



## Savannah Historic District Board of Review

---

Virtual Meeting  
May 12, 2021 1:00 PM  
MINUTES

### May 12, 2021 Savannah Historic District Board of Review

**Members Present:** Dwayne Stephens, Chair  
Nan Taylor, Vice-Chair  
David Altschiller  
Kevin Dodge  
Stan Houle  
Ellie Isaacs  
Becky Lynch  
Melissa Memory

**Members Absent:** Steven Bodek

**MPC Staff Present:** Leah Michalak, Director of Historic Preservation  
Olivia Arfuso, Assistant Planner  
Aislinn Droski, Assistant Planner  
Bri Morgan, Administrative Assistant  
Pamela Everett, Assistant Executive Director

#### I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

#### II. SIGN POSTING

#### III. CONSENT AGENDA

##### [1. Petition of SCAD, Tom Hensley | 21-002182-COA | 328 Barnard Street | Installation of Vents](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-002182-COA.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

#### **Motion**

Approve the installation of exhaust vents at 328 Barnard Street with the following conditions, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the vent installations are undertaken using the gentlest means possible, to cause minimal

damage and reduce the possible impact to any historic materials.

2. Ensure that the vents are as unobtrusive as possible and do not alter, damage, or detract from any of the decorative brick work.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

[2. Petition of Anthony Debrecey | 21-002179-COA | 143 Bull Street | Storefront Alterations](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation 21-002179-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ Staff Research.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval for storefront alterations for a portion of the building located at 143 Bull Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards.

1. Color selections for the storefront, doors, and tile/stone.
2. Specification for proposed pendant light fixture at corner entrance.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

[3. Petition of Don Bell Signs | 21-002210-COA | 11 West Liberty Street | Illuminated Sign](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-002210-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Drawings.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Photos.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Research.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approve the installation of an illuminated sign at 11 West Liberty Street with the following conditions to be submitted to Staff, because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Reduce the sign area to be a maximum of 20-square-feet.
2. Ensure that the aluminum box / backer is applied for under a separate Certificate of Appropriateness (as proposed), to be reviewed by Staff.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

[4. Petition of Pantheon ADC, James Galluci | 21-002225-COA | 323 West Jones Street | Rooftop Addition](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation - 21-002225-COA - 323 W Jones St.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Drawings sml.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet - Materials.pdf](#)

**Motion**

Approval of a non-habitable, rooftop addition for the property located at 323 West Jones Street as requested because the work is minimally visible, is visually compatible, and meets the standards.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain

Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

#### IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

##### [5. Adopt the May 12, 2021 HDBR Agenda](#)

###### **Motion**

Adopt Agenda as presented.

###### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Ellie Isaacs

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

#### V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### [6. Approval of the April 14, 2021 Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 04.14.21 MEETING MINUTES.pdf](#)

###### **Motion**

Approve April 14, 2021 Meeting Minutes as approved.

###### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye

Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

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

**VII. CONTINUED AGENDA**

[7. Petition of GMSHAY Architecture | 21-000792-COA | 618 Montgomery Street | New Construction: Part II \(Design Details\)](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

[8. Petition of Sottile & Sottile, Christian Sottile | 20-005548-COA | 336 Barnard Street | New Construction: Part II \(Design Details\)](#)

**Motion**

Continue.

**Vote Results ( Voting )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Not Voted
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye

Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

## VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

## IX. REGULAR AGENDA

### [9. Petition of Signs by Dave Legasse | 21-001792-COA | 190 West Bryan Street | Illuminated Sign](#)

📎 [Staff Recommendation - 21-001792-COA - 190 W Bryan St.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet - Drawing.pdf](#)

📎 [Public Comment .pdf](#)

📎 [Public Comment .pdf](#)

**Ms. Aislinn Droski** presented the applicant's request for approval of an illuminated sign for the property located at 190 West Bryan Street. The sign is to be mounted from an existing awning and is to read "Salt Table" in red with a yellow background.

The property located at 190 West Bryan Street is located within the Andaz Hotel building at 14 Barnard Street. The metal awning above the entrance is an existing structure which covers a large portion of the wall frontage available to the establishment. The proposed sign, while mounted on the awning, shall be reviewed as the principal use projecting sign for 190 West Bryan Street. This structure was built in 2006 and is a non-contributing building within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District.

The sign is to be constructed of an aluminum cabinet with an acrylic face. It is to be internally illuminated utilizing low voltage LED's, which shall light up the copy behind the letters. The background of the sign is to be Golden Yellow and the letters, which read "Salt Table", are to be Cherry Red. The sign is to be bolted to an existing awning on the structure. The sign as proposed is visually compatible. The configuration of the existing awning shall not be altered with the installation of the sign. The sign shall be internally illuminated with an opaque background. The sign is to be 10 feet above the sidewalk. The distance from the outer edge of the awning was not provided to staff; ensure the sign is no less than one (1) foot from the outer edge of the awning. The sign is proposed to be 25.98 square feet and the business has 41'-8" of frontage along West Bryan Street. The internally illuminated sign is to be mounted on an existing awning structure over the public entrance to 190 West Bryan Street, 10 feet above the public right-of-way.

**Ms. Taylor** asked if this sign was the same as the signs of the other locations. **Ms. Droski** replied this is their registered signage and appears at the current downtown location on the awning.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. David Legasse**, petitioner, stated he's been in business in Savannah for ten years. The proposed sign is similar to the one on Drayton Street, the original location. It was approved seven years ago, as was the one at the airport. Some have pictures of the founders, but the sign requested for approval does not. It has been registered in the US Patent office since 2012, and is consistent throughout their graphic/advertising usage. No complaint has ever been received about the colors.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Ardis Wood**, citizen, stated the red and yellow colors are too bright for downtown Savannah. She suggested more subdued colors that support the area history. The size and bright colors are overwhelming, particularly at night with internal illumination.

**Mr. Legasse** stated to modify the sign would not harmonize with the company's established brand. Thousands of dollars have been spent to register and establish their logo. The colors are not as bright as the examples Ms. Wood presented, nor will they be in the final product. The Andaz Hotel and the landlord are supportive of their logo.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Taylor** agreed with staff comments, and the sign has been reviewed and approved in the recent past. The Board agreed with Staff recommendation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval of an illuminated sign for the property located at 190 West Bryan Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Ensure the sign is no less than one (1) foot from the outer edge of the awning.**

**Motion**

The HDBR approved the petition for an illuminated sign for the property located at 190 West Bryan Street with the following condition to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Ensure the sign is no less than one (1) foot from the outer edge of the awning.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Ellie Isaacs

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

[10. Petition of LS3P Associates | 21-000257-COA | 501 East Bay Street | New Construction, Part II \(Design Details\)](#)

🔗 [Staff Recommendation - 21-000257-COA - 501 E Bay St.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Drawings small.pdf](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet - Physical Material Samples.pdf](#)

🔗 [Specifications Received by Email on May 4.pdf](#)

🔗 [Part I Board Decision 21-000257-COA.pdf](#)

[Part I Submittal Packet - Drawings and 3D Model.pdf](#)

**Ms. Aislinn Droski** presented the applicant's request for approval of New Construction, Part II: Design Details for two, two-story mixed-use buildings connected by an exterior stair and fire-rated wall at 501 East Bay Street, a vacant parcel on the corner of Bay Street and Price Street. In 2014, a 4-story mixed use building was approved for the property and never built [14-005575-COA]. The new proposal for a mixed-use building on this property reduced the height to two-stories. Under the provisions of the new zoning ordinance, this project does not qualify as Large-Scale Development.

Adjacent to the project site is a three-story parking structure for The Brice Hotel located at 480 East Bay Street. The submittal includes two 2'-4' fences to infill between the project site and the adjacent parking structure. The fence location is beyond the property lines; however, the applicant has indicated that they are in communication with the owners of the property to allow for the inclusion of this fence. No fences for this project were reviewed in Part I: Height and Mass.

On February 10, 2021, this project was approved for New Construction, Part I: Height and Mass [21-000257-COA], with the following conditions:

1. Ensure the brick within the water table is not differentiated in color from the main building and the CMU wall facing the adjacent parking structure is proposed to be painted within the submittal for Part II, Design Details.
2. Ensure that all material and design specifications are provided for fencing, lighting, and paving as part of the submission for Part II, Design Details.
3. Provide a sample panel per the sample panel policy.

Staff has determined, through the review of Part II, Design Details for 501 East Bay Street, that conditions 1 and 3 have been met. The lighting specifications and paving materials were not included as part of this submission; however, staff spoke with the applicant and it was indicated that these would be provided to staff at a later date.

In addition to meeting the conditions as required above, the following changes were made that affect the review of Part I, Height and Mass:

1. West Elevation – Price Street: An additional level of the exterior stair, which previously ended at the second floor, has been added to access the roof. See comments under Visual Compatibility and
2. South Elevation – East Bay Lane: An additional window opening has been added to the first floor. The window aligns vertically with the window directly above and mirrors the configuration of the window to its left.
3. A new window opening is proposed for the first floor, on East Bay Lane. The window aligns vertically with the window directly above and is the same size as the window opening to its left. The new window is visually compatible.

The following alterations to the exterior stair and fence between the two new construction buildings are proposed:

- The addition of a roof level landing and railing, above the ground/first and second floor exterior stairs/landings
- The increase of railing height on the second floor to 7'-2"
- The increase in height of the fencing to 8'-8"
- The increase of the setback of the fencing on the ground/first floor (previously in-line with the façade of the building)



The roof level exterior stair and railing is to have the same 13-foot setback from the Price Street façade as the exterior stair on the second floor. The fence on the first floor is to be setback behind the façade of the buildings. Staff finds that the addition of a roof level exterior stair and the increase in the heights of the second floor railing and first/ground floor fence are visually compatible and do not significantly alter the scale of the building as approved in Part I. However, staff finds that the height of the 4'-0" railing on the roof level stair disrupts the scale of the building, as the highest part this railing extends above the parapets on either side. Staff recommends lowering the height of the railing on the roof level exterior stair to below the parapets of the buildings.

There are two awnings proposed for the over the front doors on the East Bay and Price Street facades. The awnings are to cover the width of the door and are to be 8'-6" above the public right-of-way. The exact projection of the awning was not provided; staff has determined that the awnings as proposed are visually compatible.

The following materials are proposed to be utilized for the New Construction at 501 East Bay Street:

- Exterior Walls: Modular brick in Providence by *Cherokee Brick & Tile Co.* with mortar in khaki by *Argos* (a sample of the brick and mortar were provided to staff).
- Railing on Exterior Stair: Powder coated steel with wire metal mesh in Slate Gray. Exterior stair is to be metal and minimally visible due to screening from railing and set-back from Price Street façade.
- Fences: Brick masonry base (see above specification) with metal planter boxes, steel posts, steel frame, and welded wire infill panels
- Coping: Pac-clad metal coping in Slate Gray
- All Windows and Doors: Aluminum-clad wood by *Windsor*, with exterior clad finish in Slate Gray and transparent glazing.
- Front and Rear Façade: First Floor: Two (2) tripartite windows, each with an individual pattern of 4/1. The transom above the door consists of two, four-pane glass windows, similar to the upper portion in the 4/1 pattern on the adjacent windows. There is no door on the rear façade. Second Floor: Two (2) tripartite windows, each with an individual pattern of 6/4 and one (1) paired accent window with 4/4 (matches transom).
- Side Façades: First Floor: Four (4) paired windows, each with an individual pattern of 4/1. The transom above the two (2) doors consists of two, four-pane glass windows, similar to the upper portion of the 4/1 pattern on the adjacent windows. Second Floor: Six (6) paired windows, each with an individual pattern of 6/4.
- Window and Door Soldier Course, Sill (where appropriate), and Trim: Rowlock brick (see above specification)
- Soldier Course and Alternating Recessed Soldier Course: Brick (see above specification)
- Base/Water Table: Brick with rowlock water table – no change in brick color
- Lighting Fixtures: To be provided at a later date.
- Awnings: Awning support material not provided, cover to be canvas by *Sunbrella* in Charcoal Grey
- Paving Material: Noted as "pervious – gravel/plantation mix" – official selection to be provided to staff at a later date.

Ensure the awning supports are constructed of wood or metal and provide the selected material within the final drawings for staff to review for approval. Staff recommends that the paving materials are to be loose, to ensure that it is located no closer than 18 inches to the public right-of-way (East Bay Lane).

Additionally, steel is not a visually compatible material for the railing and fencing between the buildings and adjacent to the parking lot. Staff recommends that the fencing with a masonry base be revised to be constructed of iron or extruded aluminum. Staff also recommends that the applicant consider revising the material of the railing on the second and roof level of the exterior stair to be iron or extruded aluminum, to be visually congruent with the fencing. The materials and colors proposed for the new construction buildings are otherwise visually compatible.

The exterior walls are to be Providence brick with mortar in khaki. Staff determined the selections to be visually compatible with the contributing resources within the ward.

The door shall be constructed of aluminum clad wood and all glass within the doors will be transparent. The windows feature appropriate trim. All windows are to be aluminum-clad wood with transparent glass. The windows on the first floor are designed as a storefront and shall have a brick water table differentiated with a rowlock brick sill.

The awnings shall have a vertical clearance of 8'-6" and a canvas cover. The awnings as proposed are integrated structurally and architecturally into the design of the façade. Ensure that the supports are constructed of metal or wood. The roof of the new construction buildings is to be flat; therefore, roofing material shall not be visible from the public right-of-way.

The parking lot material was indicated as "pervious – gravel/plantation mix." Ensure that the paving material is to be loose that it is located no closer than 18 inches to the public right-of-way (East Bay Lane).

The height of the fence adjacent to the parking lot and the fence at ground level between the two structures are to be 8'-8" at their tallest point (steel posts). The fence located adjacent to the parking lot is over 5 feet away from the neighboring parking garage structure. While a fence with a masonry base is appropriate for this structure, the applicant is proposing the use of a fence which has a steel frame, steel posts, and welded wire infill panels, which does not meet the standards. Staff recommends that the applicant revise all steel fence materials to be constructed of iron or extruded aluminum.

**Mr. Houle** asked if the applicant indicated the use of the third floor roof, since a stairway is now included. **Ms. Droski** stated it is simply for roof access; no structure is to be added, per the applicant. **Ms. Lynch** asked about the party wall; if it is to be finished. (?)

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Neil Dawson**, petitioner, stated they agree with reducing the height of the top floor railing. The handicap space would have to be smooth, so the parking material would have to be concrete or something durable, and use gravel for the others. Lighting information can be submitted to staff when obtained. Awning supports are steel. The rooftop use is simply to have an outdoor space; low plants and a seating area would probably be the extent of additions. The back wall is proposed to be unfinished, though staff recommends painting it; they are not sure it is possible logistically, what can be reached will be stuccoed. They agree with staff comments regarding the fence; it's largely iron but not completely iron. If aluminum were used and painted, it would look like the steel fencing proposed. Aluminum mesh is not made in the size and strength necessary; previously approved Sansabar is steel. The vertical posts made be thinned slightly.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There was no public comment.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Memory** stated she agrees with staff comments. **Mr. Dodge, Ms. Lynch, Mr. Houle** agreed with all of staff recommendations, with the exception of number four; they agree with the petitioner regarding the steel fencing material. **Ms. Lynch** stated to give attention to visibility of the back wall. **Mr. Altschiller** and **Ms. Isaacs** had no comment. **Ms. Taylor** asked staff about the petitioner comments regarding the fence; staff replied the steel is not prohibited, just not listed as permitted and wanted to bring to the Board's attention.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval of the New Construction, Part II: Design Details for two, two-story mixed-use buildings connected by an exterior stair and fire-rated wall at 501 East Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:**

- 1. Lower the height of the railing on the roof level exterior stair to below the parapets of the buildings.**
- 2. Ensure the awning supports are constructed of wood or metal.**
- 3. Ensure that if the paving material is to be loose that it is located no closer than 18 inches to the public right-of-way (East Bay Lane).**
- 4. Revise all steel fence materials to be constructed of iron or extruded aluminum.**

**Motion**

The HDBR moved to approve the petition of the New Construction, Part II: Design Details for two, two-story mixed-use buildings connected by an exterior stair and fire-rated wall at 501 East Bay Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Lower the height of the railing on the roof level exterior stair to below the parapets of the buildings.
2. Ensure the awning supports are constructed of wood or metal.
3. Ensure that if the paving material is to be loose that it is located no closer than 18 inches to the public right-of-way (East Bay Lane).

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Stan Houle

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

## Opening

- ☞ [Staff Recommendation 21-001961-COA.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Submittal Packet - Application and Checklist.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Submittal Packet - Narrative and Photographs.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Submittal Packet - Drawings.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Staff Research.pdf](#)
- ☞ [Staff Research - Clarification \(Email\).pdf](#)
- ☞ [Public Comment.pdf](#)

**Ms. Olivia Arfuso** presented the petitioner's request of approval for the alteration of the front entrance at 117 West Huntingdon Street. The scope of work includes the replacement of the existing double, duplex doors with a single front door. The proposed door will be a six-panel, solid core wood door. It will have a wood frame, and decorative wood panel surrounds. The side lights and transom light will have tempered insulated glass, and all wood elements will be painted. The rear door is also proposed to be replaced. The proposed replacement will be painted wood with divided lights that are tempered glass. A new back door canopy will be installed as well. The canopy will have a flat seam copper metal roof and a drip edge. The top edge of the canopy will connect to the sill of the existing transom window via a trapezoid end panel.

Although the petitioner is proposing to alter the existing double-door entrance configuration, the original singular entrance will be restored. The building was initially constructed as a quadruplex of attached, single family homes; therefore, a singular residential entrance is appropriate and historically accurate. The intent of the standard is met. Even though, the double-doors have acquired historic significance in their own right, the petitioner is proposing to restore the original, singular entrance configuration. Since, the building was historically a single family dwelling this alteration will not create a false sense of historical development. Ensure that the work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials. Ensure that the alteration occurs within the current entrance opening and that the existing transom and frame remain intact; therefore, the alteration is reversible and if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired. Revise the proposed door design to be historically appropriate and compatible with the style of entrance visible on the attached, historic property at 115 West Huntingdon Street. Currently, 117 West Huntingdon Street is the only residence with a remaining double-door entrance. All the other dwellings (that are part of this quadruplex) have restored the singular entrance configuration.

*Simpson Strong Ties* post supports and 4x4 treated posts will be installed and all wood elements will be painted. A decorative molding surround will be located at the joint between the post and beam. This will create a small rear portico. The existing concrete stair and landing will remain, but new round profile top rails with 1x2 pickets set narrow side out will be installed and painted. The alterations on the rear will be minimally visible from Barnard Street and Howard Street, since there is no direct lane access. Ensure that the balusters are placed between upper and lower rails and that the distances between balusters do not exceed (4) inches on center. Ensure that the railing height does not exceed (36) inches.

No paint color schemes, or door specifications were submitted to Staff. Ensure that the proposed color schemes and material specifications are submitted to Staff for review.

A new rear canopy is proposed to be installed. The canopy will have a flat seam copper

metal roof and a drip edge. The top edge of the canopy will connect to the sill of the existing transom window via a trapezoid end panel. Two posts will support the canopy and create a rear portico-like structure. Ensure that the canopy / rear portico installation does not damage any historic material and that it does not obscure any character-defining features of the rear façade.

**Ms. Taylor** asked for clarification regarding the second condition of compatibility to 115 West Huntingdon. **Ms. Arfuso** stated that because they face each other due to the configuration of the building, Staff believed it would be more visually compatible for the door and entrance to be harmonious. It appears 115 West Huntingdon kept the original configuration and transom lights.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Justin Van Hecke**, petitioner, stated they agree with all conditions. They have decided to keep the existing door and frame. The only new item between the door frames would be the sidelights. They will submit the requested colors.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Ms. Arfuso** stated they received four letters of support from area residents. There was no opposition to the project.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

The Board supports Staff recommendations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approve the alteration of the front entrance door and the construction of a rear portico at 117 West Huntingdon Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:**

1. **Ensure that the work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials and that the existing opening is not altered in any way, so that there is no damage to the exterior brick walls. Ensure that the alteration occurs within the current entrance opening and that the existing transom and frame remain intact; therefore, the alteration is reversible and if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.**
2. **Revise the proposed door design to be historically appropriate and visually compatible with the style of entrance visible on the attached, contributing historic property at 115 West Huntingdon Street.**
3. **Ensure that the proposed color schemes and door specifications are submitted to Staff for review.**
4. **Ensure that the canopy / rear portico installation does not damage any historic material and that it does not obscure any character-defining features of the rear façade. Ensure that the balusters are placed between upper and lower rails and that the distances between balusters do not exceed (4) inches on center. Ensure that the railing height does not exceed (36) inches.**

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned to approve the alteration of the front entrance door and the construction of a rear portico at 117 West Huntingdon Street with the following conditions because otherwise the work is visually compatible

and meets the standards:

1. Ensure that the work is undertaken using the gentlest means possible to avoid damage to any historic materials and that the existing opening is not altered in any way, so that there is no damage to the exterior brick walls. Ensure that the alteration occurs within the current entrance opening and that the existing transom and frame remain intact; therefore, the alteration is reversible and if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.
2. Revise the proposed door design to be historically appropriate and visually compatible with the style of entrance visible on the attached, contributing historic property at 115 West Huntingdon Street.
3. Ensure that the proposed color schemes and door specifications are submitted to Staff for review.
4. Ensure that the canopy / rear portico installation does not damage any historic material and that it does not obscure any character-defining features of the rear facade. Ensure that the balusters are placed between upper and lower rails and that the distances between balusters do not exceed (4) inches on center. Ensure that the railing height does not exceed (36) inches.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

[12. Petition of Coastal Canvas | 21-001990-COA | 112-114-116 West Congress Street | Awning](#)

[☞ Staff Recommendation 21-001990-COA.pdf](#)

[☞ Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the applicant's request for approval to install an awning for the property located at 114-116 West Congress Street, known as Sorry Charlie's. The awning will span across the St. Julian Street façade for a width of 58.6 feet, a depth of 15 feet, and with 8 feet clear above the public sidewalk. The awning will be covered with Black Sunbrella fabric. The historic buildings were constructed in 1820 and are contributing buildings within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. Although now one business internally, historically, this row of buildings were individual businesses in each bay.

The awning obscures distinctive architectural features of the building, such as the cornice above the storefront and the transition to the pilasters between the storefronts, and connects

three (3) facades; this also causes the awnings to not be architecturally integrated into the façade. Staff recommends that the awnings be reduced in height to be below the cornice (maintain the 8 feet clear above the public sidewalk) and divided the awning into three separate awnings at the pilasters so that the awnings cover only the storefronts. Ensure that the installation of the awning hardware does not damage the historic materials. The guideline is met regarding the fabric. The selected fabric is listed in the Awning Fabric Policy as a “visually compatible” selection. The awning is differentiated from the historic building and if removed, the building would be unimpaired. The materials, texture, and color of the awning are visually compatible. The scale of the awning is not visually compatible.

Typically, awning reviews are a staff level review/approval. However, when staff received this application, they expressed concerns (as outlined above) to the applicant. The applicant decided to defer this to the Board as designed. Staff contends that, although all three architectural facades are the same business inside the buildings, they are still three (3) facades and the standards are not met; the applicant does not agree that the standards are not met.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Jon Dedic** of Coastal Canvas, stated the purpose of the awning is to cover the outside seating area. Prohibiting vehicles from colliding with the awning is the reason it does not go to the intersection, which also avoids putting a column in the center of a pedestrian walkway. The height can be adjusted, it would be difficult to seal to the building because of the existing wiring. Also, a steep pitch is required to prevent water pools because it is not a vinyl, but woven, awning as the ordinance requires. He stated the non-contributing structure immediately across the street and 21 East Broughton Street have canopies that cover multiple storefronts.

**Ms. Taylor** asked if they are willing to divide the awnings into three separate awnings. **Mr. Dedic** stated that could be done, but it would add additional columns for structural support, which would be greater than a ten-foot span, requiring three columns for each section, totaling nine columns, which still does not provide the intended coverage. **Mr. Dodge** asked to know where wire obstruction would be regarding raising the awning; would it be a major problem. **Mr. Dedic** stated it may not be. **Mr. Stephens** asked if the pitch is the same as the one on the front of the building (Barnard Street side). **Mr. Dedic** stated responded it is not.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**Mr. Harley Krinsky**, owner, was unable to connect.

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, of the Historic Savannah Foundation, stated they support Staff's recommendation for denial. The building has been through a lot of changes throughout the years with COA's, although HSF opposed.

**Ms. Ellen Harris**, of the Downtown Neighborhood Association, supported the Staff's recommendation for denial.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

The Board supports Staff's recommendation. **Ms. Isaacs** states the awnings are visually incompatible.

The petitioner requested a continuance after the motion was made.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Staff denial for the request as proposed.**

**Staff recommends approval with conditions for an alternate design as follows:**

1. **Ensure that the installation of the awning hardware does not damage the historic materials.**
2. **Reduce the awnings in height to be below the cornice (maintain the 8 feet clear above the public sidewalk) and divided the awning into three separate awnings at the pilasters so that the awnings cover only the storefronts.**

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned for denial of the request as proposed.

Staff recommends approval with conditions for an alternate design as follows:

1. Ensure that the installation of the awning hardware does not damage the historic materials.
2. Reduce the awnings in height to be below the cornice (maintain the 8 feet clear above the public sidewalk) and divided the awning into three separate awnings at the pilasters so that the awnings cover only the storefronts.

**Vote Results ( Rejected )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: David Altschiller

Becky Lynch	- Nay
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Nay
Nan Taylor	- Nay
Kevin Dodge	- Nay
Stan Houle	- Nay
Ellie Isaacs	- Nay
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned to continue the petition (at the petitioner's request) to install an awning at 112, 114, and 116 West Congress Street to the June 9, 2021 HDBR meeting.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Nan Taylor

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Nay
David Altschiller	- Aye



Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

[13. Petition of Lott & Barber | 21-002183-COA | 514-518 Berrien Street | Addition](#)

[Staff Recommendation 21-002183-COA.pdf](#)

[Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the applicant's request for approval to construct an open-air addition and install a fence for the property located at 514 Berrien Street. The addition and the fence are proposed to be constructed on the adjacent parcel at 518 Berrien Street; the parcels will be recombined. The addition will be attached to the west façade of the existing one-story building and will be used for outdoor fitness; 518 will be used for indoor fitness for the same business. Alterations are also proposed to the existing building as follows:

- Paint exterior.
- Replace all coil doors with sectional glass panel doors.
- Replace all human doors with flush hollow metal painted doors.
- Interior improvements (not in purview).

The industrial building was constructed c.1975 and is not a contributing structure within the Savannah Local Historic District; it is outside the boundaries of the Landmark District.

The recombined lot standard is met.

Addition:

- Steel structure all painted gloss black
- Fence: Stucco, painted Snowbound (white). Aluminum fence, black.
- Metal roof, gutters, and downspouts: Slate Grey
- Existing Building:
  - Exterior paint: Snowbound (white)
  - Overhead Doors: frame color, black
  - Hollow metal doors: Snowbound (white)

Materials, textures, and colors are visually compatible. The entire addition is open-air. The open-air addition is not to be used for structured parking/a parking area. No information regarding the paving material for the ground under the addition was provided.

The proposed fence creates a wall of continuity along the street and is visually compatible. The fence is proposed to be 7 feet high. A masonry (stucco) base is not proposed for the fence, not meeting the standard. The unique curved roof shape does not fit within the above design standards but is visually compatible with the curve of the existing building. The curved roof shape reflects the curved wall and roof of the existing building and is compatible with this building's shape. The main building is stucco on a portion of the front façade and the remainder is painted concrete block; the fence is proposed to be extruded aluminum with stucco piers.

The property has access to a lane; however, the driveway/curb cut is proposed along Berrien Street (in the front), not meeting the standard. Staff recommends that the driveway enter the property along the lane. The curb cut is proposed to be over 22 feet wide, not meeting the standard.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Todd Naugle** of Lott & Naugle Architects, petitioner, stated he and the property owner are in agreement with the Staff recommendations. He stated they request access to the lane from Berrien Street, not for parking but to move large objects as it is a CrossFit facility. He stated the City assured him there would be no plans to improve access along that lane. They are in agreement to maintain the 20-foot curb cut requirement. The purpose of the addition is for outdoor training.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There were no public comments.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

The Board agreed with Staff recommendations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Approval to construct an open-air addition and install a fence for the property located at 514 Berrien Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standard:**

- 1. Revise the fence design to have a stucco masonry base.**
- 2. Relocate vehicular access to be along the lane.**
- 3. Reduce the curb cut to a maximum of 20 feet wide.**
- 4. Ensure that loose paving materials are not located within 18 inches of the public right-of-way.**
- 5. Ensure that the addition is not used for vehicular parking.**

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned to approve to construct an open-air addition and install a fence for the property located at 514 Berrien Street with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because the proposed work is otherwise visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the fence design to have a stucco masonry base.
2. Relocate vehicular access to be along the lane, if the lane is not accessible, access can remain on Berrien Street..
3. Reduce the curb cut to a maximum of 20 feet wide.
4. Ensure that loose paving materials are not located within 18 inches of the public right-of-way.
5. Ensure that the addition is not used for vehicular parking.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Nan Taylor

Second: Stan Houle

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye

Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

[14. Petition of Pioneer Construction | 21-002308-COA | 19 East River Street | Balconies](#)

- 📎 [Staff Recommendation 21-002308-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA Decision and Submittal Packet 14-002319-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [COA Decision and Submittal Packet 21-001552-COA.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

**Ms. Leah Michalak** presented the applicant's request for approval for two balconies to be constructed on the second-story, River Street facing, façade of 19 East River Street (36 East Bay Street on the Contributing Resources Map). The historic building was constructed between 1859-1876 and is a contributing structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District and the Savannah Local Historic District. On November 9, 2011, the Board approved two new balconies in the same location as the current petition on the second story with a modern decorative railing design [H-2011-1020-4540-2]; however, two new balconies were constructed on the fourth and fifth stories instead. The applicant claims these balconies were installed some time in 2016-2017; the two balconies feature railings that are a similar design to the historic railings found on River Street. Staff was unable to locate an approval for these balconies. There is no evidence that balconies ever existed historically in the proposed locations within this petition.

This exact petition was heard at the April 14, 2021 HDBR Meeting. The Board approved the petition with the following conditions to be submitted to staff for final review and approval because otherwise the work is visually compatible and meets the standards:

1. Revise the railing design to be one that is differentiated, yet compatible with, the historic railings (such as the design found within the 2011 COA approval) and ensure that balusters are placed between upper and lower rails, the balusters are not more than 4 inches apart, and the railing height is no more than 36 inches.
2. Ensure the balcony decking is wood and is painted or stained.

However, following the April Meeting, the petitioner contacted staff and stated:

*"Please see the attached COA & drawings for our Vic's on the River project back in 2014-2015 prepared by Felder & Associates. We had sent all of these documents with our original application except the COA (which we thought you would have on file). The owner of Vic's on the River and the building, has Pioneer Construction install the attached approved historic balconies back in July 2015 when we expanded the Vic's on the River restaurant. Back then, the owner considered the more "modern decorative" railing but was required to put in the more historic railing.*

*Bill Hall (who owns Vic's and the building) has already had the more expensive historic railings fabricated for these two balconies. Our thoughts on moving forward with this, is that they are close in proximity (approximately 12' feet below the ones we installed in 2015) and since this section does not have any other balconies, these would match what has already been approved by the HDBR/MPC so there is consistency. The new restaurant that will be opening in place of Barracuda Bob's*

*will have a more traditional, high end, classic historic feel and look, which the proposed historic railings will also provide.*

*As an FYI, we (the Owner and Pioneer) were unaware of the 2011 request by the previous building/restaurant owner that were never installed.*

*Can this be reviewed again and the more historic railings be reconsidered?*

After receiving this information, staff reviewed the 2014 COA application and approval (which is attached). The reconstructed of the design of the historic balconies was required by the HDBR in this case because there was evidence that the balconies existed and what they looked like; therefore, the Board required recreation. In this case, balconies never existed in the proposed location; there were door openings with hoists to get products into the building.

The historic character of the building is proposed to be retained; no materials are proposed to be removed. The applicant is proposing the use of a railing that is designed to match that of the original railings found on historic balconies on River Street which creates a false sense of historical development as there were never balconies in this location historically. When features did not exist historically, they should be designed to be compatible, yet differentiated, from the historic features. The balcony design copies the design of historic balconies on the building and are, therefore, not distinguishable, therefore not meeting the standard. The distinctive features and finishes of the building are proposed to be retained and preserved. Ensure that the attachment method for the new balconies is undertaken in a way to not damage the historic brick exterior; ensure all mounting is undertaken within the mortar joints between the bricks. The addition of the two balconies will be reversible as long as the mounting is undertaken within the mortar joints between the bricks. The applicant is proposing the use of a railing that is designed to match that of the original railings found on historic balconies on River Street. The materiality of the proposed metal railing and brackets are compatible. The materiality for the deck of the balcony is referenced, however, is not provided within the submittal packet. The applicant is proposing the use of a railing that is designed to match that of the original railings found on historic balconies on River Street. The intent of the standard is met. The balconies are proposed to project 3'-5" deep; however, the balconies are not proposed for residential use.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Tim Thurson** of Pioneer Construction, representing the owner Bill Hall, stated the business "Baracuda Bob's" received approval for two lower balcony additions in 2011, which are the same balconies Mr. Hall is requesting approval for currently. He stated Mr. Hall requested a more modern railing for the fourth and fifth floors in 2015, but the Board at that time stated it should be more historic in design. This petition in discussion, requested railings on the second floor with the historic design, which was approved in April 2021, but conditioned with the modern design. The owner wants to be compatible with the historic-look railings on the floors above, to establish the new restaurant's identity.

**Ms. Michalak** clarified the petitioner is approved to install modern balconies, not the historic replicas. **Ms. Taylor** asked if the fourth and fifth floor railings were based on historic photographs. **Ms. Michalak** confirmed, and added that there never were balconies on the second floor, therefore historic replicas are not appropriate because it would create a false sense of history; but there were balconies attached on the fourth and fifth floors which would be historically accurate.

**Mr. Thurson** stated he understood; their goal was have historic continuity and context for the building. The owner wants to present a historic feel to the new restaurant, less modern.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Mr. Ryan Arvay**, of the Historic Savannah Foundation, stated his organization supports Staff's recommendation. He stated they were and still are against the addition of balconies altogether, as there never were balconies on the second floor, which still yields to a false sense of history.

**Ms. Ellen Harris**, of the Downtown Neighborhood Association, stated the balconies may be appropriate with a more modern design, as the historic design presents a false sense of history. They support staff recommendation.

**Mr. Thurson** stated they were trying to be consistent, although there is a modern canopy underneath the balconies. They will proceed with the April 2021 approval for the balconies.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

The Board agreed with Staff recommendation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**Denial for two balconies to be constructed on the second-story, River Street facing, façade of 19 East River Street (36 East Bay Street on the Contributing Resources Map) because the standards are not met.**

**Motion**

The HDBR motioned for denial for two balconies to be constructed on the second-story, River Street facing, façade of 19 East River Street (36 East Bay Street on the Contributing Resources Map) because the standards are not met.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Stan Houle

Second: Melissa Memory

Becky Lynch	- Aye
Dwayne Stephens	- Abstain
Melissa Memory	- Aye
David Altschiller	- Aye
Nan Taylor	- Aye
Kevin Dodge	- Aye
Stan Houle	- Aye
Ellie Isaacs	- Aye
Steven Bodek	- Not Present

**X. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS**

15. Petition of STEPHEN GROSSMARK | 315 WEST TAYLOR STREET | 21-001967-COA | Mechanical Screening

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-001967-COA.pdf](#)

16. Petition of DOUG BEAN SIGNS, Angela Bean | 223 WEST RIVER STREET | 21-001976-COA | Illuminated Sign

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision - 223 W River St 21-001976.pdf](#)

17. Petition of DOHRMAN CONSTRUCTION, Susie Bull | 202 WEST BAY STREET | 21-001980-COA | Masonry Repointing

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-001980-COA - 202 W Bay Street.pdf](#)

18. Petition of ARRAY DESIGN, Shauna Kucera | 220 EAST STATE STREET | 21-001999-COA | AMENDMENT: Addition/Alteration

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-001999-COA - 220 E State St.pdf](#)

19. Petition of CHRISTINA PIROVITS | 208 EAST BAY STREET | 20-002046-COA | Non-Illuminated Wall Sign

☞ [SIGNED 21-002046-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

20. Petition of LS3P, Scott Cook | 110 ANN STREET - AMENDMENTS | 21-002064-COA | AMENDMENTS: Doors, Mechanical Equipment (roof), Windows, Lighting, Bridge/Promenade

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision 21-002064-COA.pdf](#)

21. Petition of GSI, Mandi Brabham | 300 W RIVER STREET, Unit 3 | 21-002115-COA | SIGN: District Seafood

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision 21-002115-COA.pdf](#)

22. Petition of GSI, Mandi Brabham | 300 W RIVER STREET, Unit 2 | 21-002116-COA | SIGN: District Smokehouse

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision 21-002116-COA.pdf](#)

23. Petition of GSI, Mandi Brabham | 300 W RIVER STREET, Unit 5 | 21-002117-COA | SIGN: Riverside Biergarten

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision 21-002117-COA.pdf](#)

24. Petition of GSI, Mandi Brabham | 300 W RIVER STREET, Unit 6 | 21-002118-COA | SIGN: Riverside Sushi

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision 21-002118-COA.pdf](#)

25. Petition of KEVIN DODGE | 523 EAST PERRY STREET | 21-002143-COA | AFTER-THE-FACT: Window and Wood Replacement (Denial)

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision - 21-002143-COA.pdf](#)

26. Petition of PETER THOMPSON | 535 & 537 EAST HARRIS STREET | 21-002153-COA | Siding Replacement

☞ [SIGNED 21-002153-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

27. Petition of SOUTHERN ROOF & WOOD, Jessica Ginnetto | 105 EAST OGLETHORPE AVENUE | 21-002157-COA | Roof Replacement

☞ [SIGNED Staff Decision - 105 E Oglethorpe Ave - 21-002157-COA.pdf](#)

28. Petition of LANDMARK PRESERVATION, John Ecker | 328 BARNARD STREET | 21-002163-COA | Color Change

[☞ SIGNED 21-002163-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[29. Petition of OCEAN WAY CONSTRUCTION, David Spitdowski | 504 PRICE STREET | 21-002164-COA | Siding Replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 504 Price St - 21-002164 .pdf](#)

[30. Petition of OCEAN WAY CONSTRUCTION, David Spitdowski | 502 PRICE STREET | 21-002176-COA | Color Change](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 502 Price St - 21-002176.pdf](#)

[31. Petition of ROOFCRAFTERS, Kyle Conaway | 424 E Macon St | 21-002197-COA | Roof Replacement](#)

[32. Petition of GERALD CHAMBERS | 222 EAST GWINNETT STREET | 21-002203-COA | Exterior Lighting](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-002203-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[33. Petition of 13 BRICKS, Vann Ellison Seales | 606 ABERCORN STREET | 21-002204-COA | Illuminated Sign](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision 21-002204-COA.pdf](#)

[34. Petition of CHARLESTON SIGN, Andrea Rhoades | 321 MONTGOMERY STREET | 21-002215-COA | Illuminated Sign: Amendment](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-002215-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[35. Peition of COASTAL CANVAS, Joseph Corbin | 301 W RIVER ST | 21-002222-COA | Awnings](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 301 W River St - 21-002222.pdf](#)

[36. Petition of CHARLES DEGENHARDT, JR. | 226 E HALL ST | 21-002255-COA](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-002255-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[37. Petition of GSI, Mandi Brabham | 500 W RIVER STREET | 21-002278-COA | SIGN: Atlantic Hotel](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision 21-002278-COA.pdf](#)

[38. Petition of LIBBIE SUMMERS | 546 E HARRIS ST | 21-002287-COA | Color Change](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision - 546 E Harris St - 21-002287.pdf](#)

[39. Petition of FIRST TABERNACLE BAPTIST CHURCH, Andre Osborne | 310 ALICE STREET | 21-002328-COA | Windows/Stucco](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-002328-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[40. Petition of MERRIMAN MILLWORKS, Stephen Merriman, Jr. | 321 ABERCORN STREET, Suite 301 | 21-002360-COA | Windows Replacement](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-002360-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

[41. Petition of CITY OF SAVANNAH, Dan Reel | 316 \(318\) Bay St | 21-002398-COA | Stair Repair](#)

[☞ SIGNED Staff Decision 21-002398-COA.pdf](#)

[42. Petition of STEVEN BODEK | 536, 538, 540, 542 EAST CHARLTON ST | 21-002460-COA | Replace Roof](#)

[☞ SIGNED 21-002460-COA Decision Packet.pdf](#)

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

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

[43. COA Inspections - May Report](#)

📎 [May 2021 COA Inspections Report.pdf](#)

[44. Stamped Drawings - May Report](#)

📎 [May 2021 REPORT.pdf](#)

**XIII. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**XIV. OTHER BUSINESS**

[45. Plan 2040 Presentation - Nicholas Fazio, Advance Planning and Aislinn Droski, Historic Preservation](#)

**Mr. Nicholas Fazio** and **Ms. Aislinn Droski** presented the Plan 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

[46. Discussion Regarding Work Without a COA](#)

**Mr. Dwayne Stephens** stated the after-the-fact infractions need to stop. Members of the HDBR have been involved in such actions, and it is not a good look nor does it send the message to the community that the Board is serious regarding this matter. It puts the Board in a position of losing credibility, particularly knowing the process as a Board member.

**Ms. Isaacs** stated that ideas need to be presented to help with this matter.

**Ms. Taylor** stated it is frustrating when the Board is denied the ability to review the project prior to work being done. She asked if rather than approve after-the-fact, can the violator be made to start from the beginning.

**Ms. Isaacs** stated her thought was similar: that they should be reviewed as if the work has not been done. If it does not fall under their decision, they have to deal with the consequences.

**Ms. Michalak** stated the Board does not have the ability to penalize anyone. That is the responsibility of Code Compliance. **Ms. Michalak** suggested the Board report what they see in the community and check, as well as asking the neighborhood associations to take responsibility.

**Ms. Isaacs** recommended a subcommittee comprised of all the historic Boards to discuss and prepare an active plan.

**Ms. Taylor** stated educating the public is key as well.

**XV. ADJOURNMENT**

[47. Next Regular HDBR Meeting - June 9, 2021 at 1pm](#)

[48. Adjourn](#)

There being no further business to present before the Board, the May 12, 2021 Historic Board of Review adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Leah G. Michalak  
Director of Historic Preservation



/bm

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