



## Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals

---

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room  
May 23, 2023 - 9:00 A. M.  
Meeting Minutes

### MAY 23, 2023 CHATHAM COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Members Present: James Coursey, Chairman  
Robert Vinyard, Vice Chairman  
Benjamin Polote  
Meredith Stone

Members Absent: Keewan Drayton  
Ashley Field  
Coren Ross

Others Present: Marcus Lotson, Development Services Director  
Melissa Paul-Leto, Development Services Planner  
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant  
Warren Durrer, Executive Assistant  
Hind Patel, IT Helpdesk & Support

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

Chatham County Staff Present: Jefferson Kirkland, Environmental Program Manager  
Yolanda Washington, Zoning Administrator

#### I. Call to Order and Welcome

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

**Mr. Coursey** called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. He explained that this is a quasi-judicial proceeding. All those wishing to give testimony during these proceedings will please sign in. Witnesses will be sworn-in prior to giving testimony. All proceedings of the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals are recorded. Decisions of the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals are final. Challenges to the decisions of the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals must be filed through the Superior Court of Chatham County.

#### II. Pledge of Allegiance

##### [2. Pledge of Allegiance](#)

**The Pledge of Allegiance** was recited in unison.

#### III. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

#### IV. Petitions Ready for Hearing

#### V. Approval of Minutes

##### [3. Approve March 28, 2023, Meeting Minutes](#)

[☞ March 28, 2023 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

### Motion

The Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve March 28, 2023, Meeting Minutes.

### Vote Results ( Approved )

Motion: Robert Vinyard

Second: Benjamin Polote, Jr.

James Coursey	- Aye
Meredith Stone	- Aye
Robert Vinyard	- Aye
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Aye

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

## VII. Consent Agenda

## VIII. Old Business

### [4. 37 Pine Drive | Fence Height Variance | ZBA-0223-000362](#)

[☞ Staff Report 052323.pdf](#)

[☞ Aerial View.pdf](#)

[☞ Map.pdf](#)

[☞ Letter of Support.pdf](#)

[☞ Photo 1 \(1\).pdf](#)

[☞ Photo 1 \(2\).pdf](#)

[☞ Updated Photo 1.pdf](#)

[☞ Updated Photo 2.pdf](#)

**Mr. Marcus Lotson** gave the Staff report. The petitioner is requesting a two-foot fence height variance to allow an 8-foot-high fence in the side yard of an existing single-family residence. This request was continued from the March 28, 2023, meeting. The Board continued the hearing so that the applicant could seek design alternatives to address issues associated with the proposed 8-foot-high fence. Staff has contacted the applicant on at least two occasions but to date, the applicant has not provided any additional information.

**Mr. Lotson** showed the Board a map of the subject property at 37 Pine Drive, which is off of Gamble Road. He also showed them a photo of the fence as it existed at that time. The fence is at least eight feet in height, which is not permitted in the side yard of a residential dwelling. He also showed an updated photo which was taken approximately one week ago. As he has stated, the staff has been reaching out to the Petitioner regarding his design alternatives that he was supposed to bring back to the Board, but staff has not heard from him. It does not appear that the Petitioner is present today.

**Mr. Lotson** explained that under the March petition, based on the findings in the report, Staff recommended denial. He said Staff does not have any new evidence to support changing that recommendation. Consequently, Staff is still recommending denial. If the petition is denied by the Board, it will become a code compliance issue for Chatham County. Therefore, Chatham County would have to address the removal of the section of the fence that is eight feet in height. He entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Coursey** stated that the Board gave the Petitioner a lot of leeway and the opportunity to come back to the Board.

**Mr. Lotson** concurred and stated that he believed the Board's intention was for the Petitioner to come back with a design that could include a height in some other form, whether it be lattice or vegetative; some design that the Board could evaluate. But, as he has said, Staff has not received any new information. Although, Staff has made several attempts to contact the Petitioner.

**Mr. Coursey** said what he has noticed about the photograph is the paneled fence seems to be six feet roughly in height, but there is a structure two feet above it. The Petitioner has not applied or made a request to do anything with the additional two feet.

**Mr. Lotson** stated, "That's correct."

**Mr. Coursey** asked if anyone was present to speak for or against this petition.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

No one came forward.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Coursey** explained that looking at the photo, it seems to him that the Petitioner is in the progress of making an eight-foot fence of some sort.

**Mr. Lotson** stated that he would not disagree with that assessment.

**Mr. Vinyard** asked Staff if the panel part without the upper section is in compliance.

**Mr. Lotson** answered that Staff cannot be certain as they have not gone through a process to achieve this. He said, however, based on observation, it might be. But the original portion of the fence certainly is not in compliance.

**Mr. Vinyard** asked staff if the Petitioner has submitted any new drawings of the fence.

**Mr. Lotson** answered no.

**Mr. Coursey** entertained a motion.

#### **Motion**

The Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby deny the request for a fence height variance at 37 Pine Drive.

After the votes were cast, Mr. Cousey asked Mr. Lotson what the next step with this Petitioner is.

Mr. Lotson answered that the Petitioner was already in code compliance with Chatham County. Therefore, Chatham County will still seek remedy to get the Petitioner in compliance,

#### **Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Benjamin Polote, Jr.

Second: Meredith Stone

James Coursey	- Aye
Meredith Stone	- Aye
Robert Vinyard	- Aye
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Aye

## IX. Regular Agenda

### [5. 2 Marsh Island Lane | Variances to the 25-foot minimum rear yard setback and to the 35-foot minimum marsh buffer setback | ZBA-1122-000336](#)

- 📎 [application.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Letter of Support #1.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Letter of Support #2.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Aerial View 2Marsh Island.pdf](#)
- 📎 [site visit photos.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Letter of Support for Variance Request at 2 Marsh Island Lane.pdf](#)
- 📎 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

**Ms. Melissa Paul-Leto** gave the Staff Report. The petitioner is requesting variances to the minimum marsh buffer setback and to the minimum rear yard setback requirements. Ms. Paul-Leto showed the Board a picture of the stairs on the rear of the property that are go to the existing concrete porch. The two requested variances would allow the property owners to add decking over the existing concrete elevated rear porch, extend the deck, and construct a screened in covered porch in a section of the rear yard porch to the rear of the property at 2 Marsh Island Lane.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** said the requested variances are:

- :
  - A 22-foot encroachment of the 35-foot County marsh jurisdictional buffer.
  - A 5-foot encroachment of the 25-foot rear yard setback requirement

**Ms. Paul-Leto** point out the original Department of National Resources' (DNR) line. She explained that this was extended after the existing property was built. The new property owners have purchased the property and wants to improve their screened porch. They realize that the State marsh buffer line extends into the black dotted line area, which is already encroaching into the house and with the additional ten-foot County marsh buffer. She stated that technically it encroaches five feet into the rear yard. Ms. Paul-Leto pointed out this area and said it is the 25-foot rear yard setback. She explained that technically, it is 17 feet into the new DNR line with the additional ten-foot of the County. She explains that this actually makes it 22 feet of encroachment into the marsh buffer. The parcel is approximately 1.06 acres or 46,173.6 square feet in size and is located in the Planned Unit Development Environment and Overlay Zoning District and the Landings Subdivision. The property is positioned southwest of Marsh Island Lane. The single-family residence was constructed approximately in 1996.

**Ms. Paul Leto** stated that there are eight lots fronting Marsh Island Lane that are impacting the marsh. The parcel to the southeast numbering from 4 Marsh Island Lane to 8 Marsh Island Lane have rear yards facing the marsh. The three parcels that are southwest include 1 Marsh Island, 2 Marsh Island Lane - which is the subject property, and 3 Marsh Island Lane. They have rear yards facing the lagoon. Ms. Paul-Leto explained that the lagoon is a nontraditional marsh, but the DNR made the determination that it is tidal connected. She showed the Board some proposed elevations and renderings that the architect submitted. Ms. Paul-Leto point out the rear porch area where the petitioner is requesting to add decking and extend it with a wooden post. She also pointed out the area where the Petitioner wants to screen the rear porch. Steps are already here, and the layout is already existing. Ms. Paul-Leto showed the Board a picture of what it would look like with an extended roof.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** explained that going through the variance criteria, the development patterns surrounding the subject parcel, include parcels with similar lot width and lot areas as the subject parcel. She said that

Staff finds that there are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions regarding the size, shape, or topography of the land. The existing residence encroaches into the marsh buffer setback. Since the property was built, the marsh buffer setback has moved further into the property owners' rear property. Any further encroachments, such as the proposed rear porch, would be considered as an expansion of the existing nonconformity.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** stated that the fact that the 36-foot marsh buffer setback as naturally encroached further into the property owners' rear property is a hardship. However, the Petitioner is proposing to expand a portion of the rear yard porch five feet into the required 25-foot rear yard setback and 22 feet into the existing 35-foot marsh buffer setback for a screened-in covered porch, which is not a hardship. There are conditions that are peculiar to the property involved. The rear yard and a portion of the rear residence is currently placed in a minimum required 35-foot marsh buffer setback. However, the proposal to encroach further into the required marsh buffer setback and encroach five feet into the required 25-foot rear yard setback where the proposed expansion of a screened-in covered porch is not peculiar to the particular piece of property involved. Variances to the regulations in this case are likely to impair the intent of the Zoning Ordinance and expand on the existing nonconformity.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** reported that Staff's recommendation is based on the findings that are identified in the Staff report and the variance criteria. Staff recommends denial of the Petitioner's request to encroach five feet into the required 25 feet rear yard setback as well as encroaching 22 feet into the required 35-foot marsh buffer setback. However, she reported additionally that if the Board chooses to approve the requested variances, the MPC Staff recommends the following condition:

-Gutters be placed on the new roof design to direct the water flow away from the marsh.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** entertained questions from the Board and reported that the architect along with the property owners were present to answer questions also.

**Mr. Vinyard** asked Staff if the new property owners purchased the property after the expansion of the marsh buffer.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** answered yes. The property owners were not aware that there was an expansion or that a state water buffer requirement was there. They were just looking to have a screened-in area against the mosquitos, etc. This is when they found out about all of this from the DNR.

### **PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Greg Adamski and Mr. David Marbry, owners, and Ms. Joye Reno, architect**, came forward and were sworn in by Mr. Coursey. Ms. Reno explained that as a part of their submittal packet for the variance request, they gave some listing of the hardships and the reasons behind the design. She stated that they also submitted the design and gave their desire for this project to come to fruition. She said that she was not sure whether the Board read the information contained on their application. Therefore, she would read the information now.

**Ms. Reno** read that the owners want to add a modestly sized new screen porch on top of a portion of the existing concrete terrace. The variance is for a 5-foot reduction within the 25-foot rear yard setback, and a 22-foot encroachment within the 35-foot marsh buffer setback. She said that the Board saw their plans earlier. The new porch and existing terrace are designed to be level with the existing house floor level to allow aging-in-place. This also provides much needed outdoor screened living space that is handicap accessible for the owners' family members. The overall size of the new porch allows for wheelchair access around the tables and chairs. The new porch is designed for minimum environmental impact. A sophisticated drainage system including gutters and downspouts are included, and drainage shall be directed away from the existing lagoon and away from the adjacent neighbors. The new addition will not negatively impact the area. She said they submitted, in their submittal packet, a letter from Mr. Jefferson Kirkland and a letter from the DNR stating that the new addition on the existing grade does not really impact the environment, the site, or the tidal lagoon. She read that the existing concrete terrace shall remain in place to avoid disturbing existing soils. This is minimal impact on the environment. The new non-conforming addition "footprint" only adds approximately 120 square feet. The new porch is elevated on support piers and is open beneath to create permeable ground. The owners were not aware that their property was adjacent to a tidal marsh when they recently purchased it. Approximately 90% of the

lagoons at the Landings are not tidal, so this is a very unique situation. -The screen porch addition was approved by the Landings Architectural Review Committee. They have submitted a copy of the Architectural Review Committee's approval letter and also the letters of support from their adjacent neighbors.

**Ms. Stone** asked Ms. Reno if she explored any design alternatives that would have left the footprint consistent with what the existing footprint is now to make it work.

**Ms. Reno** answered yes. She explained that they have been working on this almost a year and explored many different alternatives. The reason for the placement of this addition is that their existing house is kind of public versus private. This end of the house is the existing kitchen/living space. The complete other end of the terrace is their private master suite. So, in a perfect world, it is their party space. The screened porches for entertaining, etc. would not be next to their bedroom. Originally, it was going to be more elaborately enclosed, and somewhat match the existing terrace which is succored and so forth. Ms. Reno said in talking with Mr. Kirkland and DNR representatives, they came up with the conclusion that best for minimal impact to just have support piers and have everything open underneath. Therefore, they are not creating impermeable lands so to speak; but they are opening it up so that any rainwater or anything else will soak into the ground and not impact the total marsh.

**Ms. Stone** asked if this would be covered with a roof.

**Ms. Reno** answered that a roof is on top of the screened porch. There is plenty of room to put the drainage within this site.

**Mr. Vinyard** stated as the Petitioners might imagine, this puts them in a difficult situation. He lives here and, therefore, is perfectly familiar with all the problems associated with living on lagoons, tidal marsh, etc. He said he does not know what the Board could do to help them, this is what they are in the business of doing, but they are in the business of also following the law. Mr. Vinyard said he went to the site and looked from the street as he did not know if anyone was at home. Therefore, he parked and walked to the site. Is there a way to use the existing footprint and have a porch?

**Ms. Reno** answered that the existing terrace is very small. Literally, they have tried to sit here and have meetings, but this is not a huge expansion. They are also elevating the floor level of the existing terrace. Currently, you step down three steps. If this is to be handicap accessible, it is too tight. For a house of this style [it is an astounding home], the outdoor living space is very minimal. She believes that they have been through this conversation in previous Zoning meetings. They tried to work with any existing footprint while fully knowing that it was complicated and knowing it is a sticky situation. This is why they have been working for months after months with the Zoning Boards, Mr. Kirkland, and others to try to ensure that they are not doing anything to impact the existing site. Ms. Reno explained that they have multiple letters supporting this, which state that they are not hurting anything or anybody. They are just putting a roof over an existing terrace. As she has stated, this does not change the permeability factor at all.

**Mr. Adamski** showed the Board the table that they were talking about. He said that the chairs could not be pulled out at all. This is typical of this space. It is very narrow. They are only proposing to cover the stairs. He wanted it to be kept in mind that they are raising the deck using wood. He explained that you cannot see the three steps down to the concrete, but they are raising it up and covering over the stairs. This is actually all that they are doing. He said they are extending about five feet.

**Mr. Marbry** said they are not using impermeable structures beyond those steps. It is just a post to hold up the raised deck.

**Mr. Vinyard** stated that the steps are the problem. It is the five feet, and it is not the Petitioner's fault. The buffer is already here, and a large part of the house is already nonconforming in terms of the buffer lot.

**Mr. Adamski** asked if four feet would be more acceptable.

**Mr. Coursey** asked if the Landings Architectural Review Committee approved this. However, he assumed that the Architectural Review Committee approved this; if not, the Petitioners would not be here.

**Ms. Reno** answered that the Landings Architectural Review Committee approved this.

**Mr. Coursey** asked if the Architectural Review Committee had any concerns.

**Ms. Reno** stated that the Landings Architectural Review Committee approved this in November 2022.

**Mr. Adamski** showed the stairs to the Board again. He said a matching set of stairs are over here. The stairs are going down. Pointing to an area, he said that they are only putting a post right here. As Mr. Kirkland has recommended, it is minimally basic. The deck is raised up off the ground.

**Mr. Coursey** asked the Petitioner how close they are to the lagoon.

**Mr. Adamski**, pointing to an area, said the lagoon is right here.

**Ms. Reno** pointed out that the red dotted line denotes the County's marsh buffer. This makes it the 22 feet for the marsh buffer setback. Otherwise, it would be 17 feet for the State.

**Mr. Adamski** said when they originally bought the house, the plat that they were given before the purchase was showing the County's line. However, afterward, they were informed that it is under the house.

**Mr. Vinyard** said he came here not particularly wanting to see this petition approved. He said he is a stickler for following the rules, but the homeowners are in a very atypical situation. He said he lives over on Moon River and he probably can reach out from his back porch ad touch where the Landings right-of-way is. He is probably not within the boundaries either and he lives in a new house. Therefore, he knows how things are here.

**Mr. Coursey** said he would like to hear from Mr. Kirkland on this matter,

**Mr. Kirkland** came forward and entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Coursey** asked Mr. Kirkland why this is appropriate.

**Mr. Kirkland** explained that as far as the buffer that he enforces, the proposed work meets the definition of a minimal impact as it appears in the State water buffer. The regulation allows for this sort of minimal impact. The buffer that he enforces is triggered by a land disturbing activity. Its sole purpose is to prevent pollution from moving from the upland area during construction into the State waters. Therefore, once the construction is done, his buffer goes away. The County's buffer is the one that exists regardless of what is happening on the property. Mr. Kirkland said he was somewhat surprised that this lagoon was considered coastal marshlands. This is highly unusual. When he came here to do the site visit, he had to double check to see if he was in the right place. Normally, these lagoons do not meet the definition of coastal marshlands. Mr. Kirkland said the Board has seen plenty of variance requests on lagoons at the Landings.

**Mr. Coursey** said he was looking at two parallel dark lines. He asked that someone define what these two lines represent.

**Ms. Reno** explained that the top line is the property boundary, and the low line is the 25-foot rear yard setback.

**Mr. Kirkland** stated that this is the same as the State water buffer on this parcel.

**Mr. Coursey** asked what the possibility is of cutting off the isosceles triangle that encroaches into the 25-foot.

**Mr. Adamski** asked if this could be reduced because cutting it off would be terrible.

**Ms. Reno** said it would be a roofing nightmare. She asked the Board if they would accept instead of five feet, just reduce it a little bit. She said she worked really hard to get the rooflines to work with the crazy hips. This is her personal request as a designer. The impact will be a little less painful.

**Mr. Coursey** said before he offers an opinion about this, tell him about the drainage. Where is the water be drained to?

**Ms. Reno** said there is a swale going around the entire perimeter of the property. They will tie it into that swale. It keeps everything on the property away from the marsh.

**Mr. Coursey** asked if the swale at any time points toward the marsh.

**Ms. Reno** answered no.

**Mr. Kirkland** pointed out that drainage is allowed into the marsh. He said ideally rather than directing a pipe directly to the marsh, a swale is a better way to discharge into the marsh. It gives the water a chance to slow down and filter out any potential pollution. There is no regulation that states that a pipe can not be directed to the marsh. But they just ask that folks try to drain in a more environmentally friendly way.

**Mr. Marbry** added that presently the downspouts do empty out towards the marsh. They have suggested that with this project that they be able to direct this around the house and then down. There is an opportunity to slow down the water as it comes off the roof and goes down the downspouts to go out on the side of the house as installed presently, it goes directly towards the marsh.

**Mr. Coursey** asked if they have considered some sort of cistern to put the water into so that it can drain below the surface.

**Mr. Adamski** said this is an interesting question. But because of the water table, he is unsure if they could engineer a cistern for this property.

**Ms. Reno** said she believes that the permeability of their site is pretty high as far as being able to soak up the water.

**Mr. Coursey** said he believes the offer on the table now is to reduce back two feet. What would this do to the outside? This will reduce it by two feet along the bedroom wall as well, won't it?

**Ms. Reno** explained that if you push it back two feet, you will be in the consistent line with the existing terrace.

**Mr. Adamski** said, pointing to an area, if they take it from here straight over, would give them what they need.

**Ms. Reno** concurred and said they will still have that point, but it will just be closer to the house.

**Mr. Adamski** pointed out that this is the family room, these are the sliding glass doors, a couch is here, and they are looking out this way.

**Mr. Coursey** asked if they have problems with the sliding glass doors.

**Mr. Adamski** said the sliding glass doors will be replaced.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

**Mr. Vinyard** stated that it pays to be flexible. They are here to follow the rules as best as they can. The Board tried with a previous case, but the Petitioner did not show up today. These Petitioners are here and have offered a reasonable suggestion, plus there is a real problem. He went to this site and looked. Therefore, he is familiar with all of this.

**Mr. Coursey** asked the Petitioners if the neighbors had a say in this matter.



**Ms. Reno** answered yes. The neighbors submitted letters supporting their petition.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** confirmed the Board that letters of support were received from the neighbors.

**Motion**

The Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the Petitioner's variance requests with one condition.:

1. There shall be gutters placed on the new roof designed to direct water flow away from the marsh.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Meredith Stone

Second: Robert Vinyard

James Coursey - Aye

Meredith Stone - Aye

Robert Vinyard - Aye

Benjamin Polote, Jr. - Aye

[6. 5 LAUREL OAK COURT | Rear Yard Setback Variance Request | ZBA -0423-000378](#)

[📎 Staff Report .pdf](#)

[📎 Photos.pdf](#)

**Melissa Paul-Leto** gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting a 7-foot rear yard setback variance from the 25-foot requirement to reduce the rear setback at 5 Laurel Oak Court from 25 feet to 18 feet for the construction of an enclosed porch. Ms. Paul-Leto stated that the subject property is located on the eastside of Laurel Oak Court, south of Wedgefield Crossing in the South Bridge Subdivision. It is a conforming lot of record and is developed with a single-family residence constructed in 1988.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** explained that the Petitioner is requesting a reduction in the rear yard setback to accommodate the construction of an enclosed porch on the northwest corner of the home. The lot is in a planned development with a rear yard setback of 25 feet. The extension to the home as proposed would require a 7-foot reduction of the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 18 feet. The proposed porch would be 10x13 feet and would align with the edge of the existing residence. Ms. Paul-Leto showed the Board the site plan that was provided to Staff.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** stated that there are extraordinary conditions pertaining to this particular piece of property. This lot is separated from lots to the rear by a significant vegetative buffer and a lagoon. These features obscure the proposed addition and lessen any visual impacts that may occur. The Petitioner is not suffering any undue hardship; however, the proposed addition is in keeping with the development pattern in the neighborhood. The subject property is affected in particular because of its relation to the wooded area on the rear. Homes which abut this particular common area enjoy a significant buffer and additional separation from their neighbors. Ms. Paul-Leto said based on previously stated findings, a variance in this case would not impair the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. It is unlikely that this variance will affect the neighborhood or uniformity of houses in any noticeable way.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** said based on the findings in the staff report, staff recommends approval of a 7-foot rear yard setback variance from the 25- foot requirement for 5 Laurel Oak Court. Ms. Paul-Leto stated that Mr. Lotson and she visited the site and spoke with the property owner and neighboring property owner. She entertained questions from the Board.

**Mr. Vinyard** asked Staff if they received any letters against this request.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** answered that Staff has not received any letters for against this request.

**Mr. Coursey** said that Staff has stated that there are other homes in the general area that have encroachment issues.

**Ms. Paul-Leto** said that there is a common area here that have screened porches that are also encroaching.

**PETITIONER COMMENTS**

**Mr. Coursey** asked the Petitioner to come forward.

No one came forward. **Ms. Paul-Leto** explained that the Petitioner is an elderly person.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board was in agreement with the Staff recommendation.

**Motion**

The Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the rear yard setback variance request for 5 Laurel Oak Court.

**Vote Results ( Approved )**

Motion: Meredith Stone

Second: Benjamin Polote, Jr.

James Coursey	- Aye
Meredith Stone	- Aye
Robert Vinyard	- Aye
Benjamin Polote, Jr.	- Aye

**X. Other Business**

**XI. Adjournment**

[7. Adjourned](#)

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Coursey adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:48 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marcus Lotson, Director  
Development Services

ML:mem

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