



City of Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
May 23, 2024 - 10:00 A.M.
Minutes

MAY 23, 2024 CITY OF SAVANNAH ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Members Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair
Brad Baugh
Betty Jones
Armand Turner

MPC Staff Present: Edward Morrow, Current Development Services Director/Current Planning
Brad Clements, Current Development Senior Planner
Sally Helm, Administrative Assistant II, Development Services/Current Planning
Nykobe Richardson, Development Services Tech Intern

Hind Patel, IT Helpdesk & Support

Virtual Attendance: Pamela Everett, Esq., Assistant Executive Director, Compliance & Operations

City of Savannah: John Anagnost, Zoning Plans Examiner

I. Call to Order and Welcome

II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

III. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

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

[1. 1125 East Gwinnett St. | Variances for Lot coverage, building setback, side yard setback | 24-001569-ZBA](#)

Motion

Item removed from final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr.

- Abstain

Benjamin Griffith

- Not Present

Michael Condon

- Not Present

Brad Baugh

- Aye

Stephen Plunk

- Not Present

Betty Jones

- Aye

Armand Turner

- Aye

[2. 615 East 45th Street | Variance to rear and side yard setbacks and addition of story residence to nonconforming structure | 24-002434-ZBA](#)

Motion

Item removed from final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Benjamin Griffith - Not Present

Michael Condon - Not Present

Brad Baugh - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Not Present

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner - Aye

V. Item(s) Requested to be Withdrawn

[3. 12405 White Bluff Rd | Variance to the rear yard setback within a B-N zoning district | 24-002458-ZBA](#)

Motion

Item withdrawn.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Benjamin Griffith - Not Present

Michael Condon - Not Present

Brad Baugh - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Not Present

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner - Aye

VI. Approval of Minutes

[4. Approval of the April 25, 2024 SZBA Meeting minutes](#)

🔗 [april-25-2024- city of savannah board of appeals minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

Approval of meeting minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Betty Jones	
Second: Armand Turner	
Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Benjamin Griffith	- Not Present
Michael Condon	- Not Present
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Not Present
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye

VII. Approval of Final Agenda

VIII. Consent Agenda

IX. Old Business

5. 537 East Anderson Ln | Variance for reduction of rear setback | 24-001932-ZBA

🔗 [537 E ANDERSON LN_24-001932-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [MacGregor Opposition_2.pdf](#)

🔗 [AERIAL-SITE MAP 24-001932-ZBA.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

🔗 [SITE PLAN 24-00224-BR.pdf](#)

Mr. Brad Clement, Senior Planner, Development Services, presented the Staff Report. Mr. Clement stated the Petitioner, L. Robert Isaacson, is requesting a 10-foot rear yard setback variance from the 20 - foot rear yard setback requirement of the Savannah Zoning Ordinance for the existing property located at 537 East Anderson Lane described by PIN 20053 21008. The present request in slightly different form than was approved by the ZBA on February 25, 2021. However, the subject parcel remained undeveloped, and the previously granted variance expired after no building permit was sought within 12 months (Sec. 3.21.11). A new request was then sought on July 25, 2023. The requested variance was again granted and remains in effect. This new request is for 9-lots comprising a single parcel.

The subject property is located on the south side of East Anderson Lane between Price Street and East Broad Street in the Midtown Neighborhood. The property is within the TN-2, Traditional Neighborhood Zoning District, and the Streetcar Historic District. The subject property was proposed and approved for a recombination of nine lots into three lots in October of 2020 (File No. 20-005036-SUBP), however, the Final Plat was never signed or recorded, so the existing parcel is still legally comprised of the original nine lots. The creation of new buildable lots on a public lane are typically not permitted. However, if the subject site is located within a historic district within the City of Savannah, and there are existing habitable structures dependent on the public lane for access, new lots may be created along the lane right-of-way.

MPC Staff recommends approval of the request with the following conditions:

1. Construction shall consist of a single duplex in conformance with the plans of the granted COA 23001800-COA.
2. The plat shall contain a note referencing this ZBA decision and indicating that no further subdivisions or development is to occur until East Anderson Lane is improved.

Mr. Merriman, Chairman, asked if the condition about the plat will be followed through with the City.

Mr. John Anagnost, City of Savannah Zoning Dept., said if it is a condition of this approval, yes.

Mr. Bob Isaacson, the Petitioner, stated this is the third time coming before you regarding this variance request. We are unable to build here unless we have the setback variance. We are not asking for anything other than our property that is on the lane. We have owned this property since 2021. This is an unbuildable lot without variance. Previously we requested to put three duplexes here, but we were told in order to do that, we were required to make lane improvements. That was over \$300,000. We could not do that. We own all the utilities to this property, the sewer is in place, the easement for the water has been obtained and we have paid for the Architectural and Engineering drawings. We have been approved by HPC already. We want to put up a single duplex to be able to get some sort of value out of the property.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Brian McGregor said he has lived on this block for over 20 years. He expressed concerns regarding flooding and the curvature of the lane. He expressed concern for Fire and safety being able to reach the properties and lack of access to fire hydrant.

Mr. Isaacson said maintenance of the lane is not his responsibility. He stated he has spoken with Traffic Engineering, most of the lane is curved, it is on my property. Instead of fencing it off, we have tried to work with the city, allowing others to have access. The drainage does need to be addressed. The Building Department probably will not issue a permit unless the area is safe. They will check the fire hydrants and accessibility.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None

Motion

Approval of the request with the following conditions:

1. Construction shall consist of a single duplex in conformance with the plans of the granted COA 23-001800-COA.
2. A plat shall contain a note referencing this ZBA decision and indicating that no further subdivision or development is to occur until East Anderson Lane is improved.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Benjamin Griffith	- Not Present
Michael Condon	- Not Present
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Not Present
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye

X. Regular Agenda

[6. 546 East Taylor Street | Variance to increase the allowable 40% of principal dwelling footprint to 50%| 24-002368-ZBA](#)

📎 [546 E TAYLOR ST_24-002368-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

📎 [AERIAL-SITE MAP 24-002368-ZBA.pdf](#)

🔗 [Site Plan.pdf](#)

🔗 [Tax Assessor Drawing.jpg](#)

🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff Report. Mr. Morrow stated that the Petitioner requests a variance to increase the allowable footprint for an ADU from 40% of the principal dwelling footprint to between 50% and 54% at 546 East Taylor Street. The subject property measures +/- 1,800 square feet (0.041 ac) in area per the Chatham County Tax Assessor. The property is zoned D-R (Downtown Residential). It is likely a nonconforming parcel in the D-R zoning district by frontage (approximately 18') but conforming with regard to lot area for a single-family attached dwelling. The property is within the Savannah Downtown Historic District. The lot is presently developed as an attached townhome with a rear accessory structure. The footprint is indicated as approximately 741 sf (18' x 40'). The footprint of the existing accessory structure is 288 square feet (38.8%). The proposed site plan indicates a requested vertical expansion of the existing accessory structure to establish an ADU. This will result in an ADU footprint of 400 square feet and approximately 50-54% in relation to the footprint of the principal dwelling.

MPC Staff recommends denial of the requested variance to permit an ADU that is approximately 50-54% of the area of the principal dwelling.

Mr. Adam Drummond, Petitioner, stated there have been several discussions regarding the property discrepancies. The actual measurements of the existing structure are slightly different than the property card represents. We are requesting an additional 80 square feet. This is an existing garage. We are going vertically. If we did not get the variance, it would cause us to set the ADU back 4 feet and that would not be consistent with the vernacular architecture of Savannah. Most carriage houses go straight up as do both the options shown for this petition. The neighbor to the west of the property has an ADU that is larger than allowed.

Mr. Merriman asked about the Tax Assessor measurements.

Mr. Morrow stated the best way to determine for sure is to ask for a survey.

Mr. Drummond stated the measurement needs to be to the exterior of the walls, in a shared wall. The Tax Assessor may be showing the interior dimensions of the spaces, and the actual calculations have to be taken from either the exterior wall or the center of the wall.

Mr. Jones asked if the petitioner needs to go back to the Tax Assessor's office.

Mr. Morrow stated this petition was recently seen by the HDBR Board, the MPC Staff recommended approval that was a forwarded recommendation to this Board.

Mr. Drummond stated we have had approval twice from the HDBR Board. We are ready to pull permits.

Mr. Baugh asked if the petitioner was going to demolish what is there and build a 2-story version in the exact same footprint and the exact same roof area.

Mr. Drummond stated we are keeping the existing walls and will build on top. We are not changing the footprint. This is a non-contributing building; we will lose the roof only. We have a smaller lot than usual, there is a smaller main building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Baugh stated it appears they are not enlarging the roof area, they are smaller than the surrounding properties, this is not a big request.

Ms. Jones pointed out that the HDBR has already approved the design and requested this Board approve the variance.

Motion

Approval of the requested variance to permit an ADU that is ~50-54% of the area of the principal dwelling.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Brad Baugh

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Benjamin Griffith	- Not Present
Michael Condon	- Not Present
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Not Present
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye

7. 1130 East 49th Street | Variance for ADU | 24-002078-ZBA

🔗 [24-0327_MPC Packet - 1130 E 49th Street.pdf](#)

🔗 [AERIAL-SITE MAP 24-002078-ZBA.pdf](#)

🔗 [SIGNED Staff Decision - 24-001435-COA.pdf](#)

🔗 [24-0405_ZBA Application + Checklist - 1130 E 49th Street.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, gave the Staff Report. Mr. Morrow stated the Petitioner requests approval of the following variances: 1. Reductions of the rear yard setback requirement to 0 feet from 3 feet; 2. Reduction of the (interior) side yard setback requirement to 0 feet from 5 feet; and 3. Relief from the minimum lot area requirement of 125% (or 7,500 square feet) in the RSF-6 zoning district to establish an ADU.

The subject property measures approximately 6,300 square feet in area (60' x 105') per SAGIS. The property is zoned RSF-6 (Residential Single Family-6) and is a conforming parcel in the RSF-6 zoning district by area and frontage. The parcel is deficient with regard to minimum lot area to establish an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) by right and requires relief from the ZBA. The property is located within the Parkside Conservation District. Construction of the proposed ADU requires the demolition of what the Historic Preservation Officer has determined to be a noncontributing building on the parcel (24-001435-COA). The lot is presently developed as a detached single-family residence with an existing nonconforming accessory structure that encroaches into required side and rear setbacks. The footprint of the principal is indicated as 1,322 square feet and the square footage of the proposed ADU is 304.75 square feet (26.5' x 11.5'). The Petitioner requests setback relief to construct a new ADU in the location of the existing nonconforming structure proposed for demolition. The Petitioner has provided two potential scenarios: one with a 0 foot rear setback from East 48th Lane and the other with a 1'-6 foot rear setback from the lane. In either scenario, the proposed ADU meets the 10' separation requirement between the principal dwelling and a detached ADU but requires 5 foot side setback relief.

MPC Staff recommends approval of the following variance request with the condition that gutters be installed on the proposed ADU to ensure stormwater runoff is not discharged onto adjoining properties:

3. Relief from 125% minimum lot area required to establish an ADU.

MPC Staff recommends denial of the following variances:

1. reduction of the rear yard setback requirement to 0 feet from 3 feet; and
2. reduction of the side yard setback requirement to 0 feet from 5 feet.

Alternatively, MPC Staff recommends the following setback relief:

1. 12-inch relief for setback of rear eaves to permit 24 inches where 36 inches are ordinarily required (1foot reduction);
2. Reduce the side yard setback to 3 feet where 5 feet are ordinarily required (2-foot reduction);
3. 12-inch relief for setback of side eaves to permit 24 inches where 36 inches are ordinarily required (1foot reduction).

Mr. Chris Reynolds, the Petitioner, stated he has parents in their 80s that he is trying to provide them space to stay. The area for the setback for parking, on 49th street, there is no off-street parking, this is to have an area for my parents to get out safely and park.

Mr. Turner asked if the alternatives put forth by MPC Staff allow you to build and thrive in the way you want.

Mr. Reynolds stated yes, the alternatives are just moving the ADU more into the yard. This request is just to have a place to park a car and have space for my aging parents.

Mr. Merriman asked Staff if the reason for denial was simply to bring to compliance to new zoning rules.

Mr. Morrow said yes.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None

Motion

Approval of the following variance request with the condition that gutters be installed on the proposed ADU to ensure stormwater runoff is not discharged onto adjoining properties: Relief from 125% minimum lot area required to establish an ADU.

MPC Staff recommends denial of the following variances:

reduction of the rear yard setback requirement to 0 feet from 3 feet; and reduction of the side yard setback requirement to 0 feet from 5 feet.

Alternatively, MPC Staff recommends the following setback relief:

12inches; relief for setback of rear eaves to permit 24inches; where 36inches; are ordinarily required (1 foot reduction);

reduce the side yard setback to 3 feet where 5 feet are ordinarily required (2 feet reduction);

12inches; relief for setback of side eaves to permit 24inches; where 36inches; are ordinarily required (1foot reduction)

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr.

- Abstain

Benjamin Griffith

- Not Present

Michael Condon	- Not Present
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Not Present
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye

8. 1121 East 48th Street | Variances for rear and side yard setbacks and reduction of minimum lot area required for ADU | 24-002446-ZBA

🔗 [1121 E 48 ST_24-002446-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [AERIAL-SITE MAP 24-002446-ZBA.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

🔗 [Williams_ADU Variance support_49th St neighbors.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff Report. Mr. Morrow stated this is a request to establish a dwelling unit at 1121 East 48th Street. The Petitioner is requesting variances for the following:

1. To reduce the rear yard setback in the RSF-6 zoning district from 3feet to 2 feet;18-inch setback for rear eaves where 36 inches is (3 feet) ordinarily required;To reduce the side yard setback in a RSF-6 zoning district from 5 feet to 1 foot;6-inch setback for side eaves where 36 inches (3 feet) ordinarily required;
5. Relief from 125% minimum lot area required to establish an ADU.

The subject property measures approximately 6,300 square feet in area, per the Chatham County Tax Assessor. The property is zoned RSF-6 (Residential Single Family-6) and is a conforming parcel in the RSF-6 zoning district by area and frontage. The parcel is deficient with regard to the minimum lot area to establish an ADU by right in this zoning district (125% or 7,500 sf). The lot is presently developed as a detached single-family residence and is located within the Parkside Conservation District. The parcel contains a garden shed deemed noncontributing by the Historic Preservation Officer, which will be demolished to construct the proposed ADU. The principal dwelling footprint is 1,704 square feet and the square footage of the proposed ADU is 384 feet (16' x 24'). The proposed ADU is within the 40% maximum allowable footprint in relation to the principal dwelling. The proposed ADU will encroach into the rear and side yard setbacks, however this is consistent with the historic development pattern in the area.

MPC Staff recommends approval of the following variance request with the condition that gutters be installed on the proposed ADU to ensure stormwater runoff is not discharged onto adjoining properties:

Relief from 125% minimum lot area required to establish an ADU.

MPC Staff recommends denial of the Petitioner's original variance requests:

1. To reduce the rear yard setback in the RSF-6 zoning district from 3 feet to 2 feet;
2. 18-inch setback for rear eaves where 36 inches (3 feet) is ordinarily required;
3. To reduce the side yard setback in a RSF-6 zoning district from 5 feet to 1 foot;
4. 6 inch setback for side eaves where 36 inches (3 feet) is ordinarily required;

Alternatively, MPC Staff recommends the following setback relief:

2. 12-inch relief for setback of rear eaves to permit 24 inches where 36 inches are ordinarily required (1 foot reduction);
3. Reduce the side yard setback to 3 feet where 5 feet are ordinarily required (2-foot reduction);
4. 12-inch relief for setback of side eaves to permit 24 inches where 36inches are ordinarily required

(1 foot reduction).

Mr. Merriman, Chairman, asked if there were any other ADUs on the block that are doing what the Petitioner is proposing to do.

Mr. Morrow said this is consistent with other accessory structures in the area that are adjoining in the rear. Staff is trying to create space for proper lane maintenance and maintenance of the proposed ADU. To have things that are encroaching into these spaces is consistent with the historic development pattern. There have been letters of support sent in for this petition.

Mr. Robin Williams, Petitioner, stated he and his wife are wanted to construct an ADU for his aging parents. We do have letters of support from the adjacent neighbors and property owners behind us. When speaking to members of the staff they explained that the rear yard setback was mostly going to be a concern for people across the lane. That tends to be the expectation. Those people have signed letters of support. Our fence is on the 0-lot line. One of the reasons for coming a little closer to the lane would be to provide an easier turning radius given where our fence is. There are carriage houses on the street that are on the 0-lot line. There has never been an issue with any utility trucks coming through this area. Where the garage is, it would be 18 feet from the opposite fence. This is the consistent pattern in Parkside on the lane.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Baugh said one foot doesn't seem to make much difference, especially when the rest of the lane works that way.

Mr. Turner agreed with Mr. Baugh.

Mr. John Anagnost, City of Savannah Zoning Dept., said this is in the Parkside Conservation District and there is a requirement in the Zoning Ordinance that if there is a variance requested for the minimum lot area for an ADU, it requires a recommendation from the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Morrow said that is correct. There is a lack of clarity in the ordinance in the Conservation Districts that ADUs get an approval, short of a COA in order to establish an ADU on a parcel that is less than 125%. This is a requirement that is there but there are no triggers. This is not a request for a COA. There is no design review that is associated with it. Staff would like to request to the City, when these items come through, there is a form letter that is sent to the Director of Historic Preservation at the MPC, to ensure that it is properly and timely placed on an Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) agenda so there is no question as to what is happening. There are no particular criteria for the HPC to review this.

Mr. Merriman said it makes sense the petitioner would not go before the HPC, spend a lot of money on the design details before he knows if he can even build it. There is nothing prohibiting us from granting the variance.

Motion

Approval of the requested variances.

- 1.To reduce the rear yard setback in the RSF-6 zoning district from 3 feet to 2 feet,
- 2.18 feet setback for rear eaves where 36 inches (3 feet) ordinarily required,
- 3.To reduce the side yard setback in an RSF-6 zoning district from 5 feet to 1 foot,
- 4.6-inch setback from side eaves where 36 inches (3 feet) ordinarily required.
- 5.Relief from 125 percent minimum lot area required to establish an ADU.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Brad Baugh

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Benjamin Griffith - Not Present

Michael Condon - Not Present

Brad Baugh - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Not Present

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner - Aye

9. 103 Brandywine Rd | Variance to maximum square footage allowed for ADU | 24-002482-ZBA

🔗 [24.04.26_103 Brandywine rd_ZBA Application \(1\).pdf](#)

🔗 [AERIAL-SITE MAP 24-002482-ZBA.pdf](#)

🔗 [24.04.26_103 BRANDYWINE RD_ZBA DRAWINGS.pdf](#)

🔗 [BUILDING AND TRADES PERMIT_24-4-2019_11-51-19-514-AM_0.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/ Current Planning, presented the Staff Report. Mr. Morrow stated the Petitioner requests the following variances at 103 Brandywine Road:

1. Relief from the maximum footprint of 40% of principal dwelling and 700 square feet for an ADU (47%/900 square feet);
2. To permit an ADU of architectural style that differs from the primary dwelling.

The subject property measures approximately 9,017 square feet in area (90' x 100'), per the Chatham County Tax Assessor. The property is zoned RSF-6 (Residential Single Family-6). It is a conforming parcel in the RSF-6 zoning district by area and frontage. The lot is presently developed as a single-family home with a footprint of 1,911 square feet. The parcel also contains a 900 square foot (30' x 30') prefabricated metal building (Quonset hut) that was previously permitted in April 2019 as an accessory structure (permit # 19-03400BR). Per the Chatham County Tax Assessor, the current owner acquired the property in 2022. The request indicates an intent to convert the accessory structure for use as an ADU. The 900 square foot structure is 47% of the floor area of the principal structure, which is 7% larger than permitted, and 200 square feet in excess of the upward limit of 700 square feet in area. The structure meets current side and rear setbacks and is within total lot coverage allowance for the zoning district. Sec. 8.7.4.e of NewZO requires that an ADU be designed in a similar architectural style as the principal building. Being a prefab building, the structure was not designed as an accessory to the principal dwelling, which is a brick-faced ranch-style home built in 1952, per Tax Assessor records. While specific permitting criteria are not within the scope of the present review, the structure was neither permitted nor designed as a dwelling, and in its present state is likely not suited for habitation without significant modification, including, but not limited to, the installation of plumbing and windows.

MPC Staff recommends denial of the requested variances for maximum ADU footprint and varied architectural style from the principal dwelling.

Mr. Merriman asked for clarification, the structure is there to stay, the question is whether or not to exist as a shed or ADU.

Mr. Morrow said yes. There are some design-related concerns that are beyond the scope of this present review. This is merely a request to convert this for ADU purposes. The final design could look different. There will have to be modifications for this to be habitable. There is no plumbing, windows, etc. Any issuance of building permits is a separate matter.

Ms. Shelby Scallion, the Designer representing the Owner, stated we are here today to request the variances requested. This structure was inherited by the owner when they purchased the property. The square footage of the structure is out of our control since the structure already exists. The footprint of the dwelling is 900 square feet. The front wall is recessed 2 feet so the actual footprint of the interior of the dwelling would be closer to 800 square feet. We understand the dwelling was not designed in a similar architecture design; however, this is an existing structure and the only way to meet this requirement would be to demolish the Quanza Hut and rebuild. The structure was not initially permitted as a dwelling, but this should not preclude the possibility of it being adapted for habitation. Many other buildings have been repurposed from their original functions to serve as homes, often bringing new life to structures that might otherwise remain unutilized. The structure is currently insulated, has power, and HVAC. While plumbing and doors are not currently installed, we would consider the standard procedure in residential conversions and could be completed easily by licensed professionals. The only modification to the exterior of the Quanza Hut would be the interior wall where we will put doors and windows. Financial gain is not the primary motivation, this is an underutilized structure. While the current state of the structure may not be suited for habitation, with careful planning, appropriate modifications, and adherence to regulatory requirements, it can successfully be converted to a safe and habitable dwelling.

Mr. Baugh stated under 5 feet of the unit wouldn't be usable. Is there any type of measurement as to what the actual usable footprint is after subtracting out the edges?

Ms. Scallion said we have developed a concept; the ribs are approximately 1 foot deep that is unusable. We brought the space in to have the height of 8-foot walls on the inside which causes an additional loss of 3 feet on each side. We have close to 700 feet of usable square footage. The other alternative, the front wall could potentially be pushed back some. The bigger issue appears to be the architecture style and there is nothing we can do about that.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Baugh stated in the Downtown Historic District, if you have a fence and what you have developed in the back yard doesn't match the architectural style that would be required in the front, it is allowed in the back, you can do something a little more varied. Most of it is blocked by the fence not visible from the public right of way.

Mr. Turner said the structure already exists whether anything is changed or not, it exists.

Ms. Jones agreed with both comments.

Motion

Approval of the requested variances for maximum ADU footprint and varied architectural style from the principal dwelling.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Brad Baugh

Stephen Merriman, Jr.

- Abstain

Benjamin Griffith

- Not Present

Michael Condon

- Not Present

Brad Baugh

- Aye

Stephen Plunk

- Not Present

Betty Jones

- Aye

Armand Turner

- Aye

XI. Other Business

XII. Adjournment

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