



City of Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals

February 27, 2025 at 10:00am
Minutes

February 27, 2025, City of Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals

Members Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair
Michael Condon, Vice-Chair
Stephen Plunk (online)
Armand Turner
Betty Jones
Brad Baugh

Members Absent Benjamin "Trapper" Griffith

MPC Staff Present: Edward Morrow, Current Development Services Director
Sadie Esch-Laurent, Assistant Planner
Sally Helm, Administrative Assistant II, Development Services
Hind Patel, IT Helpdesk & Support

I. Call to Order and Welcome

II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

III. Swearing in of Witnesses

IV. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

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

VI. Item(s) Requested to be Withdrawn

1. 1212 Seiler Avenue | side setback for accessory structure | 25-000586-ZBA

Motion

Item withdrawn from the final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Betty Jones

Second: Michael Condon

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Michael Condon - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Not Present

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner - Aye

Brad Baugh - Aye

Benjamin Griffith

- Not Present

VII. Approval of Minutes

2. Approval of the November 21, 2024 SZBA Minutes

🔗 [11-21-2024-city-of-savannah-zoning-board-of-appeals-minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

Approval of the November 21, 2024 meeting minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Betty Jones

Second: Michael Condon

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Michael Condon - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Not Present

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner - Aye

Brad Baugh - Aye

Benjamin Griffith - Not Present

3. Approval of the December 19, 2024 SZBA Meeting Minutes.

🔗 [12-19-2024-city-of-savannah-zoning-board-of-appeals-minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

Approval of the December 19, 2024 SZBA meeting minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Betty Jones

Second: Armand Turner

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Michael Condon - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Not Present

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner - Aye

Brad Baugh - Aye

Benjamin Griffith - Not Present

VIII. Approval of Final Agenda

IX. Consent Agenda

X. Old Business

XI. Regular Agenda

[4. 12 Bee Rd. | Variance for relief from nonconformity for side and rear yard setback of nonconforming accessory structure | 25-000516-ZBA](#)

🔗 [FINAL 2025 CITY ZBA APPLICATION AND CHECKLIST 12 BEE RD.pdf](#)

🔗 [12 BEE RD SITE.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report_SE 12 Bee Rd.pdf](#)

Ms. Sadie Esch-Laurent, Assistant Planner, presented the Staff report. **Ms. Esch-Laurent** stated the Petitioner is requesting two variances in association with converting an accessory structure into an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in an RSF-6 zoning district: To reduce the side yard setback of an accessory structure from 5 feet to 3 feet and to reduce the rear yard setback of an accessory structure from 5 feet to 3 feet. The property is located at 12 Bee Rd, with a PIN of 20077 10004, in the Victory Manor/East Hill/Donwood neighborhood. According to the Chatham County Tax Assessor, the subject property is approximately 8,220 square feet. The property is zoned RSF-6 (Residential Single-Family-6) and is a conforming parcel in this zoning district with 60 feet of frontage and 137 feet of depth. The principal structure is a single-family detached home built in 1943. According to the Tax Assessor, it is 1,736 square feet in area and conforms to all setbacks. Per the Petitioner, there is a detached accessory structure that currently exists on the property measuring 592.5 square feet. The Petitioner acquired the home with the structure having been converted for use as an ADU. However, it was later determined that the ADU conversion had not been properly permitted. The structure, which predates NewZO, encroaches into the side yard and rear yard setback. Additionally, with the conversion, they need relief from nonconformity since the use is being changed. In accordance with Section 8.7.4.a.iii of the Zoning Ordinance ADUs require rear yard setbacks of 5 feet and the same side yard setbacks as the principal structure, which is also 5 feet within this zoning district. The Petitioner is requesting 2 feet of relief for both the rear yard and side yard setbacks. The lot has enough square footage to meet the minimum lot size to establish an ADU. Additionally, the building footprint of the ADU is less than 40% of the principal structure. However, the principal structure may not be separated by 10 feet from the ADU.

MPC Staff recommends approval of the following two variances in association with converting an accessory structure into an ADU in the RSF-6 zoning district as follows with one condition: To reduce the side yard setback of an accessory structure from 5 feet to 3 feet and to reduce the rear yard setback of an accessory structure from 5 feet to 3 feet. The condition being: The Petitioner shall install gutters to divert run-off from adjoining properties.

Ms. Jennifer Saja, Petitioner, said she purchased the home about 2 1/2 years ago. After purchasing they found out the house was not Code compliant. They are just trying to make sure everything is compliant.

Mr. Stephen Merriman, Chairman, asked if the Petitioner was okay with the Staff recommendation.

Ms. Saja said yes.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

Motion

Approval of the following two variances in association with converting an accessory structure into an ADU in the RSF-6 zoning district with one condition:

1. To reduce the side yard setback of an accessory structure from 5 feet to 3 feet;
2. To reduce the rear yard setback of an accessory structure from 5 feet to 3 feet.

Condition: The Petitioner shall install gutters to divert run-off from adjoining properties.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Brad Baugh

Second: Betty Jones

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

5. 202 Fair Street | Variances to side and rear yard setbacks | 24-006580-ZBA

🔗 [202 FAIR ST_24-006580-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [202 FAIR ST_24-006580-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report 202 Fair St.pdf](#)

🔗 [P. Anderson, public comment, Woodville Zoning Appeal 2.27.25.pdf](#)

Ms. Sadie Esch-Laurent, Assistant Planner, presented the Staff report. **Ms. Esch-Laurent** stated the Petitioner requested the two variances in association with the expansion of a kitchen within a place of worship in the RSF-6 zoning district: To reduce the side yard setback from 20 feet to 13.5 feet. and to reduce the rear yard setback from 30 feet to 20 feet. The property is located at 202 Fair St., with a PIN of 20627 03012, in the Woodville neighborhood. According to the Chatham County Tax Assessor, the subject property is approximately 13,150 square feet. The property is zoned RSF-6. It is a conforming parcel in this zoning district with 100 feet of frontage and 131.5 feet of depth. The principal structure is a place of worship built in 1980. The structure is nonconforming with regard to side and rear setbacks. The Petitioner proposes to expand the existing kitchen through construction of a side addition to the building. The addition will encroach into the side and rear setbacks as required by the district for nonresidential uses. Although the expansion encroaches into the rear setback, it will align with the existing structure and not increase the nonconformity. The structure has an existing building footprint of 4,035 square feet per the Tax Assessor. The proposed addition will increase the building footprint by 600 square feet and be part of the principal structure. The expansion will not cause the use to exceed permissible lot coverage of 40%. Section 5.1.2 of the Zoning Ordinance requires side setbacks of 20 feet and a rear setback of 30 feet. The Petitioner's proposal will encroach into the side setback by 6.5 feet and the rear setback by 10 feet.

The MPC Staff recommends approval of the requested two variances to reduce the side yard setback from 20 feet to 13.5 feet and to reduce the rear yard setback from 30 feet to 20 feet.

Mr. Dontre Wallace, Petitioner, said this project, as it stands, the area they are looking to add to is for an overflow of worshipers. If there is an event, the fellowship hall is too small. They need a larger space.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Pamela Anderson, President of Woodville Neighborhood, said they support the petition.

Motion

Approval of the requested two variances in association with the proposed kitchen addition:

1. To reduce the side yard setback from 20 feet to 13.5 feet;
2. To reduce the rear yard setback from 30 feet to 20 feet.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Betty Jones

Second: Armand Turner

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

6. 2206 East 38th Street | Variance to building size for ADU | 24-006742-ZBA

🔗 [2206 E 38 ST_24-006742-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report 2206 E 38th St.pdf](#)

🔗 [B. Paxton Slides 2206 E 38th Variance Request.pdf](#)

Ms. Sadie Esch-Laurent, Assistant Planner, presented the Staff report. **Ms. Esch-Laurent** stated the Petitioner is requested a variance to the maximum Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) size permitted in relation to the principal dwelling for a parcel within the RSF-6 zoning district. The proposed ADU's building footprint is 55% of the principal dwelling where a maximum of 40% is permitted. The property is located at 2206 East 38th St., with a PIN of 20079 13008, in the Victory Heights neighborhood. The subject property measures approximately 10,350 square feet in area per the Tax Assessor's records. The property is zoned RSF-6 (Residential Single-family-6). It is a conforming parcel in this zoning district with 90 feet of frontage and 115 feet of depth. The parcel has lane access. The principal dwelling on the lot was built in 1949 and is conforming. It contains between 1,057 and 1,200 square feet of living area based on documentation provided by the Tax Assessor and Petitioner. Section 8.7.4.d.i of the Zoning Ordinance states that the building footprint of the accessory dwelling unit shall be a maximum of 40% of the building footprint of the principal dwelling not to exceed 700 square feet. The Petitioner is requesting to exceed the 40% maximum to establish an ADU that is 576 square feet where a maximum of 422-480 square feet would be permitted. The proposed ADU meets all other requirements, including setbacks. The MPC Staff recommends denial of the requested variance to the ADU building size maximum of 40% in relation to the principal structure.

Ms. Briana Paxton, representing the property owner, Donald Calahan, said the Victory Heights Neighborhood is on the east side of Savannah. This is a large lot and a very small house; it is only 1,000 square feet. They are asking for a 55% building size ratio. The photos show that the house is set back further than the other homes on the block. Historically, this has been a very small house on a large lot. There is a spattering of existing lane dwellings around here. A lot of other homes in the area have been expanded and are larger than their principal structure. The total building footprint is 1208 square feet. The heated square footage for the proposed ADU will be 576 square feet with the total footprint being 672 square feet. This will be a one-bedroom structure with a nice living room and a six-foot porch off the front and will be under the 700-foot threshold. Ms. Paxton said that almost 40% of households in Savannah are single-person households. Only 17% of our housing stock has one bedroom. This is fulfilling the need for a smaller one-bedroom housing unit in Savannah. When reviewing minutes from 2024, approving building size variances around 50 - 55% have happened. They are trying to be respectful by keeping it under the 700 square feet.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Baugh said this seems to be a good project. With the zoning the way it is they could tear down the existing house and build a 4,000 square foot house which would fit as well within the neighborhood.

Mr. Condon said he agrees with Mr. Baugh. The 40% rule is not applicable in certain situations. When they are dealing with houses that have small footprints, if this was a two-story house, 2,000 square feet, it would be okay, but the first floor is 1,000 square feet, you still are allowed to build a 400 square foot ADU. This is why they are here to remedy these types of conflicts.

Mr. Merriman said he agrees as well.

Motion

Approval of the requested variance to the ADU building size maximum of 40% in relation to the principal structure. (Allowing an ADU footprint of 55% of the principal dwelling where a maximum of 40% (up to 700 square feet) is permitted).

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Brad Baugh

Second: Michael Condon

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

7. 1217 E. 33rd Street | Variance to reduce minimum lot frontage and side yard setback within a TR-2 zoning district | 25-000502-ZBA

🔗 [1217 E 33RD ST ZONING APPEAL \(VERSION 2\).pdf](#)

🔗 [2024-209-ZONING.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report_SE 1217 E 33rd St.pdf](#)

Ms. Sadie Esch-Laurent, Assistant Planner, presented the Staff report. **Ms. Esch-Laurent** stated the Petitioner requests the following variances in association with subdividing in a TR-2 zoning district: Reduce the minimum lot width requirement from 40 feet to 30 feet and to reduce the side yard setback from 3 feet to 1.96 feet. The property is in the Live Oak neighborhood at 1217 East 33rd Street. . According to the Chatham County Tax Assessor, the subject property measures approximately 7,920 square feet. The property is zoned TR-2. The existing configuration of the property conforms to the zoning district requirements for both frontage and area. There is a two-story residential structure built around 1910 on the property. It has a building footprint of 1,288 square feet per the Tax Assessor. In its current state, the structure is conforming. Section 5.9.5 of the Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum lot width of 40 feet for single-family detached dwellings on a street and minimum side setbacks of 3 feet. The Petitioner is requesting 10 feet of relief for the lot width and 1.04 feet of relief for the side setback. The right-of-way that will provide access in the rear is a street, not a lane, as is ordinarily anticipated by the Ordinance. The Petitioner requests to reduce the minimum lot width from 40 feet to 30 feet and one side setback from 3 feet to 1.96 feet. The Petitioner proposes to subdivide the parcel to create two parcels with nonconforming lot widths of 30 feet each. The existing structure would encroach into the side setback by 1.04 feet. Additionally, the minimum lot area required in this district is 3,000 square feet. When subdivided, each parcel would be 3,960 square feet, which is

conforming.

The MPC Staff recommends approval of the following variances with a condition in association with subdividing in a TR-2 zoning district:

1. Reduce the minimum lot width requirement from 40 feet to 30 feet.
2. Reduce the side yard setback from 3 feet to 1.96 feet.

The condition is the final plat must demonstrate a building envelope with a side setback of not less than 4.04 feet for the newly created parcel.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, asked for clarification regarding the ROW encroachment permit that was mentioned.

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, said for this parcel that is to be created, there is no current curb cut. There is something here that resembles a curb cut at the rear of the property, but it is not wide enough.

Mr. Jamie Stuckey, T.R. Long Engineering, said this lot was originally a 30-foot lot. At some point this lot was combined. They are just trying to put it back the way that it was. The new zoning requires 40 feet on the front end.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, said he understands why this would be done. One of the two variances is a technicality. If there was a lane in the back, one of the variance requests would not be on here. As a builder he does not want to be standing straight up on a ladder with a building being too close to another building. Do you have any problems with the condition in the request that the buildings maintain at least a five-foot distance?

Mr. Stuckey said they do not have a problem with that at all.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

Motion

Approval of the following variances with a condition in association with subdividing in a TR-2 zoning district:

1. Reduce the minimum lot width requirement from 40 feet to 30 feet
2. Reduce the side yard setback from 3 feet to 1.96 feet

Condition: The final plat must demonstrate a building envelope with a side setback of not less than 4.04 feet for the newly created parcel

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Michael Condon

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

[8. 1033 Milton Street | Variance to side yard setbacks | 25-000310-ZBA](#)

📎 [1033 MILTON ST_25-000310-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

📎 [SITE PLAN.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Report_SE 1033 Milton St.pdf](#)

Ms. Sadie Esch-Laurent, Assistant Planner, presented the Staff report. **Ms. Esch-Laurent** stated the Petitioner requests variances to reduce both side setbacks of a proposed primary dwelling from 5 feet to 3 feet within an RSF-6 zoning district. The property is located at 1033 Milton St, in the Liberty City/Summerside/Southover/Richfield neighborhood. According to the Chatham County Tax Assessor, the subject property is approximately 2,100 square feet (20 feet of width and 105 feet of depth). The parcel is non-conforming regarding the lot width and the lot area. The property is zoned RSF-6. The lot is currently vacant. The Petitioner is proposing to build a primary dwelling on the property. The proposed dwelling is 826 square feet (14 feet by 59 feet), according to the Petitioner. The proposed site layout has side setbacks of 3 feet, where 5 is required. The proposal meets the front and rear setback requirements, as well as maximum lot coverage. Section 5.7.5 of the Zoning Ordinance requires side setbacks of 5 feet in the RSF-6 zoning district. The Petitioner's proposal will encroach into both side setbacks by 2 feet. The MPC Staff recommends approval of the requested variances to reduce both side setbacks of a proposed primary dwelling from 5 feet to 3 feet within an RSF-6 zoning district.

Mr. Robert Price with Price Builder Custom Homes and Ms. Anita Dixon, Executive Director for Community Health and Services Agency, said this supports their affordable housing efforts in Savannah. In Savannah there are housing cost challenged as well as the number of housing units challenged. They asked the Board to please support their petition.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Arneatha Salters said the pictures she brought are in reference to where the property is located. The house that Mr. Price is requesting to build is much smaller. This will be close to the church parking area. The only parking area they would have would be in the grass because the church parking lot would not be a legal parking area. Most of the houses in that area are built on 60-foot-wide lots. The houses will just be too close.

Ms. Queen Reeves, President of Summerside Neighborhood Association, said there is only one way in and one way out of the neighborhood. They are opposing this house mainly because of the lot size. Going from 5 feet down to 3 feet will put the Petitioner right on the house next to it. They oppose the tiny houses packed into the area. They would like the houses to look similar to the other homes that are here. They have three schools at the head of their subdivision; they are packed.

Ms. Dixon said while they appreciate the concerns of the neighborhood, this particular house and lot are appropriate. There is designated parking in front of the property so they would not be parking in the grass.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, said the house is not 20 feet wide, it is 14 feet wide. Correct?

Ms. Dixon said that is correct.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, asked what the side yard setback was on the house that was constructed.

Mr. Price said 5 feet.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, asked if there will be eight feet between the two homes.

Mr. Price said yes.

Mr. Merriman, Chairman, asked with this being a twenty-foot-wide lot, why does the Petitioner only need one variance?

Mr. Morrow, Director, said this is a good example of adopting new development standards along with a new Ordinance in areas that have already been built. This is an existing lot of record. The reason Staff is

able to support this is because the Ordinance does support the idea that they should encourage building on existing lots of record that are already in place. The implication is that this is an existing lot of record, therefore, the Ordinance does give a right to develop a single-family home on a parcel that is already zoned for residential use. This does meet that standard. It is up to this Board whether or not it is deemed that any particular request is actually a hardship within the meaning of the Ordinance.

Mr. Merriman, Chairman, said so a twenty-foot-wide lot can be built on by right.

Mr. Morrow said yes.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Baugh said they would not have to look very hard to find a precedent for a twenty-foot-wide lot with a fourteen-foot-wide house on it. He is certainly sensitive to concerns, but this seems like a good fit.

Motion

Approval of the requested variances to reduce both side setbacks of a proposed primary dwelling from 5 feet to 3 feet within the RSF-6 zoning district.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Brad Baugh

Second: Armand Turner

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

9. 601 Indian Street Unit A | Variance for sign | 25-000128-ZBA

🔗 [601 INDIAN ST, UNIT A_25-000128-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report](#)

🔗 [Submittal Packet](#)

Ms. Kelli Mitchell, Senior Planner for Historic Preservation, presented the Staff report. **Ms. Mitchell** stated the Applicant is requesting approval of two illuminated awning signs with variances and two window signs at 601 Indian Street, Unit A. The application comes with multiple variance requests. Staff finds that only three of the four variance requests are necessary. The project came to the Historic Department with two awning signs and two window signs as well as the request for four variances. This was heard at the February HDBR meeting. The Board had no issues with the window signs. The main issue was with the over awning signs. One of the requests was regarding the location of the signs. Staff found that request not to be necessary. Two other variances were for internal illumination as well for the size of the sign. The Applicant wanted signs that were twenty-five square feet each. The Zoning Code allows up to twenty feet. The Applicant also wanted both sides to be illuminated. The Zoning Ordinance said the signs cannot be opposite residential units. The sign facing Indian Street would have been opposite the Baxley Apartment Complex, with residential use on separate floors. Ms. Mitchell said as of yesterday, the Applicant updated their design to have external illumination as well as reduced the size.

Those two variances are no longer necessary. The HDBR declined recommending approval those variances as well. The final variance is for the standard that reads: one foot sign will be permitted per business, per building facade when an entrance is located providing public access to said business. 601

Indian Street is a corner unit with an angled entrance facing both Fahm and Indian Streets. In previous cases, Staff has allowed for two signs in these situations. Both Staff and the HDBR recommended approval of this variance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the two awning signs and two window signs at 601 Indian Street, Unit A, with the following conditions to be met prior to the start of the project because the work otherwise meets the standards and is visually compatible.

- 1.The awning signs are reduced in size to meet the standards.
- 2.The awning sign facing Indian Street either have no illumination or be externally illuminated.

And

Approve a Variance Recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the standard that reads as follows:

In addition to a ground, projecting, or wall sign, one such sign shall be permitted per business per building façade where an entrance is located providing public access to said business, except in the D-R zoning district where such sign is not permitted because Staff found that the variance standards were met.

Mr. Merriman, Chairman, said, there were originally four variances requested. Which ones are they considering now?

Ms. Mitchell said the variance for total number of signs.

Ms. Tracey Jones, Petitioner, said they appreciate the opportunity to present their sign request to the Board. There has been a lot of confusion with the different variance requests which has made it difficult to dissect each one on its own merit. Right now, they are just looking at the fact that they are facing two streets, Fahm Street and Indian Street, they would like to be able to have the two signs as proposed.

Mr. Woodward, Complete Signs, representing Foxtail, said they are trying to be ambitious with signs and make them more visible. They were running into roadblocks every step of the way, which is why the number of variances went from four to one. They also received conflicting information throughout the process about the number of signs. The client has decided to reduce the size to meet the standards, so they do not have to start the process over. They have reduced the size and took out the illumination. Today they are just asking to be allowed to have two signs since they are on a corner which is recessed into the building and hard to see as it is.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

Motion

Approval of the variance request for additional signage, allowing for two signs instead of one.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Condon

Second: Armand Turner

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

🔗 [REVISED APPLICATION_635 W VICTORY DR_24-006581-ZBA.pdf](#)

🔗 [SITE PLAN.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report_SE 635 W Victory Dr_.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** said the Petitioner requests variances to increase the maximum permissible front setback and reduce the minimum rear yard setback in the TR-3 zoning district. Additions to the home are proposed to decrease the current front setback from slightly less than 20 feet to 12.2 feet where a maximum of 10 feet is permitted, and to reduce the rear setback to 15.3 feet where a minimum of 20 feet is permitted. The property is located at 635 West Victory Drive with a PIN of 20089 03008. It is in the Cann Park neighborhood. Per the Petitioner, the request is made to extend the master bedroom to facilitate the care of an aging or infirmed resident. A front addition is also proposed that will make the front setback of the legal nonconforming structure more conforming with current development standards, but still 2.2 feet short of the current maximum 10-foot setback requirement. The structure predates adoption of the current standard. Section 5.9.5. of the Zoning Ordinance requires a rear setback of 20 feet. The Petitioner is proposing an addition to expand the master bedroom which would encroach into the rear setback by 4.7 feet, reducing the rear setback of the structure to 15.3 feet. There are no special circumstances or conditions which are not applicable to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district. The request is the result of the Petitioner's chosen design. The request is not purely financial in nature.

The MPC Staff recommends approval of the request to reduce the rear yard setback from 20 feet to 14 feet. Staff recommends denial of the request to increase the maximum front yard setback from 10 feet to 12.2 feet.

Mr. Dontre Wallace, Petitioner, said there was an omission of the front porch. They thought it would make sense to add a front porch since there is no front entry at all on the house. They were looking at eight feet, but they are allowed to go up to ten feet. On the rear, the owners just want to be able to have enough space when family comes, to have a place so they can be together.

Mr. Merriman asked the petitioner if he was in favor of the Staff recommendations of the approval and denial of what was recommended.

Mr. Wallace said yes.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

Motion

Approval of the request to reduce the rear yard setback from 20 feet to 14 feet.

Denial of the request to increase the maximum front yard setback from 10 feet to 12.2 feet.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Condon

Second: Betty Jones

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

11. 605 West 32nd Street & 0 Burroughs Street | Variances to minimum lot size and max. permissible floor area for ADU | 24-006741-ZBA

- 🔗 [605 W 32nd Duplex-ELVS.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [605 W 32 St_24-006741-ZBA_Application.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Report 605 W 32nd St.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [B. Paxton Slides 605 W 32nd St.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [S. Royalston, public comment Petition #24-006741-ZBA.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [20250226_135353.jpg](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** said the Petitioner requested two variances in the TR-1 zoning district in association with a proposal to construct an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). the Petitioner has requested the Board to grant relief from the 125% minimum lot area required to establish an ADU and to grant relief from the 40% building footprint for an ADU requirement. This petition is currently under review for recombination of the two parcels. Once the recombination has met everyone's requirements, there is the intent to place a principal dwelling here that is a duplex. The principal dwelling was not listed on the public notices because there are no variances in association with that construction which is by-right. The parcel is of sufficient area to construct a side-by-side or over under duplex in this case. The two properties measure approximately 6,467 square feet in area per the Tax Assessor. A Petitioner-submitted survey that indicates the properties jointly total 5,001 square feet in area. They are both zoned TR. The lots are currently vacant. Sanborn maps show that there was a side-by-side duplex there historically. The Petitioner is proposing to build a side-by-side duplex 1,525 square feet and an ADU in the rear, which is proposed to be 610 square feet. The ADU will be above a 2-car garage with entrance via the lane. Per correspondence from the Zoning Administrator, only one side of the duplex is counted as the "principal dwelling," because the definition of a dwelling indicates that it contains a single household. In this interpretation, a side-by-side duplex is treated differently from an over-under duplex. The side of the duplex that is considered to be the "principal dwelling" is 762.5 square feet, which would permit an ADU 305 square feet in area were the 40% standard applied strictly. The proposed side-by-side duplex and ADU meet all other applicable development standards.

The proposal is consistent with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance in that it states that the minimum lot area for an ADU shall be variable upon a determination of appropriateness by the Board. Additionally, the proposed ADU maintains a scale similar to that anticipated in relation to a principal structure on the lot. In this particular instance, the principal dwelling is a duplex. Were the structure a single-family home, the proposal would be conforming. There are no special conditions and/or circumstances applicable to the site. The interpretation of the provisions regarding the size of an ADU permitted when applied in this instance would apply to other similarly situated multifamily structures in the same District.

The MPC Staff recommends approval of the requested relief from the minimum 125% lot are required to establish an ADU on the property. MPC Staff recommends denial of the request to permit the proposed ADU to exceed the 40% maximum floor area in relation to the principal dwelling.

Mr. Merriman, Chairman, said they are requesting to exceed the 40%, if they exceeded it, what is their proposed encroachment into that 40%?

Mr. Morrow said it is 610 square feet as opposed to the 305 square feet. That is the difference in interpretation. If this were an over-under duplex, so that the single dwelling constituted the entire bottom floor of this structure, the 610 square feet would be permitted. Because of this interpretation, where they are cutting the dwelling in half where you have one side that is seven hundred plus square feet on one side and seven hundred plus square feet on the other, it is basing the ADU only on one half.

Mr. Merriman said they are looking at two variances. Staff is recommending that they allow the Petitioner to exceed the 125%.

Mr. Morrow said to allow them to establish an ADU, Staff is in support of an ADU at this location. They have taken the position in accordance with the Zoning Administrator and their interpretation with regard to

the 40% in relation. The first variance is simply to allow an ADU to be established on the property. A duplex can be built by-right, but because the property is not 125% of the minimum lot area that is required by this zoning district, they have to ask for the Board's permission to even build an ADU.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, asked how short of the 125% are they?

Mr. Morrow said it is at 119%.

Ms. Briana Paxton, Petitioner, said their owner is looking to redevelop the vacant lots in the Cuyler-/Brownville local Historic District. Once they establish whether an ADU can be built on this property, and the size of that ADU, they will be going before the HPC to determine the look of the two structures and how they relate to the local Historic District guidelines. As Staff shared, the recombination of these two lots is in progress, and they will be addressed 605 and 607 West 32nd Street. Right now, the larger lot is addressed as 0 Burroughs Street. The redevelopment plan is a side-by-side duplex with a rear ADU. The principal building footprint of the duplex is 1,525 square feet and the ADU would be 610 square feet which was designed specifically to be 40% of that. In discussion with City Staff, it was determined that they need to have an emphasis on the term "principal dwelling" that is in the Ordinance and, therefore, required to split the duplex in half. The reason they are trying to build a side-by-side duplex is because there previously was a side-by-side duplex on this property and there is an existing historic contributing duplex side by side down the street. So, they felt it would fit the neighborhood context better. They are here today asking for 119% lot area and technically 83% building area size on the ADU due to the interpretation of the dwelling. There are other existing accessory structures down the lane as well as two story houses in the vicinity. There is a property across the street with an addition on the rear and another church behind that.

The Sanborn map shows there were previously a considerably larger number of dwellings in this area. It also shows the previous side by-side duplex that was there. The property owner expects to deed this property to their son who recently moved back here and is working in the construction industry, so this will be partially owner occupied. He will live in one unit and rent the other two units. This will be an opportunity for him to lessen his housing cost as he is establishing his career in Savannah.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Tommy Whaley and Latrina Johnson said he has lived in the area all his life. This area is too small for what they are asking to do. The neighborhood is concerned about what is going on there. For a duplex to go there, that is just too large for that area. This area is getting too congested.

Ms. Paxton said the duplex is allowed by right and meets all the development standards. Today they are here to establish whether an ADU is appropriate and what the size of that ADU would be.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Condon said this is like another petition they just heard where there is a bit of a technicality. If this were an over under unit, the ADU size would be in question. It is because the building is set up as a side by side. It only gives them half the footprint to which they are entitled. He does not see a problem with the petition.

Mr. Merriman said what about the denial for the second variance request.

Mr. Condon said the actual footprint of the house that will be built would be 1,525 square feet. He does not need an approval for the 40% max if he builds garden level styles. He could build it by right. He is at 119% only asking for 6% lot size minimum to build the ADU. If they approve that, if he builds a garden style instead of the side by side, he could build it by right. This is just because of how he is building it.

Mr. Merriman said this is a textbook case as to why they are here.

Motion

Approval of the requested relief from the minimum 125% lot area required to establish an ADU on the

property.

Approval of the request to permit the proposed ADU to exceed the 40% maximum floor area in relation to the principal dwelling.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Condon

Second: Armand Turner

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

[12. 238 Alfred Street | Variances to accessory structures height, building coverage, size, for outdoor storage | 25-000582-ZBA](#)

🔗 [238 ALFRED ST_3 PARCELS_25-000582-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report_SE 238 Alfred St.pdf](#)

🔗 [P. Anderson, public comment, Woodville Zoning Appeal II 2.27.25.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** said the Petitioner requested the following variances in association with constructing an accessory structure (carport for an RV) in an RSF-6 zoning district: To increase the height of an accessory structure to be above the principal structure, to increase the permissible size of an accessory structure as it relates to the principal structure, to increase the length and height of outdoor storage for a personal recreational vehicle, and to allow parking of an unhitched trailer in a residential district. The properties are located at 238 Alfred Street, 0 Alfred Street, and 0 Division Street, in the Woodville neighborhood. According to the Chatham County Tax Assessor, 238 & 0 Alfred Street are approximately 7,100 square feet each. 0 Division Street is approximately 14,000 square feet. The square footage of all three parcels comes to 28,200 square feet. The properties are zoned RSF-6. Both 238 & 0 Alfred Street are nonconforming parcels in this zoning district regarding the required minimum lot width. 0 Division St is a conforming parcel. There is a principal structure at 238 Alfred Street built in t 1945. It has an existing building footprint of 1,466 square feet per the Tax Assessor. There is also a detached garage that overlaps 238 & 0 Alfred Street. The detached garage is 903 square feet. 0 Division Street is currently a vacant lot. The Petitioner is requesting to build an accessory structure to be used as a carport for their RV at 0 Division Street. They are requesting four variances for the construction of this accessory structure. Additionally, the Petitioner is in the process of getting a survey done to recombine all three lots into one parcel.

Section 8.7.3.d of the Zoning Ordinance states that the height of an accessory building shall not exceed the height of the principal building in a Residential district or where otherwise prohibited by this Ordinance. The principal building at 238 Alfred Street is 16 feet 8 inches high. The Petitioner is requesting a 1-foot variance for the accessory structure. The plans indicate it to be 16 feet 8 inches high, and they are requesting 1 foot as an adequate margin. Section 8.7.3.e.ii of the Zoning Ordinance states that within residential zoning districts, the floor area of an accessory structure shall not exceed 40% of the floor area of the principal building. The principal structure has a floor area of 1,252 square feet. The accessory structure is planned to be 810 square feet, which would be 65% of the principal structure. The Petitioner is requesting a 25% increase in floor area from the maximum allowed. Section 8.7.16.a.i. of the

Zoning Ordinance states that Recreational vehicles and watercraft shall not exceed 22 feet in length nor 10 feet in height. The Petitioner is requesting a variance for an additional 12 feet in length and 3 feet 4 inches in height for their RV. Section 8.7.3.d of the Zoning Ordinance states that parking of heavy vehicles, construction equipment, tractor trailers, and/or unhitched trailers shall not be permitted. The Petitioner is requesting that the RV can be parked under the carport, unhitched while in storage.

The requested variances are inconsistent with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The configuration of structures requested by the Petitioner are more common to a rural setting; however, the Petitioner is the owner of all subject properties, and the resulting recombination of land would form a new parcel that is conforming with regard to the standards for the zoning district. The proposed RV is larger in size than that anticipated by the Ordinance, and the identified variances are requested to accommodate the larger vehicle. There are no special conditions or unique circumstances which are peculiar to the land, buildings, or structures involved and which are not applicable to other buildings regarding the subject property. The requested variances are the result of the Petitioner's desire to store an RV on their property. The request is likely not financial in nature.

MPC Staff recommends denial of the following variances in association with constructing an accessory structure (carport for an RV) in an RSF-6 zoning district:

1. To increase the height of an accessory structure to be above the principal structure.
2. To increase the permissible size of an accessory structure as it relates to the principal structure; 3. To increase the length and height of outdoor storage for a personal recreational vehicle; 4. To allow parking of an unhitched trailer.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, asked if the Petitioner did not build the structure he is proposing, would he need a variance to park the RV in the back yard?

Mr. Morrow said yes. It would still exceed the length that is permitted. The Ordinance permits up to twenty-two feet and they are in excess of that. It also needs to be attached to a vehicle.

Mr. Les Fussell and Janice Fussell, Owners, said this is not the normal request that you would hear for a side and front setback. It is a request to put up an accessory building. If you refer to the Staff facts and findings, item two, historically they know these are non-conforming lots. They do not know when they were divided. Until about the late 1980's, there were two houses there. The other house ended up being demolished because it was too close. They are currently collaborating with a surveyor for the recombination of the lots. They have done the preliminary field work but put the surveyor on hold to make sure that they could move forward with the accessory building before spending the money involved with the recombination. The road that was mentioned on Market Street to Division Street is unimproved. They own the property next door at 185 Division Street. They purchased it approximately four years ago. In reference to item five, section 8.7.3.d., the measurements on the principal residence at 238 Alfred Street, measured 16.5 feet and the accessory building will be 16.8 feet. The difference will be three inches. The actual accessory building will be approximately 45 feet from the principal building. No one will notice, however, in Staff notes, they identified that the resident is 16.8 feet and that the accessory building was 16.8 feet. If everyone agrees to the 16.8 feet, they do not need this variance. But based on their measurements and engineering, there is a difference of three inches. Item 6, section 8.7.3.e.ii referring to the existing building footprint of the primary structure, when they did their calculations, they used the heated square footage, which is 1,254 square feet. That is confirmed on the tax records in Chatham County. Instead of 1,466 full footprints, which includes two porches. The difference is 224 square feet. That is only 15% of an increase in the required area instead of 25%. Item 7, section 8.7.16.a.i. referencing typical height of a fifth wheel, the average fifth wheel is between 20 feet and 49 feet. The average height of fifth wheels today is 13 feet 5 inches. Our 34-foot RV is on the mean. Regarding parking of an unhitched trailer, he was unaware of this requirement by the Ordinance until they had their meeting with the Zoning Administrator and MPC Staff. He does not know how you park an RV long term and not unhitch it. He has - a Ford F- 350 which is also my daily drive vehicle.

What they propose is the height for the accessory building and the residence is 16.8 feet therefore the variance requirement goes away. The variance for the floor space from 25% to 15% based on using the footprint of 1466. The square footage of the accessory building is 810 square feet. The third variance requested, the length and height, unfortunately he cannot change that. The request for parking of an unhitched vehicle to the trailer, which will have to be a requested variance. They did meet with the

Woodville Community Action Organization on February 12th They understand that they have submitted a request to speak today. They did submit a support letter from one of the property owners, Mr. Pike. They have talked with the adjoining neighbor to the west unfortunately he did not provide a letter but does agree that this will not be any infringement or in any way impact his property values They currently live in Richmond Hill, it i their intent at some point after renovating this property, to downsize and move to this property. They have already started renovating the house. Ms. Fussell said she grew up on Alfred Street and went to school in that area. One of the things the neighbors have asked is will someone be living in the accessory building or RV. The answer is no, there will be no electricity, sewer, or water This is simply for storage only. They will make sure, if approved, to make it look nice.

Mr. Merriman, Chairman, asked what other properties in that area do you own?

Mr. and Mrs. Fussell said the lot that is next to the resident, the empty lot they are asking to put the accessory structure on, plus the lot next to it to the right. There is a considerable vegetation buffer around the area as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Pamela Anderson, Woodville Community President, said they has a meeting on February 12th. Mr. Fussell came to the meeting and explain what they wanted to do. The residents are opposed to the structure for the RV. They have had five active code enforcement cases. Since COVID, there have been different ethnics move into the community; they are bringing in RV's and people are staying in those RV's. There have been all kinds of problems. One case just closed with them removing the RV. they know that is not Mr. Fussell's case but that is what they are having to deal with in this area. They are opposed to the height of it and opposed to the house. The house is not higher than the structure. They also have a problem with, if they allow this and there are already five active cases now with code enforcement because of the issues, something needs to be done.

Mr. Fussell said he is aware of the illegal RV's. Woodville, Alfred Street, King Street, all of that area, this is not unique. This is an issue throughout the County and City They are asking permission to build a respectable nice storage facility for their RV. They travel on an average of 6-7 months in the year. The RV will be sitting there all the time. There will be no power, no water, and no sewer. No one will be able to live there. This is only for recreational travel. they appreciate Ms. Anderson bringing this forward, but the issues with Code Enforcement are not relevant to the petition. When they were in the neighborhood meeting, they asked if anyone had any questions, no one had any. No one came to him and said they did not like it. In the letter he sent it was mentioned that it is not allowed in Richmond Hill by their HOA, it should not be here. The RV has been stored in Richmond Hill at the marina RV storage until it was damaged by the last storm and is not available anymore. They have been working on this project for quite some time. They intend to reside at this residence. He does not have an HOA where they live, today his RV is sitting in his driveway and has been there since December.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman said typically he is against a structure exceeding the primary structure as it says in the Ordinance but that seems to be a matter of debate, and 3 inches is not a lot. They do own the properties next to it and it is in an industrial area, he does not see any problem with granting these variances.

Mr. Turner said he agrees that the RVs are an issue all over Savannah. The Petitioner is trying to go through the proper channels to do this the correct way.

Mr. Baugh said he agrees with Mr. Merriman. Three inches are not a lot. There are things they could do to make sure the site lines are not affected, and he is otherwise following the laws. It seems like it could work.

Ms. Jones asked the Petitioner if they could find someplace else to store the RV other than where they requested.

Mr. Fussell said there are several storage places within the City and County. There is the issue of security with most of those. From an economic standpoint, if he invests money on his property he has a return on his investment, verses paying rent to someone to store his vehicle for however long. The

problem they had with the last storage was, as mentioned before, they travel extensively, they had to pay a monthly retainer to hold their spot. There is a high demand for that storage. If you pull the vehicle out, do not pay rent when you leave, your spot will not be there when you get back. There may not be another spot available for quite some time. The answer is yes, but they prefer not to have to do that. They would like to put that investment into their own property.

Ms. Jones, Board Member, said if you are not staying on that property right now and put the RV there, you still have a problem with someone vandalizing the property.

Mr. Fussell said they have a good security system in the RV. Their intent is to eventually be staying on that property once the renovations are complete

Motion

Approval of the following variances in association with constructing an accessory structure (carport for an RV) in an RSF-6 zoning district:

1. To increase the height of an accessory structure to be above the principal structure;
2. To increase the permissible size of an accessory structure as it relates to the principal structure;
3. To increase the length and height of outdoor storage for a personal recreational vehicle;
4. To allow parking of an unhitched trailer.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Brad Baugh

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

[13. 8730 Rivers End Dr. | Variance to reduce side yard setback in an RSF-E zoning district | 25-000529-ZBA](#)

🔗 [8730 RIVERS END DR_25-000529-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [230020-VARIANCE EXHIBIT.pdf](#)

🔗 [DB 2840 PG 609.pdf](#)

🔗 [PRB 21P PG 37.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report_SE 8730 Rivers End Dr.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** said the Petitioner requested a variance to reduce the side yard setback from 20 feet to 14 feet to create a minor subdivision in the RSF-E zoning district. The property is located at 8730 Rivers End Drive, in the Lundhurst/Rivers End neighborhood. It has a frontage of 385 feet and is triangular in shape. The property is zoned RSF-E (Residential Single-family-Estate). The subject property is conforming within this district; however, it contains two principal structures with nonconforming side setbacks.

Further, some of the property is located on the marsh. The Petitioner is looking to subdivide the lot into three parcels. Each principal structure would be on its lot, with the third lot undeveloped. Both principal structures would encroach into the side setback with the proposed subdivision. The requested variance is consistent with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed subdivision is otherwise conforming with the current development standards. The nonconforming structures were built before the adoption of NewZo. The lot contains two pre-existing nonconforming structures, whose permitting preceded adoption of the current development standards. The lots are otherwise of sufficient area to subdivide and meet current development standards. To move forward with the subdivision process, the Petitioner will need approval from the Chatham County Department of Public Health regarding the minimum lot size required for a suitable septic drain field.

The MPC Staff recommends approval of the variance request to reduce the side yard setback from 20 feet to 14 feet to create a minor subdivision in an RSF-E zoning district with the following condition: The preliminary plat shall be modified to include the proposed building envelope of 'Parcel C.'

Mr. Colby Phillips, Property Owner, said they are wanting to subdivide the property to build the residence for their family on the back portion of the property. Potentially his wife's parents would move into one of the houses. They do not ever plan to sell any of the property. They own the two houses where the variance is being asked for on the setback.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, said the new parcel will be accessed via the existing driveway.

Mr. Phillips said yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Patricia Senil said she lives on the other side of Rivers End from the petitioner. She was here in support; this is a legitimate reason to reduce the setback to subdivide the parcel.

Motion

Approval of the variance request to reduce the side yard setback from 20 feet to 14 feet to create a minor subdivision in an RSF-E zoning district with the following condition:

1. The preliminary plat shall be modified to include the proposed building envelope of ' Parcel C.'

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Condon

Second: Betty Jones

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

14. 501 Rivers End Drive | Variances to front and rear yard setbacks | 25-000623-ZBA

🔗 [501 RIVERS END DR_25-000623-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

🔗 [2025 01 27_501 RIVERS END DRIVE_SITE PLAN.pdf](#)

🔗 [Staff Report_501 Rivers End Dr.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** said the Petitioner requested a variance to reduce the front yard setback from 40 feet to 30 feet and the rear yard setback from 40 feet to 20 feet for the addition of a porch and garage to an existing nonconforming dwelling on a nonconforming lot of record in the RSF-E zoning district. The property is zoned RSF-E (Residential Single-family-Estate) and is nonconforming with regard to the 1-acre minimum area requirement for this district. The property is not configured in a manner likely to permit a conforming dwelling under current development standards. The existing dwelling was built in 1954 and now requires a variance relief to permit a garage addition. According to the Chatham County Tax Assessor, the subject property is approximately 26,100 square feet in area. It has a frontage of approximately 320 feet on Rivers End Drive and is narrow and rectangular in shape. The property was previously subdivided into north, middle and southern parcels prior to the adoption of NewZO. The resultant parcels are also nonconforming with regard to the current standards. The property has an average depth of 98 feet, with the wider end having wetland frontage. The proposed addition will encroach into the required front and rear yard setbacks, necessitating 10 feet of relief in the front and 20 feet of relief in the rear. The Petitioner intends to comply with all other associated development standards. The requested variance is not consistent with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance, but the applicable standards are not presently applied to a conforming lot created within the context of the Ordinance. The subject property is a nonconforming lot of record and the existing dwelling a legal nonconforming structure. The subject property is a nonconforming lot of record with significantly deficient land area and the existing dwelling a legal nonconforming structure. The request is necessitated by the actions of the Petitioner. However, the subject parcel lacks the configuration and land area common to other similarly situated properties within the RSF-E zoning district.

The MPC Staff recommends approval of the variance request to reduce the front yard setback from 40 feet to 30 feet and to reduce the rear yard setback from 40 feet to 20 feet as requested.

Mr. Martin Ronaszegi, Petitioner, said what they are trying to do is add a garage to the house. Just because of the way the lot was divided, they would need a variance to do anything.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Patricia Sinel said she lives about 4 houses up and across the street. She stated her support for this petition is for the relief of the side setback requirements. Current setbacks make the lot undevelopable and unbuildable. If the house currently did not exist, you would not be able to construct a house using the current setbacks.

Motion

Approval of the variance request to reduce the front yard setback from 40 feet to 30 feet and to reduce the rear yard setback from 40 feet to 20 feet as requested.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Condon

Second: Betty Jones

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

XII. Other Business

XIII. 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.