

CHATHAM COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

112 EAST STATE STREET

JUNE 26, 2007

9:00 A.M.

REGULAR MEETING

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

**Wayne Noha, Chairman
Davis Cohen
Steven Day
Brian Felder
Jimmy Watford**

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Terrance Murphy (Excused)

TECHNICAL STAFF PRESENT:

**Robert Sebek, Chatham County Inspections
Department**

MPC STAFF PRESENT:

**Deborah Burke, Assistant Secretary
Christy Adams, Administrative Assistant**

RE: Called to Order

Mr. Noha called the meeting of June 26, 2007 Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

RE: Regular Agenda

**RE: Petition of Caesar Cuspert, For
Oakland Missionary Baptist Church
B-070516-51399-1
187 Buckhalter Road**

Present for the petition was Caesar Cuspert, Senior Deacon and Lee Meyer, Architect

Mrs. Burke gave the following Staff report.

The petition was continued from the April 24, 2007 meeting.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a 28 foot setback variance from the 50 foot setback requirement of Section 4-5.1 (17a) of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct an addition to an existing church. The subject property, located at 187 Buckhalter Road, is zoned R-A (Residential-Agriculture).

Findings

1. Section 4-5.1 (17a) of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance requires that any building or structure associated with such use (churches or other places of worship) shall be set back not less than 50 feet from any property line, except where a property line is the right-of-way line of a street, in which case the setback established for the particular class of street in the zoning district shall apply. The Ordinance further states that the Board of Appeals shall be authorized to reduce the setback requirements in the case of a particular church or other place of worship if on the basis of evidence presented, it finds that a reduction in the setback would be in keeping with the purposes of this Ordinance, and would not create conditions which would be detrimental to the adjoining properties or the neighborhood.

2. The subject parcel has a width of approximately 197 feet and a depth of 185 feet at its shallowest point and 205 at its deepest point, resulting in a lot area of approximately 38,400 square feet. The parcel is a conforming lot of record.

3. The petitioner is seeking a 28 foot setback variance in order to construct an addition to an existing church 22 feet from the southern property line.

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 subject property. The parcel is a conforming lot of record that is square in shape.

 - 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. However, there does not appear to be any location on site where an addition could be situated so as to meet the 50 foot setback requirement.

 - 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 most likely not cause substantial detriment to the public good. The church is currently in existence and is surrounded by properties utilized for large lot single family residences and agricultural uses.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting a 28 foot setback variance appear not to be met.

Mr. Felder asked if the property to the north residential?

Mrs. Burke stated yes. She said she also met with those folks this morning about the petitioner's plan and they were fine so they chose not to stay for the meeting.

Mr. Cuspert stated they needed more room for their fellowship hall and it would not require them increasing their parking. He said the area that they were currently using as their fellowship hall they wanted to convert into classrooms for Sunday School.

Mr. Noha asked if they could put the addition in another area on the site?

Mr. Meyer stated on the other side was the Pastor's office and bathrooms. He said they felt it would be more convenient to do it on this side.

Mr. Day asked if they could move it further towards the front?

Mr. Meyer stated no, because it would take away from the existing bathrooms.

Mr. Day asked if it could be turned 90 degrees?

Mr. Meyer stated no because then it would interfere with the roof. He said they felt the proposed location was best because they would be able to tie into the existing structure conveniently.

Mr. Felder stated he felt no matter where the petitioner put the addition he would encroach into the setbacks on all four sides.

CZBA Action: **Mr. Felder 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. Cohen seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Dennis Todd
Savannah Sunrooms, For
Tina Love
B-070516-51639-1
51 Runabout Lane**

Present for the petition was Dennis Todd.

Mr. Day stated he has done business with Mr. Todd's brother in the past. He said he felt that it was not necessary for him to recuse himself from this petition.

Mrs. Burke gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of an 18 foot marsh setback variance from the 50 foot marsh setback requirement, and a three foot riparian buffer variance from the 35 foot riparian buffer requirement of Section 4-12(f) of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct an addition to an existing single family dwelling. The subject property, located at 51 Runabout Lane, is zoned R-1/EO (One-Family Residential/ Environmental Overlay).

Findings

1. Section 4-12(f) of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum 50 foot setback from the marsh line and a minimum 35 foot riparian setback from the marsh line be established for lots upon which structures existed at the time of adoption of the Environmental Overlay District (November 16, 2001).
2. The subject property is an existing lot of record with an existing structure which does not appear to meet the required 50 foot setback.
3. The petitioner is requesting an 18 foot variance from the required 50 foot marsh setback and a three foot variance from the required 35 foot riparian buffer in order to add a sunroom to an existing single family residential structure within 32 feet of the marsh line.
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 subject property. The parcel is a conforming lot of record.
 - 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 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. Although, it would appear to be in conflict with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting an 18 foot marsh setback and a three foot riparian buffer variance appear not to be met.

Mr. Cohen stated he was trying to determine if the petitioner built the pool in violation of the Zoning Ordinance or whether or not they built the pool in conformity with the Zoning Ordinance. He said if it was before 2001 then the Board had no complaint. He said he felt if it was built after 2001 and no permit was issued then he felt that was something for the Board to take into consideration on their request for what they were here today for.

Mrs. Burke stated if the Board had requested that information prior to the meeting she would have been able to pull it together for today. She said not having known that was going to be a question raised by the Board it was difficult for her to respond, but they could ask the petitioner when they come up to speak.

Mr. Day stated the petitioner was asking for an 18 foot marsh setback from the 50 foot marsh setback requirement. He said they were also asking for a 3 foot riparian buffer setback from the 35 foot. He asked if the Board was going to vote on this one time or would there be two different motions?

Mrs. Burke stated it would be one vote because if the Board did not approve one then the other would be moot.

Mr. Day stated the reason he asked the question was because they could make it smaller than what was requested but they could not make it larger.

Mrs. Burke stated right, which in that case if the Board said 15 feet so that it would be outside of 35 was what the Board typically done. She said if the Board was to say no that they won't grant 18 feet but grant 15 feet then there would be no point on voting on the riparian buffer request. She said it would just be a 15 foot marsh setback variance and the riparian buffer request would go away because it would not be encroaching into the riparian buffer any further.

Mr. Todd stated they applied for a building permit without knowledge of having an Environmental Overlay (EO) that affected this. He said they were informed by Mr. Sebek during the course of attempting to obtain their permit. He said they went ahead and contacted Georgia DNR because they needed to come out and determine the jurisdiction line. The property owners were not present but they built the concrete wall which has now become the jurisdiction line. It actually extended into their property but he did not know how far. He said he would guess about 5 feet. When he talked to Georgia DNR (John Wynn) he said that that in their opinion was the stop of any salt marsh encroachment. He said that was basically the line of demarcation.

Mr. Day stated he did not understand what he just told the Board.

Mr. Todd stated Georgia DNR were the ones that established the jurisdiction line. The homeowner built a concrete buffer and wall along on his property. He said when he did that

then Georgia DNR said on this side of the salt marsh they were concerned about that area. He said they informed him that their interests basically stopped at that wall.

Mr. Day stated there were still setback guidelines based upon where their line of jurisdiction is.

Mr. Todd stated there was a 25 foot building setback. He said it was his understanding that the 35 and 50 foot was established later in the EO.

Mr. Noha stated it was his understanding the riparian was to be undisturbed.

Mrs. Burke stated it was her understanding that could be limited clearing but no grassed yard.

Mr. Todd stated they were contacted by the homeowner to build them a sunroom on the rear of their existing property. He said it extended 12 foot off the back of their property and goes the entire length. He said it would be downstairs and half of the upstairs. The remainder would be a covered deck on top of the first floor. He said it was two floors.

Mr. Day asked if it was a concrete floor?

Mr. Todd stated yes. He said they did not put down that they would have to do a concrete over pour. He said he assumed that the estimator when they went out there did not see the need to concrete and that they were just going to use the existing concrete patio.

Mr. Day stated the structure was basically there and they were enclosing with glass.

Mr. Todd stated yes.

Mr. Noha stated there was a deck up top that did not have a roof but it had an awning.

Mr. Todd stated they were taking out the awning and putting a new roof on it.

Mr. Cohen asked if he knew why the owners were not present?

Mr. Todd stated no, but they told him that they would be here.

Mr. Cohen asked if he knew anything about the pool?

Mr. Todd stated no. He said he also did not know anything about the enclosure. He said they were just contracted to build the sunroom.

Mr. Cohen stated there was a theory in equity that if you come to ask equity from a Court you must come in with clean hands. He said you could not ask for equity when you are not equitable. He said he did not know about the pool because if they erected the pool without going through the proper procedures then they would not be coming and asking the Board to do something that they don't necessarily have to do when they have violated the code. He said that was something that was important to him that people that come in and ask the Board to do something come in with clean hands. The other thing was the owner was not here today. He said he felt a person who was asking the Board to do something would come in so that they could ask questions of them. He said Staff did not seem to know a lot about it at this point. He said he did not see any real good reason why they should do this. He said those were some of his observations in that the petitioner was not here and the Board did not know whether or not

they violated the code or ordinance by putting in the pool. He said he did not see in great hardship. He said he felt sorry for the sunroom people because they may not be able to build.

Mr. Felder stated he agreed with Mr. Cohen. He said it did not have anything to do with the applicant today but there were all sorts of violations and it was not just the owners but the neighborhood. He said there were trees behind the concrete wall in the marsh. He said he would question whether or not the bulkhead received a permit. With regards to the pool if it was within 25 feet and it was before 2001 then that was okay.

Mr. Day stated the Board did not know whether or not the homeowners got a permit for the pool and the Board was making a presumption. He said they did not know if there were any other violations as far as the concrete wall. He said what the Board did know was that they were asking for an 18 foot marsh setback and a 3 foot riparian setback. He said from his perspective he did not believe they should be going into the riparian setback. He said he felt that was something the Board needed to hang their hats on and say that that protects the marsh. He said there were some things that they could do with the 50 foot setback. He said he would not be so reluctant if they were not talking about not having to go into the 35 foot setback for riparian marsh. He said he did not know but they may have gotten a permit to put in the pool, so he felt he could not take that into consideration. Also, he did not know if they got a permit for the wall so he felt he could not take that into consideration. What he did know was that they were asking to 3 feet into riparian setback and he felt they should not be doing that.

Mr. Sebek stated he checked with his office and there was a permit applied but never issued for the pool. He said for the screen around the pool it was applied for after-the-fact but never issued. He said the pool and the screen were built without permits. He said Mr. Todd was the only one who has done it in the right order for the sunroom.

Mr. Todd asked Mr. Sebek if there was any information on the concrete bulkhead?

Mr. Sebek stated Inspections would not have information on that. He said the homeowner would have had to go through DNR.

Mr. Noha asked if the deck was added after the home was built?

Mr. Sebek stated he was not sure. He said when he called his office he was primarily asking about the pool and the screen.

Mr. Todd stated he hoped the Board would not hold the homeowner's past transgressions against what was being requested today.

Mr. Felder stated he agreed with Mr. Day. He said he felt they have already damaged the marsh buffer but also felt they needed to stay out of the riparian setback.

Mr. Day stated the Board needed a good solid reason to deviate from the zoning laws as they are today. He said from his perspective he has not seen a good solid reason to allow deviation from the 35 foot riparian setback. He said he felt the riparian setback was extremely important to the marsh. However, there were places he felt they could deviate from the zoning laws but this was not one of them. He said he was not it against these people that they did not have a permit for the pool. What he was saying was that from his perspective and the reason he felt he could not vote in favor of this petition was because he did not believe that the Board should grant a variance on the 35 foot riparian setback.

Mr. Todd stated if you looked in the history there have been four variances applied for.

Mr. Day stated the reality of it was that he felt they were beginning to understand that the marsh was a living organism and they have to protect it. He said he felt in the past it probably has not been protected as well as it should, but he felt the Board needed to take a good strong look at that.

Mr. Todd stated he wished the homeowners were here because they were able to shed some light on the concrete wall that was built.

CZBA Action: Mr. Day made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals deny the petition. Mr. Felder seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Petition of Jimmie L. Roberson
B-070516-52164-1
102 Terraza Lane**

Present for the petition was Jimmie Roberson.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a nine foot rear yard setback variance from the 25 foot rear yard setback requirement of Section 4-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct an addition to a single family residence. The subject property, located at 102 Terraza Lane, is zoned R-A (Residential-Agriculture).

Findings

1. Section 4-6.1 requires a minimum rear yard setback of 25 feet from the property line.
2. The subject parcel has a width of approximately 80 feet and a depth of 100 feet, resulting in a lot area of approximately 8,000 square feet. The parcel is a conforming lot of record.
3. The petitioner is seeking a nine foot rear yard setback variance in order to construct an addition to a single family residence 16 feet from the rear property line.
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 subject property. The parcel is a conforming lot of record that is square in shape.

- 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.

- 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 most likely not cause substantial detriment to the public good. However, it would not appear to meet the intent and purposes of the Zoning Ordinance.

Summary of Findings

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

Mr. Noha stated when they visited the site it was staked out and it was not what is on the plans.

Mrs. Burke stated it was her understanding, when they visited the site, the petitioner showed them and she believed the two stakes was the far line but he also indicated that there was going to be a step in when he pointed out.

Mr. Day stated they were requesting a 9 foot variance but it showed 28 feet.

Mrs. Burke stated she felt it was not done to scale. She said what the applicant has requested was a 9 foot variance.

Mr. Noha stated if they looked at the 28 foot that was to the structure was there today. He said they were adding on 12 feet. If you took the 12 from 28 that would give you 16 which was 9 short of 25.

Mr. Felder stated also the bump on the left was built over the property setback line.

Mr. Roberson stated he have an existing patio in the back that was 10 X 26. He said he wanted to enclose the patio which would increase it approximately 2 feet out and the roof would go out about 4 feet. He said that was why the property was staked the way that it was. He said he also had a letter from the Homeowner's Association supporting his request.

Mr. Day asked how did the fence line go out towards the road?

Mr. Roberson stated approximately 10 feet.

Mr. Felder stated when they visited the site it appeared about 10 feet off the road and it was landscaped by the Homeowner's Association. He also said if you looked down the row of houses there was not a maintained line of setback from the road.

CZBA Action: Mr. Watford 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 Donna Swanson
Doug Bean Signs, Inc. For
Quacco Baptist Church
B-070523-35525-1
215 Quacco Road**

Present for the petition was Louis Goodwin, Doug Bean Signs and Gene Cannon, Minister.

Mrs. Burke gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a 24 square foot variance from the 16 square foot maximum area permitted of Section 7-3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct a freestanding sign. The subject property, located at 215 Quacco Road, is zoned R-A (Residential- Agriculture).

Findings

1. Section 7.3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance allows a maximum sign area of 16 square feet for freestanding signage in residential districts on Class II streets.
2. The petitioner is requesting a 40 square foot sign that is ten feet in height. Per the applicant, the proposed sign will replace an existing sign on the subject property that is 32 square feet in size.
3. 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 conditions pertaining to the subject parcel.
 - 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 applicant would be permitted to provide signage that is in compliance with the Ordinance.

- 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 most likely not cause substantial detriment to the public good. However, approval of the request would appear to be in conflict with the purposes and intent of the Ordinance.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting a 24 square foot sign area variance appear not to be met.

Mr. Goodwin stated the church wanted to build a new sign. He said when he received the information last week he learned that they were asking for a 24 square foot variance rather than an 8 foot variance. He said it was impression that they were given permission months ago to rebuild the sign the same size as the existing which would have been 32 square feet.

Mr. Noha asked what does the ordinance allow?

Mr. Sebek stated since it was an existing sign they would be allowed to replace the existing sign. He said even though the ordinance says 16 square feet, since they had a larger sign they could do that.

Mr. Noha asked Staff what was advertised?

Mrs. Burke stated Staff advertised for what the ordinance required which was 24.

Mr. Day asked if she was saying that the petitioner could put in a 32 square foot sign if they liked?

Mrs. Burke stated yes.

Mr. Goodwin stated the extra 8 square feet would give the church an extra line. He said it would add may be an inch or less to the Quacco Baptist Church copy up top. All of the additional space, 6 inches of it plus the space around it would come in the additional line in a reader board. He said they have 275+ feet on Quacco Road. He said it was a huge piece of property at least 300 feet deep.

Mr. Cohen asked if it would look like the sign that was currently there except larger?

Mr. Goodwin stated no. (Showed picture of proposed sign).

Mr. Felder asked if it was internally lit?

Mr. Goodwin stated yes.

Mr. Felder stated he felt the size of the sign was fine. He said he was concerned in that there were single-family residences across the street and then you would have an internally lit sign that was lit all night long.

Mr. Watford stated he was concerned about the sign being 10 feet high.

Mrs. Burke stated per the ordinance the petitioner would be allowed to do 15 feet.

Mr. Day stated the line that says Dr. Barry Minski, Pastor was also a part of the sign which would make the variance larger and felt the Board may not be able vote on the petition today.

Mr. Noha stated he would have to disagree. He said he believed if that was the only problem the petitioner would probably be willing to put the pastor's name somewhere in the 40 foot area. He said he felt it was appealing to the eye and not jumbled. He said the petitioner could put the same sign back up with poles which he felt was unsightly.

Mrs. Burke stated she asked Mr. Sebek how they would at it if they were permitting it and he felt they would consider it as a part of the sign.

Mr. Cannon stated the placement of the Pastor's name was an idea that developed during discussion of the construction of the sign. He said it was not something that was critical to the issue and they would be willing to change it.

Mr. Sebek stated the Board could look at the name part of the sign as an announcement sign as opposed to an advertisement. He said they would be allowed 32 feet announcement signs.

CZBA Action: Mr. Cohen 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. Felder seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Other Business

Ms. Tina Love stated she thought she had to go to the Court House for her petition today. She said she did not know about the Metropolitan Planning Commission. She asked if the Board could explain to her why her petition was denied?

Mr. Cohen stated she was outside the zoning requirements. He said she was requesting that the Board grant certain variances to allow her to do something that the zoning ordinances did not allow. He said the Board heard from everybody that was present and they voted on it and it was denied.

Ms. Love asked how much of a buffer did you have to have? She said the rules have changed since her house built. She also asked what she needed to do from this point?

Mr. Cohen stated she could appeal to Superior Court.

Ms. Love stated they have changed the rules. She said it used to be 25 feet and then it became 50 feet after the house was already built.

Mr. Cohen stated she may want to seek legal advice.

Mr. Felder stated the Board was concerned about going into the riparian buffer of 35 feet. He said if she resubmit staying out of the riparian he felt they could hear it again.

Ms. Love stated the concrete was already poured and they wanted to close it in because of the bugs and heat.

Mr. Felder stated the Board saw it but they don't have to make it worst.

Mr. Day stated what the Board was saying was that they were not willing to grant a variance to allow her to go 3 feet into the riparian setback. He said if she wants what she want then she needed to be willing to come back to the Board where she was not going into the riparian setback and ask the Board for a different level setback variance on the marsh setback so that she was only going into marsh setback. He said he did not know if she could do that with the configuration of her property and her house. He said she would need to sit down with an architect and figure that out or MPC Staff.

Ms. Love asked what was a riparian setback?

Mr. Day stated Mr. Sebek can meet with her after the meeting.

Mr. Cohen stated he felt that she should not go away with the understanding that if she brought it back 3 feet and avoid the riparian that it would be automatically approved. He said the Board would have to hear it as a new proposal and then vote.

RE: Minutes

1. Approval CZBA Meeting Minutes – May 22, 2007

CZBA Action: Mr. Watford made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals approve the minutes of May 22, 2007 as submitted. Mr. Day seconded the motion and it was passed. Abstaining to the motion was Mr. Cohen.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the County Zoning Board of Appeals, the meeting was adjourned approximately 10:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Burke,
Assistant Secretary

DB:ca