



CITY OF SAVANNAH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
April 25, 2013 10:00 A.M.
Minutes

April 25, 2013 Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting

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 Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals are recorded. Decisions of the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals are final. Challenges to the decisions of the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals must be filed through the Superior Court of Chatham County.

Note: All persons in attendance are requested to so note on the "Sign-In Sheet" on the table outside the entrance of the meeting room. Persons wishing to speak will indicate on the sheet.

I. Call to Order and Welcome

II. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

III. Approval of Minutes

- 1. [Minutes will be available on Tuesday May 23, 2013](#)

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

- 2. [322 West Broughton Street, Lot Area per Dwelling - 001515](#)

Attachment: [Images -001515.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Staff Report -001515 revised.pdf](#)

Board Action:	
Staff recommends a 30 day continuance.	- PASS
Vote Results	
Motion: Brian Reese	
Second: Sidney J Johnson	
Sidney J Johnson	- Aye
Eli Karatassos	- Abstain
Timothy Mackey	- Aye
Brian Reese	- Aye
William Ronning	- Aye

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.

V. Consent Agenda

3. [9 Steel Magnolia Lane, Rear Setback Variance -001138](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report -001138.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Images -001138.pdf](#)

Present for the petition: Stuart Abel

Jack Butler gave the following summary;

The petitioner, Stuart Abel, agent for Rose J. Galbreath, is requesting approval of a nine-foot variance in the required 25-foot rear yard building setback in order to enclose an existing patio as an addition to an existing residence. Because the property has a remainder interior parcel to the rear that consists primarily of federally protected wetlands, it is unlikely any use that might be affected by the encroachment will take place on that property. Staff recommends **approval** of the requested nine foot variance from the 25-foot rear yard setback requirement.

Speaking on the petition: Ms. Maryann Jones, neighboring resident asked if granting the petitioner's request would devalue her neighboring property. She explained where her property was located and stated that this property has been in her family for over 80 years. Once confirmed by staff that the petitioner's request would not devalue her property, she stated that she had no opposition to the request and that her property is presently for sale.

Board Action:

Approval of the requested nine foot variance from the 25-foot rear yard setback requirement. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Eli Karatassos

Second: Brian Reese

Sidney J Johnson - Aye

Eli Karatassos - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Brian Reese - Aye

William Ronning - Aye

VI. Old Business

4. [3704 Bull Street, Use Approval \(Child Care\) -00796](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report -000796 - April.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Images -000796.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Church - Day Care Site Drawings -4-17-13.pdf](#)

Present for the petition: Ms. Hampton, Agent

Mr. Jack Butler gave the following summary;

The petitioner, Jana Biggins, Agent for Fresh Fire from Heaven Church, is requesting approval of a use (22b – Day Nursery and Kindergarten). Approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals is required in order to establish such use in this location. This case was continued from March 28th.

The school which is proposed to be operated by Fresh Fire from Heaven Church, has met with a professional landscape architect and developed a new design. The petitioner will provide the parking area and a pass-through from 54 street to the lane and exit to Bull Street. The petitioner will also fence the property according to the ordinance standards. Staff recommends approval, with the condition that the limiting number of students is 25.

Speaking on the petition: Ms. Hampton, agent stated that the initial request was for 30 to 50 children but the request has been amended to 25 children.

Ms. Flossy Williams representative of the proposed daycare stated that the hours of operation would be from 7a to 4p.

Mr. William Ronning, Board Member question what would be the definition of a daycare; the ages of the children in the proposed daycare.

Mr. Butler explained that the definition of a daycare is for children from the ages of three (3) months to four (4) years.

Mr. Sidney J. Johnson, Board Member stated that he had concerns regarding the parking. He asked the petitioner whether or not approval had been granted from the traffic engineer regarding off-street parking.

Mr. Butler stated that this would be a part of the site plan review process. He explained the process to the board.

Chairman Mackey stated that the board would be in keeping to request the eight foot opaque fence and the appropriate buffer. He stated that he would request a thick vegetative buffer.

Mr. Butler stated that typically a six- foot buffer is required.

Mr. Chairman asked that this be a part of the record along with the hours that were state; 7a.m to 4p.m.

Mr. Butler stated that the actual applicant, Ms. Jana Biggins, stated that the hours of operation would be from 6a- 6p. He stated that he believed that Ms. Biggins stated these hours of operation to allow for drop off and pick up times.

Mr. Brian Reese, Board Member, stated that he agreed. With toddlers of his own he stated that he did not know of any daycare with hours from 7am to 4pm.

Ms. Hampton agreed. She stated that the hours from 6a to 6p were best.

Board Action:

The use will be limited to 25 children; 2)that the children be limited in age to four years and younger; 3) that the play areas be fenced and buffered according to the requirements of the ordinance (8) foot opaque fence and six-foot vegetative buffer); and 4) that the hours of operation for the day-care/nursery be limited to 6a-6p. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Brian Reese
Second: William Ronning
Sidney J Johnson - Aye
Eli Karatassos - Aye
Timothy Mackey - Aye
Brian Reese - Aye
William Ronning - Aye

VII. Regular Agenda

5. [1313 Habersham Street, Use Approval \(Restaurant with Alcoholic Beverages\) and Parking Variance -001585](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report -001585.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Images -001585.pdf](#)

Present for the petition: Justin Barfield and Kevin Veitinger

Jack Butler gave the following summary;

The petitioner, Justin Barfield, is requesting approval of a use, 43 (restaurant or cafeteria where alcoholic beverages are sold as part of a meal), and a seven-space parking variance from the 18 spaces required by the ordinance. Such use and variance must be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The subject property is a 5,000 square foot commercial building on a 7,450 square foot lot located at 1313 Habersham Street, on the corner of Habersham and East Anderson. The property is zoned 1-B (residential and neighborhood convenience uses, Victorian District zoning). The Zoning Board of Appeals shall decide upon uses with the following criteria considered; 1) that the proposed use is in keeping with the residential character of the neighborhood; this property is designated Traditional Neighborhood on the Future Land Use Map and Traditional Neighborhoods do include dining establishments. The proposed use will not be contrary to the purposes stated for the chapter and would not adversely affect the health and safety of residents and

workers in the city. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use of adjacent properties as nearby properties on Habersham Street include a diner, a college dormitory, and a hair salon. Residential uses in the area all well buffered from the subject property. The proposed use will not be adversely affected by the existing uses and the lot is of sufficient size to satisfy the space requirements for such a use provided that the board allows the requested reduction in parking. The proposed use could constitute a traffic and noise problem, depending on the character of the establishment and the hours of operation. There is insufficient parking to accommodate the proposed 70 seats, and the operation-of a restaurant with very late hours could have a disruptive impact on the neighborhood. Further, the proposed parking arrangement on site would be angled to accommodate vehicles entering from Anderson Street. the layout would require vehicles to exit onto Henry Lane which is an unpaved city lane. The standards appear to have not been met in their entirety. The petitioner is proposing a use which will demand 18 parking spaces. The subject property has 11 spaces on-site and they are requesting a variance of seven spaces. There are no extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape, or topography. The application of this chapter to this particular piece of property would not create an unnecessary hardship and there are no peculiar conditions on this piece of property. Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance therefore; staff recommends approval of the proposed use provided that a condition is approved setting hours of operation at no later than 11 p.m. and if the parking variance is not supported staff is recommending denial of the requested variance. Further since Henry Lane is unimproved and not designed for regular commercial use staff is recommending a condition that Henry Lane be paved to city standards from Habersham Street to the rear of the parking area, and that the exit from the parking lot be designated for "right turn only". In conclusion he explained to the Board its charge for this item.

Speaking on the petition: Justin Barfield petitioner stated that his immediate concern was that his petition was filed for Use 43a (cafeteria/restaurant which does not serve alcohol). Note: "(43a is not a cafeteria, but rather a Drive through or Fast Food Restaurant)". Staff reviewed the petition as a restaurant/cafeteria that serves alcohol. He stated he only wanted to serve coffee and that there will be no food prepare on site. A bakery will provide baked goods. He stated that he was taken aback by this.

Mr. Karatossos stated that in the justice of time, he made the motion that the petitioner's request be approved for Use 43 and not Use 43a not containing but the ability to serve alcohol.

Mr. Ronning seconded the motion.

Mr. Reese asked if the petitioner would require 70 seats for the coffee shop.

Mr. Barfield stated that he would like to have the seating plan that was submitted only reduced by 10 or 15 seats. He added that he would be reviewing and looking at opening late morning and over the course of six months to determine how early he would need to open. He stated that he would image that there would be no need to open prior to 6:30 A.M. for those that are commuting. He expects to keep later hours on Friday and Saturday night.

Mr. Reese questioned which hours would be peak hours of operation.

Mr. Barfield responded that those hours would be during the dismissal of the classes at the college across the street. He added that most of his traffic would be pedestrian and bikers from the students who do not have cars.

Chairman Mackey questioned staff on the perspective of the use. He asked if the change of the requested use changed if the requirements would change. He asked Mr. Barfield if he would be asking for the same parking requirements.

Mr. Barfield responded yes.

Chairman Mackey asked staff to explain the error that occurred with the petitioner's request.

Mr. Butler explained that the use the petitioner is requiring Use (43a) is less intense than the use that was evaluated (Use 43). The recommendation remains the same; staff recommends that the use be approved; and that the parking variance be denied.

Board Action:

Approval of the use, # 43a (fast food or drive-thru restaurant) and a parking variance of seven spaces from the 18 required, with the condition that the lane be paved. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Eli Karatassos
Second: William Ronning
Sidney J Johnson - Aye
Eli Karatassos - Aye
Timothy Mackey - Aye
Brian Reese - Aye
William Ronning - Aye

6. [102 and 106 East 37th Street, Variances - 001614](#)

- Attachment: [Staff Report -001614.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Maps and Photos.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Comments.pdf](#)
- Attachment: [Additional Comments Received 4-24-13.pdf](#)

Present for the petition: Phillip McCorkle, Agent/ Christine Sottile, Architect

Mr. Butler gave the following summary;

The petitioner, Adam Ragsdale, as Agent for Ernest Mitchell/Christ Church Anglican, is requesting approval of variances to allow the construction of a church and associated parish house/classroom building. The petitioner is requesting a 10-foot height variance to permit the sanctuary building (only) to be 55 feet above ground level; a 10-foot rear setback variance to allow 32 feet of the parish house/classroom building (only) to be built on the lot line at 36th Street Lane; building footprint variances of 1,300 square feet (sanctuary)

and 300 square feet (parish house/classroom building) to allow the structures to exceed the 5,500 maximum building footprint standard in the zoning district and a 240-foot variance (over the 150-foot maximum permitted in the ordinance) in separation distance to allow remote parking on a private lot 390 feet from the subject property. The subject property presently consists of two lots located at 102 & 106 E. 37th Street at present comprising a single two-story frame house that has been deemed a historically contributing structure. The properties are zoned TC-1 in the Mid-City/ Thomas Square District. The petitioners are proposing to construct a church sanctuary of 6,800 square feet and an attached parish house/classroom building of 5800 square feet, after recombining the two lots into a single parcel of 0.53 acres or 23,086 square feet while possibly relocating a 1,300 square foot single family residence to the rear of the property. The petitioner is requesting a 10 foot height variance. The Zoning Board of Appeals may authorize a variance in an individual case upon a finding that: 1) there are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question; 2) there are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions that would require construction of a building 55 feet in height that would cause the structure to exceed the maximum allowed height by 10 feet; 3) the application of this chapter to this particular piece of property would not create an unnecessary hardship and; 4) relief, if granted, could cause substantial detriment to the public good, violating the key tenets of the district by exceeding the scope and mass designed for the area, as well as overshadowing non-commercial and non-institutional buildings. He noted that overshadowing in this case does not imply that there is an actual shadow cast. This implies overwhelming or diminishing in apparent mass. The petitioner is requesting a 10-foot rear setback variance to allow 32 feet of the parish house only to be built on the lot line at 36th street lane. There are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions that would require construction of a building at a zero lot line adjacent to a lane. The proposed building has not been built or designed, and could easily be constructed to observe the required setbacks. Conditions are not peculiar to the particular piece of property that would force the petitioner to construct along the lot line and staff is recommending denial of that variance. The petitioner is requesting approval of a building footprint variances to allow structures to exceed the 5,500 maximum building footprint standard in the zoning district.

The Administrator has determined that the coverage proposed should be calculated on the basis of all structures on the property. This would be approximately 12,600 square feet of church sanctuary and parish hall/classroom building and possibly the 1,300 square foot (footprint) of the historic frame building presently on the property. This would exceed the maximum 5,500 square foot building footprint by 7,100 square feet or 129 percent. There are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question that would require the petitioner to exceed the maximum lot coverage by 129 percent. Relief if granted could cause substantial detriment to the public good, by violating key tenets of the district by exceeding the design standards for the area.

The petitioner proposes to meet the parking requirements for the proposed use with remote parking as well as on-site parking. The remote parking is located 390 feet from the subject property. In summation, the petitioner is requesting four variances. Staff is recommending denial of the height variance; denial of the setback variance; and denial of the square footage variance, however, staff is recommending approval of the remote parking variance.

Speaking on the petition: Christine Sottile, Architect gave a brief background history on his company. He stated that this is a landmark project for the neighborhood and the City of Savannah. He went on to say that he has met with the city and the MPC staff during the design process and have received consistently positive feedback. This was reflected in the

original MPC staff report. MPC has recommended approval of the general development plan. MPC staff has re-directed the project to this board for review of the four requested variances to dimensional standards of the Mid-City Ordinance however, the petitioner has received no indication of any change in the staff assessment of the project. He stated his surprise by the current staff recommendation which contradicts the previous staff report as well as the advise and direction he received in extensive engagement with MPC staff. He added that he has since met with staff to provide additional information and to discuss the project further and it is his hope to provide further clarification to the rationale and intent behind the requested variances that are before the board. The overall design of the project follows the historic pattern of churches throughout the neighborhood. Dividing the program into multiple distinct buildings; a church, a parish hall and a rehabilitated residence in order to divide the scale of the overall project. The height and mass are stepped down around the perimeter to blend the scale of the civic architecture with the scale of businesses and residences. In regard to height, staff has surveyed a broad range of historic examples of similar structures throughout the neighborhood. This issue has been approached with great sensitivity both to the neighboring structures and to the historic buildings patterns that characterize Thomas Square as a whole. No building in the proposal exceeds the 45-foot height limit. Only the sloping roof over the church will exceed the height limit. This taller portion of the roof is located over sixty feet away from neighboring structures across the lane and we have studied other churches and civic buildings in the neighborhood and have found this height to be well below that of many fine historic structures within the surrounding blocks. He presented an exhibit to illustrate the variance that was being requested. He outlined information regarding the height, mass, scale and variances on the surrounding properties. He also gave comparisons of the surrounding civic structures. These structures contribute to the diverse architectural character of the neighborhood and they project an appropriate scale for civic buildings within a historic neighborhood. We believe adding a slope roof to the church does not present any detriment to the public good. In respect to footprint, staff has proposed varying the footprint standard of 5,500 square feet to allow for a 6,800 square foot footprint for the new church. And a 5,800 footprint for the parish hall. While 5,500 square feet is an appropriate standard for the majority of private buildings a detailed survey of religious and civic uses reveals that the proposed 6,800 square foot footprint is again in the range of historic precedence within the immediate neighborhood with range in footprint from 5,200 square feet to 43,000 square feet. This is a unique property in Thomas Square. At 23,085 square feet it is over 400 percent larger than the average non-residential lot in the neighborhood. Applying the 5,500 square foot maximum in this case results in a unnecessary hardship by severely limiting its development potential in preventing other requirements of the ordinance such as the requirements for buildings to occupy a minimum of seventy percent of their street frontages to be met on a lot of this unique size. It should additionally be noted that the proposed design with all structures represent only 60 percent lot coverage. Applying the ordinance to an average non-residential lot in Thomas Square that is zoned TC-1 would allow maximum lot coverage of over 80 percent. The plan proposes three distinct buildings with three distinct identities; the church, the parish hall, and the potential redevelopment of the floral shop. The church and the parish hall are connected but attached buildings are common in traditional urban setting and permitted by the mid-city ordinance. He presented exhibits to illustrate how the proposed footprint relates to the neighborhood context. He continued by reviewing the parking. He stated that the project does meet its parking requirements per the Mid-City zoning ordinance. He added that he would not be requesting a variance from the required

number of parking spaces. The Mid-City ordinance is silent on the allowable distance to a remote parking facility he has been asked to use a 150 foot standard from another section of the ordinance for the purpose of this request for a variance therefore, he is requesting to be allowed to walk a block 390 feet to the parking resource that has been made available by the Georgia Infirmary through the city's remote parking agreement.

Phillip McCorkle, Agent began with a brief history on the Mid-City zoning ordinance and how long it has been in effect. He stated that after review the ordinance there was no mention of problems with churches or civic institutions; something that would need to be addressed to protect the community from these churches. the thrust of the ordinance was that the problem in the Mid-City was the encroachment of commercial uses in the mid block in overcoming and overwhelming residential neighborhoods. In summary he stated that if there is opposition to a church in this location the property is zoned TC-1 where churches are an allowed use. He gave a virtual tour of the surrounding property. He explained that the development in the mid-city has always been dense. He added that a 10 foot setback does not make sense when there is a lane. He gave an illustration depicting the blocks without lanes and this showed that the vast majority of blocks have no lanes. Those blocks that have lanes require a 10 foot setback requirement . He stated that from River Street to Columbus Drive if you drive through the lane you will see that there is not a 10 foot setback from the lane. More than likely, he stated you have not seen a building setback 10 feet from the lane. You would have a 20 foot lane and the building would setback an additional 10 feet. This is just not accurate. In this particular lane no one is setback from the lane. He pointed out a building in the subject lane that not only did it not setback from the lane but was built five feet into the right-of-way. In closing he stated that he would respond to any concerns and that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Mackey asked Mr. McCorkle to clarify the percentage.

Mr. McCorkle responded that there is no percentage requirement not like most areas of the zoning ordinance in the remainder of the city. There is no lot coverage requirement or limitation. In most of the city in a commercial zone there is no lot coverage some other zones like in the RIP and the BC-1 have 50 to 75 percent so somewhere around 60 percent is fairly standard. In the Mid-City there is no mention of 60 percent lot coverage except with residential. In the TN-2 zone the residential zone there is a 60 percent coverage for houses on a housing lot, on the commercial zone there is no percentage. There is a 5500 ground coverage limitation which again on an average lot makes sense but on a half acre lot makes no sense whatsoever.

Mr. Reese asked Mr. Butler to confirm if the board was actually viewing two lots.

Mr. Butler stated that at the present time there are two lots that the petitioners are proposing to recombine to a single lot.

Daniel Carey, Representing Historic Savannah Foundation stated that he wanted to make an important distinction at the very beginning; which is that the Foundation is not necessarily in favor of or opposed to this petition. The Foundation is for what is best for the site and would like to improve the proposal. It is rare that a proposal will come before the Historic Board of Review and be passed the first time especially one of this size and complexity. In other words this is an iterative process. What we have here is a building that is taller and bigger than the norm and the footprint is bigger than the norm. In comparison

to some of the other buildings it is a bit of a false comparison because those buildings evolved over time. He stated that the petition should be refined a bit more and then brought back to the board. He added that this is the process that the Savannah Foundation is used to and this is what it would like to offer and to suggest. Finally, but most importantly is the Marriwiche Building. This historic building is a contributing building to the district and must be retained on the site. This is the most important contention of the Foundation. It may be acceptable to move the building a little to the east if it needs to accommodate a larger building but it must be retained on site.

Chairman Mackey stated that if the conversations are of a building removal; this is not in the board's purview. The Board is dealing with height, setbacks, building approvals and remote parking. He stated that these are the four issues that the Board has before it. He asked Mr. Butler to confirm.

Mr. Butler responded yes. The removal of the building would require a certificate of appropriateness from the Board of Review.

Mr. Carey stated that the variances that would be allowed would dictate a lot of what would happen on this site and if the variance is allowed, this will spell the future or the fate of the building.

Chairman Mackey stated that he is clear on the Board's charge. As a committee, the Board has a charge. The job of the Board is to act on this charge based on fact. He stated that if the Board is unable to act on the charge then a viable alternative will be given.

Mr. Karatassos stated that the square footage that the board has been sited with has included the house that is currently here.

Mr. Butler stated that the actual number in staff recommendation does not include the house because the disposition of that house does not determine or if you were to determine you would have to make the lot cover variance 400 square feet rather than 7100 square feet in order to accommodate the house.

Mr. Karatassos questioned if the diagram was rendered by the petitioner.

Mr. Butler replied that the diagram did come from the petitioner, but urged the board to keep in mind that this was not a submitted site plan, not a document that the petitioner can be bound to. He added that the board is not considering a site proposal. There is no site proposal before the board. Although the petitioner's architect has shown some pictures of conceptual drawings, there is no site plan; there is no building design being presented to the Historic Review Board, they are not bound to any particular design. He explained the board's charge.

Mr. Franklin Williams, resident at 122 E. 36th Street stated that his family has lived at this address since 1943. He stated that he has seen both good and bad times in Thomas Square. He has been working actively to create a better Thomas Square for this age and for the future. He stated that he supports staff in this matter.

Mr. Robert Hodges, resident at 115 E. 36th Street stated that he was opposed to granting

this variance without having a plan associated with it.

Bruce Arnsdoff, 111 E. 36th Street resident stated that his contention is that this is a very large building that will create tons of traffic in the lane. He stated that he was opposed to the petitioner's request.

Nancy Arnsdoff, 111 E. 36th Street resident stated that her house was built in 1902 and many things have changed since that time. She voiced her concerns regarding the parking or the lack thereof and stated that she was opposed to the request and asked that it be denied.

Virginia Mobley, President to the Thomas Square Neighborhood Association opened with a brief video clip by Christian Sottile of the zoning standards explaining the development of the Victorian District zoning. She continued with a history of the subject neighborhood. She added that she has been very active in the past twenty years in the development of the Mid-City Plan; we would respect the size and the scale of the buildings that were present. The visible relationship to the surrounding structures is mentioned in the ordinance nine times. She stated that there are several buildings now that have additions that would not be allowed in today's zoning. She was opposed to the petitioner's request.

Chairman Mackey questioned Ms. Mobley on how the development to the neighborhood speaks to churches.

She explained that the TC-1 and the TC-2 allow for churches, but of a scale that would fit in with what is presently in the areas. The large monumental buildings are in a civic (CIV) classification, which is different than a TC-1 or TC-2. The TC-1 or TC-2 was designed to accommodate the fact that this was a unique neighborhood where you have a mix, but the residents wanted to keep it and keeping it in scale of what was intended.

Todd Brummett, 113 East 36th Street stated that his house would be abutting the subject property. He explained that there was more going on with the property than the proposed variances. One of the problems was the parking; the second problem was that the petitioner's have asked for a variance for the length of space between the remote parking facility and the church and they have had people walking down the alley/lane which is illegal according to zoning 4-1010 to walk down an alley. He stated that he then recalculated the variance that they are looking for and he calculated 660 linear feet to the side entrance and to the main entrance it was a little over 700 linear feet. He stated that he did not think that they can use the variance going down the alley or lane to get into their entrance that is behind the dumpster. It is illegal to walk down an alley/lane. He added that there are a lot of issues with their off-street parking in the lane and he has zoning requirements that states it is essentially an encroachment in the lane and all the cars that park there will be towed according to zoning. He added that according to the zoning there should also be a curb that separates that off-street parking between the lane and the parking spaces. If the lane is considered a street then there should be a 36- inch wall. In conclusion he stated that their whole parking issue needs to be reviewed and re-calculated.

Jason Cobb, 122 E. 37th Street resident stated that the proposed structure is massive and overtakes the lot and takes away from the pattern in the neighborhood. He stated that he is opposed to the request.

Peter Shank, operator of the Georgia Infirmary and management of Williams Court Apartments stated that he is excited to support the proposed project and to allow them the extra parking spaces.

Nicki (last name inaudible) stated that she believes that the addition of a new church in this area would benefit the community in many ways without drastically impacting the week day routine of residents. She is in favor of the petition.

Lauren Montgomery, gave her perspective, as a resident of the Thomas Square District; as an urban designer; and as a member of this congregation. In summary she was in favor of the petition.

Mr. Sottile stated that he only wanted to speak to some facts regarding the proposal. He stated that he was concerned about the misinformation that a plan has not been submitted. He stated that this was not factual in this case. He stated that a plan has been submitted, the design of the structure including elevations with very specific height and mass information has also been submitted. The project site plan has been reviewed twice by the city of savannah site plan review staff and a full general development plan submittal has been made to the MPC and they have met with the Historic Preservation Officer on several occasions.

Mr. Brummett stated that all of the surrounding structures are residential structures. The neighbors have been working hard to make this a neighborhood where families, retirees, etc can come in. Between Abercorn Street and Drayton Street this would be the largest development between the JEA and Duffy Street. He stated that this project is a massive departure from what the residents of this neighborhood are trying to do.

Ms. Mobley, stated that in the Mid-City zoning there is no percentage of lot coverage for buildings in the TC-1 district. There is a square footage limitation on the size of a building. She concluded that if the board allows or neglects or ignores the ordinance that limits the size of the building for this location, it will open the door for any size building to come into the area. She asked that the board support and maintain the guidelines that hours and years and lifetimes were put into creating a neighborhood that was diverse.

Mr. McCorkle stated that the standards may be different but the petitioner has met the standards.

Board Action:

Approval of the requested 10-foot height variance. - PASS
-

Vote Results

Motion: William Ronning

Second: Eli Karatassos

Sidney J Johnson - Aye

Eli Karatassos - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Brian Reese - Not Present

William Ronning - Aye

Board Action:

Denial of the requested 10 ft setback variance. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Eli Karatassos

Second: Sidney J Johnson

Sidney J Johnson - Aye

Eli Karatassos - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Brian Reese - Aye

William Ronning - Nay

Board Action:

Approval for the requested 8400 square foot ground floor building footprint variance with the condition that the existing two-story wood frame historic structure be preserved on site, and if damaged, that it be repaired. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Eli Karatassos

Second: Sidney J Johnson

Sidney J Johnson - Aye

Eli Karatassos - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Brian Reese - Not Present

William Ronning - Aye

Board Action:

Approval of the requested 240 ft remote parking separation variance to allow parking at the Georgia - PASS Infirmary parking lot.

Vote Results

Motion: William Ronning

Second: Sidney J Johnson

Sidney J Johnson - Aye

Eli Karatassos - Aye

Timothy Mackey - Aye

Brian Reese - Not Present

William Ronning - Aye

VIII. Other Business

7. [Archaeological Field Trip](#)

Attachment: [Archaeology Site visit invite 040813.pdf](#)

Mr. Butler stated that The MPC Site and Monument staff has organized field visits to a multi-era historic dig on Hwy. 204 (Abercorn Extension) and invites board members to participate.

IX. Adjournment

8. [Adjournment of the April 25, 2013 SZBA Meeting](#)

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.