



City of Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
May 25, 2023 - 10:00 A.M.
Meeting Minutes

MAY 25, 2023 CITY OF SAVANNAH ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Members Present: Michael Condon, Vice Chair
Larry Evans
Karen Jarrett
Betty Jones
Stephen Plunk
Armand Turner

Member Absent: Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair

MPC Staff Present: Melanie Wilson, MPC Executive Director
Marcus Lotson, Development Services Director
Melissa Paul-Leto, Development Services Planner
Mary Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Warren Durrer, Executive Assistant
Hind Patel, IT Helpdesk & Support
Edward Morrow, Principal Planner

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

City of Savannah: Tom Bolton, Zoning Plans Examiner
John Anagnost, Zoning Plans Examiner

I. Call to Order and Welcome

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

NOTE: The Chair, Mr. Stephen Merriman, Jr., does not vote unless there is a tie.

Mr. Michael Condon, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m., He explained that this is a quasi-judicial proceeding. All those wishing to give testimony during these proceedings were asked to please sign in. They were sworn in by Mr. Condon. He explained that all proceedings of the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals are recorded. Decisions of the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals are final. Challenges to the decisions of the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals must be filed through the Superior Court of Chatham County. All persons

II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

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

The Invocation was given by **Mrs. Betty Jones**. The Pledge of Allegiance was given recited in unison.

III. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

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

V. Item(s) Requested to be Withdrawn

VI. Approval of Minutes

[3. Approve April 27, 2023 Meeting Minutes](#)

📎 [April 27, 2023 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve April 27, 2023, Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Betty Jones

Karen Jarrett - Aye

Michael Condon - Aye

Larry Evans - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Aye

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner - Aye

VII. Approval of Final Agenda

VIII. Consent Agenda

IX. Old Business

X. Regular Agenda

[4. 3400 Highgate Boulevard | Sign Height Variance | 23-000851](#)

📎 [Staff Report - 23-000851-ZBA.pdf](#)

📎 [Pines at NH Site Layout.pdf](#)

📎 [New Hampstead POA Approval Correspondence.pdf](#)

📎 [NHPOA approval of _The Pines at NH_ Neighborhood Entrance Sign Design with locations.pdf](#)

📎 [103607 THE PINES MNMT_PERMIT.pdf](#)

Mr. Marcus Lotson gave the staff report. The Petitioner is requesting a 4-foot sign height variance from the 6-foot sign height maximum for two neighborhood identification signs at the entrances to a subdivision. The property, known as The Pines, is zoned PD (Planned Development) and is within the New Hampstead Master Planned Community. He showed the site layout of the neighborhood. This neighborhood includes both single and multi-family uses. The property can be accessed from Highgate Boulevard as well as Fort Argyll Road.

Mr. Lotson explained that it is true that the subdivision can be accessed from both streets (Highgate Boulevard and Fort Argyll Road), but the proposed location of the signs of the Highgate Boulevard

entrance will be ten feet back from the edge of the pavement, two feet inside of the property line, and 20 feet back from the drivable roadway. This is consistent with the requirements for free standing signs. Mr. Lotson showed the Board the signs and stated that the New Hampstead development has a property Homeowners Association [HOA]. This HOA manages the declaration of covenants for all the new neighborhoods that are created within their boundaries. The HOA has approved this sign design and height, which they are required to do. This was a condition that was listed in the Staff's recommendation. The approval information for the proposed sign was received from the HOA.

Mr. Lotson stated that one of the things Staff looks at relative to the variance request, is any conditions that might be unusual or different to this location. He said that Highgate Boulevard has a 125 foot plus or minus right-of-way. The entrance to the property is quite a distance from the existing roadway. Staff found that based on the additional height, it actually improved the situation from a visibility and safety standpoint and was not out of character with the general development pattern.

Mr. Lotson reported that based on these findings and the other findings, Staff is recommending approval of the four-foot sign height variance. He said staff is not putting a condition on the variance request because the New Hampstead Homeowners Association has already approved the petition. He entertained questions from the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Sean Congleton, CEO of Sign Design, stated that they started this process two years ago at the beginning of COVID-19. They are transparent; the signs are already existing, and they did so based on an email from the City of Savannah that he put in the packet. Mr. Congleton explained that he was at the mercy of the Board. Somehow, the mistake was made, and the work was done. He is pleading the mercy of the Board. He appreciates the comments made by the MPC staff as well as the HOA's approval. Their company's policy is to do things the right way to ensure that the permits are filed. They would not install a sign without a permit; except this time, it was an accident. They thought they had their permit. However, today, they are here to do things the right way. Consequently, he referred to the Board's judgment, but respectfully asked that they please consider approving their variance request. He entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Jarrett said her only concern is sight distance. They need to ensure that the cars nor pedestrians are not blocked by the sign. Has anybody looked at this?

Mr. Congleton said originally, they were going to have double-sided signs here that was perpendicular to the road. He explained that Mr. Tom Bolton of the City of Savannah identified that the placement of the sign was an issue. Consequently, they relocated the sign so as not to have any sight distances. The sign is set back far enough so as not to cause any traffic concerns. He said, therefore, in an answer to Ms. Jarrett's question, the sight distance concern was addressed earlier.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the Staff recommendation.

Mr. Condon entertained a motion.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve a 4-foot sign height variance from the 6-foot maximum sign height for two neighborhood identification signs at the entrance to the Pines at New Hampstead, 3400 Highgate Boulevard.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Betty Jones

Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Larry Evans	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye

5. VARIANCE | 424 East 55th Street | 23-002253-ZBA

[Site Visit.pdf](#)

[Application.pdf](#)

[Staff Report.pdf](#)

[Letters of Support.pdf](#)

Ms. Melissa Paul-Leto gave the staff report. Ms. Paul-Leto showed an aerial view of the property. The subject property is a two-story residence, located within the RSF-6 (Residential Single-Family-6) Zoning District where the maximum lot coverage is 40%. The petitioner, Peter T. Callejas, is requesting a variance to increase the 40% maximum lot coverage to 43.4% to construct a rear bedroom addition.

Ms. Paul-Leto explained that the subject property has a total lot area of .15 acres, or 6,534 square feet. The request to construct a 322 square-foot, one-story rear bedroom addition is the reason a variance is required to the excess of 224 square feet, or 3.4% over the required 40% lot coverage requirement. The subject property, 424 East 55th Street, was built in 1941 and currently occupies 2,007 square feet. It is a single-family residence with three bedrooms and two bathrooms. The family has owned the property for ten years. They have two children, and the parents work from home. The third bedroom, which is dedicated to their youngest son, has only enough room for a crib bed, dresser, and chair without a closet. Their son is growing and needs a single twin bed. Ms. Paul-Leto stated that the room does not have enough room to accommodate a twin bed. The Petitioner is requesting an additional 198 square feet, or 3.4% above the 40% lot coverage requirement to construct a rear bedroom addition for their son.

Ms. Paul-Leto stated that based on the variance criteria, Staff finds that the requested variance would not be detrimental to the welfare of the community. The proposed rear addition would not be seen from the front of the house and would not cause a precedent to the neighborhood as the area has several additions as families have grown with more children. She explained that the size of this property is slightly smaller with 5,700 square feet in size, unlike the larger lots on East 55th Street with 8,000 to 9,000 square foot lot sizes. Ms. Paul-Leto explained that the special condition would be the existing size of the third bedroom being too small for a single twin bed and a closet. This room was built when the house was constructed. The condition is not the result from actions of the homeowners.

Ms. Paul-Leto reported that based upon the variance criteria, staff recommends approval of the requested variance. She entertained questions from the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Peter T. Callejas, AIA, of Homestead Architecture came forward and thanked the Board for hearing their petition. He explained that the house is in somewhat an odd configuration. They have looked for ways to incorporate and reconfigure the interior spaces to accommodate this, however, it is an odd layout. Mr. Callejas explained that this is a two-story elevation, but there is no way to add another bedroom in the current footprint without completely gutting the house and reconfigure the entire house due to the fact that you would have to reconfigure some windows, egress, and change the footprint in a

way that would be cost prohibitive. Mr. Callejas said because of the growing family, they were looking at a couple of different things. What they have here is just enough to get the size of the bedroom. There will also be a closet and bathroom They do not feel that this is terribly extravagant, nor are they trying to do anything that is crazy; they are just trying to get enough square footage so this growing family can have enough living space in this house in a configuration that works for their live style. The family wants to stay in this neighborhood; they love the neighborhood and love the house.

Mr. Callejas said they have letters of support from the neighbors. He believes that one or two of the neighbors have concerns. However, he does not feel that they are doing anything out of the ordinary. Originally, the reconfiguration was 198 square feet, but there was a little bump out on an existing accessory shed that he did not notice. When he added the square footage for that, it came up that they are asking for 224 square feet. He entertained questions from the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

Mr. Condon entertained a motion.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve a 43.4% lot coverage variance for property located at 424 East 55th Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Betty Jones

Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Larry Evans	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye

6. 111 WEST CONGRESS STREET | SIGN HEIGHT VARIANCE | 23-002268

📎 [Staff Report - 23-002268-ZBA.pdf](#)

📎 [HDBR Staff Report COA 22-004373 Dated 11-9-2022.pdf](#)

📎 [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Research Packet- 111 W Congress St.pdf](#)

Mr. James Zerillo gave the staff report. The Petitioner is requesting a variance to the 10-foot height requirement to allow for a marquee sign with 8 feet and 9 inches of clearance above the sidewalk to align with the heights of adjacent historic buildings. Mr. Zerillo showed the Board a photo of the property. The property is zoned D-CBD (Downtown Central Business District.).

Mr. Zerillo explained that a variance recommendation request was approved by the Historic District Board of Review on November 9, 2022. He said that the Staff report references the historic context of the existing stone marquee sign which does not conform to the standard in the Ordinance. Mr. Zerillo stated that the Petitioner provided samples of the two most prominent signs, which are the Trustees Theatre sign and Savannah Theatre sign. There are two other marquee signs that are used as reference. He showed the Board the renderings that the Petitioner provided as examples for the marquee sign. He also showed the Board the elevation drawings.

Mr. Zerillo stated again that the Petitioner provided examples of marquee signs. Staff found several examples of existing marquee signs on Broughton Street and one on Bull Street which do not conform to this standard. None of the referenced existing marquees present a detriment to the public health, safety, or welfare of the surrounding neighborhood or pedestrians utilizing the sidewalk. Special conditions do exist on the subject parcel. The existing structure is shorter in height than surrounding structures on this block of West Congress Street. He said that according to the Historic District Ordinance, signs must be signed on the signable area per the architectural context of the building. The architectural context has the sign placed lower than it could be placed based on the windows sill height and the area where it could be signed. Mr. Zerillo stated that the special conditions and/or circumstances were not created by the Petitioner, and they are not financial in nature. He said that the literal interpretation would deprive the Petitioner of rights enjoyed by the rest of the community as there are examples of existing marquee signs within the same Zoning District, which do not conform. Mr. Zerillo explained that in addition the HDBR Staff report stated that "reducing the height of the proposed sign could cause it to no longer meet the visual compatibility standards in the Downtown Historic Overlay ordinance." He said that this requires signs to match the historic context. He stated as far as the minimum variance, this variance if granted, would be the minimum variance. Mr. Zerillo again referenced the HDBR staff report.

Mr. Zerillo reported that based upon the development pattern and variance criteria, Staff recommends approval for a variance to the 10-foot height requirement to allow for a marquee sign with 8 feet and 9 inches of clearance above the sidewalk at 111 West Congress Street. He entertained questions from the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Kevin Rose thanked the Board for hearing their petition. Mr. Rose said he agrees with the Staff recommendation. He entertained questions from the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the staff recommendation.

Mr. Condon entertained a motion.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approval a variance to the 10-foot height requirement to allow for a marquee sign with 8 feet and 9 inches of clearance above the sidewalk at 111 West Congress Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Stephen Plunk

Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Larry Evans	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye

☉ [Staff Report - 23-002215-ZBA.pdf](#)

☉ [SIGNED Commission_Decision_- 23-001790-COA_- 523_Seiler_Avenue.pdf](#)

☉ [House Plans.pdf](#)

Mr. James Zerillo gave the staff report. The Petitioner is requesting a variance for a reduction of the building frontage minimum from 70% to 60% to accommodate a ribbon strip driveway on the side of the building to meet the required parking minimum. Mr. Zerillo stated that 523 Seiler Avenue is currently an unimproved lot. The Petitioner received a Certificate of Appropriateness [COA] from the Historic Preservation Commission on April 26, 2023 (23- 001790-COA) approving the construction of a new single-family residence on the property. The HPC also approved a variance recommendation request to the Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals to allow for a reduction of the building frontage from the minimum 70% to the proposed 60%. He noted that there is no lane access on this block; the parcel is 94 feet in depth and 34 feet width. Within the context, there are examples of single-family residences on this block, both new and existing construction that have front yard driveways. He stated that examples are 515, 516 and 519 Seiler Avenue. He showed the Board a photo and stated that the address is 510, which is also an example of an existing front yard driveway. He also showed the Board a copy of the proposed site plan with the ribbon strip driveway on the side and showed them the front elevation.

Mr. Zerillo said that Staff found this to be consistent with the Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan. There are several properties on this block of Seiler Avenue that have front yard driveways. Therefore, they found this to be in compliance with the character of this block. He said in addition, there is no public safety or welfare concerns for this block as Seiler Avenue is not particularly a high traffic road. Therefore, Staff believes that this is not a detriment to the public health, safety, or welfare. He explained that regarding the literal interpretation of the Ordinance, Staff found that there are examples of single-family residences on this block with front yard driveways, both in historic buildings and in newer constructions. Therefore, Staff found that this would deprive the Petitioner of rights enjoyed by the rest of the community. As he has stated, the subject property does not have access to a lane. The variance, if granted, would be the minimum variance to meet the parking requirements of one space per unit as well as to meet the standards on the Streetcar Local Historic District Ordinance for driveways. The variance would not grant any special privileges to the Petitioner.

Mr. Zerillo reported that based upon the development pattern and variance criteria, Staff recommends approval for a variance for the reduction of the building frontage minimum from 70% to 60% to accommodate a ribbon strip driveway on the side of the building to meet the required parking minimum. He entertained questions from the Board.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Inna Adams stated that she is the owner of the lot. Ms. Adams said upon the recommendation of the Historic Board, they went through the design process. The driveway seems to be important. The size of the house is very comfortable. There will be four bedrooms and three and one-half bathrooms. This is plenty of space. The house on the inside is 18 feet wide, which does not seem to be that much, but it is very comfortable. Ms. Adams entertained questions from the Board.

Ms. Jarrett asked Ms. Adams if this is a single-family residence.

Ms. Adams answered "yes." The lot is 30 feet wide. It does not allow much room for configuration or changes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Kathlan Molfin said she does not live on Seiler Avenue, but she is considering buying property nearby. Ms. Molfin asked if this is a single-family home. Is there a possibility that this could come back in a couple of years and turn into a multi-family home?

Mr. Condon stated that realistically, they cannot predict the future. But, for the home to be multi-family, it would require a variance.

Mr. Lotson stated that this lot does not have enough lot area to allow a duplex.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the Staff recommendation.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve a variance for the reduction of the building frontage minimum from 70% to 60% to accommodate a ribbon strip driveway on the side of the building to meet the required parking minimum at 523 Seiler Avenue.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Betty Jones

Second: Stephen Plunk

Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Larry Evans	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye

8. VARIANCE | 520 East 51st Street | 23-002254-ZBA

📎 [Application.pdf](#)

📎 [Letter of Support.pdf](#)

📎 [MAP.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Ms. Melissa Paul-Leto gave the staff report. The Petitioner is requesting two variances. One variance is for lot coverage. They are requesting to go 1.4% or 198 Square feet over the 40% required percentage in the RSF-6 Zoning District. Ms. Paul-Leto stated that the Petitioners also have an after-the-fact accessory building that was constructed within the five-foot required rear yard setback. She showed the Board pictures of the rear yard single-family residence. The deck will be removed. There is a meter area. Therefore, the addition will start after the meter; this is where the one-story master bedroom will begin.

Ms. Paul-Leto said the other property is .11 acres or 4,791 square feet. This is a one-story, single-family residence and was constructed about 1930. It currently occupies about 1,061 square feet of interior space. It has two bedrooms and one bathroom. The Petitioner is requesting a rear addition to the principal residence for the following purposes. A small laundry area with pantry, a utility room for the water heater, a new master bedroom, and master closet. The rear addition will exceed the required 40% lot coverage maximum by 1.4%, or 198 square feet.

Ms. Paul-Leto explained that the Petitioner is also requesting an after-the-fact variance to the carport that was constructed without a building permit. The property owners hired a builder who did not apply for a building permit. The property owners were not aware of this. Therefore, they were not informed that the carport was required to have a five-foot rear yard setback. The builder constructed the carport with a zero rear yard setback. She stated that as the Board could see from the picture where the French doors are, that at one time, this was an existing accessory building that was nonconforming with the rear yard setback. The owners hired a builder. He worked on the roof and added on to the carport without the property owners knowing that he did not have a building permit. Otherwise, if the owners had gone through the building permit process, as the Board knows, they would have been informed that they

needed to apply for a variance rear yard setback. The Petitioner at this time is requesting the variance.

Ms. Paul-Leto showed the Board some more images. She directed the Board to look on the screen at the shaded area of the site plan, which is the rear addition. The slide shows the existing shed and the expansion of the nonconformity of the rear yard setback to go into the carport to the rear of the property with a zero-foot rear yard setback. Ms. Paul-Leto said she has more drawings from the architect. She also has photos of the accessory building. The East 50th Lane indicates that there are some accessory buildings within the lane that were nonconforming with the rear yard setback. Ms. Paul-Leto showed the Board the development pattern on this subject block. The shaded areas indicates that all the accessory buildings are on the zero-lot line within the East 51st Street, East 50th Street, and East 50th Lane.

Ms. Paul-Leto said that based on the variance criteria in Section 3.21.10, staff found the following: The requested variances would not be detrimental to the welfare of the community. The proposed rear addition would be replacing the rear deck area on the property with a total of 480 square-feet for the rear addition, 198 square-feet of the 480 square-feet is the reason for the requested variance. The after-the-fact carport is considered an expansion of the existing accessory building's non-conformity constructed with a 0-foot rear yard setback within the required 5-foot rear yard setback requirement. There is direct access to East 50th Lane which the property owner utilizes for ingress and egress to and from his property. The size of the property is slightly smaller with 4,791.6 square feet in size unlike the larger lots on East 51st Street with 6,000 square foot lots on the subject block within the RSF-6 zoning district. However, there are seven out of thirteen properties that are of similar size as the subject property along East 51st Street. The property owner is a military veteran with existing physical conditions from his time of service. Part of the reason for the addition is to increase accessibility. Entrance to the rear of the house with a few 4-inch steps would allow him more space and to physically be able to come out of his vehicle from the carport and walk a short distance into his bedroom. The condition is a result of the actions of the Petitioner to make his quality of life greater.

Ms. Paul-Leto reported that based upon the development pattern and the variance criteria, staff recommends approval of the requested variances with the following condition: 1. Add gutters to direct stormwater runoff consistent with the City's stormwater management policy.

Ms. Paul Leto informed the Board that a letter of support was provided by the owners' neighbor. The adjacent neighbor had a question regarding the elevation of the rear addition roof. This neighbor's deck aligns with the owners' deck. The neighbor wanted to know how high the pitch of the roof will be. Ms. Paul-Leto said this is a question that the architect will be able to explain when making his presentation to the Board. Ms. Paul-Leto entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Evans asked who constructed the garage.

Ms. Paul-Leto answered that Staff does not know who constructed the garage.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Pete Callejas thanked the Board for hearing their petition. He said there are a lot of nuances for this request. Mr. Callejas said he was hired to look at building an addition to make the owners home more livable for a disabled veteran. As the Board knows, these homes are small, tight, the bathrooms and kitchens are tiny, and the hallways are narrow. The family has one bathroom that they are sharing with their child. Therefore, the owners are trying to make their small house more accessible and more livable for the 21st Century living.

Mr. Callejas said as far as the addition is concerned, the addition is not the master bedroom but is actually the master bathroom. Therefore, it is not adding another bedroom, but adding a bathroom and a utility area on the rear. As far as the carport, it was built before he came on the scene, and he was not sure who was the builder. He does not know the person's name and he was not here to point fingers or report it. But, when he noticed that it did not conform and did not have a permit, he brought this up with the homeowner who immediately, first of all, was surprised and shocked that the builder did not have a permit. The homeowner is new to the area and did not understand the process.

Mr. Callejas said what the homeowner told him was that he wanted to make this legitimate and do what needed to be done so that nothing would be hanging out there nonconforming and illegitimate. Mr.

Callejas said he contacted Development Services and talked with Mr. Ghilarducci who told him that he could do a set of construction documents for this existing building that was already built. Mr. Callejas said the building was not badly done. It is a nice building. Therefore, he was happy to do as he was informed. The construction documents were approved by all the departments until it got to Zoning. This is where they got their snag. Consequently, his job was to see whether they could get it approved without the homeowners having to take five feet of the roof off just to meet the Ordinance. Mr. Callejas said they are very apologetic that this happened. It should not have happened. If he was designing it, he would have designed it differently. However, it is existing, and does align with 23 other accessory buildings on this lane with the zero-lot line. Therefore, the owners have not created any anomalies and they have not created any barriers or obstructions than what is already existing. This does not prevent any service vehicles, trash, or fire trucks if it became necessary for them to travel through here.

Mr. Callejas said they are trying to get the approval, get permission, and get forgiveness so that his client can have a nice place to park and have an accessible path to their house. The new design will become a more livable space for the homeowners. As he has said, the owner is a disabled veteran, and he appreciates his service. Mr. Callejas said he was trying to do what he could do to improve the owner's life and get through this process. He does not believe anything that they are asking for is unreasonable or out of the ordinary. It is what it is. Therefore, this is why they are here. Mr. Callejas entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Evans stated that he understood that Mr. Callejas was not trying to cast aspersion on anyone.

Mr. Turner said that staff's recommendation regarding adding gutters, is this just to the rear addition or to the carport as well.

Ms. Paul-Leto said this is for the roof structure all around.

Mr. Condon asked if this includes the carport retroactively.

Ms. Paul-Leto answered yes.

Mr. Callejas said they are perfectly happy to do that.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Emily Hood was online. Ms. Hood said she is the adjacent neighbor who raised the concern regarding the roof height. When the garage was built, it seemed as if it was larger than anyone expected. She was wondering if this would happen again. Will this be a sloped roof, follow the existing, or something else? If they look at all the houses long this strip, the backyards all have fairly low-profile roofs that do not restrict anybody's access to light. Ms. Hood said her concern is more about volume than actual footprint on the property. Is there any way they can get a preview of what the total structure of the addition will be?

Mr. Callejas answered that they have not actually designed the space yet as they are trying to get approval. However, the intent is to be a one-story building. The roof height will be lower than the existing roof height of the house. It is not connecting to the carport or accessory building in any way. Therefore, it will be a small addition on the rear. It will not be more than the one-story addition. The roof height will conform to whatever height restrictions they may have. He said that he could not speak to the reasoning or design because he was not the designer of the carport, but because it got wider, the roof sloped the way it was as it got a little higher. Mr. Callejas said that he does not believe that anybody expected anything as nobody saw any drawings. It is what it is. But it is not higher than what is allowed in the area.

Ms. Hood said she understood that approval needs to be gotten before Mr. Callejas designs it. She asked him to please restate what the use of this addition will be for.

Mr. Callejas said it will be a master bathroom and a small utility area. The homeowners now only have one bathroom which they share with their child. The homeowner is a partially disabled veteran, and the house is small. They have a small kitchen and hallway. They are trying to make the home more livable and more accessible. They do not feel that they are asking too much. He told Ms. Hood that they

appreciate her concerns.

Ms. Hood thanked Mr. Callejas for the clarification.

Mr. Scott Anderson resides at 506 East 50th Street and submitted a letter of support.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was in agreement with the Staff recommendation.

Mr. Condon entertained a motion.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve the requested variances for 520 East 51st Street with the following condition:

1. Add gutters to direct stormwater runoff consistent with the City's stormwater management policy.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Larry Evans

Second: Stephen Plunk

Karen Jarrett - Aye

Michael Condon - Aye

Larry Evans - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Aye

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner - Aye

9. VARIANCE | 1313 Habersham Street | 23-002255-ZBA

📎 [site visit.pdf](#)

📎 [Application.pdf](#)

📎 [MAP.pdf](#)

📎 [Parking Calculations email.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff Report.pdf](#)

The Board continued this petition to the June 22, 2023 meeting.

Motion

The Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals does hereby approve to continue this petition to the June 22, 2023, meeting.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Betty Jones

Karen Jarrett	- Aye
Michael Condon	- Aye
Larry Evans	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye

XI. Other Business

XII. Adjournment

10. Adjourned

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Condon adjourned the meeting at 11:10 a. m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marcus Lotson, Director
Development Services

ML:mem

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.