

CHATHAM COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

112 EAST STATE STREET

NOVEMBER 1, 2005

9:00 A.M.

SPECIAL MEETING

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

**Jimmy Watford, Chairman
Steven Day
Charles Stewart
Terrance Murphy**

MEMBERS ABSENT:

**Davis Cohen (Excused)
Robert Sharpe (Excused)**

TECHNICAL STAFF PRESENT:

**Robert Sebek, Chatham County Inspections
Department**

MPC STAFF PRESENT:

Jim Hansen, Secretary

RE: Called to Order

Mr. Watford called the November 1, 2005 Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals special meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

**RE: Continued Petition of David Rock, Annette Rock
B-05-60174-1
28 Hardee Drive**

Present for the petition was David Rock.

Mr. Hansen gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a 25 foot marsh setback variance to the 50 foot marsh setback requirement and a 10 foot riparian setback variance to the 35 foot riparian setback requirement of Section 4-12 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct a single family residence. The subject property, located at 28 Hardee Drive, is zoned R-1 E O (One-Family Residential Environmental Overlay).

Findings

1. Section 4-12(f) of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance requires that a minimum 50 foot setback from the marsh line and that a minimum 35 foot riparian setback from the marsh line be established for properties upon which existing structures existed at the time of adoption of the Environmental Overlay District (November 16, 2001). Setback requirements for both the marsh and riparian buffer are established at 25 feet if the

parcel was vacant at the time of adoption of the Overlay District. A residential structure was constructed and occupied on the lot prior to adoption, thus the more stringent requirements apply.

2. The petitioner has removed the previously existing structure from the property and is proposing development of a new single family residence. As proposed, the development would need variances from both the marsh and riparian setback requirements. The proposed residential structure meets or exceeds the front and side yard setback requirements.
3. The subject property is trapezoidal in shape, measuring approximately 75 feet along the front, 162 and 184 feet along the sides, and approximately 110 feet along the rear. The R-1 district requires a minimum lot frontage of 75 feet and a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet.
4. In accordance with Section 10-6.3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals may authorize upon appeal in specific cases such variance from the terms of the regulations as will not be contrary to the public interest where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions will, in an individual case, result in unnecessary hardship, so that the spirit of the regulations will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done. Such variance may be granted in an individual case upon a finding by the Board of Appeals that:

- a. **There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape, or topography.**

Though somewhat irregular in shape (trapezoidal), the parcel contains approximately 24,400 square feet and has no extraordinary topographic features.

- b. **The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship.**

Application of the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance would not create an unnecessary hardship.

- c. **Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.**

The conditions described above are peculiar to the subject property.

- d. **Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.**

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good. The purpose of the marsh and riparian setback is to protect the natural wetlands, stream beds and rivers from man-made encroachments that might exacerbate runoff conditions and inadvertently pollute said waterways.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting a 25 foot marsh setback variance and a ten foot riparian setback variance appear not to be met.

Mr. Rock stated the area that they were asking for the variance where they wanted to put a deck and that corner of the house was 41 feet back from the bulkhead. The existing house that was there the pool was within 14 feet of the bulkhead. He said they applied for a permit and their permit showed that they were required to have a 25 foot setback.

Mr. Stewart asked if the pool was still there?

Mr. Rock stated no. He said they have started constructing the house. He said they put pilings in to carry the deck. When they went down with their marsh survey was when they found out that they had to be 50 feet instead of 25 feet.

Mr. Day asked if the deck was going to be a slab on the ground or elevated?

Mr. Rock stated a concreted elevated slab with brick on it.

Mr. Day asked if it was on pilings?

Mr. Rock stated yes.

Mr. Stewart asked if it would be a screened porch?

Mr. Rock stated it would be an opened deck.

Mr. Stewart asked if it would have a roof?

Mr. Rock stated no.

Mr. Day asked if it was attached to the house?

Mr. Rock stated yes.

Mr. Day stated he understood that a house used to be there and it was torn down. He said according to the ordinance if a piece of the house was still there they would not be here today. He asked Staff if he was correct?

Mr. Sebek stated no. He said as of 2001 the ordinance was enacted. He said any lot that had an existing structure has a 50 foot marsh buffer. So, if there was an existing house on this site at that time then it was a 50 foot buffer. If there was no house on the lot at that time then there is a 25 foot buffer.

Mr. Day asked if there was a house on there at that time?

Mr. Sebek stated yes.

Mr. Day asked if the petitioner was before the Board because he tore the house down completely?

Mr. Sebek stated no. He said either way he would have been required to comply with the 50 foot buffer because there was a house existing at the time of the enactment of the ordinance.

Mr. Day stated the petitioner said that the corner of the house was 41 feet away from bulkhead which in itself was not within the guidelines. He asked how did that happen?

Mr. Rock stated he went to the building department and asked them what he had to have for a setback. He said he went back and looked at his notes and he was told 25 feet setback with a 10 foot riparian. He said he did not do the 10 foot riparian. When he submitted the plans the only thing that was asked for was to make sure that he was 25 feet from the bulkhead, 7 feet from the sides, and 25 feet from the front. He said the issue came up when they submitted the marsh survey.

Mr. Sebek stated he does not review all permits as they come through the office unless there was a question by the Staff that handles them. In this particular case, they did not pick up on the fact that there had been a house on the lot so that the 50 foot buffer would be in effect.

Mr. Rock stated the house to the left of him just received approval from the Board last month to install a pool at 25 feet back. The house to the right of him was 22 feet from the bulkhead to a deck. He said the deck was 8 feet wide to their structure. He said he felt he was sort of consistent with what was going to be in the neighborhood.

Mr. Jim Chambers (29 Hardee Drive) stated his cement pool deck was 34 feet and his wooden deck was approximately 6 feet, which would put him approximately 28 feet away from the seawall. He said the houses were uniformed. He said Mr. Rock's house was approximately even with his cement pool deck. He said he is retired and trying to maintain the value of his property. Prior to Mr. Rock building his house, the whole east side of his house had some very nice views. He said when Mr. Rock's house is completed the three triple windows on the upper floor of his house deck will not show any of the view that they had since they bought their house several years ago. He said they bought their house for the view and the side which would no longer be available if Mr. Rock's petition is granted.

He further stated looking to the house that was to the left of Mr. Rock's you could see that this was the house where his view to the right has been taken away. He said from the front side of his house the view to the right of his house and the previous house that was lined up and there appeared to be no consideration for the view of the houses around there other than the house that was being built. He said his house was 70 feet from the seawall. He said Mr. Rock indicated that his house was 41 feet from the seawall, therefore he has brought it out approximately 30 feet beyond his house. He said his pool deck is 34 feet off and Mr. Rock wants a deck 7 feet from the seawall.

He also stated that Mr. Rock hired a County Engineer that gives out approval for the permits to build. He said had that engineer do the footprint of his house. He said the question he had was would the County Engineer not have the knowledge of what the setbacks are. Also, Mr. Rock has spent probably close to 1 million dollars in knocking a house down, taking out a pool, and making a vacant lot. He asked would he (Mr. Rock) not have checked after spending that amount of money on where he could build his house. He said he felt the way to have approached this would be to start from the seawall, decide where you want the deck, and then decide where the house has to be. However, all of these factors seemed to have been ignored.

Mr. Day stated apparently there was a mistake originally in the location of the property. He said he did not know how to correct that and the Board could not correct it. He said in his presentation he talked about the location of the house in relationship to his home and how it affected his view. He asked Mr. Chambers to tell him how the addition of the deck was going to affect his view from his property?

Mr. Chambers stated he felt the point that he was making was that the house was out of code.

Mr. Day stated the Board was not addressing the house. The Board was addressing the deck, which was all they could talk about today.

Mr. Chambers asked how does the house get address?

Mr. Day stated that would need to go back to the Zoning Administrator.

Mr. Chambers stated the deck as he understood it was that once a cement deck is put in then anything could be put above that. He said he would say since there has been no regard for neighbor's views in the building of the house that he would not want Mr. Rock to put in a deck that could suddenly build a room on because it becomes a part of the house.

Mr. Stewart stated he felt he should have spoke up sooner when he saw the footings being laid. He said he felt for him because he also lived on the marsh and he could envision what happened to him because view is important. However, he felt he was too late to raise the issue and there was nothing the Board could do about that.

Ms. Pam Miltiades stated she was the original owner of the house and still lives in the neighborhood. She said she built a house 4 years ago down the street and she had to follow the rules. She said she wanted a staircase to come forward from the upstairs, but she has a 50 foot setback line from the street and it could not be changed. Therefore, she had to redesign the front of her house to come sideways. In the back, she has the 50 foot setback line from the marsh. She said many of the houses out there were being torn down because they were older or people were buying them and building bigger houses. She said if the Board changes one rule and let one person go over then everyone out there could say that this person has done it and so on. She said what Mr. Rock was saying in regard to the pool deck being much further, it was not and she had a picture with her that would show the original house. She said the house was small and the house that was on the lot because it was pie shaped was 2,800 square feet. The reason she sold her house was because there was not enough room to expand. Also, when she was building her house they told her she could not cut down any of the trees. She said this lot was full of trees and the lot has been clearly cut. She said she did not live next door to the house, but lives in the neighborhood and she did not want to see everyone come out and do whatever they want.

Mr. Stewart stated a situation like that does not set a precedent. He said every situation stands on its own. He said there were a couple of ladies on Wilmington Island who were not present today, but every time something comes up on the Island they come before the Board. He said and the Board appreciates their concern. He said he felt what they also needed in their area was an activist group to help keep their eyes on things like this and know what was going on before it happens.

Mr. Day asked Ms. Miltiades if she sold the property to Mr. Rock?

Ms. Miltiades stated no. She said she sold it to another lady who died about one year later.

Ms. Ann Phillips (27 Hardee Drive) stated her house was double in size to what Mr. Rock was building. She said it did not bother her that his house was protruding because she could still see the view of the water. She said she also felt that it has not devalued any of the homes in the area. She said she supported Mr. Rock's petition.

Mr. Day stated the Board has seen very similar situations like this from all over the County where people were coming in and paying large sums of money for waterfront property. He said what the Board sees happening is people were building larger homes because they were paying a substantial amount of money for the land. He said he felt the reasoning for this was because if at some point in time they want to sell their property they needed to be able to get their money back, which he understood. He said on one hand he felt that was fine, but on the other hand he felt that it was not so good. He said as mentioned by Mr. Stewart, if people wanted to help regulate this they needed to come together as a neighborhood association. He said the value of land on waterfront property was going up. He said if neighbors wanted to keep big houses from being built then they were going to have to do something about it either through the County board or some other way. He said people have a right to build what they want to build on their property as long as they were within the guidelines. The only reason the Board was here today was because Mr. Rock was not within the setback guidelines, otherwise he could build whatever he wanted to build on his lot as long as he was within the rules of the guidelines. He asked Mr. Rock how high was the deck?

Mr. Rock stated 4 feet off the ground. He said Mr. Chambers' windows that had the flowers in it was 77 feet off the bulkhead.

CZBA Action: Mr. Day made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the petition as submitted based upon a finding that the relief granted would not cause substantial detriment to the public good. Further, approval is conditioned such that no structure shall be built above the proposed deck unless otherwise approved by the Board of Appeals. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Continued Petition of Donald E. Dyches, Jr.
B-05-40208-1
23 Penrose Drive**

Present for the petition was Donald Dyches.

Mr. Hansen gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a five foot side yard setback variance to the ten foot side yard setback requirement of Section 4-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct an addition onto a single family residence.

Findings

1. The subject property, located at 23 Penrose Drive, is zoned R-1-A/EO (One-Family Residential/Environmental Overlay). Section 4-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum ten foot side yard setback for primary structures located within the R-1-A district.

2. A single family residence currently exists on the subject parcel. The existing structure is located within five feet of the west property line. The petitioner is requesting approval of a five foot side yard setback variance that would allow construction of an addition onto the existing house in line with the existing setback.
3. Development standards require a minimum 70 foot lot width and a minimum 12,000 square foot lot area for the R-1-A district. The subject property contains in excess of 38,000 square feet. Though approximately 700 feet deep, the lot measures only 54.4 feet in width and is thus below the minimum lot width for the district.
4. In accordance with Section 10-6.3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals may authorize upon appeal in specific cases such variance from the terms of the regulations as will not be contrary to the public interest where owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions will, in an individual case, result in unnecessary hardship, so that the spirit of the regulations will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done. Such variance may be granted in an individual case upon a finding by the Board of Appeals that:

- a. **There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape, or topography.**

The subject property contains in excess of 38,000 square feet. However, the lot width at the front property line is only 54.4 feet, tapering to 50 feet at the rear property line. The parcel is considered substandard as it is less than the 70 foot minimum width required for the R-1-A district.

- b. **The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship.**

Strict application of the regulations of the district could cause an unnecessary hardship. The existing residential structure currently encroaches into the required side yard setback. The petitioner's request is to allow construction of an addition that mirrors the existing footprint.

- c. **Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.**

The conditions described above are peculiar to the subject property.

- d. **Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.**

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good. The proposed addition will be "in line" with the structure presently existing on the parcel. The proposed setback will be no greater than that which exists currently.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting a five foot side yard setback variance appear to be

met.

Mr. Dyches stated the house that was built there was built at a 5 foot setback on the west side. The house burned after the petition was filed, but has since been removed because of safety issues. He said they were looking at whether or not they could incorporate that structure into the new structure or if it would be necessary to remove it. The structure was such that they were not sure that they could have incorporated it in. However, the plans that they have proposed were to build along the same footprint where the house was previously located. He said as stated by Mr. Hansen this is a substandard lot. He said the problem with this lot was they have setbacks on the marsh. Also, there was a large oak tree at the rear and there were certain parameters that you could build a house. He said because of those parameters they needed a setback variance to get a suitable structure in there.

He stated there was a petition signed a number of neighbors. He said there were two lots out there within 150 feet of each other. The petition references application numbers and number of neighbors. He said 20 people signed the opposing petition which represented approximately 14 properties in the neighborhood. In response to their petition, they approached a number of the neighbors out there and they got approximately 29 neighboring properties to support the application. Of the 14 properties that originally signed opposing, they approached a number of them. He said five of the properties who signed the petition opposing it when they were told that it applied to both lots and the facts about their particular case they signed a letter in support of their petition.

Mr. Day asked how close was it to the house next door?

Mr. Dyches stated the house that would be affected by the variance on the west side was a small house approximately 15 feet -20 feet from the property line.

Mr. Day asked what about the one on the other side?

Mr. Dyches stated approximately 7 feet – 8 feet off of the property line.

Mr. Day asked if they were new houses or old houses?

Mr. Dyches stated older.

Mr. Day asked if it was possible for some one else to come in and buy those lots and build a big house like he was proposing and sit it as close as what he was proposing?

Mr. Dyches stated yes. He said there were only three lots that were 50 feet. The remaining lots were in excess of the minimum yard requirements. He said all were 70 feet or greater. He said these were three grouped together that were all 50 feet each. He said he did not have plans drawn up because they did not know what they were going to build. However, to say that they were talking about a 5 foot setback variance they have things that would be knock-outs or chimneys that may come into the 5 foot, but most of the house may not be at 5 foot and would be no closer than the 5 foot setback.

Mr. Stewart asked how much closer?

Mr. Dyches stated the house may have a chimney that extended out from the one side. He said those would not go any further than the 5 foot. He said some of the house may be in fact

greater than 5 foot from the setback. However, in no case would it be more or less than 5 feet.

Mr. Day asked if they will install a fence around the property?

Mr. Dyches stated yes.

Mr. Day stated he was concerned about this from the standpoint that you have 5 feet with a fence around it and that it would limit emergency access to the rear. Also someone else could come in and build another house like this which would also have safety concerns.

Mr. Dyches stated he felt they would be keeping the 10 feet on one side. The other side had probably 7 feet or 8 feet, so it would be approximately 17 feet – 18 feet which would be accessible to emergency folks.

Mr. Stewart asked if there would be any obstruction within the 5 feet?

Mr. Dyches stated no, there were no trees or shrubbery.

Mr. Day asked if at some point will there be trees or shrubbery?

Mr. Dyches stated they did not have a landscape plan as of yet.

Ms. Pamela Sreptock (37 Penrose Drive) stated she was a neighbor of Mr. Dyches. She said she was opposed to a 5 foot variance because the wall would be within 5 feet of the property line. She said they also were not sure how far the overhang for the roof would be and they were concerned about fences.

Mr. Day stated if the Board granted the 5 foot variance it would be the full width of the house including the overhangs. He said they could put up a wall or fence and put it on their property line.

Ms. Sreptock asked if he was saying that most people have a 2 foot overhang as far as the roof was concerned?

Mr. Day stated the overhang would be at the 5 foot setback.

Ms. Sreptock asked what the walls or fences?

Mr. Day stated the fence could be on the property line.

Ms. Sreptock stated they had some friends who had a home on Wilmington Island on Wilmington River and those lots sold. She said the homes that went up next to their house on both sides were enormous. She said they all built 10 foot or 12 foot walls and ruined the view. She said it also affected the value of their property and took them some time to sell their property. She said she was concerned about that happening along the entire creek.

Mr. Day stated they could build an 8 foot fence without board approval.

Ms. Sreptock stated the size of the lot was huge and felt it was not a hardship to build a house on that lot without a variance. She said it was also her understanding that if you built within the footprint of your old house you would not need to apply for a variance because you were

grandfathered in.

Mr. Sebek stated if you had less than 50 percent of the value of the existing structure you would not need to change. However, beyond that point you would need to comply with the current regulations.

Ms. Sreptock stated she felt the size of the lot was known from the beginning. She asked if the setbacks were posted some where?

Mr. Sebek stated the setbacks were in the development standards of the County Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Stewart asked Mr. Dyches if he understood that the drip line would be 5 feet away from the property line?

Mr. Dyches stated yes.

Mr. Arthur Sheffield (37 Penrose Drive) stated he was opposed to the variance. He said he felt that every one should know when they purchase a piece of property what the setbacks are. He said it was a 50 foot lot when the petitioner purchased the property which he felt he knew. He said he felt that you should not be able to come in for any reason and request a variance. He said he also felt that it would adversely affect property prices.

Mr. Day stated he was looking for a reason to grant the petition other than the fact that Mr. Dyches just wanted to do it. He said he felt the Zoning Board of Appeals mission is to help homeowners do what they wanted to do with their property as long as there was a valid reason to go against the County Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Dyches stated when you talk about 2 foot eaves and the drip lines that took your 30 foot if you did not have the 5 foot setback on one side to 26 feet wide.

Mr. Day asked if he could change the design of the house so that it would not have 2 foot eaves?

Mr. Dyches stated he did not know.

Mr. Day stated what he was getting at was other than the fact that he wanted to do this what was a solid reason for the Board to grant his petition.

Mr. Dyches stated you have a steep hill at the front of the lot, so you would not be able to come out any further. He said there was a 48" Live oak that they would like to keep. He said there was stone Belgium block house that was built around 1940 that was existing and was shown on the footprint. He said unless you were going to start tearing down existing buildings there was not enough space in there. He said he felt the house would get longer and longer which would also block the view. He said the neighbor that would be most affected signed a letter in support of the petition. He said he felt that you would either get a house that looked like it fits in or you would have something that looked like a trailer that was extremely narrow and long.

Mr. Sebek stated as a point of information the eaves were allowed to extend 2 feet into the standard setback. He said that would not include a variance or whatever stipulations the Board put on it.

Mr. Murphy asked the petitioner if he said that the people on both sides were relatives?

Mr. Dyches stated no. He said the property owner to the east was a relative and the one to the west was not, but also supported the petition and signed a letter. He said this also was a proposed footprint and the existing garage would have to be replaced. He said if it was detached it has a 5 foot setback already.

Mr. Stewart asked if he was saying that regardless of what was put on it, it would not encroach upon the 5 foot setback on one side and 10 foot on the other. He said it would be within the 30 feet regardless how deep it was.

Mr. Dyches stated it would be within 35 feet.

Mr. Sebek stated the ordinance says – “an accessory structure on a river lot is allowed to be in front of the house, however it must be 10 feet from the property line.” He said there would also be limitations on the side (900 square feet maximum).

Mr. Day stated it may need to be attached to the house.

Mr. Sebek stated it either had to be attached to the house or 10 feet off of the property line.

Mr. Dyches stated okay.

CZBA Action: Mr. Stewart made a motion to approve the petition as submitted.

The motion failed for lack of a second.

CZBA Action: Mr. Day made a motion to deny the request. Mr. Watford seconded the motion. The motion failed on a vote of 2 - 2 with Mr. Stewart and Mr. Murphy voting against.

CZBA Action: Mr. Stewart made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition as submitted based upon a finding that the conditions necessary to grant the relief requested have been met. The approval is further conditioned by a requirement that the eaves of the primary structure not extend beyond the five foot relief granted and that no fence or gate is to be allowed in the western most side yard setback. Mr. Day seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Gregory L. Sicilia
B-05-40327-1
Johnny Mercer Blvd.**

Present for the petition was Mark Crapps.

Mr. Hansen gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of an application to establish a parking facility on two separate lots of record in order to provide remote parking for an excursion boat in conformance with the requirements of Section 6-2.9 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance. The subject property, located at the northeast intersection of Johnny Mercer Boulevard and U.S. Highway 80, is zoned T-B and W-I (Tourist-Business and Waterfront-Industry).

Findings

1. An excursion boat is presently operating from the Bull Run Marina located on the Bull River at its intersection with U.S. Highway 80. The operator (petitioner) is proposing to develop a public parking facility on two adjoining parcels. Whereas the proposed parking is not located on the same lot as the marina and whereas the proposed facility is located on two separate yet adjoining parcels, approval from the Board of Appeals is required in accordance with Sections 6-2.9, 6-3.3, and 10-6.2 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.

2. Parking regulations require that a total of 78 spaces to be provided to meet the needs of the excursion boat operation. The petitioner is proposing to provide 82 spaces. Typically, required off-street parking must be provided on the same parcel as the primary use. However, Section 6-2.9 of the Ordinance provides that the Board of Appeals is authorized to vary off-street parking and loading requirements. Specifically, Section 6-3.2 of the Ordinance provides that "...if the required off-street parking space cannot reasonably be provided on the same lot as the building it serves, the Board of Appeals may permit such space to be provided on other off-street property. ...such property shall be within 600 feet of such other use measured along the nearest pedestrian walkway. All such remote off-street parking property shall be in the same possession or ownership, either by deed or long term lease as the lot on which is located the building it is to serve as an off-street parking area."

The subject parcels are both owned by the same individual. The petitioner has entered into a long term lease with the property owner with the express purpose of using the land for a parking facility and launch point. The proposed use area meets the 600 foot distance requirement as well.

3. In accordance with Section 10-6.2 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals shall hear and decide upon requests for permission to establish uses based upon a finding by the Board that:

- a. **The proposed use does not affect adversely the general plans for the physical development of Chatham County, as embodied in these regulations and in any Master Plan or portion thereof adopted by the Commissioners of Chatham County.**

The proposed use does not affect adversely the general plan for the physical development of Chatham County. The property in question is zoned for tourist business and waterfront industry.

- b. **The proposed use will not be contrary to the purpose stated for these regulations.**

The proposed use is not contrary to the regulations.

- c. **The proposed use will not affect adversely the health and safety of residents or workers in Chatham County.**

No adverse affects are expected or anticipated.

- d. **The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or the general neighborhood.**

The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties. The site has been used for commercial purposes in the recent past.

- e. **The proposed use will not be affected adversely by the existing uses.**

The proposed use will not be affected adversely by the existing use. The site is currently vacant.

- f. **The proposed use will be placed on a lot of sufficient size to satisfy the space requirements of said use.**

The parcels are of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed use. The petitioner is not seeking any variances from the prescribed development standards.

- g. **The proposed use will not constitute a nuisance or hazard because of the number of persons who will attend or use such facility, vehicular movement, noise or fume generation, or type of physical activity.**

It is not anticipated that the proposed use will create either a hazard or a nuisance. Because the proposed use is a parking facility, it is inherent that traffic movements will be associated therewith. Access to the site will be from U.S. Highway 80, a major arterial roadway serving this part of the community.

- h. **The standards set forth for each particular use for which a permit may be granted have been met.**

The petitioner is seeking no variances to the development standards of the district.

Summary of Findings

It appears that all conditions necessary to grant approval for a remote parking facility on the subject properties have been met.

Mr. Day asked how long was the lease?

Mr. Hansen stated he did not know.

Mr. Stewart asked if the Board approves the petition for parking, would this go along with the title and not necessarily the lease?

Mr. Hansen stated the permit runs with the land. He said it could be used for remote parking until such time they come in and remove that particular permit.

Mr. Day asked if there was any other use that could be substituted for parking?

Mr. Hansen stated no, not without coming back before the Board.

Mr. Mark Crapps (Kern Coleman Engineering) representative for Mr. Sicilia. He said the petition was pretty straight forward. He said they were going to utilize the same piece of property and put back the parking spaces.

Mr. Day asked if it would be black topped?

Mr. Crapps stated yes.

Mr. Day asked how many spaces?

Mr. Crapps stated they were required to have 78, but they will have 82.

Ms. Sonya Allan (2 Cornus Drive) stated she lived in the house next door where they proposed parking would be. She said she was concerned in that she has a situation at her home where a storage place was allowed to build directly behind her house and part of the Williams' property. She said in the pictures the parking lot to the storage area was built up almost one foot high behind her home. She said she did not know how that happened. She said she guess her parents did not understand that would flood their backyard, which it does. Also, the fact that they did not have a door on the backside but on the side kept it from going into the house.

Mr. Stewart asked if she had a map?

Ms. Allan stated her property was between the Sanders Country Store and Williams Seafood. She said her point was, she did not want to be like a bowl affect. She said she wanted to make sure they were not going to flood her out.

Mr. Hansen stated as a means of clarification there are two separate distinct petitions that were literally side by side. He said he felt this particular individual was concerned about the petition which was the next item to be discussed on the agenda.

The Board agreed.

Mr. Day asked the petitioner where will their water flow?

Mr. Crapps stated their water will discharge off into the marsh area. He said it will drain off across the parking lot into the back into the marsh. He said they were allowed this under the Chatham County engineering ordinance to be allowed to discharge directly without any detention requirements.

CZBA Action: **Mr. Stewart made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition as submitted based upon a finding that the conditions necessary for granting the relief requested have been met. Mr. Day seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Thomas W. Williams
B-050927-40496-1
8010 Highway 80 East**

Present for the petition was Jim Gerard, Agent for Thomas Williams.

Mr. Hansen gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of an application to establish a remote parking facility to serve a commercial use in accordance with Section 6-2.9 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance. The subject property, located at 8010 Highway 80 East, is zoned T-B/EO (Tourist-Business/Environmental Overlay).

Findings

1. The petitioner is proposing the establishment of a restaurant in accordance with the provisions of the existing zoning district, and is further proposing to develop parking facilities on two adjoining parcels. Whereas the proposed parking is not located on the same lot as the proposed restaurant and whereas the proposed facility is located on two separate yet adjoining parcels, approval from the Board of Appeals is required in accordance with Sections 6-2.9, 6-3.3, and 10-6.2 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.

2. Typically, required off-street parking must be provided on the same parcel as the primary use. However, Section 6-2.9 of the Ordinance provides that the Board of Appeals is authorized to vary off-street parking and loading requirements. Specifically, Section 6-3.2 of the Ordinance provides that "...if the required off-street parking space cannot reasonably be provided on the same lot as the building it serves, the Board of Appeals may permit such space to be provided on other off-street property. ...such property shall be within 600 feet of such other use measured along the nearest pedestrian walkway. All such remote off-street parking property shall be in the same possession or ownership, either by deed or long term lease as the lot on which is located the building it is to serve as an off-street parking area."

The subject parcels as well as the proposed restaurant site are all owned by the same individual. The proposed use area meets the 600 foot distance requirement specified by the Ordinance.

3. In accordance with Section 10-6.2 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals shall hear and decide upon requests for permission to establish uses based upon a finding by the Board that:
 - a. **The proposed use does not affect adversely the general plans for the physical development of Chatham County, as embodied in these regulations and in any Master Plan or portion thereof adopted by the Commissioners of Chatham County.**

The proposed use does not affect adversely the general plan for the physical development of Chatham County. The property in question is zoned for tourist business uses.

- b. **The proposed use will not be contrary to the purpose stated for these regulations.**

The proposed use is not contrary to the regulations.

- c. **The proposed use will not affect adversely the health and safety of residents or workers in Chatham County.**

No adverse affects are expected or anticipated.

- d. **The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or the general neighborhood.**

The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties. The site has been used for commercial purposes in the recent past.

- e. **The proposed use will not be affected adversely by the existing uses.**

The propose use will not be affected adversely by the existing use. The site is currently vacant.

- f. **The proposed use will be placed on a lot of sufficient size to satisfy the space requirements of said use.**

The parcels are of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed use. The petitioner is not seeking any variances from the prescribed development standards.

- g. **The proposed use will not constitute a nuisance or hazard because of the number of persons who will attend or use such facility, vehicular movement, noise or fume generation, or type of physical activity.**

It is not anticipated that the proposed use will create either a hazard or a nuisance. Because the proposed use is a parking facility, it is inherent that traffic movements will be associated therewith. Access to the site will be from U.S. Highway 80, a major arterial roadway serving this part of the community.

- h. **The standards set forth for each particular use for which a permit may be granted have been met.**

The petitioner is seeking no variances to the development standards of the district.

Summary of Findings

It appears that all conditions necessary to grant approval for a remote parking facility on the subject properties have been met.

Mr. Gerard stated the request was to establish off-street parking on two lots. He said one lot was owned by the Williams' estate and the other was owned by the seafood company. However, both lots will be possessed by the restaurant company. He said the real estate

improvement that will be converted into the restaurant was located over here which was on a separate lot. He said the lady (Ms. Allan) that spoke on the previous petition owns property over here. As the Board may know that under the zoning regulations parking was supposed to be provided on the same lot as the primary use unless it is impossible to physically do that which in this case it is. He said as a result they were petitioning to establish the parking to serve the restaurant which will seat approximately 70 to 80 people. He said they did not intend on seeking variances from the developments of the parking lot. He said also with him today was Downer Davis, Engineer and Brian Felder, Architect.

Mr. Day asked Mr. Hansen if the proposal had to go before the MPC for buffers, sound buffers, site buffers, things like that to buffer the parking lot from any residential area?

Mr. Hansen stated no, provided that the petitioner does not seek any other sort variance relief. He said as long as the petitioner complies with the code it would not have to go before the MPC.

Mr. Day asked if the code says that it would have to have a buffer?

Mr. Hansen stated yes.

Mr. Downer Davis (Davis Engineering) stated they have taken into consideration some of the buffer and drainage concerns that the neighbors mentioned. He said what they were proposing was a loop drive to provide traffic circulation with parking on both sides of the loop. He said they have tried to minimize the amount of pavement to allow for maximizing the parking spaces provided. He said one of the things that they looked at when they provided the lay out was taking the deck for the restaurant, which will go before the staff of MPC and putting it out to the side or the rear. He said they moved that around to the front to minimize any impact to the neighbors for noise creation. In doing that they took away the ability to put a lot parking on this lot and they wanted to preserve some significant existing trees. He said they looked at putting a minimal amount of parking adjacent to the restaurant to allow for the handicapped parking and a few other spaces to be provided close by. In regards to the site it appeared to be flat. He said any drainage impact could possibly be towards the property in the rear and not to the side.

Mr. Day asked if that was not the direction of the storage facility?

Mr. Davis stated yes. He said what they were looking at doing was the unopened right-of-way there was the potential because it was not a buildable lot that they could create drainage corridor through there and put it into the grassy swells and let it filter out into this yard before it reached the marsh. He said the other thing that they could do was use a pervious pavement. He said if they did that there would be no increase in run-off. He said the other thing they were considering was along the rear of the property and the sides in their grassy areas which they had to provide parking trees for the parking spaces as well as overall parking and meet the tree points requirements of Chatham County and MPC. He said they were looking at possibly depressing those areas and using more of a bio-retention rain garden type affect to negate the need for irrigation. He said they have the potential to reduce run-off on this site and not increase it. He said in looking at the pictures of the neighbors house he was not sure how that happened. He said raising the site up, they would have no need to raise their site above their neighbors. He said the facility appeared to be very old. He said as most of the Board may know you are required to put walls around mini-storage warehouse facilities adjacent to residential neighborhoods. Basically, they have addressed the storm water management, but they have not provided a plan because they wanted to get approval for this before they spent funds for additional topographic survey.

Mr. Day stated they provided enough parking spaces to satisfy the requirements for the number of patrons that were going to be in this. He asked how many employees will they have? He said the reason he asked that question was because he wanted to know how many parking spaces was designated for employees.

Mr. Davis stated the current plan for the restaurant was 150 seats. The old restaurant was 450 seats. He said they have scaled back considerably and it will be more family controlled. He said he could tell him the number of employee parking. He said may be staff has that number. However, he felt the way the ordinance was written they will meet the requirements. He said they are asked to designate employee parking he felt they could do that.

Mr. Day stated he was making sure that they had enough to satisfy the employees as well as patrons.

Mr. Hansen stated they will have to meet the requirements for patron parking as well as for employee parking prior to receiving any sort of CO for this particular project. He said at this point they did not have any kind of plan before them to show exactly what it was that they were proposing. He said rather what they have before them today was the permission to establish remote parking.

Mr. Davis stated if there were any neighbors that have a drainage concern from this project he welcome them to contact the Chatham County Engineer's office (652-7800). He said he would rather know about concerns up front and they had no problem in addressing her concerns at the appropriate time.

Mr. Stewart stated he was familiar with the gravel pavement that was mentioned earlier. He said during the torrential rains we sometimes have in Savannah, the parking lots if they are enclosed with curbs it will flood, but will also drain off in a short period of time. Have they considered that?

Mr. Davis stated it depended on the type of stone because not all stone was porous.

Mr. Stewart asked what about the honeycomb with gravel on it?

Mr. Davis stated if you did not overly compact the ground and if you provided a surface that had more voids than existing ground it will not.

Mr. Stewart asked if they were allowing for run-off in case of torrential rains.

Mr. Davis stated there was run-off from the site now. The storm water management ordinance for Chatham County and the City states that you could not direct run-off in a concentrated flow above what was already there. He said you also could not increase the run-off from the site. He said they were not in any way proposing a 100-percent retention of their site. He said what they were stating was that they would not increase the run-off onto the property of others and they would not concentrate it.

Mr. Gerard stated they had a neighborhood meeting last month. He said if he remembered correctly no one came other than the people who were enthusiastic about having the restaurant return to that site. He said as far the projections on the capacity for the parking facility, they tried to overestimate than underestimate what they might have in the way of patrons and

employees. However, he felt the parking spaces that have been shown on the map should be sufficient to meet the requirements for both employees and patrons. Also, they know what zoning ordinance and storm water ordinances they needed to comply with. He said as indicated by Mr. Davis they know that the County Engineering department was going to be on them to ensure that they comply.

Ms. Allan pointed to her lot on the plans which was next door to the proposed site. She said the other concern was she wanted real assurances about not getting flooded because they already flood a little bit in the backyard. The other concern was and she went by and talked to the architect and he told her they were thinking about this. She said may be could have a natural buffer (hedge) to keep the headlights and/or noise down. Also, she was concerned about lights for safety for the parking lot. She said she did not know what the petitioner had in mind, but she would like for them to may be consider things that would not be overly bright into her house.

Mr. Hansen stated the code was very specific as to the types of buffers that were required for parking adjacent to residential and there will be required buffering. He said in this case it would be both plant material as well as a fence for properties adjacent to residential. In regards to lighting, the code was very specific and says that lighting could not spill over onto adjacent properties.

CZBA Action: Mr. Day made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition as submitted based upon a finding that the conditions necessary for granting the relief requested have been met. Mr. Murphy seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Frank Stevens, Agent for
Bob & Judy Meuleman
B-050927-40704-1
4 Marmaduke Lane**

Present for the petition was Frank Stevens.

Mr. Hansen gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of an eight foot rear yard setback variance to the 25 foot rear yard setback requirement of Section 4.6-1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct an addition onto an existing residential structure. The subject property, located at 4 Marmaduke Lane, is zoned PUD/EO (Planned Unit Development/Environmental Overlay).

Findings

1. Section 4.6-1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum rear yard setback of 25 feet.
2. The petitioner is requesting the variance in order to construct an approximately 17 foot by 14 foot screened porch at the rear of the existing residence on the subject property. The proposed porch would be 17 feet from the rear property line.

3. The petitioner has provided a letter of approval from the Landings Association Architectural Review Committee.

4. In accordance with Section 10-6.3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals may authorize upon appeal in specific cases such variance from the terms of the regulations as will not be contrary to the public interest where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions will, in an individual case, result in unnecessary hardship, so that the spirit of the regulations will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done. Such variance may be granted in an individual case upon a finding by the Board of Appeals that:

a. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape, or topography.

There are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property because of its size, shape, or topography. The parcel is approximately 110 feet wide by 150 feet deep.

b. The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship.

Application of the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance would not create an unnecessary hardship.

c. Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.

The conditions are not peculiar to the subject property.

d. Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed addition would be screened from the adjacent rear use, the Marshwood golf course, by a 50 foot wide wooded buffer. In addition, the applicant has obtained approval from the Landings Association Architectural Review Committee and the support of the adjacent neighbor to the east.

Summary of Findings

All conditions necessary for granting an eight foot rear setback variance do not appear to be met.

Mr. Stewart asked why this was not handled by the architect committee rather than having to come before the Board?

Mr. Stevens stated that has been his experience in the past. He said Mr. Sebek’s office directed him here.

Mr. Sebek stated their review committee cannot supersede the County Ordinance. He said their review committee can approve it from their point-of-view, but it still would need to be approved by Board of Appeals.

Mr. Stewart asked the petitioner if he has been before the architect committee?

Mr. Stevens stated yes, and it was approved. He said the reason for asking for the porch was because of the existence of the trees and it was beautiful out there. He said they were also holding the addition back behind the site line that was created by both properties on either side. The property over here was in years past granted a variance to come within 16 feet of the property line and they were asking to come within 17 feet. He said they also have a buffer in the back. The original submittal was for a slightly larger porch and it came out 2 feet further. He said the Landings asked them to pull it back, which they did to what they were submitting now. He said the conditions that were peculiar to this property were not conditions of hardship, but rather conditions that would render this variance innocuous.

CZBA Action: **Mr. Stewart made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition as submitted based upon a finding that the relief granted would not cause substantial detriment to the public good. Mr. Day seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Diane G. New
 B-050928-38044-1
 33 Penrose Drive**

Present for the petition was Mr. New.

Mr. Hansen gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a five foot side yard setback variance to the 10 foot side yard setback requirement of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct a single family residence.

Findings

1. The subject property, located at 33 Penrose Drive, is zoned R-1-A/EO (One-Family Residential/Environmental Overlay). Section 4-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum ten foot side yard setback for primary structures located within the R-1-A district.
2. The petitioner is requesting approval of a five foot side yard setback variance that would allow construction of a new single family residence. If the variance is approved, the proposed structure would have side yard setbacks of five and 15 feet respectively.
3. Development standards require a minimum 70 foot lot width and a minimum 12,000 square foot lot area for the R-1-A district. The subject property contains in excess of 45,000 square feet. The property is 75 feet wide and meets the district standards.
4. In accordance with Section 10-6.3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals may authorize upon appeal in specific cases such variance from the terms of the regulations as will not be contrary to the public interest where owing to special

conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions will, in an individual case, result in unnecessary hardship, so that the spirit of the regulations will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done. Such variance may be granted in an individual case upon a finding by the Board of Appeals that:

- a. **There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape, or topography.**

The subject property contains in excess of 45,000 square feet. The lot is 75 feet wide. The parcel is considered a standard lot.

- b. **The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship.**

Strict application of the regulations of the district would not cause an unnecessary hardship. The proposed structure could be located on the lot in such a manner to meet all setback requirements.

- c. **Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.**

The conditions described above are not peculiar to the subject property.

- d. **Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.**

Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good. Approval of the request would, however, not be in keeping with the intent and purposes of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance. Setback regulations have been established for each zoning district to allow for ample light, air, and safety considerations. The proposed structure can be sited to avoid the necessity for a variance.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting a five foot side yard setback variance appear not to be met.

Mr. Day asked if the garage shown on the drawing as a separate structure was there?

Mr. Hansen stated no, the lot was currently vacant.

Mr. Day asked if the Board was looking at a petition for variance on the garage or would it have to come back as a separate item?

Mr. Hansen stated no, the Board could consider that also today. He said as indicated in the last petition accessory structure ie. garage is allowed in the front yard on the marsh or riverfront property. However, that structure has size limitations and the petitioner has not indicated a request to exceed that size and it was not dimensioned. He said it would be 900 square feet and he did not believe that they were requesting a size variance. However, the code requires

though it was permitted in the front yard that it be setback a minimum of 10 feet from the side property line. He said if the intention is as it seems to be indicated on this particular site plan to align the garage with the side of the house then the garage would also need the 5 foot setback variance or would have to be shifted in order to meet the minimum 10 foot requirement.

Mr. W.L. New stated the reason for the request was if the house is located like it was shown it would be 23+ feet from the house on the right and it would 19 feet from the house on the left. He said they felt it would make it more symmetrical and from aesthetic standpoint it would look better to the neighborhood. The main factor was because of safety. He said if any emergency equipment ie. fire truck, ambulance or whatever have to get to the front of the house it would be better to come up on the left side of the lot. He said after the fire that occurred at the Dyches property it was even more of concern now.

Mr. Day asked how big was the house?

Mr. New stated approximately 2800 square feet.

Mr. Day asked if it was one story or two story?

Mr. New stated one story with a large attic space.

Mr. Day stated the reason he asked that question was because he was looking at the drawings and it appeared that the house was approximately 50 feet wide. He asked what was the depth?

Mr. New stated approximately 70 feet.

Mr. Day stated that would be approximately 3500 square feet on one floor.

Mr. New stated no, because of the recesses and space. He said the 50 feet also included a 4 foot deck on the left side.

Mr. Day asked if he was saying that the house itself was not 50 feet wide?

Mr. New stated yes. He said the house was approximately 48 feet wide.

Mr. Day stated given the concern the Board has for safety if they anticipated putting any kind of fence along the property lines?

Mr. New stated no. He said the pool may require a fence or a cover, but there would be nothing on the left hand side. He said there was no reason to access the front with septic tanks or wells because both will be on the front side of the property. He said he felt this was a reasonable and legitimate request. However, the neighbors were here and they have shown some concern about a 5 foot setback. He said he could withdraw their request and redesign the house if his neighbors wanted to object to the proposed petition.

Ms. Pamela Sreptock stated she was reluctant to say anything against the petition because the New's have been their neighbors for 20 years. But she has concerns about the 5 foot variance because she was not sure what they may want to do with their property in the future. She said they bought their house 20 years ago and it stretched them to their limits. Now, they were getting to the point where they could do some other things and may want to add on to their house. She said what would happen if they wanted to add on to that side of their house. Would

that mean that they would not be able to? Does that mean that they would need to apply for a variance also?

Mr. Day stated if they went beyond the 10 foot setback line they would have to apply for a variance.

Ms. Sreptock asked what was the possibility that they would be denied because there would already be a house within 5 feet of their property line?

Mr. Day stated the Board considers each and every case on an individual basis. She said when they do that there may be an entirely new Board.

Ms. Sreptock stated that was her main concern. She said she did not want any problems with her neighbors.

Mr. Day asked how wide was their lot?

Ms. Sreptock stated 100 feet wide.

Mr. Day stated it was 25 feet wider than this lot. Therefore, she would have more flexibility to do things on her lot than what the other lot has. He said there was at least that consideration for her to look at in the future. He said the Board also could not tell her how they would rule in the future as far as setback requests were concerned because they did not now.

Mr. Sreptock stated still was not sure what the plans were. He said it was mentioned 19 feet on the left and 23 feet on the right. He said he was happy for his neighbors, but they were concerned about the 5 foot setback. He said the lot was not even considered substandard. He said he was sorry that they did not get together before this to see what could be worked out.

Mr. Day suggested rather than asking the Board to vote one way or the other that the petitioner continue the request so they could talk about it and come up with a mutual solution. He said it could come back before the Board next month.

Mr. New agreed to a continuance.

CZBA Action: **Mr. Day** made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals continue the petition until the next regularly scheduled meeting. **Mr. Stewart** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Minutes

1. Approval of CZBA Minutes – August 23, 2005
2. Approval of CZBA Minutes – September 27, 2005

CZBA Action: **Mr. Day** made a motion that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the regular meeting minutes of August 23, 2005 and September 27, 2005. **Mr. Stewart** seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Other Business

1. Letter to Ms. Michael W. Lee from Board

The Board accepted the letter to be sent to Ms. Lee.

2. Election of Officers – Chairman and Vice-Chairman for 2006

CZBA Action: Mr. Day re-nominated Jimmy Watford, Chairman for 2006 and Davis Cohen, Vice-Chairman for 2006. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the County Zoning Board of Appeals, the meeting was adjourned approximately 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Hansen,
Secretary

JH:ca