

**SAVANNAH ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

**ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM  
112 EAST STATE STREET**

**AUGUST 28, 2007**

**2:30 P.M.**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**James Byrne, Chairman  
Timothy Mackey, Vice Chairman  
Stephanie Bock  
John P. Jones  
Paul Robinson**

**TECHNICAL STAFF ABSENT:**

**Tom Todaro, City Development Services**

**MPC STAFF PRESENT:**

**James Hansen, Secretary  
Christy Adams, Administrative Assistant**

**RE: Call to Order**

Mr. Byrne called the August 28, 2007 meeting of the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 2:30 p.m.

**RE: Minutes**

1. Approval of SZBA Minutes – July 24, 2007

**SZBA Action: Mr. Robinson made a motion that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the regular meeting minutes of July 24, 2007. Mr. Jones seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Consent Agenda**

**RE: Petition of J. Craig Gordon  
B-070731-56756-2  
1218 East Bolton Street**

The petitioner is requesting approval of a 17 foot rear yard setback variance from the 25 foot rear yard setback requirement of Section 8-3025 in order to construct a single family residence on an infill parcel. The subject property, located at 1218 East Bolton Street, is zoned R-4 (Four-Family Residential).

**AND**

**RE: Petition of J. Craig Gordon  
B-070731-56865-2  
1217 East Bolton Street**

The petitioner is requesting approval of an 18 foot rear yard setback variance from the 25 foot rear yard setback requirement of Section 8-3025 in order to construct a single family residence on an infill parcel. The subject property, located at 1217 East Bolton Street, is zoned R-4 (Four-Family Residential).

**Mr. Kyle, Neighbor**, stated he had questions about the above-mentioned petitions.

**SZBA Action:** Mr. Mackey made a motion that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals move the petitions of J. Craig Gordon, B-070731-56756-2 and B-070731- 56865-2 from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda. Ms. Bock seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

**RE: Regular Agenda**

**RE: Petition of J. Craig Gordon  
B-070731-56756-2  
1218 East Bolton Street**

The petitioner is requesting approval of a 17 foot rear yard setback variance from the 25 foot rear yard setback requirement of Section 8-3025 in order to construct a single family residence on an infill parcel. The subject property, located at 1218 East Bolton Street, is zoned R-4 (Four-Family Residential).

### **Findings**

1. Development standards in the R-4 zoning classification require a minimum rear yard setback of 25 feet. The petitioner is seeking a variance of 18 feet from the minimum standard.
2. Located within the Benjamin Van Clark neighborhood, the subject parcel is considered a substandard lot measuring 75 feet wide and 70 feet deep. Though meeting the 60 foot minimum lot width requirement, the lot contains only 5,250 square feet, some 12½ percent below the minimum lot area requirement of 6,000 square feet. This condition is not unusual along Bolton Street between Cedar and Live Oak Streets. A total of 25 lots front this section of Bolton, 24 of which are considered substandard. Lots along the north side of Bolton are 70 feet in depth; lots along the south side of the street are 75 feet in depth.
3. In accordance with Section 8-3163 of the Savannah 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 is considered a substandard parcel within the R-4 zoning classification. Though the parcel is an existing legal lot of record, it does not meet the minimum lot area requirements of the 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 Zoning Ordinance would create an unnecessary hardship.

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

The conditions described above are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.

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

Relief, if granted, would not likely cause detriment to the public good or impair the purposes of the Ordinance. The request, as proposed, is consistent with the development pattern in the area and provides a good use for an infill parcel.

### **Summary Of Findings**

All of the conditions necessary for granting the requested variance appear to be met.

**AND**

**RE: Petition of J. Craig Gordon  
B-070731-56865-2  
1217 East Bolton Street**

The petitioner is requesting approval of an 18 foot rear yard setback variance from the 25 foot rear yard setback requirement of Section 8-3025 in order to construct a single family residence on an infill parcel. The subject property, located at 1217 East Bolton Street, is zoned R-4 (Four-Family Residential).

### **Findings**

1. Development standards in the R-4 zoning classification require a minimum rear yard setback of 25 feet. The petitioner is seeking a variance of 18 feet from the minimum standard.
2. Located within the Benjamin Van Clark neighborhood, the subject parcel is considered a substandard lot measuring 50 feet wide and 75 feet deep. The parcel fails to meet the 60 foot minimum lot width requirement, and the lot contains only 3,750 square feet, some 37½ percent below the minimum lot area requirement of 6,000 square feet. This condition is not unusual along Bolton Street between Cedar and Live Oak Streets. A

total of 25 lots front this section of Bolton, 24 of which are considered substandard. Lots along the north side of Bolton are 70 feet in depth; lots along the south side of the street are 75 feet in depth.

3. In accordance with Section 8-3163 of the Savannah 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 is considered a substandard parcel within the R-4 zoning classification. Though the parcel is an existing legal lot of record, it does not meet the minimum lot area or lot width requirements of the 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 Zoning Ordinance would create an unnecessary hardship.

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

The conditions described above are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.

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

Relief, if granted, would not likely cause detriment to the public good or impair the purposes of the Ordinance. The request, as proposed, is consistent with the development pattern in the area and provides a good use for an infill parcel.

### **Summary Of Findings**

All of the conditions necessary for granting the requested variance appear to be met.

**SZBA Action: Mr. Robinson made a motion that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition as submitted based upon a finding that all of the conditions necessary for granting the requested variance have been met. Ms. Bock seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**Mr. Garfield Kyle, Neighbor,** stated he was not opposed to the petition. He said his concern was sometimes after petitions are approved the owner uses the residences as boarding houses. He said in the past boarding houses had to be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals, but it seems as though people were putting them up anywhere. He said he felt when they turn

houses into boarding houses that it decreased the value in the area. He asked if a person could turn a residential house into a boarding house without getting Board approval?

**Mr. Byrne** stated this property was zoned R-4 which meant four-family residential. He asked Staff if they knew what the use was for this property?

**Mr. Hansen** stated he did not. He said the petition stated that they intended to be single -family residences. He said a boarding house does have to come before the Board for development which depended upon the number of people. He said a person was allowed to rent out a room in your house without having to go to any Board. A true boarding house could be a group development house or group home which would not be allowed. He said he could not say that they did not exist illegally in the City. He said it would become an enforcement issue. He said the discussions that he has had with the petitioner and the stated intent indicated to him that their intent was for it to be single-family residences.

**Mr. Jones** stated the property was zoned R-4 which meant four-family residential. He said each lot would have a one family house. He said he did not think you could regulate the number of people because there were some people who had 5 and 6 children plus the mother and father.

**Mr. Hansen** stated the real issue was the unrelated individuals. He said there was no limitation on how many related family members live in a house. The R-4 indicated the four-family residential really was a function of density in the final house. In other words, as opposed to R-6 which was strictly single-family R-4 you could have a duplex.

**Mr. Robinson** stated the petitioner or a representative was not here. He said he felt may be the petition needed to be continued to the next meeting.

**Mr. Hansen** stated the petitioner was aware of the meeting and up to this point had no known opposition. He said that may have influenced the petitioner's decision but he agreed that he still should have been here.

**Mr. Kyle** stated the problem he had was the house next door to him which was a single family residence that was being used as a boarding house. He said he did not want the petitioner to do the same thing.

**SZBA Action:** Ms. Bock made a motion that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals **approve the petition(s) B-070731-56756-2 and B-070731-56865-2 as submitted based upon a finding that all of the conditions necessary for granting the variance requested have been met. Mr. Jones seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Terry L. Wright  
B-070731-56070-2  
0 Vassar Street**

Present for the petition was Terry Wright.

Mr. Hansen gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a 2½ foot lot width variance from the 60 foot lot width minimum and a 150 square foot lot area variance from the 6,000 square foot lot area minimum

required by Section 8-3025 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance for each of two lots in order to subdivide an existing parcel. The subject property, located at 0 Vassar Street, is zoned R-6 (One-Family Residential).

### Findings

1. Development standards established for the R-6 zoning classification require a minimum lot width of 60 feet and a minimum lot area of 6,000 square feet. The subject parcel contains approximately 11,700 square feet, measuring approximately 117 feet wide and 100 feet deep.
2. The petitioner is seeking a 2½ foot lot width variance in order to subdivide the existing parcel into two lots of record. If approved, each newly created lot would contain approximately 5,850 square feet, thus necessitating a lot area variance in addition.
3. The subject parcel lies in the midst of a residential development. Most of the parcels in the area measure 60 by 100 feet, the minimum requirement of the R-6 district. The subject parcel, lying at the end of a dead-end street, is one of the few lots in the area that presently exceeds the R-6 minimums.
4. In accordance with Section 8-3163 of the Savannah 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 is considered a standard parcel within the zoning district. The parcel presently meets the minimum area and width requirements of the district, and is an existing legal lot of record.

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

Strict 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 particular piece of property involved.

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

Relief, if granted, would not likely cause detriment to the public good or impair

the purposes of the Ordinance. The request, as proposed, seeks a 2½ foot lot width variance, a deviation of slightly more than four percent from the 60 foot requirement. Additionally the request seeks a 150 square foot lot area variance, a deviation of approximately 2½ percent from the minimum required.

### **Summary Of Findings**

All of the conditions necessary for granting the variances requested appear not to be met.

**Mr. Wright** stated the lot was subdivided so he could build two houses. He said he was told that he would need a variance for 2½ feet to meet the guidelines. He said he also talked with the neighbors and they did not have a problem.

**Mr. Byrne** asked if he met with the neighborhood association?

**Mr. Wright** stated no.

**Ms. Ernestine Jones** stated she looked at the property a couple of days ago and there was a house that was built next to the petitioner's property. She said the house shared a driveway with another house that faced the street. She said they have asked many times that the lots not be subdivided and that they remain at 60 feet. She said they felt once they begin to subdivide the lots and build smaller houses that would decrease the value of the area. She said that's why she opposed granting 2½ feet.

**Mr. Wright** stated the house that Ms. Jones mentioned about the driveway was built by Chatham Home Builders. He said he wanted to say that he did not have anything to do with that house.

**Ms. Jones** asked Staff what requirements were not met by the petitioner?

**Mr. Hansen** stated in the Board's staff report there was four criteria that was listed from the ordinance. He said the first was extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to size, shape, or topography. He said he felt there were no extraordinary or exceptional conditions. He said the applicant could build a single unit on this property. Secondly, that the regulations would create a hardship. He said although the petitioner may have a large lot but that of itself did not create a hardship. Thirdly, the condition is not peculiar to the particular property in question. He said the fourth item was the one which most often the Board considered on the granting of variances. He said that had to do with whether or not granting the variance would cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes or intent of the Zoning Ordinance. He said that particular finding was one that the Board frequently and typically makes if they so chose. He said he felt this particular request was not onerous to the extent that the 2½ foot variance would be detrimental to the public good.

**Mr. Mackey** asked the petitioner if the houses were single-family?

**Mr. Wright** stated yes.

**Mr. Robinson** stated almost every lot in the area was 50 foot wide. He said the variance that the petitioner was requesting would be complementary to the area.

**Ms. Jones** stated she was concerned about the density in their neighborhood. She said they were trying to maintain the atmosphere that they have now and not putting a lot of small houses in their creating crime. She said she had nothing against the houses that the petitioner proposed to build in the area which were brick houses.

**Mr. Byrne** asked Ms. Jones if she disagreed with Staff's finding that relief if granted would cause detriment to the public good if it increased density?

**Ms. Jones** stated she would disagree with that but the petitioner would like her support of his petition.

**Mr. Jones** stated most houses in that area have a 10 foot from property line to the side of the house. He said he had a copy of the original deed for Liberty City and it did not say 5 feet from lot line to the side of the house.

**Mr. Hansen** stated Mr. Jones may be right that there maybe deed restrictions in Liberty City. But the area was zoned R-6 and the regulations contained within the zoning ordinance required 25, 25, and 5 foot side yard setbacks. He said assuming that the petitioner was building within that since he has not asked for a variance then he would assume that he met the 5 foot. The deed restrictions was not something that was within the purview of the Board or enforceable by the City. He said that was something that was a civil matter.

**SZBA Action:** **Ms. Bock made a motion that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition as submitted based upon a finding that the variances requested will not cause substantial detriment to the public good. Mr. Robinson seconded the motion and it was passed 4 - 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Jones.**

**RE:     Petition of Jay Weldy  
          B-070731-56313-2  
          859 East 31<sup>st</sup> Street**

Present for the petition was Jay Weldy.

Mr. Hansen gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of variances as follows for each of two parcels to be created through a proposed lot split process. Lot A (859 East 31<sup>st</sup> Street) a 3,600 square foot lot area variance from the 6,000 square foot lot area requirement; and a 20 foot rear yard setback variance from the 25 foot rear yard setback requirement of Section 8-3025 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance. Lot B (1505 Harmon Street) a 4,600 square foot lot area variance from the 6,000 square foot lot area requirement; a 25 foot lot width variance from the 60 foot lot width requirement; a 25 foot front yard setback variance from the 25 foot front yard setback requirement; a five foot side yard setback variance from the five foot side yard setback requirement; and an 18 foot rear yard setback variance from the 25 foot rear yard setback requirement of Section 8-3025 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance. The subject property, located at 859 East 31<sup>st</sup> Street, is zoned R-4 (Four-Family Residential).

**Findings**

1.     Development standards in the R-4 zoning classification include a minimum lot width of 60 feet for single family residences; a minimum lot area of 6,000 square feet for single

family residences; a 25 foot minimum front yard setback; a 25 foot minimum rear yard setback; and a five foot minimum side yard setback for a side not fronting on a street.

2. The petitioner is proposing a lot split that would create two separate parcels within the district. The existing lot is considered substandard, measuring only 40 feet wide and 95 feet deep, resulting in a lot area of 3,800 square feet. Two structures are currently located on the parcel; a single family residence fronting on 31<sup>st</sup> Street and a “carriage house/garage apartment” that has access to Harmon Street and 31<sup>st</sup> Street Lane. The split, as proposed by the petitioner would result in lots that would measure 40 feet wide and 60 feet deep (2,400 square feet), and 35 feet wide and 40 feet deep (1,400 square feet) respectively. Moreover, the proposed split would result in a parcel that has no front yard or side yard setback and only a seven foot rear yard setback.
3. The development pattern in the neighborhood is predominantly residential. Lot width ranges from 42 to 60 feet plus, and lot depths range from 92 to 100 feet plus. The proposed lots would be “out-of-character” with the prevailing development pattern and would create substantially substandard lots.
4. In accordance with Section 8-3163 of the Savannah 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 is considered a substandard parcel within the zoning district. The parcel presently fails to meet the minimum area and width requirements of the district. Dividing the existing parcel would only exacerbate the substandard deficiencies.

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

Strict 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 particular piece of property involved.

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

Relief, if granted, would likely cause detriment to the public good and impair the purposes of the Ordinance. The request, as proposed, seeks several variances

in order to effectuate a lot split of an already substandard parcel.

### **Summary Of Findings**

All of the conditions necessary for granting the variances requested appear not to be met.

**Mr. Weldy** stated they were trying to separate the lot so that the two existing houses could be sold separately. He said it has been like that for many years and he did not know why they were allowed to build two houses same size on separate small lots. He said according to the neighbors that he talked to none of them could remember a single family using both buildings.

**Mr. Byrne** asked if he lived in one of these now?

**Mr. Weldy** stated no. He said he lived in the front house for 2 years.

**Mr. Byrne** asked if he is planning to sell the other part?

**Mr. Weldy** stated yes. He said anyone who has ever lived in the back house since they had it has asked if they could buy it. He said he noticed on the tax map (block 11) number 18 was a similar situation facing Harmon Street and Anderson Lane. He said the only difference was that it had a small front yard where as on their house they had a small backyard. He said there were some other similar examples in the area as well.

**Mr. Mackey** stated he wanted the Board to give him approval to help him sell the property.

**Mr. Weldy** stated he was not trying to sell both properties. He said they may consider selling one but they wanted for the future they would have other options.

**Ms. Cali Weldy** stated there were several properties where you could see the main dwelling and the carriage house was equal size or slightly less in size.

**Mr. Byrne** stated he understood that there were other similar properties but they were not talking about precedent.

**Ms. Weldy** stated the neighbors that they talked to in the immediate area felt it would improve the area.

**Mr. Byrne** asked if they had adequate parking for both of the properties?

**Ms. Weldy** stated they had off-street parking. She said the back house had a single car garage.

**Mr. Mackey** stated he was concerned that the downtown area was becoming too dense. He said he was also concerned that they were not going to live on the premises. He said he felt what they were asking the Board was for future value (resale). He said he felt that was not the Board's purview.

**Ms. Weldy** stated she felt there was a misunderstanding. She said they were not saying that they wanted to subdivide the property to sell them for their financial gain. She said they were saying that there was always going to be two separate family dwelling on this one parcel being that there was two separate single-family homes. She said they wanted to have the option of

selling if they so chose in the future. Also, although it seemed like a lot of variances, it was just a variance in lot size.

**Mr. Jones** stated the structures were on a substandard lot. He said the requirement of the area was 6,000 square feet per lot. He said the lot was less than 6,000 square feet and they were proposing to reduce it more instead of one substandard lot they would create two substandard lots. He said he was also concerned about the parking. He said there was only on-street parking.

**Ms. Weldy** stated that was common for the neighborhood. She said with regards to substandard lots in the area was they were not trying to create something that would be unusual for the area or that would be an eyesore. She said they felt it would fit the area.

**Mr. Hansen** stated typically two off-street parking spaces are required for each unit. He said whereas this was an existing structure it would be considered what it was today.

SZBA Action: Mr. Robinson made a motion that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition as submitted.

**The motion Failed for lack of a second.**

**SZBA Action: Ms. Bock made a motion that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals deny the petition as submitted based upon a finding that the request does meet the criteria necessary for granting the requested variances. Mr. Jones seconded the motion and it was passed 4 - 1. Opposed to the motion was Mr. Robinson.**

\*Mr. Robinson left the meeting approximately 3:35 p.m.

**RE: Petition of Theodore & Shirley Quarterman  
B-070731-56514-2  
1811 Archer Street**

Present for the petition was Theodore Quarterman.

Mr. Hansen gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a variance to allow 45.6 percent lot coverage as opposed to the 30 percent lot coverage allowed by Section 8-3025 of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance in order to construct an addition onto an existing residence. The subject property, located at 1811 Archer Street, is zoned R-6 (One-Family Residential).

**Findings**

1. Development standards contained within the R-6 district allow for maximum lot coverage of 30 percent. The petitioner seeks a variance to allow lot coverage of 45.6 percent.
2. The subject parcel is considered a standard lot within the district measuring 60 feet wide and 100 feet deep. Lot coverage would be limited to a maximum of 1,800 square feet.
3. The petitioner is proposing to construct a 726 square foot addition onto an existing residence. The addition is proposed to be located at the rear of the existing structure,

and will not encroach into the required rear yard setback.

4. In accordance with Section 8-3163 of the Savannah 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 is considered a standard parcel within the zoning district. The parcel presently meets the minimum area and width requirements of the district, and is an existing legal lot of record. The lot area coverage is currently within the guidelines allowed by the 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 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 particular piece of property involved.

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

Relief, if granted, would not likely cause detriment to the public good or impair the purposes of the Ordinance.

### **Summary Of Findings**

All of the conditions necessary for granting the variance requested appear not to be met.

**Mr. Quarterman** stated they were requesting the variance so they could sit in the back and enjoy the property.

**Mr. Jones** asked if he owned both lots?

**Mr. Quarterman** stated yes.

**Mr. Jones** stated he felt that he could recombine the two lots and then he would not need a variance.

**Mr. Quarterman** stated they have two children and would like to keep the lots separate.

**Mrs. Shirley Quarterman** stated her mom is 77 years old and wheelchair bound. She said the only way her mom could visit them was in their driveway because she could not get her up the steps. She said if she could create a patio on the back she felt she could get her mom into her house.

**Mr. Mackey** asked Staff what conditions were not met?

**Mr. Hansen** stated he felt there was nothing extraordinary or exceptional about the lot with regards shape, size, or topography. He said there was nothing about the lot that was peculiar in nature. He said he felt it would not cause a hardship beyond that which might be self-imposed. Also, in Staff's opinion they felt that it would not cause substantial detriment to the public good.

**SZBA Action:** **Mr. Mackey made a motion that the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition as submitted based upon a finding that the requested variance will not cause substantial detriment to the public good. Ms. Bock seconded the motion and it was passed 3 - 1. Opposed the motion was Mr. Jones.**

**RE: Other Business**

**RE: Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals the meeting was adjourned approximately 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Burke,  
Assistant Secretary

DB/ca