



C H A T H A M C O U N T Y  
Z O N I N G B O A R D O F A P P E A L S

Arthur Mendonsa Hearing Room  
June 25, 2013 - 9:00 A.M.  
Minutes

**June 25, 2013 Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting**

**Members Present:** Lucy Hitch, Chairman  
Coren Ross, Vice Chairman  
James Overton  
James Blackburn  
Quentin Marlin  
Wayne Noha

**Members Not Present:** Brian Felder

**Staff Present:** Marcus Lotson, Secretary  
Constance Morgan, Assistant Secretary

**Advisory Staff Present:** Bob Sebek, County Zoning Administrator  
Jeff Kirkland, County Engineer

**I. Call to Order and Welcome**

1. [Call to Order](#)

**II. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements**

**III. Petitions Ready for Hearing**

**IV. Approval of Minutes**

2. [Approval of the May 28, 2013 CZBA Meeting Minutes](#)

Attachment: [May28th.pdf](#)

**Board Action:**

Approval of the May 28, 2013 CZBA Meeting Minutes as submitted. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Anthony Wayne Noha  
Second: James Overton  
James Blackburn Jr. - Aye  
Lucy Hitch - Aye  
Quentin L. Marlin - Aye  
Anthony Wayne Noha - Aye  
James Overton - Aye  
Coren Ross - Aye

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

The Consent Agenda consists of items for which the applicant is in agreement with the staff recommendation and for which no known objections have been identified nor anticipated by staff. Any objections raised at the meeting will result in the item being moved to the Regular Agenda.

#### VI. Consent Agenda

##### 3. [7 Sandle Cove-B-120524-00025-1 Request for Time Extension](#)

Attachment: [Extension Request.pdf](#)

#### Board Action:

Staff recommends **approval** of the time extension request for 7 Sandle Cove. - PASS

#### Vote Results

Motion: James Blackburn Jr.  
Second: Coren Ross  
Quentin L. Marlin - Aye  
Anthony Wayne Noha - Nay  
James Overton - Aye  
Coren Ross - Aye  
James Blackburn Jr. - Aye  
Lucy Hitch - Aye

#### VII. Old Business

##### 4. [39 Rose Avenue Rear Yard Setback Variance Request | B-130425-00026-1](#)

Present for the petition was: Charles Johnson, Owner

**Board Action:**

Due to the length of today's agenda, and that this petition was scheduled to be heard at the May 28th hearing, this petition was placed at the end of the agenda under Regular Business. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Anthony Wayne Noha

Second: Quentin L. Marlin

James Blackburn Jr. - Aye

Lucy Hitch - Aye

Quentin L. Marlin - Aye

Anthony Wayne Noha - Aye

James Overton - Aye

Coren Ross - Aye

**VIII. Regular Agenda**

5. [187 Penrose Drive B-130513-00032-1 - Front Yard and Marsh Buffer Setback Variance Requests](#)

Attachment: [187 Penrose Site Plan.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Aerial.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photos 187 Penrose Drive.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was: Mr. Neil Dawson, Applicant

Marcus Lotson gave the following summary:

The petitioner is seeking a 35 foot front yard setback variance and a 25 foot marsh buffer setback variance for the construction of a new detached garage. The subject property is located at 187 Penrose Drive. It is developed with a single family residence and abuts saltwater marshes on the east and north sides. The applicant is proposing to construct a detached garage accessory building. As currently designed, the building would encroach 35 feet into the required 50 foot front yard setback and 25 feet into the required 35 foot marsh buffer setback. The removal of vegetation and the introduction of impervious development in close proximity to the marsh is likely to have a negative impact. The degree of the requested encroachment is substantial; amending the requirement to this extent eliminates the protections afforded by the current regulations. Staff recommends **denial** of the variance request.

**Speaking on the petition:** Neil Dawson, applicant stated that the proposed garage location was chosen because of his location next to the marsh. He has to have an advance treatment septic system. This system must be at least fifty foot from the marsh line. The house does comply with the 35 feet riparian setback so there is no encroachment on the house. He explained the positioning of his house and the average setback along the street. He added that even though the front yard setback is extreme it is consistent with the overall

development pattern of the neighborhood. He stated that with regard to the marsh setback he has met with the DNR and the County representatives and confirmed that it is only 10 feet 6 inches from the marsh edge. He assured the board that he would be willing to do some type of storm water catchment system. He would then use this water for irrigation.

Mr. Noha questioned Mr. Sebek if he would not be able to approve the front yard setback based on the average setback of structures within 200 feet.

Mr. Robert Sebek, Chatham County Zoning Administrator responded that this was a little unusual in that the 200 foot rule applies to residences. Because there is a specific number given for these accessory structures on marsh front lots he did not take this into consideration. He added that the way the ordinance is written this could fall under that exception that Mr. Dawson is referring to. However, he did not think that this was the intent of that exception for the front yard setback. It was intended for residences more so than accessory structures.

Chairman Hitch questioned if the exception was for residences only or did it include accessory buildings.

Mr. Sebek's response was that the ordinance does not reference accessory structures it states buildings, however his position is that typically accessory structures are required to be in the rear yard but on marsh and river front lots they are allowed to be on the front with the requirement that they be set back so far. He stated that he did not think that this would fit into that category simply because there is a different section that has a specific number associated with it for the accessory structures to be allowed to be in the front.

Jeff Kirkland, Chatham County Engineer stated that he met with the property owner to look at the requirements for a state water's buffer. He presented a diagram that depicted the site conditions similar to these site conditions on the subject property. In summary, no state waters buffer would be required for this property but the county buffer setback would have to be honored.

Mr. Marlin commented that looking at the neighboring properties it appears that each house is encroaching onto the county line. He questioned if this structure would be materially different from any other house on the street.

Mr. Kirkland stated that this would be a question best asked and answered by Building Safety and Regulatory Services. He added that Chatham County Engineering is empowered by the State of Georgia to enforce an ENS buffer that is required during construction. This is why he visited the site. He stated again that in this case there is no ENS buffer required because the proposed work is outside of the 25 foot buffer area.

Chairman Hitch questioned staff as to whether or not there was any aspect of the construction design that could be amended in such a way that this would no longer be an unacceptable structure.

Mr. Sebek responded that this could only be accomplished if the structure was connected to the house. In that case it would be an addition as opposed to an attached accessory structure and this would not be particularly feasible in this case. Even though he added, that

a breezeway could be attached. Then the board could address the front yard setback exception that Mr. Dawson was referring to. He further explained that Mr. Dawson's interpretation of the front yard exception is correct. If the diagram that he is showing is accurate then he would say yes that this would be considered an addition as opposed to being a detached accessory structure. However this would not address the marsh issue.

Chairman Hitch asked if where the car on this property is parked now is too close to the marsh to build.

Mr. Dawson answered yes that this was correct. He added that the existing parking was also too close to the marsh. He also stated that he has considered exactly what it is that Mr. Sebek is saying, to do a breezeway and to do a garage structure would obviously comply with the 50ft front yard setback but would still require a marsh variance. Although this was given consideration, he felt that architecturally this interpretation was worse than the accessory structure which is consistent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Lotson added that he wanted to clarify that the 50ft front yard setback is specific only to detached accessory buildings in front yards of marsh front lots. Typically, throughout the county accessory buildings are not allowed in front yards. However, these buildings are allowed on these lots with the condition that the setback is a minimum of 50 feet.

Mr. Dawson gave his last point; that if he could build his house 15 feet from the right of way, which all of his neighbors have done, it seems that it would not be inconsistent to have his garage 15 feet from the right of way. He asked that the petition be approved.

**Board Action:**

Approval the petitioners request - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: James Blackburn Jr.

Second: Quentin L. Marlin

James Blackburn Jr. - Aye

Lucy Hitch - Aye

Quentin L. Marlin - Aye

Anthony Wayne Noha - Aye

James Overton - Nay

Coren Ross - Aye

6. [One Adams Point B-130521-00036-1 Square Footage and Height Variance Request](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Site Plan and Elevations.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Hammock.pdf](#)

Attachment: [One Adams Point.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photos One Adams point.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was: John Kern

Marcus Lotson gave the following summary;

The petitioner John Kern, Agent for Helen Stephens is requesting two variances; 1) a 152 square foot variance from the 900 square foot maximum and 2) a one half story variance from the one story maximum for accessory structures in front yards. The property is located at One Adam's Point within the Landings Subdivision. Each lot on this hammock is developed for single family residences. Staff is recommending approval of the square footage and height variance.

**Speaking on the petition:** John Kern, agent stated that what he has done is architecturally compatible with the house that is there. He is requesting a one half story variance which exceeds the square footage. He stated that the lot will still be below the maximum lot coverage.

**Board Action:**

Staff recommends **approval** of the 152 square foot variance from the 900 square foot maximum and a one half story variance from the one story maximum for One Adams Point. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Anthony Wayne Noha  
Second: Coren Ross  
James Blackburn Jr. - Nay  
Lucy Hitch - Aye  
Quentin L. Marlin - Aye  
Anthony Wayne Noha - Aye  
James Overton - Aye  
Coren Ross - Aye

7. [7511 Laroche Avenue-00037-1 Square Footage and Height Variance Request](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Aerial Photo.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Site Plan.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Photos 7511 LaRoche Avenue.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was: Richard Olson

Mr. Marcus Lotson gave the following summary;

The petitioner for 7511 Laroche Avenue is requesting again two variances; 252 square

foot variance from the 900 square foot maximum and a one story variance from the one story maximum. The subject property is located on a marsh front flag lot on the west side of Laroche Avenue approximately 500 feet south of the Herb River Bridge. The petitioner currently has on the site a single story storage building that he has used at this location for a number of years. He presented a view of the property from the site plan. The petitioner is requesting this variance in order to demolish the existing structure and replace it with a new structure. The proposed structure will be further away from the property line than the current structure. The intent of the ordinance in this case is to maintain appropriate visual character relative to accessory structures on residential lots. Relief is not likely in this case to be detrimental based on the adjacency of the other neighbors in the area. The new structure should not cause any blight or detriment. Staff recommends approval of the height and square footage variance.

**Speaking on the petition:** Richard C. Olson, petitioner stated that the existing house on the property is a 1300 square foot single story structure that is 4 1/2 feet off the ground with a high peak roof built in the late 1870's. He explained that the house had been moved from another location. He stated that his reason for wanting to increase the square footage and adding a storage area upstairs is due to the fact that the structure was set in a drainage plane. It is now beyond the point of repair. He stated that he would like to demolish the building and move it approximately 18 feet towards the main house and add a second level to it to provide storage. He presented renderings of the proposed structure for board review.

**Board Action:**

Staff recommends **approval** of a 252 square foot variance from the 900 square foot maximum and a one story variance from the one story maximum for accessory structures. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Coren Ross  
Second: James Blackburn Jr.  
James Blackburn Jr. - Aye  
Lucy Hitch - Aye  
Quentin L. Marlin - Aye  
Anthony Wayne Noha - Aye  
James Overton - Aye  
Coren Ross - Aye

8. [3 Longbridge Road-B-130528-00040-1 Riparian Buffer Setback Variance Request](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Pablo Residence Master Plan 5-24-13.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Photos 3 Longbridge Road.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Aerial Photo.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was: Mr. David Haynes, Agent

Mr. Marcus Lotson gave the following summary;

The petitioner, for 3 Longbridge Road is requesting an eight foot marsh buffer setback variance from the 35 foot requirement of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in conjunction with the construction of a new single family residence and associated appurtenances. The subject property is located at the Longbridge Hammock which is a fully developed hammock south of the Long Point Subdivision on the Wilmington River. It is currently under construction. He added that the encroachments would include portion of a retaining wall at this location and portions of steps and a fire pit. The petitioner is proposing a number of management practices regarding the storm water. There are several catch basins and rain gardens on the property. The petitioner, as he has depicted on the site plan is establishing substantial vegetation in an effort to help the infiltration of the storm water runoff and to slow that rate down. He also mentioned that Mr. Kirkland, Chatham County Engineer has visited this site and may have some incite on this as well. Based on the storm water management practices that the applicant has shown and the fact that the eight foot variance does not encompass the entire property the actual impervious area that is impacted within the marsh buffer is about one hundred ninety square feet. Based on these findings, staff recommends approval of the requested setback variance.

Mr. Noha questioned if the steps and the fire pit on the original plan and if so why is this just being presented.

Mr. Sebek responded that these do not require a building permit, but they are an encroachment. This would not have been reviewed as part of the building permit for the site.

Mr. Noha asked did someone at the county level approve these plans with the steps and the fire pit and every thing else.

Mr. Lotson responded that the master plan that he has presented to the board is not necessarily the plan that was approved by the county. This was provided by the property owner.

Mr. Noha asked again did the original plans have those items in it and were they approved.

Jeff Kirkland stated that he did not visit this site because the requested encroachment was not into the 25ft state water's buffer. However, he was interested in looking at the property because of the proposed stormwater management.

Mr. Blackburn Jr. asked if every lot on this hammock has come before this board for a variance.

Mr. Lotson answered that for one reason or another, staff has had three requests of the eight lots on this hammock come before this board. One of the three was for a height variance so that is not a good comparison. But there have been a couple for marsh variance setbacks and they were approved by the board.



Mr. Blackburn Jr. asked how can the board enforce that these rain gardens and drainage structures would be built.

Mr. Lotson responded that if they are a part of the approved plans then that would be a part of the inspections process before closing.

Mr. Sebek differed. He stated that staff inspections stop with the building. He does not get involved outside of that. He added that these things that the petitioner has proposed that he will be doing are not mandatory. He has stated that the petitioner has said that he will be doing these things and hopefully he will.

Mr. Blackburn Jr. stated that if we make the approval conditional on that then why won't the inspections department inspect it.

Mr. Sebek stated that the department would. Just as it was done on a previous petition regarding the fencing and the decking was reduced. Staff did inspect and certify that those were done the way were inspected to be done. He added that of course this would be done with the help of engineering because they are more familiar with this and will ensure that it is done per what is approved.

**Speaking on the petition:** Mr. David Haynes, agent stated that the purpose of requesting the variance was that the house was as far forward as it could be. Originally there was a pool house and a guess house on the rear of the property but it was eliminated because it would be in the 25ft setback. The pool was moved forward as close to the main house as possible but the planners were still unable to get the design outside the buffer.

Ms. Ross asked Mr. Haynes to address the permeability of the materials that are being used for the fire pit and the path.

Mr. Haynes responded that the fire pit would be some type of slate or stone. The raised part is just a grassy area where a retaining wall will be erected in order to have some yard at the same level as the house. There will also be a planter and some steps that will encroach just a little on this part of it and the fire pit. He added that there will also be a storm water retention on the left and right side that will catch all the storm water off the roof and bring it in the drains and then into a retention pond.

Mr. Noha asked if Long Point had its own architectural review board.

Mr. Haynes responded that it does in the rear section of the subdivision and that he has spoken with the president of that review board and the board does not have any opposition.

Mr. Overton stated that is about the third or fourth application that he has seen in the last six months, where an architectural planner or engineer has not done his homework properly with regards to variances. He stated that he does not see why the board should be granting variances on the mistakes of someone's part. He added that the house could have been made smaller during the design phase. Each time the board sees one of these we are allowing a variance of a 35ft setback. Quite frankly, what the board should do is get rid of the 35ft setback and allow everyone to build up to the marsh if the board is going to continue to allow these variances to occur. In conclusion he stated that in every case

including this one he would be in favor of maintaining the 35ft setback. On this particular vote he will be voting no.

**Board Action:**

Staff recommends **approval** of the 8 foot riparian buffer setback variance request for 3 Longbridge Road - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Coren Ross

Second: Quentin L. Marlin

James Blackburn Jr. - Nay

Lucy Hitch - Aye

Quentin L. Marlin - Aye

Anthony Wayne Noha - Aye

James Overton - Nay

Coren Ross - Aye

9. [106 Windfield Drive -130528-00041-1 Rear Yard Setback Variance Request](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Correspondence.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Photos 106 Windfield.pdf](#)

Present for the petition was: Adam Iardino, Petitioner

Mr. Marcus Lotson gave the following summary;

The petitioner is requesting a 16 foot rear yard setback variance from the 25 foot requirement of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance for an existing above ground pool and pool deck. The subject property is an approximately .24 acre lot located at 106 Windfield Drive on the west side of LaRoche Avenue approximately 850 feet north of Majestic Oaks Drive in an R-1 / EO (One - family residential / environmental overlay) zoning district. The Windfield Subdivision, developed in the late 1980's, consists of 36 residential lots. 35 of these lots, including the subject property, are developed with a single family residence. Lots on the east and west side of the subject property are developed with single family residential. North of the subject property and abutting the petitioner's rear yard is a one acre undeveloped residential lot that is not a part of the Windfield subdivision. He presented on screen photographs of the subject property. The Chatham County Zoning Administrator has determined that the pool and deck shall be considered a structure due to the height; thereby requiring conformity to the development standards and the issuance of all required permits. The deck floor is approximately five feet above grade. The petitioner

met with the Windfield Architectural Control Committee on March 12, 2013. Although the Committee found the petitioner to be in violation of neighborhood covenants, they ruled to table any decision until after the variance request was adjudicated. A wooden privacy fence, approximately six feet in height, exists on all sides of the rear yard. However, due to the height of the deck, this does not obstruct the view into neighboring properties. In an attempt to remedy this situation, the petitioner has installed evergreen trees along the east and west fence lines. The request to a rear yard setback variance is substantial on this size lot in staff's opinion. Also the height of the deck does intrude, from a visual standpoint, to the neighbors' property. Based on these findings, staff recommends **denial** of the requested variance.

Ms. Hitch questioned if an in ground pool likely have received a permit.

Mr. Lotson responded assuming it met the setback standard. But it is hard to say whether or not the petitioner could place a pool in this backyard and meet the setback.

Mr. Overton questioned what would be the result if the variance was denied.

Mr. Lotson stated that the property owner would have to bring his property into compliance by removing the pool and the deck.

**Speaking on the petition:** Adam Iardino, petitioner stated that his intention was to create an above ground pool with a deck for his family. He later came to realize that he was encroaching on the 25 foot setback. The 25 foot setback brings the pool about 3 feet from the original deck. He stated that he has tried to work with his neighborhood, where they have an architectural approval committee) unfortunately, he did not go through the proper procedures and ask for permission first. He stated that he had offered to remove it prior to coming before the board, but the potential to do the landscaping would be a more probable route. The height of the deck is undetermined and to lower the existing deck would bring it below the height of the existing fence.

Mr. Sebek, County Zoning Administrator stated that staff position regarding the deck is that if it at or near ground level it can encroach into the setback if they do not create an intrusion into the neighbor's yard. However once it gets about a foot then it becomes problematic if they are in the setback. Unfortunately, what the petitioner refers to with his slab in not uncommon where folks have a nice patio but then they want to do something on it it then becomes a problem.

Mr. Ross asked if is it reasonable to get that deck down to a single foot height.

Mr. Sebek said in this case it probably is not going to be much help to him. The pool is considered an accessory structure so it can be within 5 feet of the property line. So the pool itself is not necessarily an issue; the deck however is because of the elevated nature of it.

Mr. Marlin questioned staff as to whether the property to the rear was vacant.

Mr. Lotson responded that the lot is a residential lot but it is not developed.

Mr. Marlin stated looking at the other photos there seems to be a playground structure in

the yard as well and it appears to be higher than the deck. He added that he was just looking at the inconsistency here. The pool will remain at its present height if you lower it there is still the issue of the deck essentially and if we are worried about peering over there will still be the playground structure which he added no one is complaining about this.

Jennifer Rachlin stated that she was president of the neighborhood association at the time of this construction and she felt that it is very important to understand that it wasn't just a blind thing that our neighbor went into this. He was warned that he needed permits. He went ahead with the construction without obtaining the permits thinking that forgiveness is easier than asking. Her concern regarding the neighbor is that if the variance is granted it will destroy the integrity of the neighborhood. She stated that the playground set came with the property and she did not feel that it should be compared to the deck. This neighbor from his deck can see many yards away. The actual greenery that was planted was an after thought not supported by the neighborhood. Upon questioning, she answered that her yard could not be seen from this property but that she was concerned about maintaining the integrity of the neighborhood and it's curb appeal. She added that the neighborhood has existed since the late 80's and this sort of thing has never been a problem in the past. There is a neighbor with an in ground pool that does not encroach on anything and prior to construction they had their permits pulled. This above ground pool on the subject property does not add value to the property values. In conclusion she stated that the deck should not have been built this high. That there is not reason that the deck should have been built up above the privacy fence.

Mr. Marlin asked did the neighborhood have a covenant and did the covenant address any of these issues.

Ms. Rachlin's response was that the neighborhood has an architectural control committee that it states in the covenant that you need to go through them before a structure is added and prior to obtaining a building permit.

Mr. Marlin stated that this board is here on the issue of zoning and you mentioned people painting their houses purple etc. Is there a remedy that the neighborhood can do through its covenant without coming before this board.

Ms. Rachlin responded that she believes that this issue is a zoning issue because the petitioner is requesting a variance. The neighborhood can not control this through their covenant. This is a county issue.

Mark Egan, resident at 110 Windfield Drive, stated that he has been in the neighborhood since the late 1980's when it was first developed. During this time the neighborhood has enjoyed a lot of compliance over the twenty-five years that he has been a resident. He stated that the petitioner is a fine gentleman but did not properly go through the procedures and the results is a visual obstruction that is imposing to the continuous neighbors and others. He appealed to the board to look at this as a compliance issue and to understand that the neighbors are not in the business of trying to dictate which ordinances are successful and which ones are not. The end results is problematic. He stated that he was opposed to the petitioner's request.

Mr. Marlin stated that his only take is that the rear yard setback is there for a reason. He

stated that he will go neighborhood wide and anyone that has any structures 25 feet from their rear yard setback will be denied.

Mr. Wright Powers, 108 Winfield Drive stated that he sent a letter to Mr. Lotson with enclosed pictures from various points in his house and his property. He stated that he believes that this is a variance issue, but he does not want to set a precedent in this neighborhood and that they do not have anything similar in this neighborhood. He added that their covenant probably does not reflect this type of construction because the covenant was created in the late 1980's.

Mr. Noha stated that the board is here to enforce ordinances and not the covenants.

Mr. Blackburn confirmed that there is a private right in enforcing the covenants.

Mr. Paul Carpenter, neighborhood resident stated that his primary concern was setting a precedent. He did not want to do this and he was opposed to the petition.

**Board Action:**

Staff recommends **denial** of the 16 foot rear yard setback variance for 106 Windfield Drive. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Quentin L. Marlin  
Second: Anthony Wayne Noha  
James Blackburn Jr. - Aye  
Lucy Hitch - Aye  
Quentin L. Marlin - Aye  
Anthony Wayne Noha - Aye  
James Overton - Aye  
Coren Ross - Aye

10. [39 Rose Avenue Rear Yard Setback Variance Request | B-130425-00026-1](#)

Attachment: [Photo.pdf](#)

- Attachment: [Email.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Site Plan.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [staff report - rehearing.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [20130522\\_105937.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Rose Avenue Aerial.pdf](#)

Present for the petition: Charles Johnson, Owner

Mr. Johnson apologized for not attending the hearing last month. He stated that he lives in Louisiana. He stated that his family is from Isle of Hope and he and his wife are planning to return and build a retirement home. He continued that he had entrusted his brother to act as his agent on his behalf. His brother failed to attend the meeting. This month, he stated that he took time off to come here from Louisiana to attend the meeting due to the fact that he could not rely on his brother. He thanked Board members for voting to re-hear the petition.

Mr. Lotson gave the following summary:

He stated that there has been no new information provided since the last meeting therefore he did a recap. This is a vacant residential lot on Isle of Hope. The petitioner is proposing a new single family resident; 2400 square foot two story home. The petitioner is requesting 5 foot 2 inch rear yard setback variance from the 25 foot requirement. .

**Speaking on the petition:** Mr. Charles Johnson, owner stated that one of the aspects of this property is that it is in one of the flood zones. In planning the house he would like to keep as much of the house in the flood zone X as much as possible. He explained the design of the proposed house and asked that the petition be approve..

**Board Action:**

Open the floor for a discussion of a re-hearing. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: Coren Ross

Second: James Blackburn Jr.

James Blackburn Jr. - Aye

Lucy Hitch - Aye

Quentin L. Marlin - Aye

Anthony Wayne Noha - Nay

James Overton - Aye

Coren Ross - Aye

**Board Action:**

Motion to hear the petition. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: James Blackburn Jr.

Second: Lucy Hitch

James Blackburn Jr. - Aye

Lucy Hitch - Aye

Quentin L. Marlin - Aye

Anthony Wayne Noha - Aye

James Overton - Aye

Coren Ross - Aye

**Board Action:**

Approval of the petitioner's request. - PASS

**Vote Results**

Motion: James Blackburn Jr.

Second: Coren Ross

James Blackburn Jr. - Aye

Lucy Hitch - Aye

Quentin L. Marlin - Aye

Anthony Wayne Noha - Aye

James Overton - Aye

Coren Ross - Aye

**IX. Other Business**

**X. Adjournment**

11. [Adjournment of the June 25, 2013 CZBA Meeting](#)

There being no other business to come before the June 25, 2013 Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing, Chairman Hitch declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcus Lotson, Secretary

**Note:** Minutes are not official until signed.

/cm

*The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.*