



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room 1:00 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes

**DECEMBER 11, 2013 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING**

**HDRB Members Present:** Linda Ramsay, Chair  
Ebony Simpson, Vice 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

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

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME**

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

**Chairman Ramsay** called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. She outlined the purpose and role of the Historic District Board of Review.

**II. SIGN POSTING**

**III. CONSENT AGENDA**

2. [Petition of Rajiv Bachan | 13-005580-COA |104 East Broughton Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the principal use fascia sign at 104 East Broughton Street because it is visually compatible and meets the standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

3. [Petition of Doug Bean | 13-005902-COA | 601 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for a fascia and projecting principal use sign at 601 East Bay Street because they are visually compatible and meet the standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

4. [Petition of Doug Bean | 13-005903-COA | 301 East Bay Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the projecting principal use sign, a new supplemental identification sign, as well as a sign face change for the business located at 301 East Bay Street as requested because they meet the sign standards, preservation standards, and are visually compatible. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

5. [Petition of James Devine | 13-005917-COA | 307 East River Street | Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for the principal use fascia sign at 307 East River Street, with the staff recommendation to remove the second story projecting sign bracket on the façade of the building. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Keith Howington	- Not Present
T. Jerry Lominack	- Aye

Zena McClain, Esq.	- Aye
Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr.	- Aye
Linda Ramsay	- Abstain
Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

6. [Petition of Lott + Barber | 13-005924-COA | 123 Abercorn Street | Sign and Awning](#)

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

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for an awning, sconce light fixtures, a principal use fascia sign and a storefront system in an existing opening along the East State Street façade as requested because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets design and sign standards. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Marjorie W Reed  
Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

7. [Petition of Patrick L. Phelps | 13-005927-COA | 25 East Broughton Street | Selective Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Historic Photograph Record.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition to remove the non-historic concrete panel façade, stucco façade, tile facade, and metal canopy for the property located at 21-25

East Broughton Street with the conditions that all historic materials and features discovered below the façade and canopy be retained and that all proposed façade rehabilitation/restoration return to the Board for review and approval. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

8. [Petition of Patrick L. Phelps | 13-005930-COA | 110 West Broughton Street | Selective Demolition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [1930s Historic Photo Record.pdf](#)

Attachment: [1937 Historic Photo Record.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition to remove the non-historic stucco façade for the property located at 110 West Broughton Street with the conditions that all historic materials and features discovered below the façade and canopy be retained and that all proposed façade rehabilitation/restoration return to the Board for review and approval. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Marjorie W Reed

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

Reed Engle - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Keith Howington - Not Present

T. Jerry Lominack - Aye

Zena McClain, Esq. - Aye

Stephen Glenn Merriman, Jr. - Aye

Linda Ramsay - Abstain

Marjorie W Reed	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

9. [Petition of Joel Snayd | 13-005933-COA | 151 Bull Street | Storefront Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Staff Photographs of Existing Conditions.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Transom Diagrams.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Previous Approval Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition to restore and reconstruct the historic storefront transom windows for the property located at 151 Bull Street with the condition that the reconstructed transom window frames match the inset of the existing transom window frames that are scheduled to be restored. - PASS

**Vote Results**

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

**IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

10. [Approve Agenda](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of Agenda for Meeting of December 11, 2013. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.  
Second: Marjorie W Reed

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

## V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### 11. [Approve Minutes of November 13, 2013](#)

Attachment: [11-13-2013 Minutes.pdf](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Approval of November 13, 2013 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: T. Jerry Lominack

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

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

## VII. CONTINUED AGENDA

### 12. [Petition of Ed and Susan Hoffmann | 13-005467-COA | 307-311 East Huntingdon Street | New Construction Townhouses: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

#### **Board Action:**

Continue the petition to the January 8, 2014 HDBR meeting. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

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

**VIII. REGULAR AGENDA**

13. [Petition of Royal Bike Taxi | 13-004868-COA | 321 West River Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet- application, drawing, site plan.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photographs2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Historic Buildings Map #1737.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Ortho-Imagery -004868.pdf](#)

**Mr. Bob Hunt** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting after-the-fact approval to install a hoist at the rear of the building at 321 West River Street. The hoist is comprised of a retractable arm which extends 72 inches from the face of the building and can retract back into the exterior of the building. There is a cable which is attached to an existing bolt above the arm. The cable extends down and connects to a wind-able spool. The purpose of the hoist is to lift pedi-cabs into the loading area for storage. The pedi-cabs weigh approximately 200 lbs. Ms. Harris stated that it is not clear if the Secretary of Interior's Standard 9 is met which states new additions do not damage. Staff is concerned about the potential impact of and damage to the historic façade of the building, should the existing bolt pull through. The petitioner informed staff that the bolt has been re-mortared and sealed in place.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval with the condition that a structural engineer verify that the existing bolt and support bricks are structurally sound and adequate to hold the weight of the pedi-cabs.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked if the City has looked at the height of this.

**Ms. Harris** answered that the petitioner has applied for an encroachment permit with the City because it extends into the public right-of-way. The encroachment is pending upon the review and approval by the Historic Review Board.



**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said she was not necessarily talking about encroaching, but about the elevation above grade.

**Ms. Harris** explained that this is what is looked at in the encroachment permit. They look to see if there is any danger to trucks, people and so forth.

**Ms. Simpson** asked what did the petitioner do previously with the pedi-cabs.

**Ms. Harris** stated that the pedi-cabs were stored at another location. This was a different building. She believes that for a variety of reasons, the petitioner was no longer able to store the pedi-cabs there. Ms. Harris said the petitioner will be able to elaborate more on this.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if the encroachment permit is also after-the-fact.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the structural engineer analysis is for both the existing and new bolt.

**Ms. Harris** stated that staff has not specified this for both, but this is an excellent suggestion.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** stated that as far as safety concerns, has there been any thoughts on mischievous teenagers tampering with this.

**Ms. Harris** said the petitioner will be able to answer Ms. Weibe-Reed's question about safety. She is sure they are concerned about this.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Hunt** came forward and introduced himself.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Hunt if he was in agreement with the staff's recommendation of getting a structural review.

**Mr. Hunt** answered yes.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** asked Mr. Hunt if he had given thought to possible tampering.

**Mr. Hunt** said at night it is cranked up, is flat against the building and the cranks are padlocked. Therefore, they cannot be tampered with. He said that 99 percent of the time, someone is here during the day. The actual mechanical lift is inside the building and it only comes out to lower the bikes down. He said, therefore, the part that is considered mechanical is on the inside of the building.

**Ms. Simpson** asked that during the day is this structure vertical or horizontal.

**Mr. Hunt** explained that they lower it horizontally when they let the bikes out and then it is pulled up. But, at night it is secured so that it cannot be tampered with.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** informed the Board that they hold an easement on this property. They agree with staff's recommendation and as long as it has been verified by a structural engineer that the bolt on the brick and the additional bolt that Mr. Lominack mentioned are adequate to support the operations, then they will also be granting approval for the purpose of their easement.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said this is an historic function of these warehouses. There are original hoists and arms all over the buildings. This is just an ongoing use. The only question is to ensure that it is safe. It appears that it would not take much to knock that piece of plywood off. Mr. Engle said someone needs to check it from this standpoint also.

**Board Action:**

Approve the after-the-fact alteration with the condition that a structural engineer verify that the existing bolt and support brick, and all other attachments to the bricks are structurally sound and - PASS adequate to hold the weight of the pedi-cabs because the proposed work is visually compatible and meets the preservation standards.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Keith Howington

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	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

14. [Petition of J. Corde Wilson | 13-005459-COA | 544 East Liberty Street | New Construction Townhouses: Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerials.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

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

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

Attachment: [Previous Design Drawings \(November HDBR\).pdf](#)

**Mr. Corde Wilson** 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 seven attached multi-family townhomes with carriage houses for the vacant property located at 544 East Liberty Street. This project was continued from the November 13, 2013 HDBR meeting. Mr. Wilson has revised the submittal. The townhomes are three stories high and the carriage houses are two stories high. The Board also at their meeting of November 13, 2013 recommended to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the 30 foot structured setback parking variance required under Sec. 8-3030(n)(14)b. to allow a zero setback in this corner lot condition.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass, with the following conditions to be reviewed by the Board with the Part II submission:

1. Eliminate the false shuttered windows on the west façade of the main building along Houston Street.
2. Reduce the height of the entry door system recess to match the height of the adjacent window and add a lintel above.
3. Increase the height of the windows on the main buildings' west and rear facades to 60 inches.
4. Revise the design of the main buildings' rear porches between the first and second levels.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Wilson** said they have already addressed some of the staff's comments.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** commented that she believes the petitioner has done a great job revising the drawings. She believes this scale works much better than the previous submission. She said that the petitioner's hard work is recognized.

**Mr. Engle** said the second floor looks like a balcony instead of a porch. He said a four feet deep second floor porch is unheard of. If it is a balcony, it is only allowed to be three feet. It appears to be out of scale. The columns are much too thin.

**Mr. Wilson** said the columns are six-by-six. However, after receiving the staff's comments, they have made the changes and he believes they are now more in scale.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Wilson if he was in agreement with all of the staff's recommendations.

**Mr. Wilson** answered yes.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of the Historic Savannah Foundation** said they agree with the staff's comments, but they have a few additional comments. Ms. Meunier said instead of

eliminating the false shutters on the west façade, they suggest incorporating real windows in the center bay. They believe at least on the second and third levels based on the floor plan, windows can be added. Additionally, they believe that brick recesses should be added to the east façade to indicate windows. Even though it is not true windows, they believe it would help to break up the mass. They agree with increasing the height of the windows on the west and rear facades to 60 inches, but they also suggest increasing the windows on the first level of the rear façade to the same height as the windows on the first level of the front façade. This would create some better proportionality at least visually on the porches which are currently tall. Ms. Meunier said they agree with Mr. Engle's statement about restudying the porches to be balconies; they think they would be more appropriate. However, they do think that the proportions of the rear porches as they exist would need to be improved. The petitioner stated that they have increased the size of the columns and they agree with this, but they also suggest increasing the fascia boards below the deck and possibly adding louvers below the fascia to reduce some of the overall height.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Wilson if he wanted to respond to the public comments.

**Mr. Wilson** commented that they agree with most of HSF's comments. The windows on the front were always 72 inches. Now, all the windows have been increased to 72 inches.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said he wanted to make a comment about some of the HSF's comments. Technically, the first floor is not visible on the rear from the public's thoroughfare; therefore, this is not the Review Board's concern at all. At least the windows will not be visible. The upper part of the balcony is visible and this is the Board's concern. However, the first floor cannot be seen because of the carriage house.

**Mr. Lominack** said what he was about to say is really not a height and mass comment, but is something that he wants to pass along. He believes it is a strange relationship of the four-over-four windows on the ground floor and the two-over-two windows on the second and third floors. Mr. Lominack said he does not understand why the windows are four-over-four on the first floor.

**Mr. Engle** said the openings are larger.

**Mr. Lominack** said the openings are larger, but the panes are smaller. As he has said, to him it is a strange relationship. Also, something is weird with the scale, he said he cannot put his finger on it, but he would like to see a more inspired design.

**Mr. Howington** said his comments concerns Part II. He asked the Board how they felt about the horizontal banding between the floors. Typically, they are trying to replicate a late 19th century building where you have the water table and cornices parapet. The horizontal banding is a modern detail.

**Mr. Engle** said now that they are talking about things for Part II, if the things over the windows are supposed to be lintels, they should not stop at the opening. They are not shown anywhere else on the building. They need to be consistent. If lintels are on the front, they should be on the side and back as well.

**Dr. Henry** asked if there were any similarities between the staff's and HSF's recommendations.

**Mr. Engle** said the petitioner agreed to do the windows and this should be stated in the Board's motion.

**Ms. Simpson** said they would do so if they are in agreement with the comments.

**Ms. Ramsay** said there is a difference in staff's recommendation and HSF's recommendation.

**Ms. Simpson** said it is what the Board recommends. Staff has said what is historically in this neighborhood. There are minimal windows on that side and she does not think it would be adverse to agree with staff to remove the false shutters. Ms. Simpson said in other words, just have the two existing windows and remove the center false shutters.

**Dr. Williams** said in Troupe Square, there is a row similar to this one. A door is centered on the end elevation with real windows. Troupe Square is not far from this ward. Consequently, as a point of reference for something that would actually recommends real openings, there is precedence for this.

**Mr. Lominack** said it appears to him that if there is an office on the top floor, a hallway on the second floor, and a kitchen is on the first floor, real windows should be everywhere.

**Ms. Ramsay** pointed out that the person making the motion can decide which way to go and then the Board will vote on the motion with or without the windows.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass with the following conditions to be reviewed by the Board with the Part II submission:

1. Eliminate the false, shuttered windows on the west façade of the main building along Houston Street. - PASS
2. Reduce the height of the entry door system recess to match the height of the adjacent window and add a lintel above.
3. Increase the height of all windows.
4. Revise the design of the main buildings' rear porches between the first and second levels.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

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	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

15. [Petition of Tracy Harvey | 13-005761-COA | 612 Price Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Mercer Ward Map.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [2007 Photograph.pdf](#)  
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Ms. Tracey Harvey** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting to remove a portion of roof and wall above a three foot wide access lane between this property (612 Price Street) and 610 Price Street (to the north).

**Ms. Michalak** reported that staff recommends approval to remove the roof and siding/wall over the access lane between the historic residences located at 610 and 612 Price Street because the attachment's continued existence could be detrimental to the historic residence to which it is attached.

**Dr. Williams** commented that the 1898 Sanborn Map shows two semi-circular marks at the end which means that the passageway is covered.

**Mr. Engle** asked what happens to the gray building once the three feet of the other building is removed. There will be a wide open gable and a wide open second floor.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that something would have to be done to the eaves of that side. The sides are there and it would not be an open wall once that is taken out.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if there are any instances where damage has been done to one and the people in the other unit had to do something to protect their self.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if the passageways are common.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no.

**Mr. Merriman** said he has been in a number of these kinds of houses, but has never seen any such ones as this passageway. He stated this is in a unique situation that would not normally be encountered.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the other property has been condemned.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that the City of Savannah has condemned that property.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the property will be demolished.

**Ms. Michalak** answered that as far as she is aware; demolition for the property has not been scheduled.

**Dr. Henry** said his understanding is the building cannot be demolished. Is this correct?

**Ms. Michalak** explained that this would be a demolition of a contributing structure; therefore, the demolition request would come before the Historic District Review Board for approval.

**Dr. Henry** said he would hate to see it removed; you never see this in a framed building. He wished there was some way a protection could be put between the two buildings or move some of it rather than eliminate the entire passageway.

**Ms. Michalak** explained that staff considered also if there was potentially some other way to separate them enough for the problem to be resolved. Staff discussed this at length.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the units were structurally interdependent.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no.

**Dr. Williams** said, therefore, one unit could be cutback a certain distance and install some kind of barrier and then cosmetically put the join back in.

**Ms. Michalak** said Dr. Williams question would probably be a question for a structural engineer, but she does not see why it could not be done based on what they see therein. There are no huge structure supports attaching the two.

**Mr. Engle** said a ceiling joist is going right to left carrying the ceiling board. It would be simple enough to cut six inches off the eave and roof and maintain it. He does not believe the building will be demolished. Somebody will come along and rehab the building.

**Mr. Howington** said he believes it would be difficult to pull it back six inches as there is nothing to rest it on.

**Mr. Engle** asked if anyone has pulled the boards off the building and has done a structural analysis.

**Ms. Michalak** said this is a question the petitioner can answer. She said a structural analysis has been done on 610 Price Street before it was condemned. According to the City's report, the building is structurally compromised.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the passageway was looked at.

**Ms. Michalak** said she was not sure what was looked at.

**Mr. Engle** said there is no evidence that there is damage to the passageway structure. It is the building next door and the Review Board is being asked to take a unique feature a way without knowing what the actual condition is.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Ms. Michalak to restate the reasons why the City condemned the building.

**Ms. Michalak** said the City condemned the building because of lack of maintenance; decay of structural foundation; terminate infestation; rotten roof and other major physical

inadequacies.

**Mr. Merriman** said the Review Board is a part of the City. They should be able to accept the City's report.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes this might answer Mr. Engle's question. He asked if there is infestation on 612 Price Street.

**Ms. Michalak** answered no. This is what the petitioner is trying to stop from happening at her property. The petitioner has had to replace her roof and because 610 Price Street's roof is connected to her roof, it is coming right back under her roof.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Harvey** came forward and introduced herself.

**Dr. Williams** said according to the survey, a part is supported by Ms. Harvey's house. Therefore, he believes the question that the Board is wondering about, is whether they would be able to achieve what Ms. Harvey wants without removing the entire character defining feature.

**Ms. Harvey** explained that the property owner of 610 has had their property for 25 plus years. She has been working with the City of Savannah to get the property condemned. The owners have not done anything with it. She started the process a couple of years ago as she wanted to replace her roof. The roof at 610 Price Street continues to leak. The boards underneath the roof continue to rot. The entire side of the building has holes in it. She does not know structurally anything except that she needs to get away from that building. The inspection that the Board saw was from her inspector stating that they had information that 610 Price Street had infestations. Therefore, her concern is if she stays attached to 610 Price Street in anyway, everything she does to her property will have to be repeatedly done as she cannot force the neighbors to do anything about their property.

**Ms. Simpson** asked if people reside at 610 Price Street.

**Ms. Harvey** answered yes.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Mr. Daniel Carey of the Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said there is quite a bit of confusion with this property. He said among other things, he wonders why the individual at 610 Price Street is not petitioning for the demolition; why is the City not proactively helping to resolve all the issues that would condemn the building; or could someone come to the Historic Savannah Foundation and seek support; or any number of options before they start demolishing historic buildings regardless of its condition. Mr. Carey said he was in sympathy and respect to the adjacent property owner who is clearly trying to do the right thing. He believes they are in a position of making a decision conceivably of another piece of property and that owner is not present. He has concerns about this. Maybe that question alone would be a good reason for everybody to pause and say this needs to be continued or find out a lot more before they make an irreversible decision.

**Dr. Williams** asked Mr. Carey if the HSF has resources, expertise or persons on its staff who could be available and shed light on this situation. This is a unique feature; he does not know of any other building like this building in Savannah. Therefore, as urgent as it sounds



and for the sake of the adjacent home owner, he believes that this is one of those cases where more information is needed. Dr. Williams said he does not feel confident with what they have now in making an educated decision.

**Mr. Carey** said they will find the expertise. It may not be with the existing staff, but certainly they will find architects, contractors or someone to provide guidance in this matter. He said he agrees with Dr. Williams as, he, too, does not feel confident making an opinion saying this or that should be done. There is just too much uncertainty. But, he would say that they work with the City, the property owners, or whoever to try to at least enlighten them to the point where they can make a decision one way or the other.

**Dr. Henry** asked Mr. Carey if the HSF would be able to get this done by the meeting of January 8, 2014.

**Mr. Carey** said he was not sure as some times during holidays it is difficult to get people lined up. But, certainly they would endeavor to do so.

**Mr. Engle** wanted to remind the Board that they dealt with another petition in a similar situation. It concerned the second floor of a passageway. The petitioner wanted to remove it because the adjacent house was causing damage to it. The Board rejected this as it was a highly unique feature. Mr. Engle said he does not see the petition before the Board today as being any different. Termites swarm; this building could be ripped down and if termites are next door they will swarm and get into the petitioner's building anyway. Therefore, he does not believe that within the next 60 days there will be a termite infestation.

**Mr. Engle** said removing the passageway would change the character of the entire block. He believes it would be a huge mistake to do so without getting all the facts. Presently, the Board does not have all the facts of what is going on here. They do not even know what is supporting it. He does not want the Board to make a hasty decision. The argument given to the Board today could be made on every row house in Savannah that it is being affected by the house next door. On Price and Jones Streets, the petitioner wanted to change the entire roof because he said the property next door was dumping water onto his property when it rained. But, the Board did not accept that. The roof was redone and it worked. Consequently, the unique character is still there.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Ms. Harvey if she wanted to respond to the public comments.

**Ms. Harvey** said she appreciates that the Board is trying to preserve the buildings, but she cannot make her neighbors do anything. They have owned their property for 25 plus years; the woman who owned the property passed away in February and now it has been taken over by the estate. It is owned by the deceased person children. The property is currently for sale. Ms. Harvey said she would be glad to remain attached to the building if someone was going to come in and do something with it. She said as a matter of fact, she was actively working with some buyers to try to get them to buy the property. The house is actually falling down and she thought the persons would go in and historically rebuild it. However, she cannot make anyone do this.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Harvey if she would be willing to work with the Historic Savannah Foundation. There are some unanswered questions.

**Ms. Harvey** said she would love for someone to come inside the building and look at it. But, the other property owners have to be willing to let them go inside and see their

property. She said the problem is no one can assist her financially with all of the damages that continue to happen because they are not caring for that property. It cost her \$4,000 to put on a new roof and more damage continued to happen after the roof was put on. She said she does not have that much money.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Harvey when was the new roof installed.

**Ms. Harvey** stated that the roof was put on about 18 or 24 months ago. At that time, she could not get the Property Maintenance Department to condemn the house next to her. They were told that the roof was repaired by the previous owners. However, the repair job was painting the roof silver.

**Mr. Howington** stated that he, too, sympathized with Ms. Harvey. He told her that the idea is not to punish her as the owner, but the Board hopes she will work with them to find other resources.

**Ms. Harvey** said she has put the word out to everyone she knows to try to get the property sold.

**Mr. Howington** said the present property owners are accountable for the property.

**Ms. Harvey** said she does not know how to hold the property owners accountable. She said she thought the Property Maintenance Department was the vehicle to do this. But, it has been two and one-half years.

**Ms. Ramsay** informed Ms. Harvey that the Review Board cannot ask for a continuance, but she can.

**Ms. Harvey** asked for a continuance.

**Ms. Simpson** said she agrees with everything that has been said, but they cannot make the other owner come forth.

**Dr. Henry** said he agreed with Ms. Simpson, but at some point they have to protect the district so that people will want to live in the houses within the district.

**Ms. McClain** said the City has a process through Recorder's Court. She was sure the City can do something by way of getting the owner either by citing the owner or fining the owner.

**Ms. Harvey** said the owners have put the property up for sale. She believes that by getting the property condemned is what led to the decision to put it up for sale. It is currently in an estate and she believes there are several children involved in the estate. Ms. Harvey said Property Maintenance has a contact person for this.

**Mr. Howington** asked what would happen if the property is sold within 30 days and someone wanted to restore the property.

**Ms. Harvey** said she has no problems waiting. Frankly, it would save her \$3,800 if someone does something with the property. But, after waiting for eight years for something to be done, she is at the point where she is willing to spend the money to protect her home.

**Mr. Engle** said there are other ways. There are alternatives that need to be looked into to

preserve this as much as possible instead of total removal.

**Mr. Merriman** said it could be removed and fixed the petitioner's house so that it is not getting any more damage until such time that somebody buy the property next door. Then when that person comes before the Review Board, they could require that person to put the thing back.

**Ms. Harvey** asked if the continuance would be for 30 days or longer. What does she need to do?

**Ms. Harris** explained that it depends on what the Board intends to do. If the option is for the Historic Savannah Foundation to work with the petitioner, then there needs to be enough time to do so.

**Dr. Williams** said given that the holidays are here and to give the Historic Savannah Foundation enough time to find the appropriate expertise, maybe this needs to be continued for 60 days.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Lominack** said this is an unusual issue. The Board needs to be careful not to take action that could cause potential damage to someone else which they would be allowable for. He said he would hate for something to happen that would cause this house to be lost because the other was saved.

**Mr. Howington** said, therefore, he believes that it is important to put a limit on this.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the motion could put the time limit therein.

### **Board Action:**

Approve to continue the petition to remove the roof and siding/wall over the access lane between the historic residences located at 610 and 612 Price Street for the petitioner to work with Historic Savannah Foundation and the City's Property Maintenance Department to explore alternatives to removal. The petition is continued to the February 12, 2014 HDBR meeting. - PASS

### **Vote Results**

Motion: Robin Williams  
Second: Ebony Simpson  
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	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

16. [Petition of Sarah Ward, Ward Architecture | 13-005889-COA | 148 Price Street | Rehabilitation](#)

Attachment: [Staff report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HDBR Application.pdf](#)

Attachment: [HDBR drawings 11 20 13.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps 5889.pdf](#)

**Ms. Sarah Ward** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation and alterations to 148 Price Street.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation of 148 Price Street with the following conditions:

1. Ensure that the door frames are inset at least three inches from the façade of the building, excluding on the second floor, and
2. Ensure the height of the railing/louvers on the rear porch does not exceed 36 inches.

**Ms. Harris** commended the petitioner on the thoroughness and completeness of the application. It was easy to follow.

**Mr. Engle** asked if the rehabilitation and alterations will be done by the same party who submitted the proposal 18 months ago.

**Ms. Harris** was she did not know, but the petitioner would be able to answer Mr. Engle's question.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Ward** explained that this is a different petition than the one the Board saw before. There is a new owner. She said with regards to the staff's recommendation, the door frames are inset approximately 12 inches from the façade and are within the masonry wall. The height of the louver system is 36 inches.

**Ms. Simpson** asked if the two windows on the first floor are visible on the interior.

**Ms. Ward** answered that the ground floor has undergone a number of alterations and openings were in the ground floor, but they were not like the ones being proposed now. They are trying to align the windows with the ones above. Unfortunately, they do not match exactly, but there is flashing on the interior where they were filled in before.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if this was a one-story building that was raised or if a floor was removed from a wood framed building and a block floor was put in.

**Ms. Ward** answered that she wished she could say with 100% certainty, but she cannot. It is their belief that the building has been raised after meeting with the structural engineer. She said that the interior is a steel supported system that is actually holding up the floor. There is also an old sill that is on top of the surrounding concrete wall. It does indicate that it has been raised, but the Sanborn Maps somewhat contradicts this belief. Ms. Ward said, therefore, it is uncertain at this time based on what they could find.

**Mr. Engle** said there was discussion that there might have been a second floor balcony on the front when the Board discussed this in the past. Did you find anything to support this?

**Ms. Ward** answered that a balcony was here before as can be seen in a photograph. But, they do not know if it is original. It was not shown on the Sanborn Maps. She said frankly, it encroaches into the lane. This proposes a hazard and for a number of reason, the owner decided not to reinstate that feature, but rather put a porch on their property rather than encroach on the City's property.

**Dr. Henry** said he admired the proposed work for this project.

**Mr. Engle** said he is surprised that the property has remained standing as long as it has.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said she is glad that somebody is doing something with this building. It is exciting that it will be rehabilitated.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **Board Action:**

Approve the rehabilitation of 148 Price Street with the following conditions:

1. Ensure that the door frames are inset at least three inches from the façade of the building, excluding on the second floor; and - PASS
2. Ensure the height of the railing/louvers on the rear porch does not exceed 36," because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry

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	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

17. [Petition of Felder & Associates | 13-005908-COA | 21 Houston Street | Addition and Wall](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerials.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - Photographs, Project Description, Colors, and Specifications.pdf](#)

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

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

**Ms. Gretchen Callejas** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Leah Michalak** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a rear porch, trellis addition and existing brick wall alterations for the property located at 21 Houston Street. An existing rear covered stoop, stair, and portions of the existing wall will be removed to accommodate the additions.

**Ms. Michalak** reported that the staff recommends approval of the rear addition, trellis, and existing brick wall alterations for the property located at 21 Houston Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for review and approval:

1. Gutters and downspouts are shown on the rear elevation, but not the side elevation or section. Revise the drawings and provide specifications and color selections to staff for final review and approval.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the entire shaded rear wall would be removed.

**Ms. Michalak** answered yes. This is the first level.

**Dr. Williams** said, therefore, there is not much demolition to be done on the ground floor level, but on the parlor floor which is visible, the petitioner is proposing a considerable amount of demolition.

**Ms. Michalak** stated that Dr. Williams was correct.

**Dr. Williams** said he believes that one-third of the rear of the building would be taken out.

**Ms. Michalak** confirmed that Dr. Williams's understanding was correct.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Michalak if she said that the addition would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

**Ms. Michalak** said no; she said just behind the wall.

**Dr. Williams** said arguably who knows whether the ground floor is historic or not based on what they have, but clearly what is above brick is historic and is completely visible.

**Mr. Lominack** said the wall was built when the building was moved.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Callejas** came forward and introduced herself.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Callejas what percentage of the original building fabric would be removed from the rear elevation.

**Ms. Callejas** said they do not know the percentage that would be removed. They are creating a fairly large case opening.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Engle** said his major concern is the triple window. It bothers him that a clearly modern approach is being taken with a triple host of windows and are putting six-over-six here. Mr. Engle said he finds this problematic. If this is appearing to be a modern addition, they should be one-over-one, single panes or something else. Why put a colonial window style under what is clearly not eighteenth century. This really bothers him and he believes it is attempting to create a sense of history that was not there.

**Mr. Lominack** said he likes the width of the window, but he believes also that another type of window would be better.

**Mr. Engle** said the thermal panes are not real. Therefore, why not get rid of it and just go with one-over-one. He said the house next door shows large sheets of glass and in a way this is more honest.

**Dr. Williams** said his concern is here they have a building with very broad clapboarding which indicates very little construction. Wide clapboarding is not common in the district. The building in its present condition allows the form of the building to be read clearly. The idea that a big hole would be cut in the back of existing fabric is not exciting from his point of view. The idea of an addition that increases the usable area if it was done without cutting so much of the rear elevation would be a preferable solution, if possible. Is any other Board member concern about the lost of the fabric?

**Mr. Lominack** said he was not commenting on the lost of the fabric, but he is in agreement with the windows being more contemporary. He believes the addition is quite well executed. He lived next door to this house for almost six years and also next to the other house that was moved. Mr. Lominack said he believes it is well delineated from the original building. A part of the building was probably re-cladded when it was moved.

**Mr. Engle** said if they are going by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, this building

would not be listed on the registry. It lost its integrity when it was moved and it certainly lost its integrity when a floor was added to it. Therefore, to him they are not really looking at a historic building with integrity at all. He would be willing to bet that Mills B. Lane loved that wide clapboard and he put it on many of his restorations. He agrees with Mr. Lominack that this is not an original. Because the building has been compromised as much as it has, he can go along with the addition as is, but he believes they need to change the windows.

**Mr. Merriman** asked if a building has been moved, does it no longer comes under the Secretary of Interior's Standards because it would have lost all integrity by being moved.

**Mr. Engle** answered that if it was registered it would lose its integrity, but this is their own district nomination. The fact is it has lost its integrity to site; it has lost its integrity to mass because the entire floor was added.

**Mr. Merriman** said he understood that. But if the building was not listed before and has been moved, would it never be eligible for listing.

**Mr. Engle** answered generally, no.

**Mr. Merriman** asked that even though the building is historic by virtually its age, it is no longer historical any more. He said he is just curious.

**Mr. Engle** said significantly, it is a part of the district, but it is not historical as a building. It is contributing towards the district, but it does not have its own integrity. For this reason, he believes they can approve this, but he feels that the lite pattern is not compatible.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for a rear addition, trellis, and existing brick wall alterations for the property located at 21 Houston Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for review and approval.

1. Gutters and downspouts are shown on the rear elevation, but not the side elevation or section. - PASS  
Revise the drawings and provide specifications and color selections to staff for final review and approval.
2. Revise lite pattern proposed on the addition's triple window and submit to staff for final review and approval.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

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	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

18. [Petition of Christina H. Swenson | 13-005918-COA | 541 East Liberty Street | Awning, Demolition, Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 541 East Liberty Street 13-005918-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial View.pdf](#)

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

**Ms. Alyson Smith** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for demolition of an existing one story, stucco, CMU addition that is located on the rear east side of the building; two new windows and one new door, new awning, color change, and fence for 541 East Liberty Street.

**Ms. Smith** reported that staff recommends approval for the demolition, two new windows and one new door, new awning, color change, and the fence with the condition that the design be revised to include a masonry base and submitted to staff; because the project is visually compatible and meets the design standards.

**Mr. Engle** said the awnings do not meet the design standards nor do they meet the design guidelines of the Secretary of Interior's standards.

**Ms. Smith** said this standard would not apply to non-historic buildings.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the site plan review has been done for this project.

**Ms. Smith** answered yes.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if any curb cut problems were stated.

**Ms. Smith** answered no.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Ms. Swenson** came forward and introduced herself.

**Mr. Engle** asked Ms. Swenson if she would have any problems pulling the awning back about 12 inches from each edge.

**Ms. Swenson** answered that she would not have a problem pulling the awning back about 12 inches from the edge.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**Board Action:**

Approve the petition for demolition, two new windows and one new door, new awning, color change, and the fence because the alterations are visually compatible and meet the design standards, with the following conditions: - PASS

1. The design of the fence be revised to include a masonry base and submitted to staff.
2. The awning be recessed from the edge of the building.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Nicholas Henry  
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	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

19. [Petition of Erik Puljung, Hansen Architects, P.C. | 13-005926-COA | 138 Habersham Street | Alteration](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report- 5926.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Context - Sanborn Maps 5926.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Ortho-Zoning-Imagery 5926.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Application - 138 Habersham Street 13-005926-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 138 Habersham Street 13-005926-COA REVISED.pdf](#)

**Mr. Erik E. Puljung** was present on behalf of the petition.

**Ms. Ellen Harris** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval to alter the enclosed two story rear porch by replacing the existing plate glass windows and door with

new Marvin Exterior Clad Ultimate French Casement windows on the second floor, Marvin Direct-Set windows on the first floor and Thermal Steel in-swing French doors by Architectural Traditions on the first floor. A knee wall system of louvered cedar panels will support the windows above. Additionally, the existing stair will be removed and reconstructed in the center of the porch (the location of the new French doors). The proposed colors will match existing.

**Ms. Harris** stated that she did a research for records of the Historic Review Board to find if any alterations were presented to the Board. In May 2003, the Board approved the enclosure of the two-story rear porch with plate glass window. The approval expired, but the new property owner applied for and completed the same alterations in 2004. Therefore, it is unknown exactly when the second-story porch was constructed. Ms. Harris said she believes the petitioner has done additional research on this and hopefully will be able to shed some light on this. However, in either case, it is not considered historic because they did not exist in 1973. However, the building is historic and, therefore, the Secretary of Interior's Standards do apply on the building although not necessarily for the porch configuration. Staff feels that the Secretary of Interior's Standards are met for this project as well as the visual compatibility factors.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the alterations to the rear porch at 138 Habersham Street with the condition that the muntins are no wider than 7/8 inch, because the alterations are visually compatible and meet the design standards.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the first floor porch is open and second floor porch is enclosed.

**Ms. Harris** answered that both porches are enclosed.

**Dr. Henry** asked if the building is duplex.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes, but they are under separate ownership.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Ms. Harris if she was saying that according to the Ordinance now, that the windows would not be able to be enclosed, but since it is already enclosed with windows that it is okay to replace them with other kinds of windows.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes; this is staff's recommendation. She explained that it is a non-historic porch as well which will be filled in.

**Mr. Lominack** asked if the porch was added recently.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes.

**Dr. Williams** asked if it was added after 1973.

**Ms. Harris** answered yes. It could be enclosed as an addition.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Puljung** came forward and introduced the owner, Ms. Dean Donnigan, who will also share a brief history of her process in acquiring the property.

**Ms. Donnigan** said they did a lot of research before they actually purchased the property just to try to understand how the external portion in the back came to look as it does. She said that fortunately the next door neighbor of the adjoining property as well as the Beehive Foundation were very forthcoming and generous in the documentation that is available for the property and with regards to the restoration and addition of the porch that was done in 1990. Some of the Board's questions about the porch addition, she believes can be answered in that it was done in phases. The owner on the 2003 record did the upstairs porch as a studio and still the existing external porch staircases were made. The downstairs remained opened. Then in 2004, the owner sought permission to go ahead and enclose everything at which time they removed the external porch stair which created an interesting situation internally [although she recognizes that the internal aspect is not a part of this Board's purview] .

**Ms. Donnigan** said it already looked different from the exterior. It was no longer a mirror image of the other property. Therefore, they were trying to understand how they could work with what is there now and go forward and of course pay respect to the history of the property.

**Mr. Puljung** said one of the pieces that Ms. Donnigan was interested in was having better access to the courtyard space. This was the driving force behind relocating the stairs to the center. This property was redefined during the most recent comprehensive renovation. He said, therefore, they are proposing to take their portion of the stair off and re-detail it to match the existing edge with returns on the treads and build a new stair in the same detail so that the doorway will have better access to what will be Ms. Donnigan's courtyard space as opposed to entering the courtyard in a smaller pocket.

**Mr. Puljung** pointed out the current floor plan. He said that the only change will be the door. Any use of the courtyard space requires walking through the functioning component of the kitchen. Mr. Puljung said this was another driving force in relocating the door. The plate glass that is presently here is not aesthetically pleasing as they hoped to achieve. They want to respect the house that is here and respect the quality of the porch that was added, which they have arrived at a date around 1990 for the construction. He said the windows are a 12-over-12 pattern. Therefore, going with larger window openings, they respected what was in the upper sash. They followed the same rhythm, but with larger light openings. He said they are approximately 14 or maybe 16 inches wide and just about two feet tall with their light opening. As has informed staff, it 7/8 divided light pattern and it is a putty glaze profile. In order to keep a more delicate approach with the doors, they are proposing a new door by Architecture Traditions which has the same small putty glaze light profile, but does not require the heavier styling rail profile of a wood or steel door.

**Mr. Puljung** said they also looked at other ways porches have been enclosed in the district. He said a good way of achieving the respect of the rail height is by keeping it as a window sill; not necessarily the round rail, but where the rail is would be the window sill for each of these. They will have panel below this so there will be solid wall within the building. He showed the Board a picture of the pre-renovations of the back of the house which showed what the major comprehensive project was up against when they had to decide what to do with the back of the house when the porch was added.

**Mr. Puljung** said it definitely has been cleaned up nicely and they appreciate that the porch is there. He said they are hopeful that they have done what the Board would envision as a good job of enclosing it in a tactful way.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Puljung if they are just filling in the existing footprint.

**Mr. Puljung** answered yes. They are not taking in any new footprint.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Ms. Ramsay** reported that she received an email in objection of the request.

**Ms. Danielle Meunier of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF)** said that their Architecture Review Committee reviewed the petition and believes that the proposed design detracts from the overall symmetry of the duplex. It was originally designed and executed in the symmetrical form. They are aware that the rear porch is not historic; it was built in 1990 as Ms. Donnigan reported. The addition was meant to be respectful and symmetrical to best fit this property. Ms. Meunier said they think that such a quality addition should be respected and upheld in that manner. The inclusion of windows to enclose the porch does make the rear façade overly heavy in detailing, especially for the style of structure and in comparison to the adjoining property. She said that they believe it would be more appropriate to leave the porch stair in its current location; restudy the use of windows or types of window used and maintain the porch balustrades to mirror the other half of the duplex.

**Ms. Meunier** said overall the HSF believes the best approach would be a simplified design that is more keeping with the adjoining property and what already exist.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Meunier if the HSF was saying keep the plate glass and the staircase.

**Ms. Meunier** said they are not recommending keeping the plate glass. She said obviously it has been altered with the addition of the plate glass, but the actual form of the porch is still essentially there. The plate glass does read as a void in some respects. Therefore, by adding the windows, it creates a little bit more of a solid configuration and sort of changes it. When you look at the two properties, they are no longer really mirroring each other. She said, therefore, the HSF greatest concern is the symmetry of the two properties.

**Dr. Henry** asked Ms. Meunier, therefore, they would not do the windows.

**Ms. Meunier** said the HSF is saying restudy the type of windows or the use of windows.

**Ms. Gene Carpenter** stated that she is the owner of the other side of the building. She works at the Beehive Foundation who restored the house in 1990. Ms. Carpenter said she has been working with Ms. Donnigan and they have had amicable discussions. But, she believes that they have a slightly different philosophical approach. For a bit of background on this property, she said that Mills B. Lane, IV son worked with Mr. Harvey Jones on many restorations around town. Their approach was to do restorations as authentic as possible. This is what they tried to do here.

**Ms. Carpenter** said as has been stated, the modern porches were added on the back, but

Mr. Jones did so in the style that he thought was appropriate for these small simple wooden houses. She said with the design as is they have no problem with Mr. Puljung's design itself. But, they do not believe that it is appropriate for this house. Their main concern is the deviation from the symmetry. They were designed to mirror each other, but with the new design this will be destroyed. She said their other concern is they believe that it visually too complicated for these houses. It is out of character. These are simple houses and deserve simply clean solutions. Ms. Carpenter said she believes that if they go forward with this, they will no longer be able to tell that the right-hand side was at one time a mirror image of the left-hand side. They do not like the addition either, but they can at least tell that they were porches just as the other side, but were simply filled in with glass.

**Ms. Carpenter** said all they are asking now that Ms. Donnigan and Mr. Puljung if they can, please consider some alternative designs and keep in mind the symmetry of the buildings and the simplicity. They need clean simple plans.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Ms. Donnigan and Mr. Puljung if they wanted to respond to the public comments.

**Ms. Donnigan** said the exteriors are no longer mirror images of each other. They really wanted the internal square footage that it offers. Therefore, they are trying to understand how they can best reconfigure the space. She said in their research prior to purchasing the property, they made sure that there no covenants applied to the property by the Beehive Foundation or anyone else. She guessed the discovery that the porches were and documented through the many details files at the Beehive with regards that this was 20th century version of what a porch might have looked like that had been here.

**Mr. Puljung** said through the architecture that they are presenting, they have made efforts to respect the back as a porch rhythm is established through the centerline. They are also following a footprint that is in place, but the wall with the glass and louvers are pulled back about two-thirds of the depth of columns. Therefore, they let the columns read the most of their entirety. He said he believes the Board will pick up on the depth and rhythm of that as far as seeing how the porch reads as the other half.

**Ms. Donnigan** added that as a part of the inspection, some of the structural elements were evaluated in detail with regard to the porch and weight of the plate glass. There is some concern with regards to how the porch structure is holding up under this. She said, therefore, they will have to do a lot of work pulling this a way to look at reinforcing this. Ms. Donnigan said they will be looking at replacing the windows anyway. Therefore, they are looking to replace something that would allow them more functionality with the rooms. When you have a big plate glass window, there are certain rooms that you need more privacy for internally. Therefore, this was considered in their consideration as well.

**Ms. Carpenter** said regarding the symmetry, even though it has been filled in, it is still obvious that it is the same porch, but filled in. But, you will not be able to tell this from the design the petitioner has now. The floor plan is still there and the staircase is still there, but has simply been filled in with glass. She said she keeps hearing over and over again that because something isn't old, then it does not have to be respected and you can do whatever you want to it, but she believes this is the wrong path to take. It is preferable to her that if something is new and it has been done and is executed well then it should be respected.

Ms. Carpenter said she believes this is what they feel about Mr. Lanes' restorations. The porches were done in a correct manner to match the house at the time. She believes this should be respected.

**Mr. Puljung** said he does not know whatever he can add, but he does know that through studying the work that was done, many options were considered for the back porch and this is what they have decided on.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** commented that she believes the design that has been presented is well executed and this is how people live today. She said we cannot live the way we live just because something is old. She believes that the simulated divided light tends to detract from the three bay verticality of it. Ms. Weibe-Reed said her impression of it is if it was not divided or simulated divided the verticality would read a little stronger.

**Mr. Lominack** said he was in agreement about the divided light. He believes that having a simple casement would be a better solution. He would personally like to see it continue down to the first floor rather than what appears to be fixed glass with simulated muntins. The windows on the first floor appear to be a single piece with simulated muntins. Is this correct?

**Mr. Puljung** answered that Mr. Lominack was correct.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes that it would be a more complete solution if they were casement windows without the simulated muntins.

**Mr. Howington** said the three different styles of windows need to be more consistent.

**Mr. Engle** said he believes that the divided light is striving too hard to be something that it isn't. It is not an early 19th century porch, it is a 1990 porch and the large plate glass attempts to say it is a porch. The doors are nine feet -six inches tall doors. They are talking mansion here. This is a simple house. Mr. Engle said he believes if it was just solid glass with no muntins it would carry the feeling of existing plate glass. He has no problem with building the stairs over. Sharing a staircase with somebody does not work, particularly if there is a refrigerator in front of it. Mr. Engle said centering the stairs works and it is not an 18th century porch. Simplifying it might have been better instead of going with horizontal louvers at bay were vertical railings because it would carry which it does not do now. If they have the rails, they would still have all the horizontals when the original was always vertical.

**Mr. Engle** said if the petitioner went with solid glass casement, vertical balusters instead of horizontal louvers, he believes it would work better. Personally, he feels it is too busy and too elegant for a simple house.

**Dr. Williams** asked if the original columns from the Harvey Jones porch is being left intact. Are all the windows working within the existing frames of those columns?

**Mr. Puljung** answered that this is correct; the infill is actually pulled outside of the columns.

**Dr. Williams** said he agreed with Mr. Engle. The biggest issue seems to be the use of the space and the moving of the stair. He said he was wondering if there is a compromise here that would retain more of the current design while allowing the stair to move so that use of the space as Ms. Weibe-Reed mentioned. Dr. Williams said it appears to him that they are replacing plate glass with some real divided light glass with some fake divided light glass, but ultimately it is still glass. He said he has not heard a compelling reason why the plate glass is being replaced.

**Mr. Lominack** said the casement windows can be opened, but the plate glass cannot be opened.

**Dr. Williams** said the petitioner could have operable windows that are partially divided.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes that several Board members do not believe that muntins do not belong here. But, he believes that the casement windows are appropriate here. He believes this is a much more ardent solution than the one that exists now.

**Ms. Weibe-Reed** said she has one final comment when they start comparing this to what the neighbors have done, the neighbors have lattice on their porch. She said visually this is not a better solution.

**Ms. Ramsay** said the lattice would not be allowed now.

**Mr. Merriman** asked Mr. Puljung if the windows go all the way to bottom behind.

**Mr. Puljung** answered that the windows do not. The moveable panels are divided vertically. Between the columns are four louvered panels.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Puljung if he would be willing to eliminate the muntins on the windows.

**Mr. Puljung** answered that his hesitancy to answer Mr. Engle's question is that he has seen large casement seem very sterile when they do not have divided lights in them.

**Ms. Ramsay** asked Mr. Puljung if he wanted to ask for a continuance.

**Mr. Puljung** asked would they have an opportunity with the continuance be able to show the Board drawings that have divided lights versus the non-divided light windows. Therefore, this could enable both lights to be there for consideration.

**Ms. Ramsay** answered that Mr. Puljung would be able to provide both lights.

**Ms. Simpson** asked, for example, if there would be four single pane windows.

**Dr. Williams** said there would be two flanking doors and six single pane windows on the second floor.

**Mr. Puljung** asked for a continuance.



**Board Action:**

At the petitioner's request, approve to continue the petition to alter the rear porch at 138 Habersham - PASS Street.

**Vote Results**

Motion: Ebony Simpson

Second: Nicholas Henry

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 - Aye

Robin Williams - Aye

20. [Petition of John Deering, Greenline Architecture | 13-005934-COA | 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue | Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff recommendation.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet- site plan.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal packet.pdf](#)

**NOTE: Mr. Howington abstained from participation in this petition as 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 to install a new "greenscreen" fence at 605 West Oglethorpe Avenue, at the Embassy Suites Hotel, along the west wall of the Thunderbird Inn. She said the proposed fence will include brick piers at eight feet intervals which match the brick piers installed near the hotel area. The piers range from 11 feet to 13'-6" tall. The request also includes a variance from the maximum fence height which will require approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The proposed fence will screen the HVAC units of the Thunderbird Inn.

**Ms. Harris** reported that staff recommends approval of the proposed fence with the "finding-of-fact" that the 13'6" tall fence is visually compatible because it is on the interior of the lot and is set three feet from the Thunderbird Inn wall, which is 17 feet in height.

**Dr. Henry** said he did not find the definition in their packets for a "greenscreen." Are they talking about bushes, vines, etc.?

**Ms. Harris** explained that there are brick piers, mesh in-between and the petitioner is proposing to grow Passion Flower Vine or Carolina Jasmine. A vine will grow up through the wire mesh.

**Dr. Williams** asked Ms. Harris if she knew whether Passion Flower Vine is evergreen. He knows that Jasmine is evergreen.

**Ms. Harris** explained that her experience with Passion Flower Vine is that it is not 100% evergreen. It will live through the winter if we do not have a hard freeze, but it is not a true evergreen.

**Mr. Lominack** said that the Carolina Jasmine tends to lose some of its leaves in the winter, but it does not die.

**Mr. Engle** said it might be a good idea to have several different species.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Deering** came forward and introduced himself.

**Mr. Lominack** asked Mr. Deering if they would plant a variety of vines here.

**Mr. Deering** answered that if Board deems it so, they will instruct the owner to plant a variety of vines here. Primarily, this is to screen the mechanical units.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

#### **Board Action:**

Approve the proposed fence with the “finding-of-fact” that the 13’6” tall fence is visually compatible because it is on the interior of the lot - PASS and is set three feet from the Thunderbird Inn wall, which is 17 feet in height.

#### **Vote Results**

Motion: Zena McClain, Esq.

Second: Robin Williams

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	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

## IX. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

## X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

21. [Petition of Doug Patten | 13-005611-COA | 201 East River Street | Staff Approved - Wall Repair](#)

Attachment: [COA - 201 East River Street 13-005611-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 201 E. River Street 13-005611-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

22. [Petition of Commonwealth Construction | 13-005660-COA | 612 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 612 Drayton Street 13-005660-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 612 Drayton Street 13-005660-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

23. [Petition of Jerry Lominack for Lominack Kolman Smith Architects, LLP | 13-005668-COA | 660 East Broughton Street | Staff approved - Removal of Brick Infill](#)

Attachment: [COA - 660 East Broughton Street 13-005668-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 660 East Broughton Street 13-005668-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

24. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc. | 13-005676-COA | 240 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 240 West Broughton Street 13-005676-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

25. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc. | 13-005677-COA | 206 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 206 East Broughton Street 13-005677-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

26. [Petition of G. Bart Redmond for Redmond Construction | 13-005693-COA | 5 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Paint Ventilation Shaft](#)

Attachment: [COA - 5 West Broughton Street 13-005693-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

27. [Petition of Thomas J. Beytagh, Jr. | 13-005705-COA | 227 Houston Street | Staff Denial - Six Feet High Wood Screen](#)

Attachment: [COA - 227 Houston Street 13-005705 Denial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 227 Houston Street 13-005705-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

28. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc. | 13-005747-COA | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 310 West Broughton Street 13-005747-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 310 West Broughton Street 13-005747-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

29. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc. | 13-005748-COA | Staff Approved - Awnings](#)

Attachment: [COA - 215-217 West Liberty Street 13-005748-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 215-217 West Liberty Street 13-005748-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

30. [Amended Petition of John Cola for Alex Roush Architects, Inc. | 13-005758-COA | 540 East Oglethorpe Avenue | Staff Approved - Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 540 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-005758-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 540 East Oglethorpe Avenue 13-005758-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

31. [Petition of Dinkarray Patel | 13-005768-COA | 102 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 102 East Broughton Street 13-005768-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 102 East Broughton Street 13-005768-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

32. [Petition of Commonwealth Construction, LLC | 13-005796-COA | 612 Drayton Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 612 Drayton Street 13-005796-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 612 Drayton Street 13-005796-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

33. [Amended Petition of Jennifer Deacon for Dawson Architects | 13-005797-COA | 126 West Bay Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 126 West Bay Street 13-005797-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 126 West Bay Street 13-005797-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

34. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc. | 13-005808-COA | 32 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 32 East Broughton Street 13-005808-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 32 East Broughton Street 13-005808-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

35. [Petition of Josh Bull for Greenline Architecture | 13-005837-COA | 480 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Color Changes](#)

Attachment: [COA - 480 East Bay Street 13-005837-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

36. [Petition of Minnie Poole for Coastal Canvas Products Co., Inc. | 13-005873-COA | 13 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 13 East Broughton Street 13-005873-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 13 East Broughton Street 13-005873-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

37. [Petition of Adam Iardino | 13-005890-COA | 21 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 21 East Broughton Street 13-005890-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 21 East Broughton Street 13-005890-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

38. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects, PC | 13-005928-COA | 25 East Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Exploratory Demolition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 25 East Broughton Street 13-005928-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 25 East Broughton Street 13-005928-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

39. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects, PC | 13-005929-COA | 110 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Exploratory Demolition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 25 East Broughton Street 13-005928-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 25 East Broughton Street 13-005928-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

40. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects, PC | 13-005932-COA | 240 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Selective Demolition](#)

Attachment: [COA - 240 West Broughton Street 13-005932-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 240 West Broughton Street 13-005932-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

41. [Petition of Patrick Shay for Gunn Meyerhoff Shay Architects | 13-005935-COA | 301 East Bay Street | Staff Approved - Awning](#)

Attachment: [COA - 301 East Bay Street 13-005935-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [submittal Packet.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

42. [Petition of Paul Miller & Shea Slemmer | 13-005979-COA | 224 Houston St. | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 224 Houston Street 13-005979-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 224 Houston Street 13-005979-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

43. [Petition of Patrick Phelps for Hansen Architects, PC | 13-006000-COA | 223 West Broughton Street | Staff Approved - Exterior Alterations](#)

Attachment: [COA - 223 West Broughton Street 13-006000-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 223 West Broughton Street 13-006000-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

44. [Petition of Monica Letourneau | 13-006024-COA | 707 Jefferson Street | Staff Approved - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [COA - 707 Jefferson Street 13-006024-COA.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet - 707 Jefferson Street 13-006024-COA.pdf](#)

No action required. Staff approved.

**XI. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Work Without a COA 12-11-13.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** said the staff has submitted their written report on work performed without a certificate of appropriateness to the Board.

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

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

Attachment: [HDBR Michalak Items Deferred to Staff 12-11-13.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** said the report on items deferred to staff was included the Board's packet.

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

**Notices**

47. [Next Case Distribution and Chair Review Meeting - Thursday, December 19, 2013 at 3:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, MPC, 110 East State Street](#)

48. [Next Meeting - Wednesday, January 8, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

**XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

**New Business**

49. [Report from Energy Efficiency in Historic Buildings Committee](#)

**Mr. Lominack** reported that the Energy Efficiency In Historic Buildings Committee met for approximately two hours on December 6, 2013. In attendance were Jerry Lominack (Committee Chair), Keith Howington (Committee Member), Stephen Merriman (Committee Member), Robin Williams (Committee Member), Leah G. Michalak (HDBR Staff), Stephen Manning (VNS Corporation), Jeff and Toby Tift (Coastal Sash and Door), and Jim Walker (Home South Architectural). Mr. Lominack said they will meet again as soon as the four committee members have had the opportunity to look at the samples. Hopefully, at the next meeting, they will be able to give a detailed report and make a recommendation.

50. [2014 Meeting Calendar](#)

Attachment: [CALENDAR YEAR 2014.pdf](#)

**Ms. Ramsay** stated that 2014 Meeting Calendar has been distributed to the Board.

**Ms. Harris** stated that there is a little deviation in this year's calendar from the past years, not in terms of the meeting date which is the second Wednesday of every month at 1:00 p.m. There is no conflict with holidays. However, staff is proposing a change to the deadline submittal.

**Ms. Harris** explained that currently the deadline is on Thursday at 12:00 p.m., three weeks prior to the Board meeting. After which the proposals are evaluated, staff will get back in touch with the petitioner if something is missing; work on the staff reports; and the Board gets the Preliminary Agenda one week in advance. Staff is proposing to move the deadline date back to four weeks in advance. The deadline for submittal will be the close of the business day at 5:00 p.m. Ms. Harris said they believe this is more consistent with how other boards do it. This will make it easier for the applicants once they are used to the additional week, and it will allow the staff to better work with the applicants, particularly, in the case when information is missing or the staff has concerns in terms of getting the Board better submittal.

**Ms. Harris** said she has not sent out notices to this effect yet because she wanted to present this to the Board and be sure this was acceptable. When the 2014 calendar is approved by the Board, staff will ensure that a public relation campaign is done so everyone will be aware of the new deadline.

**Ms. Simpson**, for clarity, asked if this means that the deadline will be pushed back one week.

**Ms. Harris** answered that the deadline is pushed back one week, not the meeting date.

**Mr. Lominack** said one thing that this new deadline requires is that the designers, architects, or whoever makes the submittal would have to do so earlier and the project for all practical purposes would come to a halt as far as moving forward.

**Ms. Harris** explained that most months of the year, the deadline occurs on the meeting date. When this happens, if someone is coming to the Board for Part I approval, they have to submit for Part II Design Details the same day as they are trying to get Part I approved. For example, Mr. Puljung asked for a continuance. He would not be able to resubmit revised drawings if today was the deadline date. She said, therefore, in those situations where the Board has reviewed something in advance, if it is Part I or something that continued, this would allow for an extra week for the deadline date in this specific circumstances, but only on things that the Board has already seen. This would mean that the deadline date is as what it was in 2013, three weeks in advance.

**Mr. Lominack** stated that from the practicing architect standpoint, the owner is placed in a position of opting to go ahead and say I authorize you to proceed;



if you have to backup or it is an additional service, I expect you to eat it. The three weeks is problematic already for the persons who are submitting the applications. But, four weeks become more problematic from the applicant's side. Mr. Lominack said, however, he realizes it helps the staff.

**Mr. Engle** stated that this is being done for ZBA and all the other boards. He said this is just the name of the game. How many projects are the other boards reviewing compared to the projects the Review Board reviews? The Review Board looks at 50 to 60 projects a month.

**Ms. Ramsay** said she believes this gives time to incorporate the staff's comments.

**Mr. Lominack** said he believes there are positives and negatives; it is not a win-win situation. But, it does put the developer, the architect, the designer and so forth into a position of having to either delay a project, move forward or rest for a period of time.

**Mr. Thomson** said many planning agencies have a plaque on the director's desk that says "your failure to plan is not my problem." Some one is going to make an investment of one hundred thousand dollars, they are not going to be down one week in their schedule relying on a board's approval. There are good reasons that Ms. Harris has mentioned and somebody else said it, but what he wants to say is that they are working with essentially a half-staff person as the budget got cut. City Council votes on the budget tomorrow, but MPC has been cut by an additional five percent. He believes that everybody got cut five percent, but for the MPC a five percent cut is almost a direct cost of the position.

**Mr. Thomson** explained that for a different reason, they are adding a week for advancing an earlier schedule for the MPC submittals because City Council wanted notices to go out for some developments that ever received the notices before. In order to get this logistically to work, another week was needed in order to fit it in.

**Board Action:**

Approval of 2014 Meeting Calendar. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

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	- Aye
Robin Williams	- Aye

## XV. ADJOURNMENT

### 51. [Adjourned](#)

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Ellen I. Harris  
Director of Urban Planning and Historic Preservation

EIH:mem

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