



City of Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
February 23, 2023 - 10:00 A.M.
Meeting Minutes

FEBRUARY 23, 2023 CITY OF SAVANNAH ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

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

Member Absent: Larry Evans

Others Present: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director
Marcus Lotson, Development Services Director
Melissa Paul-Leto, Development Services Senior Urban Planner
Nirav Gandhi, Development Services Planner 2
Mary Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Warren Durrer, Executive Assistant to the MPC Executive Director

City of Savannah: Tom Bolton, Zoning Plans Examiner

I. Call to Order and Welcome

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

Mr. Merriman called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. He explained that this is a quasi-judicial proceeding. All those wishing to give testimony during these proceedings will please sign in. 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.

The Invocation was given by Mr. Merriman. The **Pledge to the Flag** was recited in unison.

II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

III. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

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

[2. 336 Barnard Street | An appeal by Andrew Jones, Agent for Anna Habersham Wright regarding a Special Exception 22-005355-COA | 22-006005-ZBA](#)

Mr. Lotson suggested to the Board that a continued date be set for the continuance of this petition. The petitioner has not set a continuance date. Therefore, he believes that the Board needs to set a continuance date. Mr. Lotson explained that the petitioner's intent for the removal is to continue this item because there is pending litigation that will not be done by the time this heard. He said he was not

suggesting that the Board wait on that because it could be a long time. Mr. Lotson said in other words if this petition comes back next month, that issue will not have been addressed.

Mr. Merriman stated that the Board can vote on the petition next month when they find out more information about it.

Mr. Lotson stated that the Board can vote on this next month. He just wanted to put this point on record.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve to continue the petition to the Meeting of March 23, 2023.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Karen Jarrett

Second: Stephen Plunk

- Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
- Karen Jarrett - Aye
- Michael Condon - Aye
- Stephen Plunk - Aye
- Betty Jones - Aye
- Hunter Hall - Not Present
- Larry Evans - Not Present

[3. 1806 Live Oak Street | Variances request to the minimum lot width and minimum lot area | 22-005897-ZBA](#)

Mr. Lotson suggested to the Board that a date be set for the continuance of this petition. He explained that the petitioner has requested that this petition be continued to the next regular meeting, which is March 23, 2023.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve to continue this petition to the Meeting of March 23, 2023.

Vote Results (Voting)

Motion: Karen Jarrett

Second: Stephen Plunk

- Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
- Karen Jarrett - Aye
- Michael Condon - Aye
- Stephen Plunk - Not Voted
- Betty Jones - Aye
- Hunter Hall - Not Present
- Larry Evans - Not Present

VI. Approval of Minutes

[4. Approve January 26, 2023 Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 January 26, 2023 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the January 26, 2023, Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Betty Jones

Second: Stephen Plunk

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Karen Jarrett - Aye

Michael Condon - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Aye

Betty Jones - Aye

Hunter Hall - Not Present

Larry Evans - Not Present

VII. Approval of Final Agenda

VIII. Consent Agenda

IX. Old Business

X. Regular Agenda

[5. 1018 Abercorn Street | Variance to the minimum rear yard setback | 23-000468-ZBA](#)

[📎 Application.pdf](#)

[📎 Submittal Packet and Materials.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Report.pdf](#)

Ms. Melissa Paul-Leto gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting a variance to reduce the minimum rear yard setback requirements from 10-feet to 7-feet 4-inches to allow for the construction of a three-story, 2,100 square foot building, with commercial space on the first floor and residential units on the second and third floors at 1018 Abercorn Street units A & B. The lot is zoned TC-1, (Traditional Commercial-1)

Ms. Paul-Leto explained that the subject property, 1018 Abercorn Street, Units, A & B is currently two separate buildings constructed at approximately the same time and are considered non-contributing resources within the National Register Victorian Historic District and the local Victorian Historic District. The buildings fall outside the Period of Significance (POS) for this district, which is 1799-1923. Although the supplement, associated with the Contributing Resources Map, indicates the date of construction as 1930, the buildings do not appear on the Sanborn Maps until 1966; therefore, they were constructed between 1953 and 1966. The two buildings were approved to be demolished on May 26, 2022 (22-002376) at staff level. Starting from the left to right: 1014 Abercorn Street, 1018 Abercorn Street Units A & B, 1020 Abercorn Street The applicant is requesting a setback reduction from the 10-foot minimum rear yard setback requirement to 7-feet 4-inches to allow for the new construction of a three-story mixed-use building. The subject property does not have lane access. The rear yard abuts to 210 E. Park Avenue, a one-story residence. The pattern of development along this block zoned TC-1 has been a mix of mixed-use buildings along Abercorn Street abutting residential homes along Park Avenue. At 1004 Abercorn

Street, across from East Waldburg Lane, is a commercial building including a Dominoes and a local market store. Along East Waldburg Lane, there consists of several residential homes close together with limited rear yards and almost no side setbacks. The new construction at 1018 Abercorn Street would not put the structure out of line with the general size of buildings in the area; however, the subject property is smaller than all of the lots on Abercorn Street, East Park Avenue, and East Waldburg Street. The Subject Property is bordered in the rear by the west side of a single-family residence. The property owner for 210 East Park Avenue, which is the single-family home, wrote a letter of support.

Ms. Paul-Leto reported that based upon the variance criteria, staff recommends approval of the requested variance to reduce the rear setback from 10-feet to 7-feet - 4-inches.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Martin Ronaszegi was present on behalf of J. Elder Studio. He explained that they are requesting to reduce the rear setback in order to build the three-story building that was approved by the Historic Preservation Commission [HPC]. It is small, but if the variance is approved, the footprint of the building will be approximately 7 square feet. He entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

Mr. Merriman entertained a motion.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the requested variance to reduce the rear yard setback from 10-feet to 7-feet 4-inches.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk
 Second: Karen Jarrett

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Hunter Hall	- Not Present
Larry Evans	- Not Present

[6. VARIANCE REQUEST | 904 E 38th St | File No. 23-000474-ZBA | Lot Width and Size Reduction](#)

[Map.pdf](#)

[Staff Report Final.pdf](#)

Mr. Nirav Gandhi gave the staff report. The subject property is zoned TR-1 for Traditional Residential. The minimum lot size requirement for this district is 3,000 square feet, and the minimum lot width

requirement is 40 feet. The applicant is requesting a lot width variance and a lot size variance for each of the 3 proposed lots in order to subdivide the property into three buildable lots. The applicant is requesting the following variances:

1. A 10 feet lot width variance to reduce the lot size from 40 feet to 30 feet.
2. A 300 feet lot size variance to reduce the lot size from 3,000 square feet to 2,700 square feet.

Mr. Gandhi explained that the subject property was historically composed of three 30-foot-wide lots, as is typical of the neighborhood in which it is situated. The lot does not have lane access, and therefore requires a 40 feet width in the TR-1 district. There are a significant number of lots in the surrounding area that are also 30 feet wide and less than 3,000 square feet. Nearly half the lots in a one-block radius surrounding the subject property are 30 feet wide and 2,700 square feet in size. However, if the property is not granted the variance, it would still be able to be subdivided into two properties with a single-family residence on each.

Mr. Gandhi reported that based upon the variance criteria, staff recommends denial of the following variances to be applied to each of the three proposed lots:

- A 10 feet lot width variance to reduce the lot size from 40 feet to 30 feet.
- A 300 square feet lot area variance to reduce the lot size from 3,000 square feet to 2,700 square feet.

Mr. Gandhi entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Jarrett asked staff if parking is their main concern.

Mr. Gandhi answered that they are concerned about parking. However, there are lots where people have been able to basically create easements and have the parking spaces in the back. He explained, pointing to an area, that easements are here, and parking is there. It is possible to have on street parking, but the applicant did not request a parking variance. It would be assumed that if this passes, they would have to park onsite.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Attorney Robert McCorkle of the law firm of McCorkle, Johnson and McCoy, LLP was present on behalf of the petitioner. Attorney McCorkle explained that as staff has reported, their petitioner acquired the 92 feet wide property. They are trying to put back the historic lots. Other people and he have come before the Zoning Board of Appeals [ZBA] many times pertaining to these size lots in this neighborhood and in other neighborhoods. As the Board is aware, all of these lots were historically 30 feet when they were laid out. All of the deeds to these properties still refer to the original lot numbers; the three lot numbers that they are trying to reestablish. This City has had a rule for many years in place that if an individual owner owned multiple lots and the zoning changed; and that zoning made their lots preexisting nonconforming uses, then they treated them as being recombined, even though, the owner never filed a recombination plat asking for them to be recombined. This is the case here.

Attorney McCorkle said over the years as they have gone through these requests, typically, the main consideration at least in his opinion and his experience in doing so, has been what are the other lots on the blockface? What are the other lots in the immediate adjacent surrounding area? He said he believes this is relevant, even beyond just what the standards are because as the Board knows, these standards were placed on these neighborhoods and this neighborhood after it was developed, even after the houses were built. The houses that are on this block, for instance, were not built to the standards that apply to it on the Zoning Ordinance. They were already existing, and the standards were placed on them that do not actually represent what is happening on the ground. Attorney McCorkle said this is a common situation in a lot of different areas. He said it may be true for one block and not true on another block, but they have a large zoning district that applies to every single block and every single house in a large area. Therefore, with this property, it shows the houses that exist on the block. There are basically 20 lots on the blockface that they are on and the face immediately facing them. He said of those 20 lots, 18 of them are 30 feet are less and have less than 3,000 square feet of lot area for the houses. The only two that do

not are the one on the corner across the street and the lot that they are talking about today.

Attorney McCorkle showed the Board pictures of lots in this vicinity. He pointed out the side of their empty lot and the house that is immediately next to it, which is on a lot that is less than 30 feet. He also showed the Board pictures of the houses that are further down the block. Attorney McCorkle explained that the places are nice; built on 30 feet lots and still meeting the setback requirements, which this is what his client intends to do. Some of the houses meet the 30 feet setback requirements and some do not as they predate the setback requirements. He said he was before the Board in March, 2022 for this exact same request, on the same block. Attorney McCorkle said, therefore, [pointing to an area] this red dot is 914 East 38th Street. They are here today for the same client. The client has acquired this piece of property and they are requesting exactly the same variance today. When they were before the Board in March 2022, the staff actually recommended approval for this same variance and the Board approved the variance request. The property has been subdivided. But the only reason it is not shown as such on SAGIS, is because they have not gotten the property identification numbers. Therefore, this is why it is shown as one lot.

Attorney McCorkle said that the staff has confirmed that this will not be injurious to the neighborhood or the neighbors. It is consistent with what is here. They have these other standards; and it is true that this particular piece of property can be divided into two lots and build two houses. But the only thing they are asking today is, "can they build two houses or three houses on this lot." He stated that he understands that this would not be appropriate in certain areas where a 30-foot-wide lot is not allowed. However, in this case, he believes it is appropriate. He believes also because of the peculiar circumstances to this lot; it is a 90-foot lot on a street that has essentially nothing but 30-foot lots. Therefore, to him, to not have a variance and not allow them to do what every other lot essentially on the block has done, does threaten them in a different way. It does deprive them of the same rights that everybody else on the block has been able to do.

Attorney McCorkle said the City has a housing crisis. They are trying to provide as much housing as humanly possible. His client can develop this with two larger houses. Certainly, it is not that it takes away the use of the property. They believe that here, the 30-foot lot is appropriate due to the surrounding area; and similar to the variance they requested last year [2022] in March that was approved by the Board. They are requesting that the Board also approve this variance so they can build three infill houses on the block. Attorney McCorkle entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Plunk asked if staff received any public comments on this petition.

Mr. Gandhi answered that staff did not receive any public comments.

Ms. Jarrett said since the applicant has not applied for a parking variance, she assumed that he will provide parking.

Attorney McCorkle said they will meet all parking requirements.

Mr. Merriman entertained a motion.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the Lot Width and Size Reduction as requested for 904 East 38th Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Hunter Hall	- Not Present
Larry Evans	- Not Present

[7. 116 East Henry Street | Variance to the minimum interior side yard setback | 23-000477-ZBA](#)

[Application.pdf](#)

[Application Details.pdf](#)

[Staff Report.pdf](#)

Ms. Melissa Paul-Leto gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting a variance to reduce the minimum side yard interior setback requirement from 3-feet to 0-feet to allow for the construction of a two-story carriage house with a workshop/storage space on the first floor and an accessory dwelling unit on the second floor at the rear of 116 East Henry Street. The stair to the second floor will be located within the side setback; the wall to the building itself is at 3-feet 4 1/2-inches. The lot is zoned TN-1, (Traditional Neighborhood -1).

Ms. Paul-Leto explained that the historic main building was constructed in 1871 and is a contributing resource within the National Register Victorian Historic District and the local Victorian Historic District. The storage shed currently at the rear of the property is in deteriorating condition and is listed as non-contributing. The applicant will be demolishing the existing garage and build a new two-story carriage house. The primary contributing building first appears on the 1888 Sanborn Map as a two-story frame structure with no outbuildings. By 1898, there was a one-story frame dwelling at the rear of the property, split across the rear of 116 and 118 East Henry Street. In 1916, there were two one-story frame structures at either corner at the back of the property. The 1953 update to the 1916 map shows two frame structures still, but one is referred to as a garage. Sometime between 1955-1966, there was one single story garage at the northwest corner of the property. Throughout these years, the neighborhood was largely residential, but evolved to have some commercial businesses including a bakery, auto services, and in later years Sears Roebuck & Co. had an auto service and retail store. The Duffy Street Methodist Church also appears on the maps, which is known today as Asbury Methodist Church and also appears on the maps. Currently, many of the Victorian era structures remain intact with carriage houses as part of the development pattern. On November 21, 2022, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) approved the design of the carriage house and recommended a variance to the side yard setback per 22-005077-COA.

Ms. Paul-Leto reported that based upon the variance criteria, staff recommends approval with one condition:

1. No portion of the building shall encroach into the setback other than the staircase.

Ms. Paul-Leto entertained questions from the Board. She was not sure whether the architect was present via Zoom, but she did not see him in attendance in the hearing room.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the petitioner could put the stairs in the space between the house and the carriage house. This would make it narrower, but it could go between the two structures.

Ms. Paul-Leto answered yes to Ms. Jarrett's question, but she said that this is a question for the architect.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the fire department has seen this request.

Ms. Paul-Leto answered that she is not sure whether the fire department has seen this request. However, the fire department will see this at the building permit phase.

Ms. Jarrett asked if the applicant was present.

Ms. Paul-Leto answered that the applicant was not present.

Mr. Merriman confirmed that the applicant was not present.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby continue the petition to the meeting of March 23, 2023. The petitioner was not present.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Karen Jarrett

Second: Michael Condon

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Hunter Hall	- Not Present
Larry Evans	- Not Present

[8. 222 East 53rd Street | Variance to the minimum interior side yard setback | 23-000490-ZBA](#)

[Application.pdf](#)

[Staff Report.pdf](#)

Ms. Melissa Paul-Leto gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting a side yard setback variance to extend the front façade of an existing storage building located at the rear of the property that has a side yard setback of 0-feet. The proposed extension would bring the front of the building forward by 8-feet. The lot is zoned RSF-6, (Residential Single-Family -6) and is located within the Ardmore Conservation District. The parcel is approximately 0.14 acres, or 6,098.4 square feet in size.

Ms. Paul-Leto explained that the subject property is located on East 53rd Street between Battey Street and Habersham Street, with lane access from East 52nd Lane. The parcel includes a one-story, single-family residence built in 1938, and a wooden storage building located to the rear of the property built in 1980. The storage building is a total of 288 square feet in size and is non-conforming to the RSF-6 development standards regarding the minimum rear and side yard setback requirements. The applicant is intending to construct an addition to the front of the existing storage building. The proposed addition would be an 8-foot extension, approximately 104 square feet. Because the existing building is on the property line, the 8-foot extension is an encroachment. Ms. Paul-Leto stated that the applicant received three letters of support from adjacent neighbors to extend the front of the existing garage eight feet to the

front of the property.

Ms. Paul-Leto reported that based upon the variance criteria, staff recommends approval to allow for an 8-foot forward extension of the existing storage building with the 0-foot side yard setback. She entertained questions from the Board and stated that the petitioner was present to speak to the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Nancy Oosterhout and Ms. Rosemary Schuster came forward. Ms. Oosterhout thanked Mr. Bolton, Mr. Lotson and Ms. Paul-Leto for guiding her through this process. They all were very helpful.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jarrett stated that she and Ms. Oosterhout are friends, but this will have no effect on her decision.

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the petitioners request for a variance to the minimum interior side yard setback at 222 East 53rd Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Betty Jones
 Second: Michael Condon

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Hunter Hall	- Not Present
Larry Evans	- Not Present

[9. 2200 Waters Avenue | Reestablishment of a nonconforming use | File no. 23-000495-ZBA](#)

- [📎 Application.pdf](#)
- [📎 Photos.pdf](#)
- [📎 Staff Report 0495.pdf](#)
- [📎 Letter of Support Juliana Martin.pdf](#)

Mr. Lotson gave the staff report. The petitioner, Juwaan Holmes, is requesting the re-establishment of a nonconforming use for a vehicle repair business in a TC-1 (Traditional Commercial) zoning district. He explained that:

1. The subject property is located at the southeastern corner of the intersection of Waters Avenue and East 38th Street within a TC-1 zoning district and is developed with 1,500 square feet, commercial building with three garage bays and an office.

2. The land use on the subject property has been a vehicle repair center that has operated under different business owners for more than 30 years. Prior to 2019, the property was zoned P-BG-1 (Planned - General Business-Transition) a commercial district that allowed major vehicle repair. In 2019, the property was rezoned to TC-1 in conjunction with the adoption of the new Zoning Ordinance. The use became nonconforming upon the adoption of the Ordinance and a business tax certificate (business license) had not been associate with the property for several years.
3. The petitioner is a potential new business operator and is requesting approval to reestablish the use on the site. Under the current TC-1 zoning, only minor vehicle repair is permitted. Minor vehicle repair is differentiated from major vehicle repair in Article 13 of the Ordinance. Minor repair typically includes, brake service, oil and fluid changes, tire repair and installation, tune ups and other similar activities. Major vehicle repair can include engine and transmission services, body work and the repair of commercial vehicles. The petitioner is seeking major vehicle repair.
4. The development pattern on Waters Avenue north of Victory Drive to 37th Street, includes nonresidential uses abutting Waters, and primarily residential uses on the intersecting east/west streets. The area around the subject property is consistent with this pattern.
5. Per Article 3 Section 3.24.7(a), the Zoning Board of Appeals may authorize the re-establishment of a nonconforming use given that all of the following criteria are met:

The design of the building cannot readily accommodate a permitted use of the zoning district in which it is located.

Mr. Lotson reported that based on compliance with all the criteria outlined in Section 3.24.7(a), staff recommends approval of the re-establishment of the nonconforming use of a vehicle repair center and the use Vehicle Service, Major with the following conditions:

1. A solid fence at least 5 feet in height shall be established parallel to Waters Avenue between the building façade and the driveway.
2. Landscape improvements shall be installed between the fence and the wall consistent with a Type A buffer. A Type A buffer includes understory trees and shrubs.
3. The hours of operation shall not exceed 7 a.m. – 7 p.m.

Mr. Lotson entertained questions from the Board. He stated that the petitioner was also present to answer questions from the Board.

Mr. Merriman asked that prior to NewZO, was there a differentiation between heavy automotive work and light automotive work.

Mr. Lotson answered yes. There was a differentiation between heavy automotive work and light automotive work. However, the Zoning District that was on this property at the time permitted major vehicle repair.

Ms. Jarrett asked if there is anything that they can do about the number of vehicles that are kept here.

Mr. Lotson answered that this is a great question. They have had this discussion before, not specifically to this case, but they have had it in other cases that address vehicle repair. He explained that there are other City codes that address this. But it is somewhat an enforcement nightmare to really put a condition on something such as this type of zoning approval. He believes these are property maintenance issues, which can be addressed through the City Code by Code Compliance. There are many examples that they have probably seen of vehicle repair shops that have those issues with vehicle storage over long periods of time. However, staff did not think that it was appropriate to place this as a condition here as it

can be dealt with from a Code Compliance standpoint.

Ms. Jones said it appears that a neighboring house is next door. How does this neighbor feel about the shop next door to them?

Mr. Lotson said he believes that a triplex is located immediately east of the subject property. Staff notified this property owner as well as the other property owners in the area about this request and did not receive any correspondence on this matter. Mr. Lotson explained that staff received one letter of support that is attached to the petition. The letter of support was received from the owner of 2304 Waters Avenue.

Ms. Jones asked if the letter of support was received from the next-door neighbor.

Mr. Lotson answered no. The letter of support was not from the adjacent resident.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Maher Sammour came forward and stated that he is the owner of the property. The building was built in 1991. He purchased the property in 2007. It was already occupied by a tenant. Since that time, three other tenants have used the property as a garage. They have not received any complaints from the neighbors. Mr. Sammour said the last tenant moved out in 2016. Since that time, he has used the property for storage. He never received documentation regarding the property being rezoned.

Mr. Sammour explained that Mr. Paige asked him to rent the property to him. So, he moved all of his stuff across the street to his other building. When Mr. Paige applied for his license; he was told that it was not zoned for a garage. This is why they are present today to try to get the property back to where it was so that it can be a garage.

Mr. Plunk asked Mr. Sammour and Mr. Paige if they opposed or were in favor of the three conditions that staff recommended.

Mr. Sammour explained that they talked with the City officials about the fence; but were told not to do anything before this is approved. However, they have no problem with installing a fence. They have no problems with the trees and shrubs, and they have no problems with the opening and closing time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the requested reestablishment of a nonconforming use for 2200 Waters Avenue to allow Vehicle Repair, Major with the following conditions:

1. A solid fence at least 5 feet in height shall be established parallel to Waters Avenue between the building façade and the driveway.
2. Landscape improvements shall be installed between the fence and the sidewalk consistent with a Type A buffer. A Type A buffer includes understory trees and shrubs.
3. The hours of operation shall not exceed 7 a.m. – 7 p.m.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Condon
Second: Betty Jones
Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain
Karen Jarrett - Aye
Hunter Hall - Not Present
Michael Condon - Aye
Stephen Plunk - Aye
Betty Jones - Aye

XI. Other Business

XII. Adjournment

10. Adjourned

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Merriman adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marcus Lotson
Development Services Director

ML: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.