



Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
June 28, 2022 9:00 A.M.

JUNE 28, 2022 CHATHAM COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Members Present: James Coursey, Chairman
Robert Vinyard, Vice Chairman
Coren Ross
Meredith Stone

Member Absent: Benjamin Polote, Jr

Others Present: Pamela Everette, Esq., Assistant Executive Director
Marcus Lotson, Development Services Director
Nirav Gandhi, Development Services Planner and Historic Preservation Development Planner
Jacqualle Johnson, Development Services Technician
Melissa Paul-Leto, Development Services Planner
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst
Mary E Mitchell, Administrative Assistant

County Staff Present: Tabitha Hartman, County Zoning Administrator

I. Call to Order and Welcome

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

Mr. Coursey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. He explained that this is a quasi-judicial proceeding. All those wishing to give testimony during these proceedings will please sign in. Witnesses will be sworn-in prior to giving testimony. All proceedings of the Chatham Zoning Board of Appeals are recorded. Decisions of the Chatham Zoning Board of Appeals are final. Challenges to the decisions of the Chatham Zoning Board of Appeals must be filed through the Superior Court of Chatham County.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

[2. Pledge of Allegiance](#)

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.

III. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

IV. Petitions Ready for Hearing

V. Approval of Minutes

[3. Approval of May 24, 2022 Meeting](#)

📎 [May 24, 2022 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Chatham County Zoning Board of Review does hereby approve the May 24, 2022 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Coren Ross

Second: Robert Vinyard

James Coursey	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Aye
Meredith Stone	- Aye
Robert Vinyard	- Aye
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Not Present

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

[4. Variance Request | File No. ZBA-0422-000262 | 5906 Garrard Ave](#)

Motion

The Chatham County Zoning Board of Review does hereby continue the petition as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Coren Ross

Second: Robert Vinyard

James Coursey	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Aye
Meredith Stone	- Aye
Robert Vinyard	- Aye
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Not Present

VII. Consent Agenda

VIII. Old Business

IX. Regular Agenda

[5. Variance - 53A Henderson Avenue - ZBA-0522-002848](#)

[📎 Application.pdf](#)

[📎 MAPS.pdf](#)

[📎 53A Henderson Avenue -Site Visit.pdf](#)

[📎 51 Henderson Ave 2' & 6' side variance.pdf](#)

[📎 Letter of Support #1 - Mr. Wyly -53 Henderson Avenue.pdf](#)

[📎 Letter from Mr. Wyly regarding other properties.pdf](#)

[📎 STAFF REPORT.pdf](#)

[📎 Revised Proposed Site Plan.pdf](#)

Ms. Melissa Paul-Leto gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting variances to the minimum side yard setback for a proposed principal dwelling and a minimum side yard setback for a proposed accessory building at 53A Henderson Avenue. The property owner of 53 Henderson Avenue is also the owner of 53A Henderson Avenue. The plan has been revised three times since it was submitted to staff. Originally, the site plan indicated a 3-foot side yard setback to the principal dwelling; a 3-foot rear yard setback with a detached garage; and a one-half foot sideyard setback to the detached garage.

Ms. Paul-Leto stated that after speaking with the petitioner, the detached garage was moved forward to comply with the 5-foot rear yard setback. She explained that 51 Henderson Avenue, the adjacent neighbor, submitted a letter of denial regarding the 3-foot side yard setback between her and the proposed principal dwelling. Since receiving the letter of denial, the petitioner revised the site plan to comply with the 5-foot rear yard setback and basically shifted everything over a little.

Ms. Paul-Leto explained that the subject property consists of one parcel approximately .146 acres, or 6,375 square feet in size. The parcel is located in Isle of Hope within the R-1-/EO (Residential Agricultural / Environmental Overlay) zoning district and is a vacant piece of land. Based on the proposed site plan, the following variances are required:

- The one and one-half story principal dwelling would provide a minimum side yard setback of 3-feet on the east side of the parcel, whereas 5-feet is the minimum side yard requirement.
- The proposed one-story detached garage would provide a 1-foot 6-inch side setback, whereas 5-feet is the minimum side yard setback for an accessory building.

Mr. Coursey asked Ms. Paul-Leto if staff heard from the adjacent opposing neighbor since the plans were revised.

Ms. Paul-Leto answered that the opposing neighbor is planning to attend today's meeting via Zoom. However, she does not believe that the opposing neighbor is aware of the revised submittal. Therefore, she believes that this neighbor will be okay with the revised submittal as her objection was the 3 feet and not the 5 feet. However, the only remaining variance that they are requiring is the one and one-half foot side yard setback for the detached garage.

Ms. Paul-Leto explained that based on the criteria, staff finds that presently, the petitioner has sufficient land to build a principal dwelling and a detached garage. The applicant is working with an architect so they can make the house smaller by a couple of feet and then adjust to have a driveway that goes directly down the property and meets the detached garage. This has been the overall design proposal based on everything else. The size of the principal dwelling is an issue as well. She said that once you shift the dwelling, you shift the driveway and the way you drive into the garage.

Ms. Paul-Leto reported that based on the findings identified in the staff report, staff recommends denial of the petitioner's request. Ms. Paul-Leto entertained comments from the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. John Wyly came forward and was sworn-in by **Mr. Coursey**. Mr. Wyly explained to the Board that he is renovating a small cottage next door at 53 Henderson Avenue. It is a 900 square foot cottage. There is plenty of room in the backyard for green space. The garage that the petitioner is looking to move is more than 5 and one-half feet; he does not see this affecting anything that he plans to do in the future in the backyard. The house he is working on is small, is in the back, and any garage he builds, would be just like the house that Ms. Jennifer Oetgen drew. It would be on the right side of his house. Therefore, it would be on the other side of the property and would not be near the structure. Mr. Wyly said Ms. Jennifer Oetgen is the architect for this project.

Mr. Coursey invited **Ms. Oetgen** to come forward. She was sworn-in by Mr. Coursey. Ms. Oetgen explained that she is looking to build a single-family house on the lot at 53A Henderson Avenue. She purchased a house plan that has been modified slightly by an architect. This is not a brand-new design. **Ms. Oetgen** stated that the drivers of her design are a story and one-half house that is architecturally like

the properties on either side and the properties across the street. Even though, there are no architectural design requirements on this lot. Ms. Oetgen said if you look at every property on Henderson Drive, there is a detached, secondary parcel building that has anywhere from zero lot line setback to something other than five feet. Therefore, it is similar to the other properties on Henderson Drive because the original subdivision all have a 50-foot lot width.

Ms. Oetgen said a variance would make a huge difference in the success of having a house that is architecturally similar and, set in such a way, that is equal to the other two houses on the other side of it. This allows ingress and egress to this single-family garage. This is a 100-foot lot and because of the back corner of the house and the garage, it would be difficult to get a car in and out of the garage if it is not aligned with the driveway.

Ms. Ross asked Ms. Oetgen if she had the elevation drawings that show the ingress and egress to the garage?

Ms. Oetgen explained that she believes there is a picture of the garage that she gave to Ms. Paul-Leto.

Ms. Paul-Leto said a picture of the garage is included in the staff report.

Ms. Ross asked if the driveway is there?

Ms. Oetgen explained that you will back in and out straight. A part of the reason for not turning the garage is because she cannot attach it to the structure because of the building setback to the rear setback. If she turns the garage, it takes away any greenspace to be able to back out and go forward. They did this with the original configuration and believed it was better to do a one or two garage turn and it basically left no greenspace on the lot. She stated that it would be nice to be able to pull in and back out, but then no greenspace would be left at all.

Mr. Coursey said the way he understands it, looking at the plat, there is nothing on the left side of the adjacent lot; no building or anything.

Ms. Oetgen said that is the lot that Mr. Wyly owns, and he is restoring the cottage. The driveway is on the other side.

Mr. Coursey asked if both dwellings would be rentals.

Ms. Oetgen answered that this will be her primary residence.

Mr. Wyly showed the Board a drawing. He said the drawing was not drawn to scale; it is hand-drawn. He did the drawing yesterday when he learned that the staff was not supportive of their request. He was trying to think of a way to help move this request forward. Mr. Wyly said he would not have a lot of greenspace behind the house because it is small. If the garage is built there, it would be on the right hand side of the house. He explained that what he suggests is, in the area on the property line, if you look at Ms. Oetgen's drawings of her garage, there is a 5-foot setback, and the garage is 20 feet deep. If he mirrored this on his side and came back 25 feet off the property line, came over with not what the County requires - a five-foot setback, he would put a 10-foot setback self-imposed on his property, it could be filed as a restriction on this property. Then, this would give the distance between any potential structure later, if he no longer owns the property or if someone wanted to put something here later. This would keep the distance between any new structure and the garage that Ms. Oetgen will build. This would be more than the 10 feet, if they both were five feet. He explained that he picked 10 feet because it is a round number and is easier to understand. Therefore, the five-foot setback would be a 10-foot setback in this area. The reason for the property setbacks that the County requires, is to keep the structures apart from each other.

Mr. Wyly said in addition to what Ms. Oetgen was saying, every other house on this block, because of the narrow lots, has structures that are placed up against the property lines. This would allow Ms. Oetgen to shift over, and it fits in with the rest of the neighborhood, but it would not allow anybody else to put a structure close to Ms. Oetgen's structure. Mr. Wyly said this is just a thought and would be easy to do.

Ms. Ross asked Mr. Wyly if he was proposing a permanent easement that would transfer along with his

property if the property changes hands?

Mr. Wyly answered yes. It would be a self-imposed, 10-foot setback in the 25-foot area instead of the regular five feet. Mr. Wyly explained that it would continue with the property, once it is put in place. He stated that the real estate lawyer that he uses is right next door, Attorney Mark Shaw, who has helped him with other easements in the past. He explained that he spoke with Attorney Shaw about this yesterday, and he did not see any problems with this. It is something that he can file.

Mr. Coursey said being a real estate lawyer and dealings with these situations, would it not be simpler to just redraw the plat and convey the small sliver to Ms. Oergen?

Mr. Wyly said “no” he cannot do that because all of these are already nonconforming lots just by the nature of their sizes. If they do that, they would be creating two nonconforming lots. The next best thing is to create a side yard setback by 10 feet in this area. Then, there would be no recombination.

Mr. Coursey asked Mr. Wyly if he said he was working with Mark Shaw?

Mr. Wyly confirmed that he is working with Mark Shaw.

Ms. Ross asked staff if they had any comments?

Mr. Lotson stated that staff met with Mr. Wyly regarding his proposal, which he thought was very creative. Staff talked about Mr. Coursey’s idea potentially, but this does create other issues that they would rather avoid relative to drawing new lot lines.

Mr. Lotson explained that during the staff review, they had a conversation with Mr. Wyly before this meeting. This petition has really morphed a lot since the staff received it. As Ms. Paul-Leto said, when they initially looked at this, three variances were requested, including variances with the principal structure. He said that these variances, through redesign and coordination with the neighboring property owner, they were able to get to the point where they were requesting only the one and one-half foot side yard setback on the accessory building. In staff’s opinion, they think that the Board should really focus on deciding whether the variance is justified and whether it is affecting anybody, and not necessarily go into whether they need to adjust Mr. Wyly’s property, which is not a part of the original petition. Mr. Lotson informed the Board that the staff try to stay away from somewhat designing things on the “fly” and just focus on the side yard setback. The development pattern in the neighborhood, which he will admit, does include a lot of detached buildings, which may or may not meet the requirements that are there today because of the age of the neighborhood and some of the structures.

Mr. Lotson said staff is hopeful that the Board will react to the variance request only and not necessarily try to impact the other properties in terms of the decision that they make today.

Ms. Ross asked Mr. Lotson if he was saying that since the net result would be the same either way that the Board restrict their consideration to the variance alone?

Mr. Lotson answered “yes.”

Mr. Vinyard asked would it be helpful to continue this matter to the next meeting to allow the petitioner a chance to amend the petition? He believes this matter could be quickly done. Someone would need to draw this and then they would not have to turn it down and cause the petitioner to file another petition. Is this an option?

Ms. Ross said as she understands, the net result would still be the same. The Board can either give the petitioner the variance or, as has been suggested, have the petitioner come back with new drawings. But, she believes the net result would be the same.

Mr. Lotson explained that if Mr. Wyly was able to do a legal subdivision of his property, he would not need a variance if he was essentially granting Ms. Oetgen a few feet of his property. He would not have to come to the Board. But, even if he re-records his plat to reflect the idea that he proposed earlier, Ms. Oetgen would still require a variance because the property line is not moving. Mr. Wyly is only proposing a greater setback on his own property. Therefore, it was staff’s belief that they should only evaluate the

side yard and make a decision on that.

Mr. Coursey stated that the staff's report has been direct and clear. Staff's recommendation is to deny the variance. However, he is looking for a solution.

Mr. Lotson explained that in terms of justification for variances on vacant properties that are conforming in terms of size and dimensions, it is more difficult from staff's perspective to justify variances approval. Some of the other things that go into decisions often are not things that are within the criteria, such as the historic development pattern on Isle of Hope, which they all are familiar with. The impact or lack thereof of anything on the adjacent property'; in this case, Mr. Wyly's property. The fact that the structure on the property is much smaller than the proposed structure on this housing; therefore, the rear of the cottage will not be impacted by what goes on within the adjacent property. There are things that the Board can consider, but staff does not necessarily consider this in terms of the review criteria of the Ordinance.

Ms. Ross stated that her assessment is the same as Mr. Lotson. She did a site visit. In her opinion, this design would blend-in just fine with the existing neighborhood.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Andrea Adel-Morgan was on-line. **Ms. Adel-Morgan** explained that she owns the property that abuts the rear of the property at 51 and 53A Henderson Avenue. The garage will be on the opposite side of the property. Her concern pertains to what Mr. Wyly said about 53 Henderson Avenue, that the driveway would be on the other side of the house. But, where the new lot was cutoff to be able to build the house, it is basically where the driveway was before the house; the driveway on the other side is attached to the next house. Therefore, she does not understand how it is being said that a driveway will be there. Ms. Adel-Morgan said when she built her house, she had to follow all the regulations. If there is not enough room here to put the house that Ms. Oetgen wants to build, then she needs to find another lot.

Mr. Dale Morgan was on-line. Mr. Morgan said he lives at 55 Romney Road. His concern is, if the Board has already predominantly opposed this, why is there more debate over this matter. One foot and one-half setback is not the end of the world, but what is the harm in making a slight turn in the driveway. When he built his house, he had to make a turn into his driveway. If the petitioner has a carport, she will have to turn into it as well.

Ms. Carol Jordan was on-line. She lives at 51 Henderson Avenue. Ms. Jordan said her concern is with the variance between her house and 53A Henderson Avenue. They have already conceded that, therefore, she does not believe that she has a leg to stand on. Ms. Jordan explained that when they look at the plots here, all the plots are not 50 feet. The 50 feet plots are just in their section. Some of the houses on Henderson Avenue have larger lots. Ms. Jordan said the house that is proposed to be built here is a big house.

Mr. Coursey explained that what is before the Board is that the house is proposed to be 50 feet in width.

Mr. Wyly, in response to public comments, stated they did not create the lots, they were already here. But the lot has been vacant for many years. A carport was on the vacant lot. Mr. Wyly said he did not see this, but this is what some of the neighbors have told him. His driveway is on the right side of his house. If the Board members visited the area, they may have seen where he parks.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Coursey asked staff, from their standpoint, are there any restrictions for a driveway being on one side of a lot or the other?

Mr. Lotson answered that there are no restrictions.

Mr. Vinyard said he was not sure he has a solution. He believes that if there are vacant lots, especially in this area, they should be used, obviously, for tax purposes; income is created for the County in allowing people to build houses. On the other hand, their sworn duty is to uphold the law as it is and not may be as they want it to be. Redesigning this property for it to fit, is not their job. Their purview is to interpret

the statutes as they see them. Mr. Vinyard said he does not see a reason, within the boundaries of the law, that they are bound to grant the variances. He really wants to help the petitioner, but he does not see a legal justification to change this to allow the variance based on the evidence before them.

Mr. Wyly said he is preserving a piece of history. Most people who bought this property would probably have demolished the cottage and built two new houses. He has been working on the cottage for six months and will probably be working here for another year. He realizes that this is next door, but with him preserving a piece of history at Isle of Hope, which is important to everyone here, this also allows for all the greenspace in the back. This allows him not to be affected by a garage that is five or one and a half feet off the property. If this helps with what he is doing next door, which allows for all the room in the back, and does not affect the property that he owns.

Ms. Ross, in response to Mr. Vinyard's concern, said it seems like a remedy is here which does involve an easement. Therefore, if this path is chosen to take, then the net result is that the driveway and the garage will be where they are shown. Therefore, if they insist on the easement, which the Board can do, then the net result is the same. Therefore, she believes that the Board may go ahead and approve the variance. She realizes that this may not be the rule the Board wishes to follow, but the net result, as she has said, will be the same.

Ms. Stone agreed with Ms. Ross.

Ms. Oetgen explained that, as a builder, she believes that it is important that you leave a footprint. She believes that she can build a 3600 square foot house on this lot. There is no flood zone here. She can park underneath it and can build two full stories. She has three children and is trying to build a single-family house that they all can live in. She knows that it is not a 900 square foot cottage like what Mr. Wyly is restoring, but it is architecturally driven to ask for the variance.

Mr. Vinyard explained that he understood everything that Ms. Oetgen said; and he wanted her to know that there was nothing more that he would like to see her build other than a conforming house on this property. However, they are appointed to this Board to use what they consider to be their best ideas in terms of what they can and cannot do. He said that two of them are lawyers on this Board and he was not saying this is good or bad; but it is not that he does not want Ms. Oetgen to succeed, but he does not know how to do so without making a precedent that he is not sure he wants to make. Therefore, this is his position.

Mr. Coursey asked Ms. Oetgen if she is presently one and one-half feet off the property line?

Mr. Oetgen answered yes.

Mr. Coursey asked Ms. Oetgen if she could shift over a couple of feet?

Ms. Oetgen replied that because she conforms with the rear setback, they shifted the garage forward. The corner of the house and the garage are not quite meeting each other, there is only 13 feet between the structures.

Mr. Coursey said a "slight turn" is needed.

Ms. Oetgen said it would be hard not to hit the side of the single car garage.

Mr. Wyly said he laid out all the corners. His car is the same size as Ms. Oetgen's car, and he drove straight out, but it is a glove. They were doing everything that they could. Therefore, they ended up shifting from Carol's drive and the back.

Ms. Ross moved that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals accept the applicant's request for the variance and so knowing that it is against the staff's recommendation. The motion is made considering the soft factors that go into an appropriate design in a neighborhood such as this neighborhood.

Mr. Coursey explained that, before he calls for a second, he wanted to ask staff some questions.

Mr. Coursey said if he understood correctly, staff is not disagreeing with what the applicant said regarding what the net result and what they are trying to do. But that staff just wants the Board to vote on the application as it exists. Right?

Mr. Lotson explained that from the standpoint of what the applicant requested, the request is on the table now. They have talked about the history of the request, the terms of what they are requesting now are variances to allow one and one-half feet side yard setback; as the Board sees, staff recommendation is for "denial." Mr. Lotson additionally explained, that to the second part of Mr. Coursey's question, staff understands as it is often discussed on this Board, other factors go into the Board's decision are on the table for the Board to consider. He said "yes" staff would like for the Board to consider the variance as it has been requested and make a decision based on the testimony given at today's hearing.

Mr. Coursey replied, to satisfy his concern, they need to discuss those other considerations that Mr. Lotson spoke of so that they will be placed in the record. What are they?

Mr. Lotson explained that a few considerations that staff looked at are the fact that the adjacent property to the west, Mr. Wyly's property, is a building that is much smaller than the subject's principal residence. Thereby, it is not impacted by activities that go on in the rear yard of the subject property. The other consideration is that there is, at least periodically, a pattern of accessory buildings that are detached throughout Isle of Hope and appear not to meet the setback requirements. Mr. Lotson explained that the reason for this is because it is a historic neighborhood and oftentimes, things in this area were built prior to regulations existing.

Mr. Lotson said one thing he wants to put on record is that the solutions here in terms of going from needing a variance to not needing variance, really comes down to redesigning the principal structure so that the detached building can be moved and not be impacted by the distance between the two structures, or do something such as what Mr. Wyly has suggested, in terms of rearranging the property lines, which staff does not support.

Ms. Ross said it seems to her that the only thing the petitioner can do to redesign it, would be move the house forward and then you would need another setback.

Mr. Lotson said staff looked at this. They believe that maintaining the street frontage pattern is important. Therefore, staff is not supportive of granting a front yard setback variance as the house would be closer to the street. Henderson Avenue is a narrow street and there is a fairly regimented pattern of buildings frontage along this street.

Mr. Coursey asked that if the easement that they have been discussing was recreated, would this still violate the setback line?

Mr. Lotson explained that if Mr. Wyly's property was re-platted to show a setback greater than what is here now, Ms. Oetgen would still need a variance to do what she is showing today.

Mr. Coursey asked if the easement would affect other properties?

Mr. Lotson answered that if a building was going to be built in the area near Mr. Wyly's house sometime in the future, it would be further away from Ms. Oetgen's building.

Mr. Coursey said that this would make the building conform in terms of the idea of the regulation. The regulation would still be there in terms of the setback lines, regardless of whether there is an easement on Mr. Wyly's property.

Mr. Lotson answered "yes."

Mr. Coursey stated that the only thing that would absolutely solve this problem is if Mr. Wyly replatted his property. Staff has said that this is something that they did not want to get into. He stated that this might be too nonconforming. Right?

Mr. Lotson explained that there are two things with this. He said looking at the site plan, the right side of Mr. Wyly's house is already close to the setback line. What he would have to do if he was to re-plate, is

that a gorge be at the back. However, this would not be approved as there are straight forward regulations regarding property lines.

Mr. Coursey stated that he is familiar with this area, as he lived here 35 years. He applauded that the old home is saved. He really is torn about this petition. He asked Mr. Wyly if he knew whether there are plans to put accessory buildings behind his next-door rental property.

Mr. Wyly stated that he believes at some point, this will need something, but he believed it would be on the other side. The house is very small. He was thinking about building the same thing that Ms. Oetgen is looking to build. Possibly, a 12 x 20 garage that a car could pull out of. This would be built on the other side. There is a lot of room in their backyard.

Mr. Coursey asked Mr. Wyly if he would need a variance for this.

Mr. Wyly answered no; he has more greenspace that will be larger than the house.

Mr. Coursey asked Mr. Wyly if he was going to put it next to Ms. Oetgen's garage?

Mr. Wyly explained that this is not his intention. Therefore, he brings the 10 feet off as it would stay with the property - the side yard setback off Ms. Oetgen's property line in this area.

Mr. Coursey asked Mr. Wyly if he had any other considerations for this request that he could put on the record, which would impact the Board's decision for this area. They have talked about the pattern, the accessory buildings not being totally in conformance in the neighborhood. They have talked about the adjacent property, and it is in keeping with the neighborhood. Do you have anything else on your mind that might move the needle over a little bit?

Mr. Wyly answered that the only thing he could think of is, that the only property affected by this requested variance is the one that he is doing, which is 53 Henderson Avenue. He did not know if there is any other reason for having setbacks on properties. If there is a five-foot property line on either side, other than keeping structures 10 feet apart from each other, he did not know of any other reason.

Mr. Coursey asked staff that the only purpose for keeping the setback line is to keep the structures apart. Is it not?

Mr. Lotson answered "yes" that's correct.

Mr. Coursey explained that here, they do not have that problem because a structure is not adjacent here. Therefore, he believes this could be taken in consideration.

Mr. Lotson agreed with Mr. Coursey.

Mr. Coursey asked Ms. Ross to restate her motion and include the considerations that they just discussed.

Ms. Ross moved for approval of the petitioner's request for 53A Henderson Avenue. This decision is limited to the development plan submitted and reviewed by the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals.

The motion was seconded by **Ms. Stone and carried**. Voting in favor of the motion were: **Mr. Coursey, Ms. Ross, and Ms. Stone**. **Mr. Vinyard** voted against the motion and **Mr. Polote** was absent.

Motion

The Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the petitioner's request for 53A Henderson Avenue.

This decision is limited to the development plan submitted and reviewed by the Chatham County Zoning

Board of Appeals.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Coren Ross

Second: Meredith Stone

James Coursey	- Aye
Coren Ross	- Aye
Meredith Stone	- Aye
Robert Vinyard	- Nay
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Not Present

X. Other Business

XI. Adjournment

[6. Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals, Mr. Coursey adjourned the meeting at 9:57 a. m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marcus Lotson
Development Services Director

ML:mem

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.