



City of Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
December 14, 2023 - 10:00 A.M.
Meeting Minutes

DECEMBER 14, 2023 SAVANNAH ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Members Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair
Michael Condon, Vice Chair
Karen Jarrett
Stephen Plunk
Armand Turner

Member Absent: Betty Jones

MPC Staff Present: Edward Morrow, Development Services Director
Nykobe Richardson, Development Services Tech
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Hind Patel, IT Helpdesk & Support

Virtual Attendance: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director, Compliance & Operations

City of Savannah: John Anagnost, Zoning Plans Examiner

I. Call to Order and Welcome

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

NOTE: The Chair, Mr. Stephen Merriman, Jr., does not vote unless there is a tie.

Mr. Merriman called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. He explained that this is a quasi-judicial proceeding. All those wishing to give testimony during these proceedings were asked to please sign in. They were sworn in by Mr. Merriman. He explained that all proceedings of the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals are recorded. Decisions of the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals are final. Challenges to the decisions of the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals must be filed through the Superior Court of Chatham County.

II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

[2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance](#)

Mr. Merriman gave the Invocation.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.

III. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

IV. Item(s) Requested to be Removed from the Final Agenda

[3. ADU Minimum Lot Area Variance | 114 E 55th Street | 23-005664-ZBA](#)

- [☞ Staff Report.pdf](#)
- [☞ AERIAL-SITE MAP 23-005972-ZBA.pdf](#)
- [☞ Map and Site Plan.pdf](#)
- [☞ Letter of Opposition.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve to remove 114 East 55th Street from the Final Agenda. Petition Needs to Be Heard by HPC.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Michael Condon

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Stephen Merriman, Jr. | - Abstain |
| Karen Jarrett | - Aye |
| Michael Condon | - Aye |
| Stephen Plunk | - Aye |
| Betty Jones | - Not Present |
| Armand Turner | - Aye |

V. Item(s) Requested to be Withdrawn

VI. Approval of Minutes

[4. Approve November 30, 2023 Meeting Minutes](#)

- [☞ November 30, 2023 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the November 30, 2023, Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Armand Turner

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Stephen Merriman, Jr. | - Abstain |
| Karen Jarrett | - Aye |
| Michael Condon | - Aye |
| Stephen Plunk | - Aye |
| Betty Jones | - Not Present |
| Armand Turner | - Aye |

VII. Approval of Final Agenda

[5. Approve the Final Agenda](#)

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the Final Agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Armand Turner

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Not Present
Armand Turner	- Aye

VIII. Consent Agenda

IX. Old Business

[6. Parking Variance | 1401 Paulsen Street | 23-005664-ZBA](#)

- [☞ Staff Report.pdf](#)
- [☞ AERIAL-SITE MAP 23-005664-ZBA.pdf](#)
- [☞ 1401 Paulsen St_22-005939-ZCL_Letter_Revised 2023.12.11.pdf](#)
- [☞ Letter of Support - 23-005664-ZBA 1401 Paulsen Street.docx](#)
- [☞ Laundry Diner - Letters of Support.pdf](#)
- [☞ 1401 Paulsen - Compilation Support.pdf](#)
- [☞ Laundry Diner Support Letter 11.20 \(003\).pdf](#)

Note: Mr. Condon recused himself from participating in this petition.

Mr. Edward Morrow presented the Staff report. Mr. Morrow explained that the petition before the Board is a request to eliminate the off-street parking requirement for an existing historic structure at 1401 Paulsen Street. The building is identified as “The Laundry Building.” Historically, it was used as an actual laundromat.

Mr. Morrow stated that the Petitioner brought the parcel forward for rezoning from TN-3 to TC-1 in January 2023 for the purpose of establishing a microbrewery neighborhood grocery and restaurant at this location. A Sanborn Map was displayed which showed what was existing here and at the rear was an existing building. This building no longer exists. Therefore, what remains is the building that is fronted on Paulsen Street. Mr. Morrow explained that the TC-1 zoning was requested specifically for the purpose of establishing the microbrewery, which is the owner, because of their state license as a microbrewery, are required to only open microbreweries. They cannot have other products. They are only able to sell what they produce. They cannot distill spirits; and they cannot be retailers of other alcoholic beverages. This particular use was requested and required by the TC-1 zoning district.

Mr. Morrow explained that at the time of the hearing, the Petitioner was questioned with specific regards to the off-street parking requirement. This was in debate because the microbrewery use did not have a defined parking requirement. It was determined, in working with the City’s Planning and Urban Design Department, eight spaces were required. There has been a subsequent zoning certification letter to determine that 13 off-street parking spaces are grandfathered in essence because this structure was built without parking at that time. So, to make up for the difference for the more intense use that is requested, 13 off-street parking spaces are presently required. The Petitioner’s request is to eliminate the off-street parking which also somewhat comes in conjunction with the intent to utilize a benefit within the current

zoning that permits elimination of off-street spaces for additional bicycle and moped spaces. Mr. Morrow said at the present time, Staff has concerns as to whether there is adequate space to accommodate this. However, there is commitment on the part of the Petitioner, and this is a relevant aspect within this request.

Mr. Morrow pointed out that the subject parcel is elongated. It has a long narrow shape, but it is vacant, and the foundation of the old building is still here. At the hearing in January 2023, the Petitioner stated that the rear of the parcel was vacant, and the implication was that the off-street parking would be on the rear of the existing building. A site plan was not submitted to substantiate this. The structure contains 3,758 square feet internally. This building has a downstairs and upstairs floor.

Mr. Morrow reported that Staff recommends denial of the request in favor of a longer-term parking solution for this area. It is reasonable to anticipate that the rest of this parcel is going to be developed in a commercial manner. Therefore, at that time, Mr. Morrow assumes that an additional parking variance is going to be requested to make up the difference for that parking as well. In this instance, therefore, a parking variance is probably not the best solution to this issue. An interim solution involving parking on the parcel and seeking to work with the City to develop a parking solution, is probably better at this juncture. Mr. Morrow entertained questions from the Board. He informed the Board that Ms. Massey, the Petitioner, was online.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Attorney Josh Yellin came forward and stated that he was representing Ms. Massey of Two Tides Brewing Company. They were scheduled to be heard last month but were continued to the meeting today. They wanted to be sure that Ms. Massey was online and many of her coworkers and supporters are present at today's meeting wishing to speak on this application.

Attorney Yellin said he wanted to bring up some context for the site of the proposed restaurant is very important along with the history of the site and the rezoning that took place. He displayed a photo of the building and pointed out that this was a laundry facility that was built on the corner of Anderson and Paulsen Streets. At the time, he believes it is important to mention that the entire area was a commercial corridor. The building in the front is the one that is in question. This was a laundry facility, a mattress factory, and offices were here. These are commercial uses. A derailed depot was here for the transit facility in the area; and many commercial uses are here. Even today, if you walk in the area, they are all either commercial uses or vacant buildings. The zoning in the area opposes limitations on every user that comes in. To elevate some of those concerns, what they did in January 2023 was to rezone this property to TC-1 and obtained the special use approval to operate the microbrewery. This was fully vetted by MPC, vetted by City Council, and it was approved. There was enthusiastic support for this project as being a great benefit for the neighborhood as it would be neighborhood oriented. The intent is for it to be a walkable project; for people to ride their bicycles here, and to be a true benefit for the community and the surrounding areas.

Attorney Yellin explained that what is unique about the parking variance that they are requesting is that if they were located just a few blocks over across East Broad Street, they would not be here today asking for a parking variance. Once you cross East Broad Street, sites below 3,000 square feet are parking exempt. By virtue of their location here, they must comply with the parking requirements. As Mr. Morrow mentioned, the new zoning letter that they obtained really is treating this as a restaurant, which requires a lot of parking at one space per 100 square feet. This is one of the highest parking requirements unfortunately for any use within the City of Savannah, despite the commitment in this area to be a neighborhood, friendly development. But, by virtue of their location, they are here today requesting a parking variance. Unfortunately, he sees this time after time with many projects in the City of Savannah. Many applicants come to him asking for assistance. They ask why Waters Avenue corridor has not gotten started. Why does the east side not have more restaurants? Why does the west side not have more restaurants? What is wrong with the south side locations? Attorney Yellin said the problem in every instance is parking. Parking is expensive to build. It is hard to obtain, and it often kills projects. He said they are frequently before the Board asking for variances for parking; particularly, here with a purpose-built commercial site that was built without parking, they are asking to eliminate parking so that a new user can come in and put this building to use.

Attorney Yellin said that Ms. Massey has done a good job here as she has done with the prior rezoning

petition in terms of neighborhood support. She has held multiple open houses on site; has met with neighbors; and posted on Facebook and Instagram. Overwhelmingly, there was a tremendous amount of support for this project. He said they understand the concerns of the Board in that maybe they should be looking at the big picture of this area. Unfortunately, they have a lease for this project. They need to start their construction and they need to start paying rent. They will be happy to support any future endeavor for all the adjacent parcels. They believe it is important for this area, but they don't believe that they should be held up if that is going forward is going to be inevitable. They are happy to participate in that, but they need to get their plans moving and rolling. They have been at this for almost a year, and as he has said, there is enthusiastic support for this parking variance. He said as Mr. Morrow also mentioned, the intent is to maximize the bicycle and moped parking on site, which wants them to be a neighborhood friendly business. Therefore, they respectfully request that the Board approve today's variance to exempt them from the parking requirement because they do not have space on site. They have made tremendous efforts to locate alternative parking in the vicinity. They cannot find anyone who is willing to get a lease with them. Therefore, as their last chance, they are requesting this parking variance so this great project can move forward.

Attorney Yellin said they respectfully request the approval of today's variance to exempt the 13 spaces for this project. He entertained questions from the Board. He knew that many people were present to speak in support of the project and Ms. Massey is online as well. Attorney Yellin thanked the Board for hearing their project.

Mr. Plunk told Attorney Yellin that he believed that Mr. Morrow mentioned that when they initially applied in January, that parking would be provided on the vacant part of the lot. But he guessed plans changed. Mr. Plunk asked Attorney Yellin to explain what changed between then and now and why they cannot use the vacant property as originally planned.

Attorney Yellin explained that the rear parcel is currently vacant. There were some initial conversations as to whether it could be used. The current plan for this site is for this site to also be redeveloped. He said it may be possible to use it as a temporary solution, but all this will do is kick them down the road when they must come back to the Board in six months to ask for the exact same variance. Attorney Yellin said he does not like temporary solutions when trying to operate a small business as it makes it more costly and gives them less assurance that they can operate.

Mr. Plunk said to clarify as a follow-up, does the Petitioner own this entire portion?

Attorney Yellin stated that the Petitioner is only renting a portion. The remainder is under the same ownership, but they do not control that site.

Mr. Merriman invited the Petitioner, Ms. Elizabeth Massey, to make comments.

Ms. Massey said Attorney Yellin did a great job outlining the request for the variance. She said, but to clarify also, the reason Michael Condon is not present in the hearing room is because he owns the entire property. The lot is broken up into individual pin numbers and lot numbers as well. She said as far as her project is concerned; she does not have access to the rest of the property. She is only leasing the building that they have discussed so far. From her understanding, a lot of assumptions were made when they originally went before Zoning. They never fully discussed the use of the back lot as they were not leasing this lot. A lot of assumptions were made that she could use the lot without actually discussing it as a group. This is why they are now before the Board to formally wrap up everything that they have been discussing.

Mr. Merriman asked the Board if they wanted to ask Ms. Massey some questions.

Ms. Jarrett stated that when the Board approved this before, it was with the understanding that the property behind the laundromat would be used for parking. She asked Mr. Morrow if this was an assumption on their part.

Mr. Morrow said in reviewing the video from that meeting, he was not employed here at the time, there was a specific question asked by Mr. Melder as to what the plan was for parking and at that time, Mr. Yellin stated among several things, that the rear of the parcel is vacant. He believes this is the only assumption that was made, but he did not explicitly state that is where parking would occur. However,

Mr. Morrow, said within the scope of Mr. Yellin's comments to this question was the rear of the parcel is vacant.

Ms. Jarrett asked that at that time, were they able to park what they needed to park given the conditions that they had?

Mr. Morrow said it is obvious that a site plan would have been needed to delineate.

Ms. Jarrett injected that they were only doing zoning.

Mr. Morrow stated "right." But with a different Staff, they would have a different approach and a site plan was not a part of that, which is something that he believes would have alleviated a lot of the reason while they are here today. It would have made it clear at that time; he believes that the expectation was that the few spaces that would have been required could have easily been accommodated on that section of the parcel. Mr. Morrow said he believes this was likely the assumption.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the zoning that is in place allows for the microbrewery.

Mr. Morrow answered yes.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the City decided that microbrewery use was similar to restaurant use. And this is where they came up with the 13 required parking spaces.

Mr. Morrow explained that based on the combination of uses that were requested in association with this, in the original hearing, there were the restaurant use and the grocer. These are the things that would have been permitted under the zoning. Therefore, the special use was specifically for this add on of a microbrewery to permit the alcohol sales that would occur on this site. They had to have a special use to allow alcohol sales.

Ms. Jarrett said they still have the alcohol sales, the grocery, and the restaurant.

Mr. Morrow stated that's correct.

Mr. Merriman stated that he was a little confused. He asked if the microbrewery is the restaurant. Right? Is the microbrewery a place where you go buy beer and take it home or do you drink it while you are there?

Mr. Morrow, in an answer to Mr. Merriman questions, explained that because a retail grocery is a retail component to this, the expectation is that in addition to products that are brewed by the Petitioner, he believes that eggs and bread were mentioned during the hearing.

Mr. Merriman asked if it is consumed on the premises, or do you take it home and consume it?

Mr. Morrow answered both.

Attorney Yellin stated that one point he wanted to mention to Mr. Merriman's question is when they went to City Council, they were only having two beers on site. This is what they were committed to. There were only two products that were going to be made at this facility. As were mentioned, there are some nuances to the State law. Because they own Two Tides Brewing Company, they cannot legally operate a restaurant as this is considered a different license classification in the eyes of the State. You can have a microbrewery that serves food, which is what this is. Functionally, yes, it is a restaurant, but for licensing purposes, they are a microbrewery with only two beers; no outside products, no other people's beers; no hard liquor; no wine, just the beers that they make.

Attorney Yellin said regarding Mr. Plunk's question about the parking on site, he might get his timeline confused, but when they were going through City Council's process, they were still working with Mr. John Anagnost and the City to finalize the initial zoning letter as to how they treat this use. Is it treated as a microbrewery which did not have a defined parking requirement under the Ordinance? Do they treat it as a restaurant? Attorney Yellin said since that time, their numbers and the square footage have changed. The microbrewery component is different now than it was when they initially went through MPC.

Therefore, the parking requirement has changed since that date.

Ms. Jarrett asked in what way it has changed.

Attorney Yellin said it has gone up. The restaurant seating has increased. He believed that the number might roughly be the same.

Mr. Anagnost explained that the original analysis is that the parking requirement at the time of the rezoning was 8 parking spaces. This does not include any credits for bicycles or motorcycles/mopeds basis. Currently, the analysis is 16 spaces and does not include any credit for motorcycle or bicycle parking.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the 13 spaces that were in the report were with the idea of having bicycles and mopeds.

Attorney Yellin answered yes.

Mr. Merriman explained that the reason for asking his question about the microbrewery was to get the understanding of whether someone would be stopping, grabbing something, and leave or whether they would be inside for a while drinking two beers and eating.

Attorney Yellin said the intent is to be a full-service restaurant.

Ms. Jarrett asked if this would be a full-service restaurant where people would come in and have lunch or dinner here.

Attorney Yellin said yes; it is a diner.

Mr. Plunk asked if a survey has been done regarding the parking situation Paulsen Street or on Vine Street to see how many cars are on the road now at different hours of the day. Has this been investigated at all?

Attorney Yellin answered that he has not done a survey of the parking. He asked Ms. Massey if she could speak to what she had seen from her observations.

Ms. Massey stated that a formal survey has not been done by the City. However, she used the zoning map and the measurement tool and was able to measure that there were more than 72 unused spaces at any given time along the four-block corridor that Attorney Yellin outlined in the beginning. This includes the curb setbacks as well. Once you pass Vine Street, there is a residential home there. As you go south on Vine Street, a few residential homes are there. Ms. Massey said she did not look at these streets because she did not want to include the parking that touches the residential area in this number. She drives by this building four or more times every day and there is ample available parking, mainly on the Paulsen Street corridor and further south down Vine Street. But, as she has said, this does not include the streets that line the residential areas.

Mr. Plunk asked Ms. Massey if she said 72 spots. What would you define as that core area?

Ms. Massey explained that this was her own research. She roughly did 18 feet per parking space, and she allotted a few feet off the curb as well. Ms. Massey said again that she was only getting rough measurements, but these were the streets that directly align the building. Vine Street, Paulsen Street and when you pass 31st Street aligning where the other vacant building that is falling is commercial and aligns the lot that is owned by Georgia Power. Nothing can ever go there because electrical equipment is in the ground. So, no one will ever park here. As far as she understands, open parking is on that street as well. From what she has seen, all the residents park directly in front of their homes. She never sees anyone parking their cars on Paulsen Street and walking to their homes on 31st or 32nd Streets. She has seen residents parking on Vine Street across from the Georgia Power lot.

Mr. Plunk asked if the only residential unit on either Vine Street or Paulsen Street is 733, which is across the street.

Attorney Yellin said yes and there is a lot in between. It is vacant. Pointing to a section, Attorney Yellin said this is commercial. Therefore, commercials surround this site. When they went through the rezoning process, it was pointed out that all of this is commercial.

Ms. Jarrett asked Attorney Yellin if he could talk to her about his understanding of what parking was available at the time when it was approved.

Attorney Yellin explained that at the time they thought they were going to be parking compliant, but obviously, this has changed. This is why they need a variance. He does not believe there was an intent to mislead and say that everything would be worked out. But at the time they went through the process, they believed that through the zoning verification and the grandfather use spaces for existing sites that they would be able to reduce that to zero. As the circumstances have changed and as the plans for the building have changed, obviously their parking has increased materially.

Ms. Jarrett said they do not have the existing eight spaces that they originally proposed.

Attorney Yellin said no. Therefore, they are coming now for the full exemption for this property. He still believes that based upon the conversations that they have had with the neighborhood outreach for this project, that there has been tremendous support.

Ms. Jarrett said she understands and believes it is a great project, but she believes this is a slippery slope.

Attorney Yellin said he understood and from their standpoint as they mentioned, if they were three blocks over, in the Mid-City district, every use under 3,000 square feet is exempt from parking. He does not believe that the concerns that are in this district with the residents and the commercial businesses are causing problems in a way that they would here, he thinks it is roughly a similar situation where they should be encouraging the small neighborhood, friendly businesses because the parking is a serious part and does require that it be feasible and for them to understand the operation. Attorney Yellin said they are asking to be treated the same as the other businesses within the Mid-City district, Victorian district, and downtown. They are not required to meet these frankly very onerous parking demands.

Mr. Turner asked what are the anticipated hours that the restaurant will be open.

Attorney Yellin said the hours were a point of debate when they were before the MPC. The intent was to have a 24-hour diner which was not permitted because they have an alcohol license. The hours limit was imposed by MPC Staff. The MPC and City Council eliminated those hours because in essence, a restaurant without an alcohol license can be opened 24 hours a day, why should a restaurant with an alcohol license be treated differently. He believes, technically, that they are permitted to stay open until 3:00 a.m. Attorney Yellin said he is not sure that this is the intent, but no limitations were imposed because this would not have been required if they did not have the microbrewery aspect.

Mr. Merriman asked Ms. Massey if she wanted to make any more comments.

Ms. Massey stated that she believes Attorney Yellin is doing a good job and is saying everything that she would say. However, to clarify what Attorney Yellin said regarding the alcohol sales, their plan is to be open 7 days a week because this project has been delayed significantly and there is still some work to be done in determining their exact hours. The goal is to be open 24 hours, Friday through Sunday. However, with working with the MPC and City Council originally, even though the restaurant can be open 24 hours, there is a limit on when they are allowed to serve alcohol. Ms. Massey believed they have it worked out where they cannot serve alcohol after 1:00 a.m. until 7:00 a.m. the next day. They all worked together to figure out how they could work together with the alcohol sales to ensure that they fit in with the neighborhood and the demographic that is already here.

Mr. Morrow said he wanted to add a point of clarification for the records. He explained that Traffic Engineering took the time to weigh in disagrees with the assessment of available on street parking. The number 72 spaces are not reflective of any of the comments he has received from Traffic Engineering. Also, the presence of Savannah Classical Academy being less than 300 feet to the west and the apparent queuing at different times a day, were noted concerns. He stated again that what he just said was for a point of clarification for the record.

Mr. Plunk asked if Traffic Engineering have their own numbers that they want to provide.

Mr. Morrow in an answer to Mr. Plunk's question, said that Traffic Engineering did not have a specific number, but the understanding that Traffic Engineering has is that the availability of on-street parking does not seem to be as available as has been said.

Mr. Plunk said it is less than 72 spaces.

Mr. Morrow said yes, less than 72 spaces.

Mr. Merriman said does Traffic Engineering have something to base their disagreement on.

Mr. Morrow stated that there are identified areas where on-street parking is available. The on-street parking availability is reflected in the width of the street. Therefore, in essence, once you begin to park cars on the street, you reduce the drive isle width. You would need to have at least 26 feet for a two-way street. Once you start to park cars, you reduce the actual drive isle width. Their metrics are based on those street widths. There are identified areas where they say that on-street parking is prohibited. He believes that some of the areas that are included in the 72 spaces include areas where Traffic Engineering would say on-street parking is not permitted.

Mr. Plunk said it appears that Ms. Massey spent the most time here, he asked her to respond to the point about parent queuing for the Savannah Classical Academy. Do they que on Vine Street and Paulson Street? If so, in Ms. Massey's view since she is here four times a day, how would this affect the parking?

Ms. Massey said currently, she has not seen any ques directly around the laundry building. But, through some of her neighborhood outreach, some of the residents that live closer to Vine Street, 32nd Street, and 33rd Street side have experienced some queuing issues. While she believes this impacts the neighborhood, she does not know why her business must be affected by something that another establishment is doing. It appears that the school is abusing the parking situation as well. Ms. Massey said she is aware that the parents do not have anywhere else to go, but she does not know why the pickup for school should affect her business.

Ms. Massey said at 3:00 p.m. she does not see an increase in traffic on their side of the street. From a restaurant perspective, 3:00 p.m. is one of the slowest times in the restaurant industry between lunch and dinner. Ms. Massey said she could not imagine that they would have any increase in traffic that would impact on them at 3:00 p.m. any day of the week.

Ms. Jarrett said Ms. Massey would have employees that need to park during this time.

Ms. Massey said they would have limited employees because it is between the lunch and dinner rush.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Greg Harnack said he has lived in Savannah 14 years. He has been a business owner for the last six years and has worked with Mr. & Mrs. Massey quite a bit. Mr. Harnack said he is present to support the Masseys' endeavor. He lives on Seiler Street about seven blocks away from the Paulsen Street property. It is on his way home from his place of employment. Mr. Harnack said he has been riding his bicycle every day since he has lived in Savannah; he has never owned a car and will ride his bicycle to this diner. Mr. Harnack said it is highly important to keep in mind the Vision Zero (0) plan, keeping less cars on the roads as a matter of course means accepting variances to restrictions that would create conditions for more cars to need to be on the roads. But this establishment will be a walkable, bikeable place. This business will be for the community where they can come in regularly.

Mr. Patrick Wilver resides at 902 East 33rd Street. He is very excited about this project. Mr. Wilver is hopeful that the Board will approve the variance. His plan is to walk to this location. He remembers that about one year ago when this business was announced, he was extremely excited that finally there would be a walkable establishment in his neighborhood that he would be able to go to. Mr. Wilver said he is disappointed that they are here now having the conversation. He walks down Vine and Paulsen Streets frequently. There are some questions about parking. His dog and he do a lot of walking and he has

never seen any parking issues on Vine Street. The que for the school he sees mostly on LeGrande Street and Atlantic Avenue right at 3:00 p.m. Mr. Wilver believes this request should be approved. Attorney Yellin spoke about what is anticipating being accomplished on the Waters Avenue corridor in general with the redevelopment. He believes that the City just spent \$6.1 million dollars in SPLOST funds. This means that his tax money was spent on these streetscape projects. But there is no on street parking on Waters Avenue. If they are going to try to encourage businesses to move to this area, walkable businesses that people like him who live in the neighborhood can go to and frequent, they will have to let go of some of these parking requirements. Mr. Wilver believes they are overly burdensome and are unnecessary. He was hopeful that the Board would approve the request. Mr. Wilver fully supports this business.

Mr. Jason Combs stated that he is presently the President of the Thomas Square neighborhood Association. He has a Master's Degree in City Planning and Urban Design. He went to school with Mr. Morrow. They have a couple of disagreements about this, but he respects Mr. Morrow work. He wanted to speak first about the value of Ms. Masey as a businessperson in the Thomas Square Neighborhood. She is one of the people that makes Starland what it is. She makes it an incredible place along with her business Two Tides. Mr. Combs said he is aware that the Board cannot approve something because of a person's qualifications, but if they could Ms. Massey would be the person to do it for. She is an amazing person, and he knows she will have an amazing business just like she does at Starland.

Mr. Combs said he is trying to help the Mid-Town Neighborhood Association reorganize and they have not gotten it done yet with the officials of the City. If they had, he knows they would be here supporting this as well. As far as the parking issues are concerned, he believes that Ms. Massey did a good job in counting the parking spaces. They do not have a counter number. Given that a school is here, some congestion due to more on street parking is a good thing as this is natural traffic classification that makes people go slower when you cut down driving on some of these streets. Therefore, they need to look for ways to increase the number of people parking on the streets in this area. This will make it safer for people coming to and from the school. Mr. Combs said lastly one thing that Mr. Morrow alluded to was wanting to make a larger Neighborhood Plan for this area that might take parking into account and give similar restrictions or lack of restrictions, just like Mid-Town and Downtown, but this is a project without a timeline. Therefore, they cannot ask this business that needs to open to wait on that when there is no timeline for that project, which is valuable and should be done. But, right now the best solution is to approve the variance to help this business move forward.

Ms. Shelby Bock came forward and stated that she is a resident of Mid-Town Neighborhood and lives on East 40th Street. She is an advent urbanist that has worked in historic preservation in Atlanta, GA and Charleston, SC. Hopefully, she will be able to work in historic preservation in Savannah. Ms. Bock said this business owner has been instrumental in the growth of the Starland District. She said that the eastside of Savannah has yet to witness the same kind of development enjoyed by that district largely because of restrictive zoning. Ms. Bock said she is not sure they would have the same vibrant downtown in Starland District that they have if it was required that all these businesses have that level of on-street parking. She was sure that they all are aware that walkable and successful neighborhoods do not just appear, but created when they intentionally invest in creative solutions to provide resources such as restaurants and small grocery, which is currently virtually unavailable in this area. It takes one transformative project to start the renewal of a neighborhood. Ms. Boyd said she feels that if this variance is not approved, then this corridor of Savannah will continue to be largely dormant.

Ms. Shantina Ferguson-Waldburg said the Board would probably be interested in talking with her as she is the neighbor that is directly across from the laundromat at 1413 Vine Street. Ms. Ferguson-Waldburg said she can attest daily to everything as far as the inconveniences, positives, and negatives overall of everything. On a personal note, Savannah Classical Academy is a complete nuisance to their area with parking and not having respect for them as neighbors. One thing she can say about Mr. Condon is that he personally has come and talked to all of them about anything that can possible inconvenient them; if he was bringing anything in, taking anything down off the building, or cutting trees down. Ms. Ferguson-Waldburg said she talks a lot with Alderman Detric Leggett. They have lived here for eight years and have been complaining continuously about graffiti, negative activity, and theft issues. This area had a hole from being abandoned, it was drawing the wrong type of attention.

Ms. Ferguson-Waldburg said at one time the laundromat was secluded with horrible brushings, trees, and branches and nobody was cleaning it up. Mr. Condon came in and got all of it cut and cleaned out.

No one can dump their trash and garbage here now. Before Mr. Condon cleaned the area, they as taxpayers had to clean up the area so her children did not have to sit here and see all the garbage. When all the trash and garbage was piled up there, they could not take family photos towards this direction because the background would have been so horrible. All her family photos fronts 1413 Vine Street, her yellow house, because the scene was such a horrible scenic route. As far as the parking with Savannah Classic Academy, they had petition Mayor Johnson, City Council, Alderman Leggett, and Traffic Department because they were coming into their area. The residents could not get to their homes between the hours of 2:15 to 3:15 because they had the entire area; and even now. Ms. Ferguson-Waldburg said the only reason that they are not directly in front of her street is because her husband and she petitioned so much. However, unfortunately, her neighbors on the other side of Vine Street, the traffic goes all the way down Vine, turns off and takes up Paulsen Street entirely. You cannot drive through here. Consequently, it is unfair for they want to make rules for somebody who is bringing something positive to the neighborhood when Savannah Classical Academy doesn't even respect the rules themselves. As soon as the graffiti is put on the building, it is cleaned off. People are wanting to leave the area because of the things that have not been positive. But now they see something good coming. If they do not improve this area, it will deter other people from wanting to move here. Regarding the parking, she has an 18-wheeler truck. Since this is a commercial area, it would be allowed. This is great for her family. They have three vehicles, and they all can park right here. People can park here. People hardly ever park at the warehouse. All this area is always open. The only traffic issues they have had have been with Savannah Classic Academy. They have complained about the problem with Savannah Classical Academy and Alderman Leggett has been working with them for years. But Savannah Classical Academy has said where else they are supposed to go. Therefore, why should Savannah Classical be excluded, but, yet Ms. Massey wants to come here with something positive for the neighborhood and is told that she must go with the rules.

Mr. Clinton Edminster said he, too, was here in support of this project. Personally, he believes that off-street parking requirements anywhere in this country are a threat to national security. Specifically with this project, though, what he is interested in and as a part of the argument made in the documents, he found online, he is excited to see that they are preserving the extra space on that lot for future development. Mr. Edminster said he believes this is the best possible outcome that they could hope for this area. He has been involved in the Starland District and is currently the owner of the café on Waters Avenue. He spends a lot of time talking to people throughout the City about how they make small business more affordable and more accessible for people who want to start a business in Savannah. Mr. Edminster said the best way to do so is to create multiple, many, many hot spots that are interesting places and have aspects of walkability, small parcels where people can start a business for an affordable amount, and it isn't a huge financial risk for them to engage in. This area, the Waters Avenue area, the Starland District; Pennsylvania Avenue, and Habersham Village are all places they should really be encouraging general densification projects such as this.

Mr. Edminster said again that he supports this project. If in the future other parking variances are looked at for parcels around here, he will be right back before this Board promoting and encouraging those parking variances as well. He told the audience that he was glad to see so much support from everybody here for projects such as this. As everyone here knows, they have a huge challenge in terms of housing and transportation throughout not just this City and County, but throughout the region. Trying to figure out more ways for more people to get involved in projects such as this, to support general densification and infill as well as affordable housing initiatives throughout the entire area is really a good thing. Mr. Edminster said he was really encouraged to see everybody here and he was encouraged to see everyone so involved as they are. Waters Avenue Café has been open for nine months. He believes he was in front of this Board last December seeking a variance for himself for seven parking spaces. He told the Board that it worked out fabulously. They have tremendous buy-in from the neighborhood. Their parking lot is full, and people park where they need to park. They have communicated well with all the neighbors in the area, and nobody has confronted them about any problems. They have an incredible number of walkups and bike up traffic at the cafe. He believes that this diner, too, will see the same kind, if not more, of a combination of transportation to this spot. Mr. Edminster respectfully asked the Board to approve the variance request.

Ms. Erica Leung stated she lives on the corner of Paulsen and 32nd Streets. Ms. Leung said she wanted to voice her support for this project. She is one of the younger people and moved to downtown Savannah to be able to walk everywhere and visit many upcoming businesses, etc. Based on her point of review, as a neighbor, and as someone who would hopefully be visiting this type of microbrewery, she

would walk here as she lives close by. Ms. Leung said she also understands, however, because this is a microbrewery, people are likely going to leave their cars behind. She was hopeful that this business would be able to come into the neighborhood so that their neighborhood could continue to grow and attract a much younger crowd. They must think long term and for the community to grow, encourage people to move downtown, and to move to these up-and-coming areas, they need to have these types of businesses to attract the right type of people.

Ms. Molly Knutson resides at 516 East 54th Street. Ms. Knutson wanted the Board to know that when her husband and she had the opportunity to move when his career changed, they specifically chose Savannah because of its walkability. They originally moved downtown and once they decided to buy a home, they chose mid-town Savannah especially because of its walkability to Habersham Village and the potential for more businesses to come to the area. They had their first child two years ago. They love being able to walk in the area with their son and biking with him to local establishments. They frequent the Waters Avenue Café. Ms. Knutson said she believes that doing anything that promotes walkability and small businesses in Savannah is one way that they make mid-town and this area a stronger town in general. It is a blessing to live in this type of climate year-round where you don't have to depend on your car. She fully supports this request and is hopeful that the Board approves this variance request.

Ms. McKenzie Fitzgerald was online. She lives at 1605 Vine Street. When this project was announced, she and her husband wrote letters of total support for this business. They are excited about bringing new businesses to this neighborhood. Ms. Fitzgerald said that their letters of support were on the assumption parking would be in the rear of the building. She realizes that this is a big assumption to make, but there is currently what would ideally be a parking spot back there. It is a little rough, but she believes the area is paved. Ms. Fitzgerald said she heard that the space is being saved for further development. She and many of her neighbors own their homes, but they are experiencing some trouble with the idea of a business not having parking because many of them don't have driveways. Therefore, they rely on street parking. She works from home all day; and therefore, she sees the traffic that comes down Vine Street, especially to the school. Ms. Fitzgerald said she would repeat what one of her neighbors said earlier, which is it is a total nuisance. It is a huge pain and starts around 7:00 a.m. every day and it lasts for approximately one hour; then it happens around 2:15 p.m. until 3:15 p.m. Because these cars take up the entire Vine Street, it is impossible for neighbors to get their cars in and out. Ms. Fitzgerald said she feels for the project owner and the rest of her team that are experiencing the pain that is brought on by the school, but she wants it known that the residents on Vine Street feel this impact so much more. Therefore, introducing even less parking onto this street and movement is going to disturb this neighborhood quite a bit more. She only has one car, and she struggles sometimes to find a parking spot, especially with the traffic problem with the school. It is a huge pain.

Ms. Fitzgerald asked Ms. Massey and her team if it was possible for them to rent that space that is currently being saved for future development. Can it be paved and turned into a parking lot? She explained that the reason she asked this is to project the future. If that rear spot is being saved for further development or business, then will they not end up again in this exact same spot for another business in the future asking for more parking in this neighborhood. This will again impact the neighbors and make parking for them difficult.

Mr. Chris Underwood stated that he lives on the corner of Anderson and Barnard Streets. He has lived in Savannah for four years. Savannah is home for him because he can get everywhere. Mr. Underwood wanted it to be mindful that cars come with isolation and with isolation comes the death of hope. A car is not a person and should not be considered in such a thought. He thanked the Board for letting him speak.

Ms. Kelly Graeve was online. She and her family moved from Pennsylvania to Savannah. Ms. Graeve and her family have owned a residence since 2016 on the border of the Thomas Square Neighborhood and Mid-Town Neighborhood on 34th Street. They are a three-person family. They, too, moved to Savannah for its walkability and its temperate climate. Two of them do not have regular access to a vehicle. She and her 17-year-old daughter receive a lot of food deliveries and are often on foot because of no vehicle most of the week. More and more Savannah establishments that have previously offered delivery have recently discontinued their delivery services, including several establishments that have made themselves unavailable for delivery. They feel the more walkable options in Mid-Town for food, the better; especially with the impact if tourism limiting easy access to and affordability of local restaurants, they are of the opinion that this increases the safety of the area as it will prop the revitalization and

improvement of the surrounding communities. It is also a good resource for student population, including staff and parents as well as a good resource for those with odd hours as her husband who is a local carpenter of Union 256 wakes up at 4:00 a.m. and gets home at 8:00 p.m. with limited access to local food establishments because of his hours. Ms. Graeve said the Laundry Diner will be a welcome replacement for Fork and Dagger Diner that they are losing this weekend. Yet, this is another loss as far as walkable food options and resources in their neighborhood. The Laundry Diner is a welcome addition to their neighborhood, and they are really looking forward to becoming patrons of its new location. They are hopeful that it will open in Mid-Town. Please do not take that away from them.

Ms. Sonya Antonellis came forward and said she lives in this area on East 33rd Street. They also own a property on 32nd Street between Paulsen and Harmon Streets. Ms. Antonellis said most of the houses on 33rd and 34th Streets have off-street parking available. They have driveways. She said she has noticed that on 32nd Street not a lot of people park on the street as they have driveways. Perhaps this could be considered when surveying the area. Visitors to the areas would not be affected.

Mr. Merriman asked if anyone else from the public wanted to speak. No one else came forward. Mr. Merriman invited Ms. Massey to respond to the public comments.

Ms. Massey stated that she is appreciative of everyone who spoke on behalf of their variance request and also the ones who spoke in opposition. When she posted online that it was incredibly hard for her not to be at the meeting in person because she is not one to just be involved on the ground floor when it comes to these things. While she agrees with her decision to apply for the variance, she 100 percent respects that this is a real tricky issue and does affect this neighborhood's quality of life, whether positively or just interrupting parking. She is from Austin and before she moved to Savannah, she worked in a neighborhood that was going through a lot of growth similarly as this. One solution she has been able to think of is something that those neighbors did, although it was another state and city, is that when businesses started opening in an area that had not seen a lot of commercial traffic previously, they started offering residents only parking. When she lived in Downtown Savannah, this was offered as well. The residents were able to apply for a resident tag for their cars and the city put up signage saying that the certain blocks were only for residential parking in the mixed-use areas. As she has said, she has applied and used this kind of parking in other cities. This kind of parking is super beneficial. If the variance is approved and the residents are concerned about parking, she believes this could be a part of the larger discussion that a lot of people have been mentioning throughout this meeting.

Ms. Massey said some of the questions that were brought up in opposition to parking, unfortunately she is in the situation where she is renting this building, and she has no control over that back lot. If they do get to the point where she must rent more property to put in a parking lot, if she is being honest with the public, she is not sure that this is in her budget and that she could afford to rent more space just for parking. So, at this time, this would either require her to take a step back, evaluate whether she would be able to move forward with this project. Ms. Massey said she truly appreciates everyone who said something today and at this time she stands by her request to apply for the variance because in her opinion, it is the only option that would allow her to be successful as a business owner and allow her to provide the type of service that she is looking to provide for this neighborhood.

Mr. Plunk asked Staff if they knew how long the vacant lot has been vacant.

Mr. Morrow answered Staff does not know how long the lot has been vacant.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jarrett said she is frustrated that when they originally approved this, there were only eight parking spaces needed. There was an implication that those eight parking spaces were available on the adjacent lot, and this was why it had the opportunity to move forward. She said she appreciates the fact that this is a great business opportunity and is a local business. Ms. Jarrett said she lives close to one of the Two Tides in the Thomas Square area. She hates the fact that they are in this situation.

Mr. Plunk stated that Ms. Massey mentioned that she thinks there are 72 spaces and Mr. Morrow thinks that it is substantially less. But of course, they need substantially less; 13 is substantially less than 72. So, if it was half of that, it suggests to him that there is substantial on-street parking available most of the time. Other than it sounds like the times when Savannah Classical Academy are using the space; or as

someone pointed out, are the times when this restaurant would at least need the spaces. He does not know how many people will be there at 7:00 a.m. Maybe he is assuming this. But certainly, anytime that they look at the parking, it is always kind of that the residential versus the commercial side of things. The business needs to have parking available to stay open, but the business concern is getting people there. However, the flip side is how does it impacts the residents. However, it appears that the only immediate resident on this block is extremely in support of it. Therefore, he defers to her as the resident here who knows that area best. She does not believe that approving the request would impact their residential area.

Mr. Plunk said he agrees with Mr. Morrow that the theoretical best option is a text amendment, but he also understands Mr. Combes' point that this does not do anything for getting this business here immediately and all the contributions it is going to make to this area. He intends to be in support of the request just because of the lack of concern from the immediate residents and the acknowledgement of how good this would be for this area and all the support the Board has seen today. Mr. Plunk said he believes this is an area that has been pinpointed by the City as an area they want to promote growth and development. He believes this building has been vacant since the 1970s and waiting longer for a text amendment that they do not have a timeline when this would occur would make the waiting time longer.

Mr. Turner said he believes that in the spirit of what the City is trying to move towards as far as the neighborhoods; especially in this area, is that they do want more walking and biking to our establishments. Hearing resounding support from approximately 99 percent of the community saying that they will not be affected negatively, he believes leans toward support of what the Petitioner is trying to do.

Mr. Plunk said he would make a motion.

Mr. Merriman entertained the motion.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the Petitioner's request for a variance to the required off-street parking for a proposed restaurant, microbrewery and neighborhood convenience retail establishment at 1401 Paulsen Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Armand Turner

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Karen Jarrett - Nay

Michael Condon - Abstain

Stephen Plunk - Aye

Betty Jones - Not Present

Armand Turner - Aye

[7. Accessory Structure Height Variance | 115 Dyches Drive | 23-004540-ZBA](#)

[STAFF REPORT.pdf](#)

[AERIAL-SITE MAP 23-004540-ZBA.pdf](#)

[Site Plan.pdf](#)

Mr. Morrow explained that this petition came before the Board on October 26, 2023, for five setback variances. It was noted during that meeting that the accessory structure that was already under construction was taller than the principal residence. Therefore, the request today is making a reappearance to simply address the request that the principal structure be permitted to be taller than the principal residence. The location is 115 Dyches Drive. Mr. Morrow displayed a photo of the home and a

photo of the accessory structure.

Mr. Morrow stated that the accessory structure is supposed to be a storage shed. It is not an ADU and, therefore, even though it is a second story, the second story is described better as an attic where stairs will extend down. The Petitioner has told Staff that this storage shed is only for the purpose of storage.

Mr. Morrow said Staff recommends approval of the request for an after-the-fact variance to permit the accessory structure to be taller than the principal dwelling. He entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Merriman asked Staff if there are any other accessory structures in the general vicinity that are taller than the primary structures.

Mr. Morrow said Mr. Merriman's question was a great question. But this is something that he would have to investigate and get back with the Board on the findings.

Mr. Merriman asked Staff how much taller the structure is than the primary structure from ridge to ridge.

Mr. Merriman said the Petitioner might be able to answer how much taller is the structure than the principal dwelling.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Jose Hernandez stated that he is the owner of 115 Dyches Drive. He believes the height is a little more than 2 feet. They will only use the structure for storage.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the structure is visible from the street.

Ms. Soto said the structure is not visible from the street.

Ms. Jarrett said she believes a picture of the front of the house is shown in the Staff's report. The picture of the house was taken after the structure was constructed. Correct?

Mr. Morrow answered yes.

Ms. Jarrett said in that picture, you cannot see the structure. She asked Staff if they have gotten any feedback from the neighborhood.

Mr. Morrow answered that Staff has not received any letters in support or opposition.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Morrow explained that the setback variance was approved by the Board October 26, 2023. Only the height variance is being requested today.

Mr. Merriman entertained a motion as the Board had no further discussion.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve a variance to permit the accessory structure to exceed the height of the principal structure at 115 Dyches Drive.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Karen Jarrett

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Not Present
Armand Turner	- Aye

X. Regular Agenda

[8. Parking Variance | 111 Ann Street | 23-005992-ZBA](#)

🔗 [111 Ann Street Parking Calculations_FINAL.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report 23-005992-ZBA.pdf](#)

🔗 [111 Ann St Supporting Documents.pdf](#)

🔗 [23-005992-ZBA Letter of Support.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow presented the Staff report. Mr. Morrow explained that this request is in essence a request to amend a previously granted variance for a reduction in parking at 111 Ann Street. This matter came before this Board just prior to the adoption of NewZO. During its original conception, it was analyzed within the context of the original Zoning Ordinance. The Petitioner is bringing this back for reconsideration under the Development Standards of NewZO. -

Mr. Morrow explained that the subject parcel is zoned Downtown Expansion. The site is developed as a 232-dwelling mixed-use residential unit as well as retail uses, offices, art studios, and a gym. This project was reviewed by the Historic District Board of Review and was issued a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). He said, therefore, in terms of its appearance, it also had a look from another Board. With regards to parking, in April 2019, 107 space parking variance from the then parking requirements, which was 266 off-street spaces, was granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals. In bringing this back to look at the requirements of NewZO, a table was provided by the Petitioner summarizing the uses. Mr. Morrow explained that under NewZO at a required ratio of 232 spaces, 1 to 1 for residential uses, there is 1,222 square feet of office general; 1,258 square feet of retail space, 3,615 square feet of art photo studio and gallery space; and 3,305 square feet of fitness space. He said taking advantage of bike and moped reductions brings the total number of required spaces to 232. One hundred fifty-seven [157] of those spaces are proposed to be provided off-site, but a reduction of 75 spaces is requested from this Board today.

Mr. Morrow said that the basis for this request is that there are approximately 2,400 public spaces that are available within 1,300 feet of this development, in addition to several bus lines that provide access to this site. Also interesting is that this was granted in association with managed or valet parking arrangement. Therefore, some of these spaces are in a tandem configuration, meaning if you are in your driveway at home, two vehicles in the driveway would be parked such that one would need to be moved before the other car could be driven. Therefore, at least a part of these parking spaces is in that configuration with the assumption that a valet parking manager would be moving vehicles. Mr. Morrow said this was an interesting part of this initial request.

Mr. Morrow reported that, nonetheless, as the Zoning Ordinance does not consider the availability of nearby off-street spaces, Staff recommended denial of the original variance request and Staff continues to recommend denial of this request for a 75-space reduction in the off-street parking requirement. He entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Jarrett asked if anyone ever pursues shared parking anymore?

Mr. Morrow answered, "they do."

Ms. Jarrett said, however, they did not do so in this matter.

Mr. Morrow confirmed that they did not.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Attorney Joshua Yellin came forward and explained that he was present on behalf of the Petitioner, the Ann Street property owner, who has developed this site as a 232-unit multi-family mixed-use complex. Attorney Yellin displayed the complex to share some background data about this project, the site, and the requested parking variance. He said on its face, it appears that they are asking for something very massive and that the request that was approved by this Board in 2019 was massive. He said this was not the case. In 2019, they had been waiting for NewZO to pass for 5 years, 10 years; 15 years. But in 2019, they came to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and asked if they could apply the NewZO standards. The Board has vetted them for 20 years. They know that if it is adopted, this is what the standards are going to be, "can we just get a jump start on it?" They asked if they could come in and apply NewZO to this site. This is what was approved. The NewZO standards were put on this site. The unfortunate problem was when the motion was made at ZBA to approve of the NewZO standards it was made with a requirement that they provide a standard amount of valet parking to makeup the deficient.

Attorney Yellin said the current requirement of having valet parking is what has proven to be unworkable. There are not enough tenants in the building to dictate valet parking. The residents do not like the valet parking. They have 156 spaces ready on site. They believe that this is sufficient for the area. He explained that regarding Ms. Jarrett's question about the shared parking arrangements, a part of today's request is if they can remove that valet parking requirement so they can explore shared parking because currently, they are not allowed to do so. They are required to have valet parking to make up the difference. They believe that the 156 spaces are appropriate, but they also need the valet car parking to be lifted. It was a two-part request in their application for a variance.

Attorney Yellin said as the project they were talking about before, all these parking requirements in the City of Savannah are interesting. They are unique. It is almost a tail of two cities and how we treat parking. What is unique about this site is if they were located five feet to the east, they would have zero parking for this building. There would not be a parking requirement for any of the commercial uses nor for any of the residential uses. Simply, because someone put a line down the middle of Ann Street that said, "west of Ann Street parking, and east of Ann Street, no parking." Furthermore, despite this being our Downtown core, multi-family units in this area have the exact same parking requirement as if they were being built in New Hampstead as if they were being built on Abercorn. They have a suburban parking requirement for a Downtown Multi-family project. What is unique about this site, despite somehow not being in the exempt area, they are the closest multi-family development in the City of Savannah to the Chatham Area Transit (CAT) bus depot. There is no site in the City that has more access to public transportation than this site. Properties further to the east in the heart of downtown, no parking despite not having robust access to public transportation, here all the residents overlook the CAT Bus Depot. And they are not getting the same benefit for parking. The owners of this property have studied parking. They have other projects and know what the leasing rates are. Typically, no more than 70% of applicants coming into Savannah to rent, even bring a car with them. This number is in line with the 156 spaces that they have on site.

Attorney Yellin said while they are requesting that the valet parking requirement be removed, they do believe that the request for the variance, the 75-space variance to permit the 156 spaces, is permitted. They are not saying they want to eliminate parking as could be done on an adjacent site, they are saying that they believe that 156 parking spaces are sufficient for this site. They know the area and the location is next to CAT buses, they know that there are SCAD buses, and they know that if they were five feet away, they would be parking exempt. They know that as Mr. Morrow mentioned, there are over 2400 public parking spaces in the area. This does not account for the excess parking spaces of all the new hotels parking garages they have in recent years. Therefore, they think that robust parking is in the area. They think that the valet parking requirement, at a minimum, should be eliminated so that they could pursue altering the parking arrangements. But they also believe that the reduction is warranted. They understand that on paper it appears to be a large amount to ask for, but they are here to have this conversation with the Board. If 75 spaces are too much to ask for and if they believe 20 spaces is fine, they need to figure this out as this is what was mentioned in the prior hearing. Every parking space even though they are on site, if they must go out and find additional parking spaces, this obviously adds additional cost. This frankly increases rent; there is no easy way to say this. They are trying to keep their

costs low. They have the project as built and know it is a great project. People are not bringing their cars with them. So, they do respectfully think that this request is warranted and necessary. But he does not want to imply that this is an all or nothing approach for the Board. He is happy to have this conversation and dialog with the Board today. He believes that the 75-space variance is warranted. Attorney Yellin entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Merriman asked Attorney Yellin if this request is about getting rid of the valet parking requirement as nobody is using it.

Attorney Yellin answered that as Mr. Morrow stated, the site is required to park 232 spaces. When a valet parking plan is done with the City of Savannah, you can basically take the parking area and let people jigsaw their spaces. With jigsaw puzzle, the site is fully parked with 232 spaces. The problem is the valet parking doesn't work. There are not enough tenants with a car for the property to afford to hire someone 24 hours a day, seven days a week to be moving five cars. The people are not bringing their cars to this location. So, they are asking that the valet parking requirement be removed. If it is removed instantly, they will have 156 parking spaces currently on-site that could be used for parking. This is what the difference in the numbers was; 232 is what is required under the Ordinance. If the valet parking is removed, they are at 157. So, it was the 75-space variance which would eliminate the need for the alternative parking plan. But, if the Board is willing to eliminate the valet parking requirement, he wanted to have that discussion as to the 75 spaces because obviously any reduction is helpful for them not to have to go lease spaces from a hotel.

Ms. Jarrett said this is the financial request.

Attorney Yellin said it is not a financial request. It is a need request from the people who are coming in. It is empty parking. The parking is just there. If they are going down that road, all the sites immediately adjacent are parking exempt.

Ms. Jarrett said this is understood, but his client purchased property in an area that was not exempt.

Attorney Yellin said that is correct. But based on the marketing conditions, they believe that in the downtown urban environment that they are seeing, the 1 to 1 parking ratio of 1 parking space per unit, is grossly out of tune with what people are doing. People are not bringing their cars into this area. Maybe they are doing so in other areas of the City.

Ms. Jarrett asked Attorney Yellin if he proposes that a new parking study be done for parking in the downtown area.

Attorney Yellin answered, personally yes.

Ms. Jarrett asked him should the study be done before his request is handled.

Attorney Yellin replied no. They have represented a lot of multi-family developers in the downtown area. They have seen less come up frequently. A lot of for the parking cars is underutilized and not everyone wants to come in and open that up to the public. This has cost them a lot. He knows that this is sub-cost at this point, but there are studies about how each parking space costs.

Ms. Jarrett asked Attorney Yellin if he would be willing to go out and look for his shared parking spaces and come back and let the Board know whether he can find them before they act on his request.

Attorney Yellin said in his opinion, the variance is warranted regardless. He believes that a 75-space reduction in this area puts it exactly in line with what they are seeing with the residents.

Mr. Plunk said, for clarity, that the option available to the Board is to deny the variance request as Staff has recommended or they could grant the Petitioner 75 spaces to do as they will, or they could remove the requirement that it be valet, but not grant the Petitioner a variance for the spaces, they would still need to find 75 spots somewhere, but it would give them more options.

Mr. Merriman said it would be a variance with a condition.

Mr. Plunk said they could remove one of the conditions that was granted. Therefore, they would no longer have a variance for the 75 spots. They would not be required to do valet parking.

Ms. Jarrett said they would have to keep the valet parking until they found the shared parking.

Mr. Merriman said the removal of the valet spaces would be made up with the shared parking.

Mr. Plunk asked Attorney Yellin how long they have been open.

Attorney Yellin answered not very long.

Ms. Jarrett asked how full it is.

Attorney Yellin said it was empty.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the building was empty.

Attorney Yellin said the building is not full. As they were looking at the valet parking requirement for full transparency, it truly is not making sense.

Ms. Jarrett said that when the building is full, they might need those parking spaces.

Mr. Plunk asked Attorney Yellin if he knew the percentage of vacancies as far as the residential side, not the commercial side.

Attorney Yellin said he does not currently know the percentage of the residential side. He knows that it is less than 156 which is how they found themselves in this position. He explained that in working with the City on trying to work through the alternative parking as has been discussed, they had these conversations with the City, Parking Services, and Traffic as to do they need this valet parking if they have not hit that delta of lease ups. Currently, everything is saying no. They hope to hit that number in terms of leases, but just because the leases are coming in, they are not seeing the flip side of people requesting as many cars to come on site as well.

Mr. Anagnost stated that he wanted to ask a clarifying question. If the spaces are currently oriented as tandem parking for valet purposes, how will people get their car out if a stranger's car is in front of their car?

Attorney Yellin explained that is not the correct plan. Everything would be restriped if the valet parking was removed.

Mr. Anagnost said the restriping would entail driving isles in-between some of those spaces. So, you are confident that you would still be able to attain the same number of spaces even including those drive isles?

Attorney Yellin in an answer to Mr. Anagnost question said yes. He explained that he believes the information that he said, you and Edward work with the total parking being 156 is the proposal if the valet parking is eliminated. This was done by the project's architect from LS3P. Attorney Yellin said he is confident that they looked at the numbers and put in realistic spaces.

Mr. Condon said he wanted to be clear about this. He said following Ms. Jarrett's proposal or question, if the Board was today to waive the requirement for the valet and then ask Attorney Yellin to go and do some homework as Ms. Jarrett has requested, he asked Attorney Yellin what that would this do for him in the short term.

Attorney Yellin said it might jeopardize their ability to get a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) as opposed to a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO), but he was not sure how the City would respond if they lifted the valet. However, he would calculate this in his head as quickly as possible. Attorney Yellin explained that if they lift the valet parking requirement, they will have 156 spaces on site. But the 156 spaces are not currently compliant with the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, he was not sure whether the City of Savannah would give them a full Certificate of Occupancy and a final walkthrough because they

would not have met the requirements of the Ordinance. So, while he appreciates being able to do that, he was not sure. They may end up having to go to the alternative parking arrangement. But only making it a requirement here only makes it more difficult for the project to commence. They know they need to find the spaces if the variance is not approved. They are hopeful that valet parking can be eliminated, and a variance could be added on top of that. But understanding that there are alternative arrangements that they would need to pursue.

Mr. Merriman said the way it stands right now with the valet parking and Attorney Yellin wants to get rid of it because the folks do not like it, it meets the Ordinance where you could get your CO, is this correct?

Attorney Yellin answered that's correct. But the valet parking has not been in operation yet. They have been thankfully working with the City. Because they have not had enough cars to necessitate having a full-time valet operator, they have tried to be proactive in anticipating that one day that number will be reached. They still do not believe that valet parking is a good long-term solution just because of the cost and the burden that is added to that. So, they are asking at a minimum that the valet parking be eliminated so they can go out, if necessary, to look at all of the garages in the area, all of the access surface parking in the area, and find an alternative parking arrangement so that if the variance is not approved to reduce the parking, that they are going to be parking compliant. Attorney Yellin said in an answer to the initial question for the alternative parking plans, he might be the only person who has successfully gone through an alternative parking plan process, it is difficult to say the least. It is eight months process, but the reason they are not seeing it more frequently is that he thinks the Ordinance probably needs some tweaks that were not anticipated, but they have been trying to get through that process.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the Ordinance prefer shared parking.

Attorney Yellin answered yes.

Ms. Jarrett said this is certainly something that can be looked at.

Mr. Merriman said unless he is not thinking about this logically, it seems that the most logical solution in order not to jeopardize obtaining the CO, would be to get the CO now and then after you get it, get the variance because you risk getting a variance that puts the requirement on you finding the other spaces that you might not be able to meet.

Attorney Yellin said he believes what Mr. Merriman said is a fair point. He explained that their baseline request is to eliminate the valet parking. They need to be parking compliant. The baseline for eliminating the valet was their first and foremost concern. Because it is a requirement from the 2019 ZBA variance, which he believes was an unanticipated consequence. They thought they were coming in, getting the benefit of NewZO, but now it fully states "you must have valet parking" under the ZBA Ordinance. Therefore, they are not able to go out and start making these alternative parking arrangements. Attorney Yellin said the Ordinance contains alternative parking, you can do remote parking, shared parking, and in certain areas, you can make payment in lieu of parking.

Ms. Jarrett asked Attorney Yellin if they could have a conditional discussion with the City.

Attorney Yellin said they have had those discussions. This is why they are here before the ZBA. Currently valet parking is a requirement of this Board. Their request is if they could eliminate the valet and if the Board wants to entertain the variance, they would love that, or discuss a reduction in parking. Attorney Yellin said but first and foremost, they are trying to ensure that they can continue to take advantage of the other mechanisms within NewZO.

Mr. Condon said he was not trying to muddy the water, but he just wanted to get clarification. He asked Mr. Morrow that the way the findings are written, that in April [he was present at the meeting] a 107-space reduction was approved.

Mr. Morrow stated that is correct.

Mr. Condon asked if that number is off the required 232 spaces based on 1 space per dwelling unit. Or was the number significantly higher than 232 spaces to begin with?

Mr. Morrow explained that the original off-street parking requirement at the time that this came through was 266 spaces under the previous zoning. This reflects reassessment under NewZO as well as benefits built into NewZO for additional reductions to vehicle spaces required based on additional bicycling and moped.

Mr. Condon asked Mr. Morrow if he said 266 spaces.

Mr. Morrow answered that the 266 spaces were assessed as the requirement at the time.

Mr. Condon said if they subtract from the 266 the 107, that leaves 159. Are they looking to take 75 spaces from 159? He said he was somewhat confused; the requirement is 157.

Mr. Morrow said based on the table being displayed shows an enumeration of all the uses that are included. Each of those with their vehicle requirement adds to 254. The bike and moped bring it down to 232. So, the provided vehicle spaces are 157. Mr. Morrow said the reduction would truthfully be from the requirement at 254. This is really the baseline.

Mr. Condon said in April 2019, the Board approved 107 spaces, which would give the Petitioner 107 from 232. Why do they need a variance today?

Attorney Yellin explained that it was confusing. He had the Staff report from April 2019. Attorney Yellin said in 2019, they had the old Zoning standards. They asked if NewZO could be applied. The response was yes, but you must park it as a valet. The two levels of parking are currently in existence, but they have a requirement that basically is one of them. He explained that they gave them 107 space reduction.

Mr. Condon asked if these are being used by valets.

Attorney Yellin explained that it was made contingent upon providing 107 spaces of valet parking. He said in essence they did not really get a parking reduction in 2019, they got the ability to use valet parking.

Ms. Jarrett asked Attorney Yellin if they got 107 spaces total for the building.

Attorney Yellin answered no. There is stripe parking and valet parking. But the request was made by ZBA that they would give them 107 spaces, but that they would have to park them all on site as valet parking. They took nothing off the top.

Mr. Condon said the Petitioner does not have a 107 reduction. This is why today he needs 75 spaces. This will make the 107 fly out the window.

Attorney Yellin said if the 75 spaces were granted, this would put them in parking compliance if the valet was removed. It would also allow them to explore other avenues to find parking.

Mr. Morrow said this is somewhat a net to gross effect. He said as Attorney Yellin was describing the ability to configure now once you add in the drive isles and all the other circulation and things that are necessary, this is the gross area. Mr. Morrow said he believes this is where they are caught up. Even himself in understanding this, but in your accounting for everything, you end up with 157. It is the gross to net effect. This is what they have in bringing the parking verses valet.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jarrett said they know how she feels.

Mr. Plunk asked Staff if they received any letters of support or opposition.

Mr. Morrow answered that Staff received one letter of support. It is attached to the agenda.

Ms. Jarrett said her position is they need to use more shared parking. And until they have a planning study that says doing away with more parking works, she is not comfortable with doing away with more parking.

Mr. Plunk stated that the Ordinance for shared parking may need to be looked at as was Attorney Yellin's point. Clearly, as Attorney Yellin said, they keep hearing parking issues for the downtown area. Something here does not match the zoning requirements in this area. The ZBA does not have the authority to demand that a study be done, but maybe Ms. Jarrett as the Chair of the MPC could do something. Possibly, there could be industry support for the study.

Ms. Jarrett said maybe they can get the citizens' input.

Mr. Plunk said he is open to removing the valet requirement, which would allow the Petitioner to go out. The Petitioner would still have to come back to the ZBA if they didn't find an option. This would not necessarily remove it. They are not removing anything, but letting the Petitioner go free as the valet did not work. Can you find something better? He is certainly open to letting the Petitioner explore these other options. Mr. Plunk said Attorney Yellin said that he is the only one who has successfully made the alternative parking arrangements. He asked Mr. Condon what he thought about this.

Mr. Condon did not want to hurt the Petitioners. He suggested that maybe they need to get feedback from Attorney Yellin as to whether they would be helping them. Or should the ZBA push this down the road a little bit. Perhaps, give them a month to make some inquiries. Mr. Condon explained that when this was approved, it was acknowledged that insufficient parking was going to be provided. He was there at the time, and he vaguely remembers this. What he is fearful of is that they have given the Petitioners the opportunity to build this fantastic development and the potential exists now that what was a good idea in 2019, because since they have had COVID, and people have changed their lifestyles, and the way things go. So many people here (himself included) live downtown because they want to walk to things. Mr. Condon said he does not want to park his car; he does not want to get into a car and ride. Or if he does, even when he goes to the hockey games, a perfectly good parking lot is there, yet he gives the \$12.00 to his Uber driver each way.

Mr. Condon asked Attorney Yellin if the Board would be helping him today if they released him from the obligation of the valet or were they hurting him. If they are hurting him, would the Board be better off to give him a 30-day continuance, to the next meeting, to come up with some options, etc. It is a significant number. Mr. Condon said he believes that Ms. Jarrett, as usual, has some great ideas, as does Mr. Plunk and Mr. Turner. What would happen if the Board approved this waiver for him?

Attorney Yellin explained that releasing the valet parking requirement would absolutely assist in them being able to go out and explore those other options. They know that whether the Board makes it a condition or not, they must be parking compliant at the end of the day, or else Code Enforcement of the City of Savannah will be taking away their Certificate of Occupancy whether the Board makes it a requirement or not. This is the reality. Therefore, getting the valet parking requirement released is a benefit. This allows them to explore the other options. If they cannot make those other options work, when it was said that they must come back to the ZBA or not, they will be back before the ZBA if those options do not work. Therefore, he does not believe this needs to be a requirement that they come back. They are aware that if the valet is removed, they need to start making phone calls and trying to figure out where they can go. Attorney Yellin explained that this is the intent of today's request. They said let's lift the valet parking requirement and he still personally believes that the 75-space reduction is warranted based upon the area but understands the sentiment that is being expressed about one step at a time.

Mr. Plunk said the other thing that remains in his mind and maybe in Ms. Jarrett's mind, too, is that when Attorney Yellin first gave his presentation, he was sympathetic that they had somewhat a theoretically idea in 2019 that this Board did impose upon him, and he has now found it to be impractical. However, Attorney Yellin has said that they have not been open very long at all, and that the apartments are not even close to being full. Mr. Plunk stated therefore, his worries are could the valet potentially work if he gets to 100% tenant occupancy.

Attorney Yellin said he does not believe so. This is the concern that is related to him, it is not going to be a good system. They thought it was going to work; even if you add the logistics of it if there is one

valet parking attendant for 232 units.

Mr. Plunk said an additional unit full would not help it work.

Attorney Yellin replied that's correct. It is multifaceted. The request is to eliminate valet parking. They thought it would be feasible, but for many reasons, it is not a good idea.

Ms. Jarrett asked how long the complex has been open.

Attorney Yellin stated that he believes it has been open since the summer. The way these apartment projects work, from day one you can accept pre-leasing for a year in advance. But on day one you can have a great number of people not come in. Half of the people who do come do not bring cars.

Ms. Jarrett asked Attorney Yellin if he believed this was due to the housing shortage or perhaps maybe a less than impactful housing shortage.

Attorney Yellin said this was a good question. Maybe not for this Board, but he believes it is a good question. But they are seeing it throughout every apartment development across the City. Some at higher price points are fully leased and some at lower price points are sitting vacant. This is where he does not know the answer of what a tenant is looking for in 2023 and what needs to be provided. Attorney Yellin said that based upon this project that it is anything about the unit, the pricing, or even the location.

Mr. Turner said he believes the course of action for the Board would be the removal of the valet requirement, but denial of the 75 spaces.

Attorney Yellin said if the variance is denied, then they could not come back for a variance.

Mr. Merriman entertained a motion and then the Board would discuss the motion.

Mr. Condon motioned that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the request to remove the valet parking requirement and continue the request for the removal of the 75-parking space reduction to the meeting of March 28, 2024. This was seconded by Mr. Turner.

The Board members voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Merriman abstained.

Mr. Plunk motioned that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals submit a request to the appropriate sources that the Ordinance for shared parking be reexamined and recommend that a city-wide parking study be done due to the number of parking variances that are requested to the Zoning Board of Appeals. This was seconded by Mr. Condon.

Ms. Jarrett said her concern is the funding for a study such as this. She does not believe that it is in their budget to do a parking study. She does not know how involved looking at the Ordinance would be. Clearly, they do not have the ability to change the Ordinance. They could make a recommendation to City Council to change the Ordinance, but they do not have the ability to change the Ordinance.

Mr. Merriman said he believes a study of how many requests for a parking variance come before this Board might suggest that there needs to be a change in the Ordinance.

Ms. Jarrett said she understood this, but if you don't have the money to do it, how do you get it accomplished? She knows you can go to the City and ask them for money.

Mr. Morrow asked for a point of clarification. He asked if the Board was saying a parking study for the DX Zoning Districts specifically or is with regards to parking reduction. It is kind of to the vicinity in the Downtown area or the DX Zones. Mr. Morrow said they will look at both.

Ms. Jarrett said if they are going to do a parking study for the DX Zone, why don't they do a parking study for the Mid-Town. It is clearly more money. Maybe they need to make a request to Mr. Sean Brandon, Director of Parking Services.

Mr. Morrow said that Ms. Jones was not present at today's meeting, but Ms. Jones has reiterated on two

different occasions, a similar request for transportation and parking along the Bull Street corridor, given all the development that they see in this area. Therefore, this is in line with what is being discussed.

Ms. Jarrett said if you increase housing, you must look at parking.

Mr. Morrow said a broader conversation is that when Mr. Combs was here earlier. They have conversations regularly about the fact that he believes it is important that neighborhoods pursue plans. Since they have dedicated neighborhood associations, he believes it is more than appropriate that if they have neighborhoods that are going to meet and talk about concerns, the basis of those discussions should be in neighborhood plan. Mr. Morrow said, therefore, he believes planning at that level when something comes into this body, they can then say they have an established body of people whose opinions about this neighborhood they respect. This is their intention. He believes that this is a process and some resources have been shared. But, to push out to the neighborhood groups planning within your boundaries and have something on paper that this Board can make recommendations on. Then forward that to the City Council and say we respect this. It is in accordance with planning at all levels and they will evaluate future developments pursuant to fulfillment of the plans that the Board has established.

Ms. Jarrett asked if they were asking the neighborhoods to do the planning or are they asking them to ask the ZBA to do the planning.

Mr. Morrow said this is a conversation that could be ongoing. But equipping people to do these things themselves absolutely. The Staff is willing to provide several resources that are available online to facilitate a kind of grassroots planning approach. They can facilitate, but this is something that needs to happen whether it is formerly pushed out or if it is just a discussion such as you are meeting. This is the way you say no, we are okay with this within our areas so that it is not just Staff or a particular ZBA member or even an MPC member.

Ms. Jarrett asked, "isn't this what they did with the hotel overlay?"

Mr. Morrow answered it is. It was a special interest area where a group came together, and everyone got to weigh in. So, certain neighborhoods are comfortable with on-street parking, and they want to encourage walkability. Therefore, to take this idea that everyone else somewhat wants the same thing, there are several things that are under tension here. What they are seeing is Savannah for Savannahians and at the same time, Savannah for tourists. He believes that both must be considered. Having the neighborhoods come forward and say, "we have done more than complain, we have produced a document."

Mr. Plunk explained that the Zoning Board works from some type of master plan or maybe an individualized neighborhood master plan, which really fits the case here. They are unique in this regard. Is this correct?

Mr. Morrow answered, "that's correct." They maintain a broader plan that involves interaction of jurisdictions, but not necessarily at the neighborhood level. So, within the City and not to attempt to push more work on anyone, but just in the interest of seeing people not walk away from this process, let's place dissatisfied that perhaps they have not been heard. When you come forward with a plan document, then you can say we voiced it, and it is based upon academic principles and reasonable practice that they are able to implement these things. Make zoning work for us so that in our district we can get what they aspire for their neighborhood.

Mr. Plunk said the lack of this kind of plan results in spot zoning like they were forced to do today for the Two Tides Brewing Company. This is the result of not having those kinds of master plans. Ideally, they would have avoided spot zoning. He said Mr. Condon made a great point that they had a zoning policy that came into place in 2019, but the world changed the next year and made things very different. Maybe things will be different in 2024 than they were in 2019.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the request to remove the valet parking requirement at 111 Ann Street but continue the request for the removal of the 75-parking space reduction to

the meeting of March 28, 2024.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Condon

Second: Armand Turner

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Karen Jarrett - Aye

Michael Condon - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Aye

Betty Jones - Not Present

Armand Turner - Aye

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve that a request be sent to the appropriate sources that the Ordinance for Shared Parking be reexamined and that a city-wide parking study be done due to the number of parking variances that are requested to the Zoning Board of Appeals .

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Karen Jarrett

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Karen Jarrett - Aye

Michael Condon - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Aye

Betty Jones - Not Present

Armand Turner - Aye

XI. Other Business

XII. Adjournment

[9. Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Edward Morrow, Director
Development Services

ED:mem

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.