ryan Murphy. He said these young people are architect graduates.

**Mr. Cowart** said that these graduates, the owner and he met all day on Saturday considering the design. He stated Shawn and Ryan produced the architectural drawings and he reviewed the drawings.

**Mr. Cowart** explained that they felt as Dr. Williams feels about the concrete block that it was masonry already and would be more consistent or more honorable on the existing house. Therefore, he asked the Board to give this some serious consideration. They have talked with the owner and builder and they are prepared to put hardiplank down to the top of the foundation, if this is the Board's finding. He said they have no concern about doing the concrete steps and stuccoing them. This is their choice and they will provide this change to the Board as well. He stated that one other thing they changed the Board may have questions about is that the gable is facing the street which is not the way it was when this



was initially submitted. The way the present roof is configured, they decided that they could actually preserve the roof structure and reuse it. Therefore, their intention is to actually raise the existing the roof and ceiling structure to become the new second floor ceiling and roof.

**Mr. Engle** asked if there is no way that they can put windows on the sides. Is it too close to the adjacent property?

**Mr. Cowart** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** stated that he agrees with Dr. Williams that if this was two stories of hardiplank it would be a bleak looking building. He believes that having stucco on the first level of the blocks help to breakup the side elevations. At least there will be two materials and two textures.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked Mr. Cowart if they had plans to score the stucco other than at the extension joints.

**Mr. Cowart** answered no.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** told Mr. Cowart that they have made a lot of progress from where the owner started with this building. She believes they have done a wonderful job.

**Mr. Cowart** said they were considerate of the owners' budget and their intent. He said that the owners appear to be as happy as they are with it.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said she believes that covering the ground floor with stucco would be more in keeping with what existed prior.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** stated again that he agrees with Dr. Williams; the stucco at least reaches the masonry. If they have covered all of the building with hardiplank they would think that they have an old framed building, which they would not. They would have a masonry building that has a second floor added to it. He believes this is a lot more honest and more consistent with the standards. Stucco over block is common all over Savannah. He agrees with Ms. Weibe-Reed that a great job has been done.

**Mr. Lominack** said quite frankly he is disappointed as he was expecting a much more imaginative design solution that enhances concrete block structure rather than trying to be something that it was not.

**Dr. Henry** said he believes that the stucco will look better.

**Mr. Merriman** agreed that he agrees, too, that the stucco will look better. He asked the

Board what was their thought on the stairs. The staff has recommended that they be made of a different material. However, he likes the stairs.

**Board Action:**

Approval of Part I, Height and Mass of the new two-story addition (reviewed as new construction due to its size) as submitted.

Approval of Part II, Design Details, with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final approval with the construction drawings: - PASS  
- Replace the brick stairs with poured concrete or wooden stairs.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Nay
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of Paul Miller | 13-002430-COA | 224 Houston Street | Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Paint color mockup.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Mr. Merriman recused from participation in this petition as he is in talks with the owner about doing some work for this house.**

**Mr. Paul Miller** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of paint color changes to 224 Houston Street. She said that on October 26, 2012, staff approved an after-the-fact color change to the west exterior wall of the non-historic garage which faces the interior courtyard. She said that staff noted in the staff report that "the proposed color is compatible as an interior accent color, but would not be compatible on the entire exterior." The petitioner is now proposing the color on the entire exterior. The petitioner has provided some images of similar colors that are adjacent to their building.

**Ms. Harris** explained that this petition was scheduled to be reviewed by the Board on July 10, 2013, but was continued at the petitioner's request because he was unable to attend the meeting.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff's recommendation includes the following:

1. Approval of the following color changes as requested because they meet the standards and are compatible:
  - a. Window sashes, jambs and sills of all six-over-six wooden windows: SW 7011 "Natural Choice;"
  - b. Fascia, chimneys, basement level wooden doors and cap on courtyard wall column: SW 7645 "Thunder Gray;"
  - c. Gable above garage door: SW 6171 "Chatroom."
2. Denial of the following color change because it does not meet the standards and is not compatible:
  - a. Stucco: Sherwin-Williams SW 6356 "Copper Mountain."

**Ms. Harris** entertained questions from the Board.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff how many times has the Board reviewed this petition.

**Ms. Harris** replied that this is the first time that the petitioner is appearing before the Board for this color change. The petitioner received staff level approval on October 26, 2012. The petition was on last month's agenda, but was continued at the petitioner's request as his flight was delayed in Atlanta and the petitioner was, therefore, unable to attend the meeting.

**Dr. Henry** questioned why the Board was reviewing the color change request. He believed this was usually done at the staff level.

**Ms. Harris** explained that normally color change is done at the staff level, but staff can recommend that anything come before the Board. Because staff was planning denial of this; and instead of having a denial issue and then an appeal of staff's decision, they thought it would be a simpler process to just bring this to the Board for their review.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the color is for the stucco and not the paint color for the building.

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

**Mr. Engle** asked if the existing stucco on the historic building is painted.

**Ms. Harris** answered that it a neutral cream color.

**Mr. Engle** asked [pointing to a section] if the brick over there is just painted where it has been repaired.

**Ms. Harris** answered that she believes the entire rear façade has been painted.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff if this is an after-the-fact request.

**Ms. Harris** said the proposal is not an after-the-fact. The proposal is a current request.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the garage was an after-the-fact request, but it was approved at staff level because it was on the interior part of the courtyard. The staff report noted this because it was essentially an accent color because it was on the interior of the courtyard minimally visible from the public right-of-way that this would be acceptable. But, the staff report specifically noted that it would not be acceptable on the entire building.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked for clarification why the copper color is not compatible. She asked if this is subjective.

**Ms. Harris** answered that she believes all of their visual compatibility factors are subjective to some degree as they all are based on context.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this color does not exist on any stucco buildings downtown.

**Ms. Harris** answered that she believes that when they look at the typical colors for stucco buildings they tend to be more neutral than this proposed color.

**Dr. Williams** said the building that comes closest to his mind is on Barnard Street near Hall Street on the southwest corner. It is a tall four-story building.

**Mr. Engle** said the compatibility color is to be within the adjacent structures, not across town.

**Ms. Harris** stated that it should be compatible to what it is visually related to what is in the vicinity.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked if any photos of adjacent buildings were included in the packets.

**Ms. Harris** showed the Board a photo of a building's rear structure to the east and a building directly to the north. She said there is a vacant lot to the south which will be the McDonough Townhouses that were reviewed at last month's meeting and then a vacant building, which is the immediate context.

**Ms. Harris** said also across the square to the north and west is a building that houses Screaming Mimi and a beer house which is also a brick building. However, she does not have an image of this.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Miller** came forward and said he would answer the Board's questions that they may have about how they selected this color.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked Mr. Miller how did they go about picking this color. Is there some motivation/inspiration?

**Mr. Miller** answered that he and his wife honeymooned in Italy and about three-quarters of the structures in Florence, Venice and Rome where they were, were similar to this

color. He said this was actually their inspiration for the color.

**Dr. Williams** said those cities, especially Rome, have a wide pallet of stucco finish.

**Mr. Miller** stated he wanted to make two points. There is a house at 18 East Jones Street [it is not included in the packet] that their neighbor has just given them a photo of this house a couple of days ago. They confirmed with Sherwin Williams that this house is painted the same color that they are proposing. He said that there is also a house on Taylor Street that features the exact same color. There are several examples of it in the historic district. Mr. Miller said the Board can tell from the photo that the house needs a tremendous amount of stucco repair. They need to do something to waterproof the house and this is the direction that they want to head. Ultimately, their intention is to restucco the building at some point in the future when they decide what they will do with the windows on the front of the house which are historic in nature. They hope to be able to do something with the windows in the near future, but they just need to do something in the meantime.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked Mr. Miller if he understood staff's reason for not wanting this color.

**Mr. Miller** stated that he understood, but he does not know if he agrees with it. He believes it is a wonderful color. Mr. Miller said on Perry Lane there are a couple of houses that are painted dark forest green which is a saturated color and it is beautiful. He believes the house is noteworthy to stand out a little bit.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** stated that the copper color is very subjective. This is a very large building and this color may be a little too dark for the entire property. The HSF feels that if the color was lighter shade of orange, it may be more appropriate.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** stated that his concern is that the Board is getting into paint color. The staff has done a great job in the past on maintaining color. It is subjective and he is concerned that the Board may be getting into color on every project and the Board should not be getting into color. This is not even legal in the other districts. The Historic Landmark District is the only district in Savannah where color is allowed to be taken in consideration by the Board. Therefore, he does not believe that the Board should be dealing with this. He believes that the Board should support the staff in their recommendation. As he had stated, the staff has done a good job with color and he feels that the Board should back off this and support the staff's recommendation.

**Mr. Lominack** said the color is before the Board. He believes the staff brought this to the Board probably because they were somewhat uncomfortable in making a decision on their own. He said he appreciates this and personally, he likes the color. If the color to which one is trying to make it compatible is rather unfortunate "red" across the lane, he feels this would be a mistake because it is the worst color on the street. However, this color does fade within a short period of time. But, he believes it is a good solution for the building. Mr. Lominack said personally, he would like to make a motion that they approve the color

as submitted.

**Dr. Williams** showed the Board the house he was referring to at Barnard Street and Hall Street.

**Ms. McClain** pointed out that the house on Barnard and Hall is a little less intense.

**Dr. Williams** stated that this house is a similar size to the petitioner's property. It is in a different area of town, but it is the only building that is like the petitioner's. Therefore, the point is that there is a precedent in the district for buildings to stand out and not blend in with its surroundings.

**Mr. Engle** explained that the ordinance calls for compatibility, not standing out.

**Ms. McClain** said it has to be compatible with the surrounding structures.

**Mr. Engle** said he does not see how the color is compatible.

**Ms. McClain** said she believes the color would be overwhelming.

**Mr. Engle** said he does know who approved that color; he does not see how it goes with the red color that it is directly adjacent to. It is subjective and is an illusive combination.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes it is a beautiful color. However, his concern is this is a very large house and is very visible in the district. He said that the Sorrell-Weed House is similar to this color. However, he believes it was based on some historic exploration of what the color was in the past.

**Mr. Engle** said the Sorrell-Weed House original stucco was this color, not a painted stucco, but the actual stucco. In 1830-1840 this was a common color.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the stucco color as requested (Copper Mountain) - the motion failed. Therefore, no action was taken. The Board recommended that the petitioner return to staff with an alternative color selection for review. - FAIL

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack  
Second: Marjorie W Reed  
Reed Engle - Nay  
Nicholas Henry - Nay  
Keith Howington - Nay  
T. Jerry Lominack - Aye  
Zena McClain, Esq. - Nay

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of Gunn Meyerhoff Shay | 13-003155-COA | 0 Alice Street | New Construction Multiple Residences: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

**Ms. Maggie Ward of Gunn Meyerhoff and Shay** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction Part I, Height and Mass, of two detached two-story single family dwellings and one attached duplex at 0 Alice Street, between Jefferson and Montgomery Streets, and Alice and Gaston Streets. The buildings are oriented to front Alice Street. As part of this development, the parcel will be subdivided into four parcels. She passed the model to the Board for their review.

**Ms. Harris** explained that this project was reviewed by the Board at its meeting on July 10, 2013 which at that time consisted of four detached single family dwellings. The petitioner requested a continuance in order to restudy the Board's concerns which primarily focused on the building form and identical configuration of the buildings.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass, with the condition to horizontally align the tops of the entrances with the tops of the windows on the front facades.

**Ms. Harris** entertained questions from the Board.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff if they were okay with the stand alone building mirroring each other.

**Ms. Harris** answered she feels that the mirroring provides enough distinction and enough difference in building form to address the Board's concern. She feels, depending the Board's discussion, that additional design variations could further accentuate this in the design detail. However, this will be in the Part II review.

**Dr. Henry** asked if there are any single houses in this area.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes. Pointing to an area, Ms. Harris said this is a duplex and here is a commercial building. She said [pointing to an area] this a residential as well as over here. The petitioner can confirm this when she makes her comments.

**Dr. Williams** said this is a short row.

**Ms. Harris** confirmed that Dr. Williams was correct.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Ward** stated that there are other single family detached homes in the neighborhood. She said [pointing to an area] these two are actually detached. One is contributing and in the adjacent Gaston Ward, there are a number of single family detached homes as well matching detached and mirrored detached. Ms. Ward said they are in agreement with the staff's recommendation of aligning the windows and the doors.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Ward why didn't they put the two mirrored detached like they appear in the map side-by-side rather than book-ending.

**Ms. Ward** said it is because of privacy. If the Board remembers, the reason they had the four identical was so they could have the privacy wall within the homes, themselves. If the Board looks at it, they will see that the windows face out and on the duplexes they face the privacy wall. Therefore, there is a little bit of privacy within each structure rather than the windows facing windows.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Ward if they have dropped the one foot front yard step-back.

**Ms. Ward** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** said he was happy to see that they have made the stoops project.

**Ms. Ward** said they pulled the stoops out of the façade and they like it.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes this is a significant improvement; however, the issue is rather the Board feels these units are compatible.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ms. Harris reported that she received a phone call this morning from a neighboring property owner who is in opposition due to the privacy concerns.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said the privacy issue is if you buy next to a vacant lot in Savannah you can guarantee that within five years you will have a neighbor. There is just no privacy concern in this city. The other issue that bothers him is that it seems to be a lot of development that wants to get rid of row homes and duplexes and go to single family houses. He has a problem with this in a lot of the wards in Savannah because row houses and duplexes are the prevailing element. Mr. Engle said he believes they could get another one next month almost identical to what happened here. They do not want a row, but single family houses in an area that does not have many. He believes the Board needs to think about this very seriously as this does have the ability to change the character of an entire neighborhood once you start putting single family houses in a row house neighborhood. It is more suburban in concept than it is in urban.

**Dr. Henry** said one building was cited as being contiguous, but technically it is a separate building.



**Ms. Harris** explained to better inform the Board's discussion, there is a standard on building form which states that "a proposed building on an east/west through street shall utilize an existing historic building form fronting the same street within the same ward or in an adjacent ward."

**Ms. Ramsay** said the ward that was pulled up is an adjacent ward.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that this entire area of the Historic District has had a variety of building types over the years; one-story detached, nice houses and attached houses. There has been a lot of things and at this point in time, it has become pretty well wiped out as far as the original historic type structures that were in the area. He believes that Hollingsworth garage is probably a historic structure by this time. This is an unusual area. He said he believes it meets the ordinance as far as whether or not it is duplexes or single family detached on small lots.

**Dr. Henry** said the Board can not discuss compatibility of the structures if the structures are no longer there.

**Mr. Howington** said they can look at the historic precedence of the Sanborn Map. It does show a mixture of single family and row houses.

**Mr. Lominack** said if they are going to be compatible with the structures that are surrounding or adjacent to it, it should probably be an auto repair garage.

**Mr. Engle** said they are not doing a reconstruction or a restoration here. The ordinance is specific that it be compatible with the existing contributing structures; not something that was here 100 years ago.

**Mr. Howington** said in their reference, they have to look at the historical pattern of what the block use to be.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board has to go with what is here today. They are not going to put a one-story log house which was probably here at one time.

**Mr. Howington** asked, therefore, are they saying that the Sanborn Maps are no relevance.

**Mr. Engle** explained that the Sanborn Maps are to track the progress of an existing building, an existing historic structure, when they added additions and when the addition was removed. This is why staff provides the Sanborn as it gives the progress of an existing historic structure. It is irrelevant what might have been on this site because they are not going to put it back.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that there are two single family homes to the east.

**Mr. Engle** stated that one of the homes is not contributing.

**Ms. Ramsay** said one the easternmost building is new; she worked on this building.

**Dr. Williams** said the building is clearly contributing because it is within the same view

scape. He said one thing the aerial shows is that those two buildings which the petitioner cited as relevant does not have windows facing its counterpart to the side. Dr. Williams said one thing he is concerned with is the aggrandizing form of symmetrical composition which is not typical of the neighborhood. He said what he asked earlier was he thinks what would be more in the spirit of this neighborhood is having the two Italianate ones with the bays paired off symmetrical to each other and then the simpler pair to one side or the other. This would probably be the most compatible with the existing structures that are being cited as precedence and with the historic of the area.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the formality of this composition [and these kind of houses in his opinion and the idea that the houses have to have windows] is not necessarily the character of these buildings. He said he believes there are four or five feet between these buildings and they will be staring into a wall. Some light will be let in, but if they want light coming in a side wall, then they need to move to the suburbs. He stated referring back to Mr. Engle's comment that you can sense the suburban mentality being placed on this block. Dr. Williams said if it is going to be free standing, pair them off and if the windows work; they work and if they don't; then they don't. However, this would be his recommendation.

**Ms. Ramsay** said it is not the Board's purview to make recommendations. They are here to decide on the visual compatibility that is presented to them.

**Mr. Engle** said, however, he concurs with Dr. Williams's statement.

**Mr. Howington** stated that he agrees with the statement as well, but this is not what was presented.

**Dr. Williams** said they have many times taken what was presented and made a recommendation of some kind of variant on what was proposed. They can simply deny it and let the petitioner come back a month from now. Such as changing of the brick steps to concrete was the staff's recommendation from the submitted proposal and the Board accepted the staff's recommendation. But what he was proposing is a variant on what the petitioner has submitted which is no different than changing a brick step to concrete.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board has the opportunity to ask the petitioner to withdraw, take the project back and reconsider. Or the other alternative is to do duplexes. The project is significantly improved, but he tends to agree with Dr. Williams either the single family ought to be clustered or go with two duplexes.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Thomson, MPC Executive Director, if Board is making a recommendation that petitioner change their project from the way it is being presented, can she allow the petitioner to come forward?

**Mr. Thomson** said the Board needs to ensure that the directions are clear enough so that the staff can deal with it.

**Mr. Engle** said the petition needs to come back because he cannot vote for it the way it is.

**Mr. Shay** came forward and stated that they brought forward a petition a month ago with the four detached houses and the comments they heard today were not exactly heard at that time. They were told that they should not look identical. He said in an effort to mitigate

that, they have gone to a form that involves a little more variety and is more consistent with development pattern of contributing buildings in the adjacent ward and what little adjacent fabric is available within the ward.

**Mr. Shay** said their client is very desirous that they move forward with the project. Therefore, with due respect he asks that the Board vote today on the project. They do not want to seek a continuance.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Shay if he would consider Dr. Williams's recommendation of the two single residences together and then the duplex on one side.

**Mr. Shay** stated that if it is the opinion of this Board that the presentation they made today is in fact incompatible, then they would have no choice but to reconsider a lot of different things. He said that they do not feel that it is incompatible.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that Dr. Williams made a recommendation, but it was not a recommendation made by the Board. The Board did not approve the recommendation. He said the recommendation made would not be the recommendation that he would make. However, he is not sure if it is appropriate for him to make a recommendation to the solution to the problem.

**Dr. Williams** said what he was trying to get across to the Board is that in his opinion it would be more compatible if it was as he stated.

**Mr. Lominack** said he would recommend that they be duplexes; but he believes that Mr. Shay and the others are quite capable of responding to the comments that were made and the Board did not all make the same comments either because they have opinions that varies.

**Ms. McClain** said the Board is actually trying to keep from designing the project. They are saying in their opinion as it is presented is incompatible.

**Mr. Howington** said as recommended is not what was presented. This is why the Board gave Mr. Shay the opportunity to comment on it. He said Mr. Shay said he likes it the way they presented it. Therefore, this is what the Board has to go on.

**Mr. Howington** said he guesses the concern is does it meets the ordinance. It may be more compatible, but the question is, is it compatible now. Are you denying it not being compatible or not being more compatible?

**Mr. Engle** answered no; he feels the prevailing pattern in this neighborhood is home duplexes and to be introducing single family, two of them are not compatible with the prevailing pattern. He agrees with what Dr. Williams said and what Mr. Lominack said, two duplexes in his mind would be far more compatible or Dr. Williams's alternative. But, he does not believe that this alternative is. They have given the architect an opportunity to go back and deal with this issue, but he does not choose to do so.

**Mr. Engle** said it concerns him that this pattern will influence future developments in other wards. Therefore, this Board has to deal with this now.

**Dr. Henry** said to Mr. Howington's point, the Board can argue that it is not fully compatible. He said that in this particular case, he has no problem saying that it is or it is not compatible. An interesting point has been raised and he believes they can do it midway.

**Mr. Lominack** said he was not sure if this Board should be making its decisions based on degrees of compatibility; more compatible or less compatible. It is either compatible or it is not compatible. This is a subjective decision to a great extent based on how a person views the project that is being presented within the context of where it is being built; when it is being built and so forth.

**Ms. McClain** told Mr. Lominack that it is not totally subjective; but it is based on observation and things that are real.

**Board Action:**

The Savannah Historic District Board of Review rejects the design as submitted because it is not compatible with the prevailing pattern in the area. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Nay
T. Jerry Lominack	- Nay
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Nay
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

16. [Petition of John L. Deering for Greenline Architecture | 13-003682-COA | 606 Turner Boulevard | Fenestration Amendment](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Previously approved rendering.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet- alternate Fahm Turner Corner drawing.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- description, details, specifications.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- drawings and renderings.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Mr. Howington recused from participation in this petition. He is an employee of Greenline Architecture.**

**Mr. John Deering** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for revisions to the fenestration to the Embassy Suites three level parking garage located at 606 Turner Boulevard.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the amended design for the parking garage at 606 Turner Boulevard with the following conditions:

1. Submit colors for storefront, mesh and spandrel glass to staff for final approval.
2. Revise the sample panel to include the wire mesh.

**Ms. Harris** entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** asked staff if they have an idea of what the color will be.

**Ms. Harris** answered that a sample panel is on-site and previously samples were approved by the Board. She said they can pass this around for the Board's review. Ms. Harris said the only thing that is unknown is the color of the storefront, mesh and spandrel glass.

**Mr. Engle** stated that this is a significant amount.

**Ms. Harris** said this is being asked to be submitted to staff for approval.

**Dr. Henry** asked if a fee is charged every time this comes back with changes.

**Ms. Harris** said yes; this is a new policy. However, in the past we did not have this policy. But, in 2013, we charge a fee based on the cost of what the proposed changes are; not on the cost of the entire project. A new application number is issued to better track the review process.

**Mr. Lominack** guesses there are three or four towers. He asked if all four of the towers are getting the wire mesh.

**Ms. Harris** explained that there are three open towers and are getting the wire mesh. One tower has glass which houses the elevator and will maintain glass and some mesh.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if this is the tower that sticks out by itself.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Ms. Harris if she knew the reason why once the lovers were approved, they were changed.

**Ms. Harris** said she would defer this question to the petitioner as she does not know.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deering** came forward and entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Deering if he had an idea of what the color the mesh and spandrel will be.

**Mr. Deering** said the mesh is a dark charcoal color which is darker than the storefront that has already been approved.

**Ms. McClain** asked if the Board has already seen a sample of this.

**Mr. Deering** answered that he believes the Board has seen the sample.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes there is a markup on site.

**Mr. Deering** said the staff has been working with them effectively on reviewing markup samples on the site.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Deering why he changed the louvers that were approved.

**Mr. Deering** answered that they really wanted the louvers, but for budget situations, they changed it to wire mesh. Now, the owners are willing to go back and put in the louvers which he is happy that they are doing so. This was their preferred solution.

**Dr. Williams** said he saw from the bridge. He asked if the corner towers are two facades or will they have return walls.

**Mr. Deering** said they will be just two facades.

**Dr. Williams** said as this project was moving its way through these presentations, this never darned on him as the elevations do not reveal this.

**Mr. Deering** stated that in 2011, they submitted their model.

**Dr. Williams** said this is just a broader comment, that there should be some kind of graphic that make things such as these more obvious as he believes the towers read as corner towers. But, when you see it from the bridge, you see the back sides of them. Dr. Williams said when he saw this the other day from the bridge he was surprised. He said he does not remember the model and it has been presented to the Board multiple times.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said being relatively a new Board member, she does not have a lot of history involved with this project. She said having some information in their packets of where they have been would be helpful. She cannot tell heads or tails what has been approved. Ms. Weibe-Reed said as Dr. Williams stated, if there is a model involved, it would be helpful.

**Dr. Williams** said with the large hotels that they saw on both ends of River Street, they had various prospective views. He knows it is too late now for this project, but his concern is if they had the street view, even from street level looking down on the façade, you would look at the towers. Dr. Williams encouraged Mr. Deering to include this kind of information with his packet.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** thanked the developer for going back with the louvers. The Board liked the louvers and they were not happy when they disappeared. He said actually the mesh should disappear.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the amended design for the parking garage at 606 Turner Boulevard with the following conditions:

1. Submit colors for storefront, mesh, and spandrel glass to staff for final approval. - PASS
2. Revise the sample panel to include the wire mesh.

**Vote Results**

Motion: T. Jerry Lominack

Second: Zena McClain, Esq.

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Abstain
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Daniel Brown | 13-003791-COA | 406 East Liberty Street | New Construction: Part I, Carriage House](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Facing South.pdf](#)

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

**Mr. Daniel Brown** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting to approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass, of a two-story garage apartment for the property located at 406 East Liberty Street. The accessory structure is proposed at the rear of the property and will provide two garage openings off of the lane.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I,

Height and Mass, of the proposed garage apartment at 406 East Liberty Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review and approval with Part II, Design Details:

1. Align the front (lane) façade with the adjacent existing carport/garages. It is unclear where this may fall in relationship to the property line. If a three foot apron cannot be provided once the new garage's façade aligns with the adjacent facades, lower the new building to have an "at-grade" entrance. The garage cannot apron into the public right-of-way (lane).
2. Increase the height of the windows on the front (lane) façade to meet the vertical to horizontal ratio of not less than 5:3.
3. Provide additional information regarding the neighboring eave overhangs and how the new building will interact with them, and if the new garage apartment eaves will overhang the adjacent property lines.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Michalak to clarify the problem with the windows.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the standards require that the windows have a ratio of not less than 5:3; presently the windows are less than this.

**Mr. Engle** noted that not just the eaves overhangs, but the stringcourse would be inside the adjacent garages. They projects out, but they abut right into the adjacent garages and therefore, it could not be built this way.

**Ms. Michalak** stated this is the question as the site plan shows the whole property line-to-property line, but it is not clear whether this is actually the case. Therefore, this is the clarification that they need from the petitioner. However, if there is to be six inches or a foot from the property line, then there will not be an issue. They need more information on this portion.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Brown** explained that their walls will be on the inside of the CMU wall. The eaves will actually go above the wall, but not across the property line.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked Mr. Brown, therefore, the eaves do not protrude into the neighbor's property.

**Mr. Brown** answered that they do not protrude into the neighbor's property.

**Mr. Brown** said that the big problem they are having with the increase to 5:3 is they are trying to keep the building as low as possible for the adjacent properties as they want to provide them with as much view as possible. They don't want to increase it as they are trying to be compatible with the carriage down the lane. He said the carriage house across the lane is much higher; it is almost two feet higher than their carriage house. Mr. Brown said they did not want to go this high because they did not want to intrude on the privacy and views of the neighboring properties. Mr. Brown said, therefore, they put in the largest windows possible for egress purposes and then left it as such.

**Mr. Brown** explained that the size of the window was the smallest window they could



place on the façade for egress purposes without increasing the height of the overall building, which is a concern of the neighbors. Therefore, if they increase it to 5:3, the building would increase in height which then would cause more blocks of the views for the neighbors.

**Dr. Williams** asked what is the current ratio.

**Mr. Brown** answered that it is approximately six inches short of 5:3.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** told Mr. Brown that he could increase the height if he took the sill down two blocks to get that ratio.

**Mr. Brown** stated that the sill is at the height for safety standards as well for having them open and not be a hazard if the windows are open and people fall out from the inside. It is 30 inches above the finished floor. He said that they can drop the ceiling level and they could also decrease the size of head that is over the top of the window.

**Mr. Engle** said he does not believe that the Board has the authority to change a design standard. The standards are explicit on the 5:3.

**Mr. Merriman** said the standard of 5:3 has to be met.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Bill Modell** came forward and stated that he has resided at 404 East Liberty Street since 1996. Mr. Modell said the reason he is contesting this and does not want the carriage house to be built is first and foremost because it is completely inconsistent with the area. He said in their area is a bank of six townhomes that were built in 1882 to 1883. They are all pretty much the same - 1,840 square feet and their designs are all similar. There is little variation, but they all approximately a 400 square foot courtyard with cinderblock walls.

**Mr. Modell** said the only blight in their area happened about 35 or 40 years ago when one of their neighbors (he is deceased now), Mr. Kelly Mims built a 300 square foot workshop which was not permitted. Mr. Mims painted the workshop battleship gray.

**Mr. Modell** said carriage house is completely inconsistent with the area and as they can see, it sticks out like a sore thumb. He said their homes are beautiful and they love them, but they are small; 1,840 square feet which normally does not merit a carriage house behind it. The ones that in the alleyway are associated with the homes that front onto Perry Street were constructed about ten years ago. Nobody said anything then because it was vacant land and was the highest and best use of that land. Mr. Modell said, therefore, his neighbors nor he had any problems with that construction. He said he is sure that some people who are on this Board approved another four or five freestanding homes completed this year that on the same alley. However, this is not their area; their area is the bank of the six townhomes that were all built at the same time. Quality of life issues are here that his neighbor Michael LaRue will address. He knows that the duties of the Review Board is architecturally compatibility. Therefore, his contention is that it is completely inconsistent with the neighborhood.

**Mr. Joe Sasseen**, retired attorney, came forward and stated that he was not present to speak for or against the project. He said he wanted to caution the Board as most of them are too young to remember Savannah during the 1940s. When he was growing up it was popular to demolish carriage houses. Mr. Sasseen said he lost the battle of replacing a carriage house on Charlton Lane between Abercorn and Drayton Streets. The plan was to put up a one-story garage and it did not belong there as everything within this block was two-story carriage houses.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Sasseen if he was supporting or opposing this project.

**Mr. Sasseen** answered that he was not supporting or opposing this project. He said he does not know if a carriage house was on this spot. But, if one was here, he would want it to be replaced. However, if a carriage was not here, he would not want someone to be made to put a carriage house here. He said in other words, he wants the ones that were torn down where there is still an empty lot that when someone comes along and wants to put a garage there or want to rebuild that they be required to go with the old historic plan. To him it would be unfair for him to make a statement about that carriage. Mr. Sasseen said he would love to see more carriage houses on the row, but he cannot say that the person be required to put up a two-story carriage house when there was not one here initially.

**Mr. Michael LaRue** came forward and stated that he and his wife have lived at 408 East Liberty Street two years. They have done a lot of exterior work to upgrade their home and to keep it in its historic value. Mr. LaRue said one of the main reasons they bought their house is that they can sit in the courtyard and look at the jail tower across the street on Habersham Street. He said if this new building is allowed to be built, they will not be able to have that view any longer. Mr. LaRue said their purpose also for moving into the historic district was to see historic buildings.

**Mr. LaRue** said he has met with Mr. Brown and he has explained his entire program. Unfortunately, the owner of the property is not present today as she is in Switzerland, which is her main residence. Mr. Brown has answered a lot of their questions, but this building is not compatible to the row of six brick houses. He has no objection if they want to put in a garage, but with the property owner being out of town, he does not understand the need or why she wants to put up this carriage house; it just does not fit in this area. There is no way they can make the building look historic unless they are going to put bricks on it and this is not within the plan.

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said that they have some issues with the visual compatibility, although, she believes that their issue relates primarily to the materials that are indicated as opposed to the massing. She said as it relates to the massing, they believe that the property appears to be a little "top heavy." They believe this is because of the stringcourse or beltcourse that is indicated above the garage doors. Ms. Meunier said they suggest probably raising this closer to the sills of the windows so that there will be a more visually proportionate relationship. The second-story reads as being taller than the first-story. She said this maybe reflecting the true interior for the floor heights, but just for visual reasons, they believe the stringcourse could afford to be raised.

**Ms. Meunier** said they have some concerns about the visibility of the condenser unit which they know is on the interior, but because this property is close to Habersham Street

they are interested in knowing whether there is any way to find out if the condenser will be visible from Habersham Street.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Meunier if the HSF had objections to the two stories.

**Ms. Meunier** answered that in general she would say that position of the HSF is that if a garage is to be built on the lane, they are more in favor of a carriage house which would typically be two stories. However, she feels it is a case-by-case basis. In this case, it seems to be primarily single-story structures on the lane.

**Ms. Michalak** said a two-story carriage house is directly across the lane from this proposed carriage house and there is a two-story carriage at the corner of Price Street.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Meunier if the HSF has any concerns about the style of the garage door.

**Ms. Meunier** stated that her understanding is the garage door would come under materials, but as proposed, they do not like what is indicated.

**Mr. Modell** said the conversation has been as if this is a foregone conclusion about how the windows and the garage doors will be. However, they wanted to make the reiteration that they are completely against this building. The building is completely inconsistent with the area. This is a different type of townhomes. It is unfortunate that when these townhomes were built, all the neighbors in this area were renters. Therefore, when the sign went up to build the townhomes, no owners were there to object. This is one of the hazards of absentee ownership which is what they have with their neighbor who lives in Switzerland.

**Ms. Leslie LaRue** came forward and stated that the architects have stated that they plan to keep the roofline low enough so that they would still have some kind of view of the jail. However, unfortunately where they placed the condenser is what they get a view of. Ms. LaRue said the jail is beautiful at night. A hawk is there and perches at night. They thoroughly enjoy their neighborhood, but now to put a carriage house here would take away the uniqueness of their property that they love so much. She said her other concern is the exterior surface of the building. They are using a stucco and it does not relate to their brick homes. The homes in front of the carriage houses across the lane are stucco. Therefore, these carriage houses match those homes and look like they are a part of it. But, the proposed carriage house in their area does not look like a part of anything. It is just a square structure sitting in the middle of the block.

**Ms. Ramsay** invited Mr. Brown to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Brown** said they are ready to take on the staff's recommendations and make the necessary changes with the design of the carriage house. He said as everyone noted, a one-story garage is not acceptable anymore. Therefore, they are trying to build a two-story carriage house by code and by standards, compliant and acceptable. Mr. Brown said there are adjacent properties showing this. There are properties down the block that shows carriage houses. He said what is no longer acceptable is the one-story garages that are adjacent to this building. If you look at these things, there are a lot of siding and have a corrugated aluminum roofs.

**Mr. Brown** said he was not trying to say anything about the neighbors nor the properties, but they are building something that is compliant to the codes and will take the staff's recommendations and make the need changes. These are some of the things that the neighbors need to know when purchasing a house that there are possibilities for these things to happen. There is nothing that is incorrect about the carriage house going into that space. Mr. Brown said if the neighbors have a problem with the condenser being there and it will take away more of their view, they can put something around the condenser or maybe drop the condenser into the carriage house. They will go through this with the next phase of approval with the staff.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said according to the street view of Google, the carriage house at the same end of the block does not look like new construction. It looks fairly old. Dr. Williams said he does not know how historical the carriage house is, but it is in the same block and has similar massing profile of side gable to the proposed carriage. Therefore, on one hand, if they want to go back to the 19th century this was a block that did not have the two-story carriage houses. However, he remembers that when they were viewing the Height Map, they discussed carriage houses in lanes. Dr. Williams said he believes that what was written into the Height Map was that lanes would aim to have two-story carriage houses.

**Mr. Lominack** said the aim was not to exceed two stories.

**Ms. Harris** read the standard which states that "buildings throughout the Historic District which front a street shall be at least two-stories except in the Beech Institute Character Area or for accessory buildings which front a lane." Ms. Harris stated, therefore, the minimum is for the street and not for the lane.

**Dr. Henry** said, consequently, one story on a lane is allowed.

**Mr. Engle** said he had never heard that a one-story garage could not be built. If the entire block is one-story, why would the Board make somebody build something that would stand out like a sore thumb.

**Mr. Howington** said the other comment is about the condenser unit. He said perhaps the unit could be taken off the roof and put it on the patio or on the ground in the courtyard. Mr. Howington said he agrees with the comment that these are brick buildings.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Howington how he feels about two stories.

**Mr. Howington** said he empathies with the neighbors in their views and concerns about that, but they cannot deny what has a right to be built.

**Dr. Henry** stated that it is allowed, but the Board's role is compatibility.

**Mr. Howington** explained that there is a carriage house on the other end of the street; there is a carriage house across the street. Therefore, it is not a block that is absent of two story carriage houses.

**Mr. Engle** said what concerns him is the 75% lot coverage area. Yet, they are not sure what the parcel boundaries are. Therefore, how do they know that there are 73.5% when they are not exactly sure where the property lines are. This is cutting it very close.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked if they were saying that the carriage house should match the main house.

**Dr. Henry** answered "yes." He believes there should be a rule to this effect.

**Mr. Engle** said they do not have a site plan that shows the property line. If the petitioner has to show the three feet in to get the apron that staff is recommending, will this change the lot coverage?

**Mr. Lominack** said the lot coverage does not have to be contiguous. The application is clear about having a fully dimension site plan and also things such as where refuse goes and so forth. The site plan does not have the information that the application requires. He said maybe this should not have been on the agenda.

**Ms. Michalak** said one of staff's recommendation is that they need much more clear information regarding the site plan. The petitioner and she discussed that the site plan needed to be submitted; and this is the way it came to the staff.

**Mr. Brown** stated that the lot coverage is 73.5 as note on the site plan. He said as they were told by the staff, they are going to align the back lane façade with the adjacent properties. It will not change the size of the carriage house and will not change the lot coverage. If the Board and staff want them to move the condenser down, they will do so. But, as he has said, the lot coverage is 73.5 and they are inside the property line.

**Ms. Ramsay** informed Mr. Brown that many members of the Board feel the application is incomplete. They cannot vote on an incomplete application. She asked Mr. Brown if he wanted to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Brown** stated that when they submitted the application to staff, they said that they would go to the property line. They have spoken with the neighbors about the issues of overhanging the property lines. What they have done was to inset the exterior wall to the inside of that CMU wall which actually reduces the total property coverage.

**Ms. Ramsay** told Mr. Brown that she believes he misunderstood what she asked him. She explained to him that the Board does not feel that they can vote on this for approval or denial of this petition as submitted because they have insufficient information. She asked him if he wanted the Board to vote on a continuance.

**Mr. Brown** replied yes.

**Dr. Williams** said because this petition would be coming before the Board for Part II, in the past the Board has allowed that Part I and Part II to be reviewed together when Part I is continued.

**Mr. Brown** told Dr. Williams that he would appreciate being able to do this.

**Mr. Engle** said the petitioner needs to show where the garbage storage and where the compressors will be located; these are requirements as well. Presently, the site plan does not show this.

**Board Action:**

Approval to continue the petition for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed garage apartment at 406 East Liberty Street for the petitioner to consider the following:

1. Provide complete Part I submission documents, including a complete site plan and elevations that illustrate the height and mass of the existing adjacent carports and garages.
2. Consider an alternative exterior material, instead of stucco, that is more compatible with the - PASS main brick building.
3. Relocate the proposed condenser unit to the ground in the interior courtyard.
4. Clarify any issues regarding the neighboring carport/garages eaves and the eaves of the proposed garage apartment.

The Board also informed the petitioner that he may return to the next meeting with both Parts I and II for review.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. [Petition of Patrick Phelps, AIA - Hansen Architects, P.C. | 13-003841-COA | 411 East Jones Street | Addition and Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet revised.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Maire Letter- Public Comment.pdf](#)

**Mr. Patrick Phelps** of Hansen Architects, P.C. was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to construct a wooden fence along the lane between the brick carriage house and a wooden frame accessory structure; after-the fact to replace two existing windows on the south (lane) elevation of the carriage house; to replace the existing, unapproved, wooden porch on the second floor of the carriage house with a three foot deep balcony constructed of steel brackets and balusters, and wooden decked floor; and after-the-fact to replace and enlarge an existing window on the second floor of the east façade of the carriage house with a door.

**Ms. Harris** explained that in July 2012, staff was notified that an exterior deck on the south (rear) façade of 411 East Jones Street, visible from the lane, was being constructed without a COA. Staff forwarded the complaint to Zoning on August 1, 2012.

**Ms. Harris** further explained that the petitioner's application for a fence, if approved, will render the rear deck and the window-to-door change on the first floor, east façade of the carriage house not visible from the public right-of-way, therefore not requiring approval. She said should the fence not be approved, the petitioner will be required to apply for a COA for these additional alterations.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Harris if she would deem the fence to be a wall of continuity.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked how high would the fence be.

**Ms. Harris** answered that the proposed height of the fence is approximately ten feet. Staff met with the petitioner on site to determine what height would be necessary to block the view of the deck and what would be the minimum as they do not want to go taller than necessary. Ms. Harris said the onsite field verification revealed that a ten foot height fence would block the view of the deck from view of the public right-of-way.

**Dr. Henry** asked staff if the maximum height is 11 feet.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the section of the fence on the right would be more or less under the peak of the roof.

**Ms. Harris** answered that she believes it would be.

**Ms. Harris** said the staff was unable to ascertain if the three standards are met regarding the replacement of the two windows on the lane façade and the enlargement of a window to a door on the east façade. The changes were completed without proper documentation of the existing windows. A photograph was provided by the petitioner. The photo appears to indicate that the widows were wood, one-over-one wood windows, possibly modified. The staff was unable to locate additional photographs. It is unknown if the prior windows were historic.

**Ms. Harris** said that staff is recommending approval of the fence and balcony as well as the after-the-fact window replacements and the conversion of the windows and the door on the east façade with the condition that the proposed colors for the door balcony railings and balcony decking be provide to staff for final approval.

**Ms. Harris** explained that staff received a letter and an email that she will read into the public record. The letter is attached to the agenda. The email was received today just prior to the meeting; therefore, the final agenda was already published before receiving the email.

**Ms. Harris** read the following letter into the records received from **Jonathan and Susan Maire**:

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

As the owners of 409 East Jones Street, immediately adjoining on the east the property which is the subject of the petition, we would have the following comments:

We appreciate the intervention of the Board of Review and its staff in this matter, which addresses what would have been a substantial deviation from the standards of consistency and aesthetic uniformity applicable to properties in the historic district. The proposed recommendations of staff go a long way toward correcting this deviation.

While we recognize that enforcement of easement rights is not a normal part of the Board's inquiry, it is a fact that our own property and the property adjoining us on the west have a five foot easement giving us access to the lane through the area that would under the recommendation be traversed by the proposed fence (see shaded area in the attached survey). The gate and the fence should, therefore, have a design which would accommodate that easement. This goes to the design of the gate and not the enforcement of an easement.

We see nothing specific in the proposal which identifies the materials to be used in the railing of the balcony and in the fence and gate itself. We would request that it be made clear that these materials be substantial and attractive and compatible with other similar features in the neighborhood.

One final point: the recommendation/proposal contemplates that the fence be white. It seems to us that most gates and fences in the area are either black or a dark green and that such a color would be aesthetically and historically more compatible with the area and period than white.

Thanking you for your consideration, we are

Sincerely yours,

Jonathan and Susan Maire

**Ms. Harris** read the following email received from **Harold L. Lamb**:

Ms. Harris:

Please see that thus letter is entered into the proceeding of the historic Review Board.

My name is Harold Lamb. My wife Susan Lamb and I have lived at 415 East Jones Street,



Savannah for 39 years.

I write with regard to a proposal before the Historic Review Board to renovate the exterior of the carriage house at 411 East Jones Lane. This property is observable from the garden and the back of our house at 415 East Jones Street.

I appreciate the board's involvement in the 411 carriage house renovation, and I appreciate the efforts of Patrick Phelps of Hansen Architects to assure that this renovation is appropriate and compatible. I appreciate the somewhat belated efforts of the 411 property owners to present conforming plans.

I understand that the fence that is included in this proposal is intended to hide from public view the large non-conforming and un-permitted deck that was built on the rear of the 411 main house in 2012. This deck looms over neighboring properties and I would raise questions regarding its size, height, details, and finishes. It seems unfortunate that the property owner is now seeking to build a fence to conceal this unsightly mistake. I would certainly welcome any efforts on the part of the 411 property owner to render the back of the main house more appropriate and compatible.

I have other concerns regarding the proposed renovations:

1. The proposal does not seem to clarify what type of door would provide access to the proposed balcony. The recently placed 6-panel door would seem appropriate; a sliding glass door of any type would seem incompatible. This door will be observable from the lane even if the proposed 10-foot fence is built.
2. A large ugly electrical conduit has recently been placed along the length of the east elevation of the 411 carriage house. This conduit is shown in the posted photographs; it is not shown in Mr. Phelps' renderings. As currently placed this conduit will be observable from the lane even if the proposed fence is built.
3. I question the use of 1-over-1 double hung windows in the two lane window openings of this carriage house. All 16 of the other windows facing south on this block of E. Jones Lane are 6-over-6 double-hung windows. I would propose that 6-over-6 windows would be more appropriate on the 411 carriage house.

Again, I appreciate the efforts of all concerned parties to afford this small historical property the appropriate renovation it deserves.

Harold L. Lamb  
Property Owner, 415 East Jones Street, Savannah, GA.

**Mr. Lominack** asked, for clarification, if the Board is being told that there is a legal easement to another property owner for access onto this property.

**Ms. Harris** answered that there is a pedestrian easement and showed the Board a faxed copy of the survey.

**Dr. Williams** asked if staff recommends approval of the window replacements, even the 1-over-1.

**Ms. Harris** answered that they have no physical evidence of what was here. It might have been 1-over-1 or 6-over-6. Staff felt that without the evidence, 1-over-1 would be the least conjectural. However, if the Board felt that 6-over-6 set the historic precedent which would allow for this, staff has no concerns with that.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the adjacent structure to which this building is attached was not built as six-over-six.

**Ms. Harris** answered that the directly adjacent structure to the west of this building has replacement windows already.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this was the structure that is shown in the photo in the far-left hand area.

**Ms. Harris** zoomed in and said the windows are divided-light.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Phelps** said they are doing everything they can to fully cover the ordinance. He said there has always been the intention with the improvements made to the property to provide the fence. He said it has been presented as a fix with the understanding that the fence will conceal those items. But, they were intentional in the beginning. It is not that they were here trying to cover up some of the issues that were created by a number of improvements.

**Mr. Phelps** said he believes the main concern of the first letter, Mr. Maire, was the paint color of the fence. They are trying to match the existing colors of the carriage that are here now. He clarified that there is a slight seam in the brick which will separate the properties. They chose a white to match the trim. Mr. Phelps said they are amenable to work with staff and the neighbors regarding the paint color. He believes that owners have already talked with the owners about changing the color of the fence.

**Mr. Phelps** said regarding Mr. Lamb's comments, the existing door is to remain and the paint color will be the same. As staff has noted, once the fence is constructed, this wall will be concealed from the public's view. He said the second item was the electrical conduit. He said this was provided by Georgia Power as service to the carriage house some time ago. He explained that Georgia Power pulls those permits and installs this work. Therefore, it is not a part of their application. Mr. Phelps said he would love for Georgia Power to be under the realm of the Review Board with Comcast and all the utilities. He stated that he understands that equipment falls under this scope; however, he is not sure that electrical services to these utilities fall under the scope of the Review Board.

**Mr. Phelps** stated Dr. Williams is correct; these are 6-over-6 wood windows. There are three carriage houses that are similar in age with the row. They all have different types of windows. He said it is hard to determine what the consistency of a 6-over-6 window type was. Mr. Phelps pointed out the location of the door on the east façade of the carriage house. He said this has been modified, but they can see there is a single-hung sash here was here. They are doing their best to try to guess the age and what was there and what would be appropriate. However, the conditions do not inform them that well.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Phelps to cover the easement issue.

**Mr. Phelps** explained that the easement is between private property owners. The shaded area is the easement and is open. The gate will close this off and be operable; it will not be locked. This allows entrance access through the background. He said there has actually been a modification. He said this property owner actually built a fence blocking off their own access to the easement. Consequently, he does not believe this is used any longer, the carriage house is accessed through the front of the property off of Jones Street.

**Mr. Foster** stated that the property was blocked off without them realizing it. Basically, they will have the same access and the amount of space on the easement. They are just putting in a gate to act as security because presently anyone can walk off the lane, their courtyard is open and, therefore, you can walk off the lane right up to their back door.

**Dr. Henry** asked how wide the easement is.

**Mr. Foster** answered five feet.

**Dr. Henry** said the drawings indicate that there will be two double gates side-by-side and a fence.

**Mr. Phelps** said the fence will continue from the carriage house all the way to the edge of the garage. There will be a seven foot door which will allow the entry access and the easement would be preserved with that five foot clearance. He said what they are proposing because if they carried the fence all the way along, they would interfere with the eave of the adjoining garage. Therefore, they are proposing to step the fence back at the continuous height which would be ten feet back far enough so that it could tuck behind the eave of the existing garage and maintain that visual block of the improvements on the property beyond. This would then become a service enclosure for trash cans.

**Ms. Ramsay** said Mr. Phelps may not be able to answer her question, but possibly the owner may be able to answer it. She asked why were the improvements made without initially coming before the Board.

**Mr. Foster** answered it was not intentional, but a lack of education of the process and knowledge. He said in all honesty it was the lack of not taking the time to make the call. However, he can say in all honesty once they were made aware of this, they worked diligently not only with the Historic Review Board, but also with the City and addressed their concerns. He said once they are made aware of an issue, they do everything in their power to get it resolved. Mr. Foster said this has been a costly educational experience with time and resources. However, they want to be good neighbors and want to do everything right. When someone tells him they want to do something to their property, he gives them the number to call. He wishes he had the number in the beginning so he could have called. He said that he cannot go back and make that right now, but from here on he will do so. Mr. Foster informed the Board that this is what brought them to this point.

**Dr. Williams** said Mr. Maire's letter contemplates that the fence will be white. Is this correct?

**Mr. Phelps** said he spoke with Mr. Maire today and they will work with staff to get an appropriate color that the neighbors are happy with.

**Mr. Engle** asked the petitioner if he is breaking down the existing balcony and will put up a new balcony.

**Mr. Phelps** answered yes.

**Mr. Engle** said the balcony will have nice brackets, but the fence will cover up the brackets. He asked the petitioner why he was covering up the brackets.

**Mr. Phelps** said this does not fall under the purview of the Review Board once they are

covered up, but some of the concerns of the neighbors have to do with the access easement that there are two columns. One in the center and one on the end; their concern was that these columns block their access easement. One of their fixes to appease the neighbors is that they will remove these and also it will take these out of the category of a porch and into a balcony which will be supported off of the carriage house and will be more appropriate to a carriage house rather than having a porch addition to it; even though it is concealed partially by the fence.

**Mr. Engle** said the petitioner is missing his point. He asked Mr. Phelps if the porch will not be there, why they are building a ten-foot high fence to screen the post.

**Mr. Phelps** said a deck addition will be back there. This is why they went into the field with staff and it was determined that at ten feet the fence would block that from the public's view.

**Dr. Williams** said without the fence, the deck on the back of the house is subject to the purview of this Board.

**Mr. Phelps** answered yes. However, it has always been their intent to provide a fence.

**Mr. Lominack** asked how far is the new balcony projecting.

**Mr. Phelps** said they understand that this is nonconforming; it is their intent to remove this and replace it with a balcony which will be bracketed off of the carriage house. This balcony fits within the ordinance requirement. Therefore, it will be 36 inches from the face of the masonry wall.

**Mr. Phelps** said the guidelines in the ordinance are different for a porch than a balcony. They are trying to do is to bring what is more appropriate to a carriage house which will be a balcony rather than a porch addition on the east and west side of the façade.

**Mr. Lominack** said there was a great deal of discussion about this same thing at the last meeting regarding the wording of the ordinance as it relates to balconies, public right-of-way and so forth. However, he does not know if it was resolved. He said, however, he understands what Mr. Phelps is doing. He asked if the deck was built when this was built as well.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered no, it was built in 2012.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the petitioner is required to screen this.

**Mr. Phelps** stated that they have been notified that since it was built without approval it is nonconforming and they will have to have modifications.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the Board was provided information about the door, but they were not provided a cut-sheet on the windows.

**Mr. Phelps** stated that they contacted the builder for the cut-sheets since this was after-the-fact, but they were not able to get a cut-sheet on the window, but they provided a description of the window within the narrative.

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that she would like to make the after-the-fact approvals meet the same requirements that they would have if the Board approved it initially.

**Mr. Phelps** said the installation does have the three inch setback from the masonry. It is a wood frame window with wood sashes; single light over single light.

**Mr. Merriman** asked who manufactured the windows and are they putty glazed.

**Mr. Phelps** said he was not sure as they could not get the information from the contractor. He apologized for not having the information.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

See Mr. & Mrs. Jonathan Maire's letter and the email from Mr. Harold Lamb.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** stated that when properties transfer, the City ought to notify the new owners that they are in a historic district and that they must build according to the ordinance because this just keeps happening.

#### **Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the new fence and balcony; after-the-fact window replacements on the lane façade, and conversion of a window-to-door on the east façade with the condition that the proposed colors for the door, balcony railings, and balcony decking be provided to staff for final review and approval. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

#### 19. [Petition of Doug Bean Signs | 13-003850-COA | 0 Barnard Street | Freestanding Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report revised.pdf](#)

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

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

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. She explained that when the petitioner initially submitted the application it was for two signs on this particular parcel which is a separate parcel from where the end of Ellis Square is. Ms. Harris showed the Board an image of the petitioner's original proposal. The image showed that one sign was L-shape with images and the second sign had some directional information for registration and parking. She said that staff consulted with the Zoning Administrator as to how to review this sign type. Would it be considered a principal use sign or because it is on a separate parcel, would it be considered a separate use sign? Ms. Harris stated that with the concurrence of the Zoning Administrator, it was determined that it was a separate or an off premise use and according to the ordinance, they would not be permitted in this area.

**Ms. Harris** explained that the original staff report that was on the Board's published agenda was a recommendation for denial of the signs based on that interpretation. Subsequent to the publishing of the agenda, the petitioner worked with the Zoning Administrator and provided additional information and clarification about the ownership and rental agreement for the parcel. The Zoning Administrator was able to determine that the Inn at Ellis sign could be considered a principal use sign. The petitioner decided not to pursue the directional sign. At this point, the staff felt that their report was technically in error and, therefore, the report needed to be revised since the petitioner removed the second sign. Consequently, staff revised its report.

**Ms. Harris** explained that she was providing the above information as some Board members asked why they were reviewing a revised submittal after it had been published on the website. Therefore, she wanted to provide the context of why staff felt that in this situation it might be appropriate to review it. If the public reviewed the original staff report and submittal, they did review the sign, but it was in conjunction with the second sign and the staff's recommendation was different.

**Ms. Harris** explained that the petitioner is requesting approval to install a double-sided, freestanding principal use sign for the "Inn at Ellis Square." The sign will be located on the adjacent park/green space property at 0 Barnard Street.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the principal use sign at 0 Barnard Street because it meets the standards.

**Ms. Harris** entertained questions from the Board.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the sign has two sides. He said if it was on a wall it would be one side, 14 square feet. Now, it has two faces; for better clarification should it be defined as 28 square feet. Do the two sides count as one?

**Ms. Harris** said the petitioner is probably more familiar with this, but even if it is 28 square feet, it is still permitted.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that when he reviewed the initial request he questioned whether it was two signs or one sign that happened to be in an L configuration. He said he still questions whether it is two signs.

**Ms Ramsay** said the petitioner will be able to answer this question when he makes his comments.

**Ms. Harris** explained that when staff conferred with the Zoning Administrator, he was in agreement that it was two signs. However, there might be additional information that could

have been provided to consider them as one sign. However, the petitioner can address this question.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Bean** came forward and stated the Savannah Sign ordinance states that a freestanding sign may be built in that configuration at an angle no greater than 90 degrees and be considered one sign. Mr. Bean said two signs are not allowed at all; they could not apply for two principal use signs unless they were replacing the sign on Bryan Street because there are two frontages.

**Mr. Bean** explained that the Zoning Administrator had to take into consideration the context of the sign. His client's desire to send people down the alley for registration or parking is something that was off premises. His argument was contents are off limits constitutionally, but after considering it more, this was the only way that the Zoning Administrator could see it. The purpose of the sign was to identify, advertise or direct someone to a separate piece of property, making that a freestanding separate use sign which are not allowed in the Landmark Historic District. Mr. Bean explained that changed the wording and eliminated the second side of the sign configured in an L shape, but it is still just one two-sided sign. He said the ordinance does make them only count one side as the total square footage. The second side is not added to the total.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if it is the same information. It no longer directs people to park.

**Mr. Bean** answered that Mr. Lominack was correct. They are simply identifying the ownership and the use of the property and the Zoning Administrator agrees. But, it does, indeed, qualify as a principal use sign which is allowed by right.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

**Board Action:**

Approval of the principal use sign at 0 Barnard Street because it meets the standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present

Robin Williams

- Aye

20. Petition of Andy Lynch, AIA - Lynch Associates Architects, PC | 13-003853-COA | 574 Indian Street | Rehabilitation/Alteration

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [North Oglethorpe Ward.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

**NOTE: Ms. McClain left the meeting at 4:20 p.m.**

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

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation, alterations, and signage for the property located at 574 Indian Street. The project includes improvements to four connected building bays; the majority of the work will be completed on the two western bays and minor façade improvements will be made to the exterior of the two eastern bays. There are four buildings and three of the four are contributing. The building that is noncontributing is the one where the majority of the work will be done. The contributing buildings were built in 1900 and the noncontributing building was built in 1960.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed alterations, fence and signage with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit:

1. The small windows on the north and south facades should be double hung, awning; or easement;
2. Window sashes should be inset not less than three inches from the exterior faced of a building;
3. Storefronts should be inset not less than four inches from the exterior façade;
4. Revise the painted signs (freestanding, building identification, and supplemental signs) to consist of applied letters;
5. Revise the size of the supplemental identification to meet the maximum permitted size of 20 square feet.
6. Provide a color for the stucco, canopy supports, existing sliding doors; and
7. Provide a sample of the corrugated metal panels and wood panel stain.

**Mr. Lominack** said some of the painted signs are actually on panels. Does this require that it be painted on the building?

**Ms. Michalak** answered that this is a good question as it says building or structure. Therefore, these might need to be clarified with the Zoning Administrator.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the wall will be repainted to cover up the wording of the existing Coastal Paper Company.

**Ms. Michalak** in an answer to Dr. Williams's question [pointing to an area] said here they are, but here they will keep the historic portion.



**Dr. Williams** said he was only asking about the middle part.

**Ms. Michalak** said they will get rid of this one by painting over it.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Ward** stated that he was present on behalf of Lynch Associates Architects. He said to clarify a few things, the small windows on the north and south facades will be inset three inches minimum and they will be casement windows; the storefront windows will be inset four inches. Mr. Ward said they are happy to follow the staff's recommendations about the signage. They are not opposed to whether it is painted or applied. Certainly, they will follow the square foot allotments. He said they know that one of the signs was bigger than it is suppose to be; therefore, they will adjust this accordingly. As far as the colors and samples, they will work with the staff to ensure that they are compatible.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Ward that the big logo that is on the gable of the central building where it says "Coastal Paper Company" if they are proposing a metal that will sit on the surface.

**Mr. Ward** answered that it will be slightly raised from the surface.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Ward if it was allowable, have they considered painting directly on the corrugated metal.

**Mr. Ward** answered no, not for this particular sign. They want something that would actually sit on the face of the building.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes it would actually be hard to read if it was painted on the corrugated metal. He asked that if the Board recommends that the owner goes to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a variance to paint the signage on those elements, would the owner do so.

**Mr. Ward** answered that he does not know.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Ward that they are willing to accept the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Ward** answered yes and he can ask the owner if he wishes to pursue the paint. The owner has not told them that he wants to paint over it.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Lominack** said this is the most exciting project that the Board has seen today. They have so few industrial buildings in the Historic District. This is an industrial historic building and the things that they want to do the buildings, appears to make it more pleasant to have here.

**Mr. Engle** said he wanted to read page 16 of the ordinance for the record as he wants to stress this point. He read that K-1-1 under the section of when a Certificate of Appropriateness is needed says "Preservation of a historic structures within the Historic District, an historic structure and any outbuilding or any appurtenances related thereto visible from a public street or lane including ....." He said it does not say an historic

appurtenance, but it says any structure related to an historic structure.

**Mr. Engle** said, therefore, there is no question that center section is related to three historic structures. Therefore, in the future staff should be reviewing anything connected to an historic structure as if it was historic itself. This is why with Kehoe they had to review that building even though it was not listed, but it was a part of the overall property.

**Mr. Lominack** said this one passes that test.

**Mr. Engle** explained that he does not have a problem with anything that is proposed to be done, but the point is it should be reviewed with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

**Ms. Harris** said she was familiar with the Kehoe building when this was reviewed by the Board. However, she hears Mr. Engle's comments and she just wanted to clarify that when they talk about appurtenances, the definition of an appurtenance reads in the ordinance "accessory object including, but not limited to fences, light fixtures, signs, downspouts and trellises." Ms. Harris asked if they want to revise this to include buildings.

**Mr. Engle** said the ordinance does not only say "appurtenances," but it says any outbuildings or appurtenances.

**Ms. Harris** asked if the outbuilding would be connected or would it be separate.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes it could be considered a building that is attached to it as well.

**Mr. Engle** said for this specific purpose, there are an awful lot of 60-70 year old buildings that have not yet been added to the list. But, they are associated with buildings that are on the list. This is to protect them; if it is over 50 years old it should be treated as potential if it is an appurtenance to an historic building. He said that a 55 year old building sitting by itself does not have any protection.

**Ms. Harris** stated that for clarification, they are talking about the Secretary of Interior's Standards should apply to any outbuilding, appurtenances or addition if it is over 50 years old.

**Mr. Engle** answered that the Secretary of Interior's Standards do not apply to anything under 50 years old.

**Ms. Harris** said the Board might want to do a text amendment.

**Mr. Lominack** said they may need a number of text amendments to clarify things such as one that came up at the last meeting. There are some other things in there, too and they should be trying to improve the ordinance so that it accomplishes its intended purpose and not prohibit the right thing to happen because the ordinance says to do it the wrong way.

**Ms. Harris** said her thought is to do a presentation at the Board's Retreat on proposed text amendments; and they have the structured parking text amendment; the issue that came up about the balconies and whether it is the public right-of-way. She said she was going to add this one to the list for the Board's discussion. Ms. Harris informed the Board that if there were any others to please let her know so they could be added to the list.

**Dr. Williams** said he wanted to get clarification about the staff's recommendation to revise the painted signs to consist of applied letters. He asked staff if their

recommendation is that it not be painted on corrugated metal and that the letters sit on the surface of the bumps of the corrugated metal. Is this staff's recommendation?

**Ms. Michalak** answered that the petitioner can basically do anything they want to other than paint it on the building. They can come back with single letters, some kind of metal plate to be attached to the door, but the ordinance reads not painted directly on. Therefore, staff leaves this to the petitioner's discretion to decide what they want the sign to look like.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the ordinance prohibits what was actually an historic pattern on this type of building.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes.

**Ms. Ramsay** said it would have to go to the ZBA for a variance and this Board does not know whether the owner wants to go through this extra month long process.

**Mr. Howington** stated that the Board could make a motion that if the owner decides that they want to paint it, they can go to the ZBA. Otherwise, they can meet the staff's recommendation.

**Mr. Ward** stated that he believes that an applied signage could be an applied piece of vinyl that adheres to the ridges of the corrugated metal. It is not paint, but gives sort of the same visual.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Ward if they were wanting to do so without seeking a variance from ZBA and, therefore, was suggesting that they might meet the letter of the law by having a piece of vinyl that follows the ridges of the corrugated metal.

**Dr. Williams** asked if only the logo is on the gable and no words are there. Is that a sign?

**Ms. Michalak** answered it is considered a building identification sign. The sign on the silo is considered a freestanding principal use sign and the projector blade sign on the front is considered a projecting principal use sign. All three of the signs are permitted on this building.

**Board Action:**

Approval of the proposed alterations, fence and signage with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit:

- The small windows on the north and south facades should be double hung, awning, or casement;
- Window sashes should be inset not less than three inches from the exterior facade of a building;
- Storefronts should be inset not less than four

inches from the exterior façade;

- Revise the painted signs (freestanding, building identification, and supplemental signs) to consist of applied letters;
- Revise the size of the supplemental identification to meet the maximum permitted size of 20 square feet; - PASS
- Provide a color for the stucco, canopy supports, existing sliding doors; and
- Provide a sample of the corrugated metal panels and wood panel stain.

Recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance to allow signs to be painted on the buildings and structures located at 574 Indian Street as requested. Per "*Historic Sign District Section (8-3121) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance, Section (4) Restricted signs., (d) Signs painted directly on exterior walls of a building or structure*" are not permitted in the B-G zoning district.

Painted signs on historic buildings are visually compatible with visually related contributing structures in this area, they currently exist on this building, and were typical historically particularly on the buildings with industrial character.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

Second: Robin Williams

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

21. [Petition of Matthew Allen | 13-003854-COA | 411 East Perry Street | New Construction Garage: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Facing North.pdf](#)

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

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

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

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of a one-story garage for the property located at 411 East Perry Street. The accessory structure is proposed at the rear of the property and will provide two garage openings off of the lane. The existing fences on the east and west property lines will remain.

**Ms. Michalak** said the two-story, detached main residence at 411 East Perry Street is a recently completed (October 2012), new construction, single-family residence that was approved by the Historic Review Board on November 9, 2011.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed garage at 411 East Perry Street with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review and approval with Part II, Design Details:

1. Add a fence along the lane, flush with the façade of the garage at the east side of the garage where there is a side yard setback, to create a wall of enclosure along the lane.
2. Set the garage back three feet from the property line at the lane so that the apron into the garage does not encroach on the public right-of-way.

**Ms. Michalak** entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Lominack** asked about the ramp being on the inside of the garage.

**Ms. Michalak** said she did not see that.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said something is said about a fence. Is this not something they are looking at today?

**Ms. Michalak** said it is not on there, but it is the staff's recommendation to add a fence to comeback with Part II.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Allan** came forward and stated that he is the petitioner.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked Mr. Allan if there is a reason why he did not do two stories.

**Mr. Allan** stated that they do not want two stories. The mass for instance two doors down has a very large two-story non-historic structure with a large gable roof. He said the true purpose of a garage is not meant to be residential.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**Board Action:**

Approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed garage at 411 East Perry Street with the following condition to be submitted to the Board for review and approval with Part II, Design Details: - PASS

1. Add a fence along the lane, flush with the façade of the garage at the east side of the garage where there is a side yard setback, to create a wall of enclosure along the lane.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

22. [Petition of Matthew Allen for J. Leander, LLC | 13-003855-COA | 502 East Oglethorpe Street | New Construction Amendment and New Construction Garage: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Aerial - Facing South.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs and Renderings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Main Building Amendment Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Garage Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Previously Approved Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Staff Report2.pdf](#)

**Mr. Matthew Allan** was present on behalf of the petitioner.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for an amendment to Certificate of Appropriateness which was for a new construction detached, single-family residence at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue. This was approved by the Board at the end of last year. The amendment includes changes to the rear of the main residence and New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass for a garage at the lane. The accessory structure is proposed at the rear of the property and will provide two garage openings off of

the lane.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the stoop will be visible from the lane.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that it will not be visible from the lane because there will be a garage, but it will be minimally from the front because the petitioner wants to move it to the side of the rear.

**Mr. Engle** said looking at the enlarged site plan it still does not reflect what was approved the last time. The steps were supposed to come out and embrace the wall.

**Ms. Michalak** said it does not; however, this is not the one she stamped. She explained that she wrote in the staff report that the main building was approved with conditions on March 13, 2013 by the Review Board. The conditions were reviewed and approved by staff prior to stamping the drawings for the building permit. The petitioner actually met all the conditions.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that the General Development Plan was submitted to the City and the Site Plan Review wants the gate to swing into the property away from Oglethorpe Avenue.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed garage at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board of review and approval with Part II, Design Details:

1. Add a fence along the lane, flush with the façade of the garage at the east side of the garage where there is a side yard setback, to create a wall of enclosure along the lane.
2. Set the garage back three feet from the property line at the lane so that the apron into the garage does not encroach on the public right-of-way.
3. Swing the pedestrian gate along Oglethorpe Avenue into the property to meet a condition of the City's Site Plan Review.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the new staircase will be on the side of the house.

**Ms. Michalak** said the staircase is new in a sense that it moves from the rear to the side. But, otherwise it is identical.

**Dr. Henry** said looking at the drawings, it appears that it will block access from the street to the back of the house.

**Ms. Michalak** pointed out that actually an existing brick fence is here already. Therefore, there is no access.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Allan** came forward and stated he is the petitioner.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier** of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that she does not know if this falls under Part I or Part II, but it states that the proposed garage is going to

match the materials of the house. She said that the HSF wants ensure that certain details such as corner boards are incorporated.

**Ms. Meunier** said she realizes that they are not looking at details in either these, but they just want to ensure that things such as if there is a fascia or anything that headers are over the garage doors are all detailed when they look at it in Part II as this somewhat affects looking at just the mass presently.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Williams** said it appears that the HSF concerns will be covered in Part II, Design Details.

#### **Board Action:**

Approval for New Construction: Part I, Height and Mass of the proposed garage at 502 East Oglethorpe Avenue with the following conditions to be submitted to the Board for review and approval with Part II, Design Details:

1. Add a fence along the lane, flush with the façade of the garage at the east side of the garage where there is a side yard setback, to create a wall of enclosure along the lane. - PASS
2. Swing the pedestrian gate along Oglethorpe Avenue into the property to meet a condition of the City's Site Plan Review.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams

Second: Keith Howington

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Aye
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye
Zena McClain, Esq.	- Not Present
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Not Present
Robin Williams	- Aye

### **IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

### **X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

23. [Petition of Dave McKinley for Coastal Canvas | 13-003172-COA | 320 West Broughton Street |](#)



Staff Approved - Awning

Attachment: [COA - 320 West Broughton Street 13-003172-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 320 West Broughton Street 13-003172-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. Petition of Eve Bluett | 13-003480-COA | 509 Barnard Street | Staff Approved - Color Change

Attachment: [COA - 509 Barnard Street 13-003480-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 509 Barnard Street 13-003480-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. Petition of Janet Lewis for Kern & Co., LLC | 13-003516-COA | 107 West Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Repairs to Front Entry

Attachment: [COA - 107 West Broughton Street 13-003516-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 107 West Broughton Street 13-003516-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. Petition of Gerald Cowart for Cowart Group, PC - Architects | 13-003577-COA | 322-324 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Stucco Removal

Attachment: [COA - 322-324 East Broughton Street 13-003577-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 322-324 East Broughton Street 13-003577-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. Petition of Jim Shirley for City of Savannah | 13-003582-COA | Forsyth Park 621 Drayton Street | Staff Approved | Alterations to Existing Wall

Attachment: [COA - Forsyth Park 621 Drayton Street 13-003582-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet Forsyth Park 621 Drayton Street 13-003582-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. Petition of John McEachern | 13-003672-COA | 507 Tattnell Street | Staff Approved - Door and Window Replacement

Attachment: [COA - 507 Tattnell Street 13-003672-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 507 Tattnell Street 13-003672-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-003730-COA | 19-21 East River Street | Staff Approved - Awnings

Attachment: [COA - 19-21 East River Street 13-003730-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 19-21 East River Street 13-003730-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Petition of Jennifer Deacon for Dawson Architects | 13-003755-COA | 38 Montgomery Street | Staff Approved - Window](#)

Attachment: [COA - 38 Montgomery Street 13-003755-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 38 montgomery Street 13-003755-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of J. J. Lamberson for Twin River Capital, LLC. | 13-003837-COA | 702 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Amended Sign](#)

Attachment: [COA - 702 W. Oglethorpe Avenue 13-003837-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 702 W. Oglethorpe Avenue 13-003837-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of D. Rushing for Coastal Canvas Products | 13-003838-COA | 303 West River Street | Staff Approved - Awning Frame](#)

Attachment: [COA - 303 West River Street 13-003838-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 303 West River Street 13-003838-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Petition of Doug & Linda Jacobs | 13-003856-COA | 315 East York Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 315 East York Street 13-003856-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 315 East York Street 13-003856-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Neil Dawson for Dawson Architects | 13-003862-COA | 115 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Mechanical Screening](#)

Attachment: [COA - 115 East Bay Street 13-003862-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 115 East Bay Street 13-003862-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Peter Thompson | 13-003919-COA | 537 East Harris Street | Staff Approved - Roof Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 537 East Harris Street 13-003919-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 537 East Harris Street 13-003919-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

36. [Petition of Vive Tapas Lounge | 13-003936-COA | 111 West Congress Street | Staff Approved - Color Change/Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 111 West Congress Street 13-003936-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 111 West Congress Street 13-003936-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Nicholas Henry | 13-003954-COA | 405 and 407 East Hall Street | Staff Approved - Roof Replacement](#)

Attachment: [COA - 405 and 407 East Hall Street 13-003954-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 405 and 407 East Hall Street 13-003954-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Erwin Bartsch | 13-003955-COA | 118 West Gwinnett Street | Staff Approved - Windows](#)

Attachment: [COA - 118 West Gwinnett Street 13-003955-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 118 West Gwinnett Street 13-003955-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Jennifer Deacon | 13-003958-COA | 126 West Bay Street | Staff Approved - Windows/Doors/Storefront Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 126 West Bay Street 13-003958-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 126 West Bay Street 13-003958-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

## XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

40. [Report on Work Performed Without a Certificate of Appropriateness](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 8-14-13.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the Board were sent the attachments on the report for the work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**Mr. Engle** said the Board did not get copies of the attachments this month nor last month. He said it is no way for them to keep track of them if they call and say something has happened.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said she likes it digitally.

**Dr. Williams** asked if they prefer to review the hard copies rather than looking at them in color on their computers.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked the Board if there was anybody else besides Mr. Engle who would like to get the paper copy.

**Note:** No one else wanted the paper copy.

**Ms. Ramsay** informed the Board that they will get the attachments digitally and Mr. Engle will get paper copies.

**Mr. Howington** asked if it is always the practice to send a sheriff when the work is performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness or can they send a letter.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that a sheriff does not take the notice, but an inspector who delivers all the letters. Initially, the inspector delivers a 30 day courtesy notice. If the person does not submit with the 30 day courtesy notice, then she issued a certifies letter and gives the person an additional 30 days. Ms. Michalak said 2 East Liberty Street would have been serviced by Lorie Odom and south of that it would be Tiras Petrea. They all have badges and Lorie literally walks the beat. Therefore, she wears a complete uniform and has a badge similar to the police.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she would like to go over the entire process of after-the-fact approval once required for submittal because she believes it should be just as hard to get after-the-fact approval as it would be if they had come to the Board initially. However, she still wants the people to come before the Board for after-the-fact, but they should have the same hoops to jump through.

## **XII. REPORT ON ITEMS DEFERRED TO STAFF**

### 41. [Report on Items Deferred to Staff](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 8-14-13.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** said when submitting the attachments to the Board for the report on items deferred to staff, will follow the same process as work performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Board members will receive digital copies and hard copies (paper) will be sent to Mr. Engle.

## **XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

### **Notices**

### 42. [2013 Historic Preservation Commission Training, Thursday August 15, 2013 in Savannah, Georgia](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Burns HPC Training August 2013 in Savannah.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** asked if the Board would have to go the hotel to pick up their packets.

**Ms. Harris** explained that she believes the Board can go directly to the Kennedy Pharmacy building. She said she will pick up the packets for the Board.

43. [Next Meeting - Wednesday September 11, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

44. [2013 Board Retreat- Wednesday August 30, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. location TBD](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** reminded the Board that 2013 Board Retreat is Friday, August 30, 2013.

**Ms. Harris** reported that she has been working with SCAD to have the Retreat at the SCAD Museum. They have indicated that it will not be a problem, but she has not gotten confirmation as to the room number, etc.

**Dr. Williams** stated that the way the 5:3 language as written and how it transpired today makes it more confusing to him.

**Ms. Harris** reviewed how it has been applied in the past. She said 5 divided by 3 = 1.667. She said that if someone comes in with a proportion less than that, for example 5 divided by 2 = 2.5. This meets the requirement. But, if someone comes in with 5 divided by 4 = 1.25. Therefore, this is less than the 1.667. She explained that this is how they applied the 5:3 ratio. Ms. Harris said 1.667 is the mean number and you have to be above this and not below.

**Dr. Williams** asked if this is how the standard is measured in the ordinance or is it the staff's way of reading the ordinance.

**Ms. Harris** said this is how it has always been interpreted.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the Board can discuss this at the Retreat.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Harris** said that Dr. Henry asked for an update on 554 East Taylor Street. She explained that a 30 inch tall wooden fence was put in the tree lawn along East Broad Street. This request was heard by the Board in February, 2013 and was denied. Staff has subsequently received comments from neighbors inquiring as to when this will be enforced. Ms. Harris said, as the Board is aware, we don't do the enforcement, but rely on the City of Savannah. Staff has continually forwarded the comments to the City and the latest comments staff has received from the City is that the property owner has received a court summons. The applicant was initially summoned to appear in court on August

19, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. However, the applicant requested that this be moved back as she will be out of town and that she also intends to submit a text amendment to change the ordinance. This will allow the applicant time to submit the text amendment. The deadline to submit the text amendment was August 6, 2013.

**Ms. Harris** reported that just before the meeting today, she checked to see if we received the text amendment. She explained that a text amendment for the Historic Review Board goes to the MPC for a recommendation to City Council. When the text amendment is received, Ms. Harris will let the Board know.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Engle** asked staff if they have gotten anything on the railroad ties that are further down the block on the tree lawn.

**Ms. Harris** answered no.

#### XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

#### XV. ADJOURNMENT

45. [Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Historic Review Board, Ms. Ramsay adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris  
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem