



City of Savannah Zoning Board of Appeals

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
October 2, 2024 10:00 a.m.
Minutes

October 2, 2024 CITY OF SAVANNAH ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Members Present: Stephen Merriman, Jr., Chair
Michael Condon, Vice-Chair
Betty Jones
Armand Turner
Stephen Plunk
Benjamin "Trapper" Griffith
Brad Baugh

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

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

City of Savannah: John Anagnost, Zoning Administrator

I. Call to Order and Welcome

II. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

III. Notices, Proclamations and Acknowledgements

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

[1. 4790 Waters Ave | Sign Variance | 24-004597- ZBA](#)

[📎 32685511 VARIANCE APPLICATION FOR SUBMITTAL.pdf](#)

Motion

Item removed from the final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Michael Condon - Not Present

Stephen Plunk - Aye

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner	- Aye
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Benjamin Griffith	- Aye

[2. 225 West 40th Street | Variances for ADU square footage and 40% | 24-004558-ZBA](#)

Motion

Item removed from the final agenda.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk
Second: Betty Jones

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

V. Item(s) Requested to be Withdrawn

VI. Approval of Minutes

[3. Approval of the August 22, 2024 Meeting Minutes](#)

[📎 august-22-2024-city-of-savannah-zoning-board-of-appeals-minutes.pdf](#)

Motion

Approval of the August 22, 2024 Meeting Minutes.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk
Second: Betty Jones

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

VII. Approval of Final Agenda

VIII. Consent Agenda

IX. Old Business

X. Regular Agenda

[4. 0 Gable Street | Side Setback Variance | 24-004053-ZBA](#)

[0 GABLE ST_24-004053-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

[Staff Report_ 0 Gable St.pdf](#)

[0 GABLE ST_SITE PLAN.pdf](#)

[0 Gable St Survey.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/ Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** stated the Petitioner is requesting approval of a variance to permit a 2.5-foot side yard setback where five feet is required on both sides of a proposed single-family dwelling in the RSF-5 zoning district. The subject property is a vacant parcel with street and lane access. The lot is nonconforming regarding both frontage and area within its zoning district RSF-5 (Residential Single Family-5). The proposed development is a single-family detached house twenty feet wide and sixty-five feet in depth. The home is also proposed to have a porch sixteen feet width and five feet in depth. The requested variances are necessitated by the action of the Petitioner, as it is possible to build a conforming dwelling on the property. The literal interpretation of the regulations could deprive the Applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district, as these regulations contemplate a property having requisite minimum frontage land area.

MPC staff recommends **denial** of the variances requested to permit 2.5 ft side yard side setbacks.

Alternatively, Staff recommends **approval** of the following:

1. Reduce the side yard setback to three feet where five feet is ordinarily required (two feet of relief);
2. Twelve inches relief for setback of side eaves and overhangs to permit twenty-four inches where thirty-six inches is ordinarily required (1-foot reduction)
- 3) Permit lot coverage up to 49%, consistent with a maximum building footprint of nineteen feet by seventy-one feet (1,349 square feet).

Ms. Patricia Nelson, Petitioner, said the reason for her petition is so that she can build a home for her daughter.

Mr. Merriman asked the petitioner if she understood Staff's recommendations. Ms. Nelson said yes.

Board Discussion

None

Motion

Approval of the following:

- 1) Reduce the side yard setback to three feet where five feet are ordinarily required (two feet of relief);
- 2) Twelve inches relief for setback of side eaves and overhangs to permit twenty-four inches where thirty-six inches are ordinarily required (1-foot reduction)
- 3) Permit lot coverage up to 49%, consistent with a maximum building footprint of nineteen feet by seventy-one feet (1,349 square feet).

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr.

- Abstain

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

[5. 305 Edgewater Rd | Side and Front Yard Fence Height Variances | 24-004496-ZBA](#)

[305 EDGEWATER RD_24-004496-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

[Staff Report - 24-004496-ZBA - 305 Edgewater Rd.pdf](#)

[Justification for Fence Height Variance _240921_140523.pdf](#)

[Fence variance pictures.pdf](#)

Mr. Brad Clement, Senior Planner for Development Services, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Clement** stated the Petitioner is requesting relief from Sec. 9.0 General Site Standards, specifically Sec. 9.6 Fences and Walls. The subject property is located in a Residential Single-Family – 6 (RSF-6) district and is situated on an otherwise conforming lot per the district standards. The Petitioner has constructed a fence that is non-conforming in height and structure per the development standards for the district and is seeking relief so that the fence may remain. The subject property measures approximately 9,504 square feet in area, per the Chatham County Tax Assessor. The property is zoned RSF-6 (Residential Single family -6). It is a conforming parcel in this zoning district with more than the required sixty feet of frontage and 6,000 square feet of area. The existing fence is five feet tall in front of the property where normally four feet would be allowable. The ordinance does allow for additional height if the design standards of Sec. 9.6.4.e.iv are met, which require the area of the fence or wall above three (3) feet in height shall be a minimum of 70% open. The side and rear yard fence have an existing height of six feet which would be allowable if located behind a façade. The current construction of the fence also does not meet this requirement. No special circumstances are present regarding the subject property or its contained structures. The requested variances are inconsistent with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The home was built after the adoption of *NewZO* and the associated development standards that apply and was not conforming at the time of its construction.

MPC Staff recommends **denial** of the requested relief to accommodate the existing construction of the nonconforming front and side fencing located on the subject property.

Mr. Brad Baugh, Member of the Board, asked if this was an action of Code Enforcement or a call in from a private citizen.

Mr. John Anagnost, City of Savannah said he was not aware of an open case with Code Compliance regarding this fence.

Mr. Griffith asked for clarification regarding the property being for sale.

Mr. Clement said the property has been on the market for some time.

Mr. Merriman asked if the fence on the side area, since it is not behind the facade, does it fall under the four-foot rule?

Mr. Clement stated yes, and currently the fence is six feet in height.

Ms. Tiffani Bannerman, Petitioner, said she sent in several pictures of other properties in the area that have fences at six feet in height.

Mr. Merriman asked the Petitioner how they ended up before the Board to request a variance.

Ms. Bannerman said Code Enforcement did come by. Ms. Bannerman said the five feet in the front and

the six feet on the side does not adversely affect anyone in the neighborhood. She also stated that she is not aware of any complaints. She stated Code Enforcement originally came for the lot next door and cited this lot as well. There are several areas in Paradise Park with fences just like hers. She is asking for the variance, even though she is selling the property, because there is a great need for privacy and security. There are a lot of people walking by, yelling obscenities, and coming on the property dropping trash. There have been people in the past to actually jump the fence. She stated they have spent over ten thousand dollars on this fence already.

Mr. Plunk asked if anyone was living in the house now.

Ms. Bannerman said it is vacant.

Mr. Turner asked if there has been any conversation with the neighbors? Has anyone complained or had any issues with the fence?

Ms. Bannerman said no, they have the enjoyment of the fence. There was a wire fence there and now they have the enjoyment of this fence.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Plunk said he is sympathetic if this was a woman living here and having harassment issues but there is no one living there at all. I am less sympathetic with that.

Mr. Turner said this is difficult. He is not sure there is enough justification to go against the existing Staff recommendations, but he does not see who it is disrupting compared to the other fences in the neighborhood which are clearly six feet or higher.

Mr. Griffith said he doesn't mind it but wouldn't want every house in the neighborhood to have that and does not want that door opened so how do you handle that.

There being no further discussion the Board entertained a motion.

Motion

Approval of the requested relief to accommodate the existing construction of the nonconforming front and side fencing located on the subject property.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Armand Turner

Second: Brad Baugh

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Michael Condon	- Abstain
Stephen Plunk	- Nay
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Benjamin Griffith	- Aye

[6. 2110-2114 Bulloch Street | Lot width Variance | 24-004497-ZBA](#)

📎 [2110-2114 BULLOCH ST_24-004497-ZA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

📎 [Staff_Report_24-004497-ZBA.pdf](#)

📎 [2110 BULLOCH STREET Site Plan.jpg](#)

[2114 BULLOCH STREET Site Plan.jpg](#)

Ms. Anna McQuarrie, Planner, Development Services presented the Staff report. **Ms. McQuarrie** stated the Petitioner is requesting a lot width variance of 2.5 feet for 2110 and 2114 Bulloch Street. The variance will allow for the lots to be recombined and subdivided to achieve equal lot widths of 37.5 feet. The subject parcels are in a Traditional Residential-1 (TR-1) zoning district, which require a 40-foot minimum lot width. The Petitioner is working with the Community Housing Services Agency, Inc., and the City of Savannah to construct affordable housing that will include a 1,032 square foot single family home, a detached shed, and parking on each lot. Subject parcels are located within the TR-1 zoning district and Cuyler-Brownville National Register Historic District and the local Cuyler-Brownville Historic District.

The Petitioner received a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Savannah Historic Preservation Commission on July 26, 2024, (24-003127-COA) for the building design. 2110 and 2114 are currently empty lots with parcel width of fifty feet at 2110 Bulloch and twenty-five feet at 2114 Bulloch Street. Historically, a one-story framed shotgun home was located on 2114 Bulloch, but according to the state resource survey, the home was demolished around 2000.

The two parcels will share a driveway with a private portion on each side. The shared portion of the driveway will be twelve feet in width with six feet of private portion on each parcel. The driveway meets the maximum width. The site plan shows the driveway as being a typical rectangular driveway. This should be adjusted to match the ordinance, which requires a ribbon driveway. Both lots will have a storage shed as an accessory structure. The 8' x 8' x 10' shed will be in the rear of the lot and meets the setback, height, and building coverage requirements. The proposed houses will be affordable housing units for first-time homebuyers that qualify for the DreamMaker home program. Savannah Local Initiatives (SLI) is a partner with the Community Housing Services Agency, Inc. (CHSA) and the City of Savannah in the delivery of affordable housing programs. The requested variances are not necessitated by the action of the Petitioner. The parcel at 2110 Bulloch Street is currently non-conforming with a lot width of twenty-five feet. Recombination as proposed will bring each lot as close to conformity as possible. The literal interpretation of the regulations would not deprive the Applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district. However, the proposed alteration of the lot width will allow for two lots that are closer to conforming under current development standards. It is advantageous that the recombination occurs while the parcels are under ownership of a City agency, as willingness to address the nonconformity is less likely once the property is in private hands. Further, the requested relief reduces the likelihood that a future owner will be faced with the challenge of building a home on a substandard twenty-five-foot lot.

MPC Staff recommends **approval** of the requested lot width variance to recombine and equally divide lots at 2110 and 2114 Bulloch Street.

Mr. Juan Uzcategui, Petitioner, said he agrees with the Staff recommendation and is open to any questions anyone may have.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Condon said anytime we have the opportunity to help people with affordable housing, especially the Dream Maker Program initiative, it's a good thing.

There being no further discussion the Board entertained a motion.

Motion

Approval of the requested lot width variance to recombine and equally subdivide lots at 2110 and 2114 Bulloch Street.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Michael Condon

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Benjamin Griffith	- Aye

7. 2653 Causton Bluff Rd | Parking Variance | 24-004506-ZBA

- 🔗 [PI - 2024 CITY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION AND CHECKLIST.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Staff Report.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [2653 Causton Buff Rd_24-004511-ZCL_Letter.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Hale Marine PI support letter.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Hancock Askew - Performance Initiatives.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Letter of Support - Tom Woiwode.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Letter. PIFit.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Oelschig Nursery.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Speedi Sign support letter.pdf](#)
- 🔗 [Downtown East Office Complex - PI Support.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/ Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** stated the Petitioner is requesting a variance of 22 parking spaces to the required off street parking in support of the expansion of an existing after School Enrichment Program and indoor sports facility use. The use has been in operation for several years and is seeking to expand into a now vacant tenant space within the same building, thereby increasing the off-street parking requirement of the use. The subject parcel measures approximately 0.95 acres and is zoned light industrial. It contains an industrial flex building constructed in 1997 measuring approximately 9,000 square feet in total area. The after-school enrichment/indoor sports use operated by Performance Initiatives was permitted in or around 2018. Since that time, the use has occupied half of the structure, or approximately 4,500 square feet. The proposed expansion would bring the use to a total of 9,000 square feet. Regulated as an 'indoor sports facility,' the use requires one vehicle space per 225 square feet. The use currently has seventeen spaces. Performance Initiatives (PI) is a 501(C)3 organization established in 2007, dedicated to serving youth ages 7-college in "Building Healthier Hearts, Minds, and Bodies." PI offers a variety of educational and athletic programs and services aimed at fostering life-changing development and growth. Per the included Zoning Certification Letter, the off-street parking requirement has been estimated at forty vehicle spaces and two bicycle spaces. The requirement may be reduced by up to 5% through provision of additional bicycle parking spaces in excess of the minimum requirement. With maximum bicycle parking, the off-street parking requirement could be reduced to thirty-eight vehicle spaces and eight bicycle spaces. Counting the existing available parking, this would reduce the deficit to twenty-one spaces. PI has two vans which pick up students from eight nearby schools. Other students arrive by bicycle, parent drop-off/pick-up, and bus transit via CAT route #10. The variance, if granted, could convey the Petitioner special privilege not otherwise granted to other property owners in the same zoning district. However, the public benefit likely exceeds any privilege granted.

MPC staff recommends **approval** of the requested parking reduction for twenty-one required vehicle spaces.

Ms. Anne Smith, Architect for the Petitioner, said we appreciated working with the Staff and the support received. We are here to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Condon asked if this was a pick-up and drop-off kind of facility not a sports facility where people drive themselves there and go inside. It is youth being shuttled by van or parents dropping them off, correct?

Ms. Smith said yes, that is correct.

Mr. Condon said the addition is not necessitated by the fact that the parking available there now is probably not being used.

Ms. Smith said that is correct.

Mr. Condon said the one thing he worries about is someone being there to guide the vehicles going in and out for drop off.

Ms. Kerrie Goodrich, Executive Director for PI, said yes, we have a staff member or volunteer security person on site during the program times to monitor the pickup, drop off, sign in and sign out of the kids.

Motion

Approval of the requested parking reduction for up to 22 required vehicle spaces upon the condition that at least 8 bicycle parking spaces be provided on site.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Betty Jones

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Benjamin Griffith	- Aye

[8. 623 E. 48th Street | Variance to Lot Area for ADU | 24-004563-ZBA](#)

[623 E 48 ST_24-004563-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

[Staff Report_SK.pdf](#)

[623_48_E_ADU REVIEW.pdf](#)

[PLOT PLAN.pdf](#)

[Public comment, Zielinski Ref Petition #24-004563 - ZBA.pdf](#)

[public comment, Micklus.pdf](#)

[Nancy M. ADU petition #24-004563 - ZBA.pdf](#)

[Picture2.jpg](#)

[Picture1.jpg](#)

[Picture3.jpg](#)

[Picture4.jpg](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services / Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** stated the Petitioner is requesting a variance to exceed the 125% minimum lot area requirement to allow an ADU to be built on the property. The property is zoned RSF-5 (Residential Single

Family - 5) and has lane access. The land use is a single-family residential structure of 1189 square feet. The land, development standards of the structure and the land use are conforming within the zoning district. The petitioner intends to construct a 425-square-foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU), which falls well within the 700-square-foot maximum requirement for ADUs. The existing principal dwelling measures 1,189 square feet, according to the Chatham County Tax Assessor. The Petitioner also plans to add an 82-square-foot extension to the existing rear porch, bringing the total building footprint to 1,271 square feet. Based on zoning regulations, an ADU can occupy up to 40% of the principal building's footprint, which in this case would allow for a maximum of 508.4 square feet. Therefore, the proposed 425-square-foot ADU is within the allowed limit. The subject property measures approximately 4,792 square feet in area, according to the Chatham County Tax Assessor. The minimum lot size requirement for RSF-5 zoned lots with lane access is 4,000 square feet. Based on calculations, the subject property has a lot size of 119.8% of the minimum lot area required by the zoning district. Therefore, it does not meet the minimum requirement of 125% of the minimum lot area required by the zoning district. The requested variance is consistent with the intent of both the Zoning Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan. The requirement for 125% of the minimum lot area to build an ADU in the RSF-5 district is a standard that may be varied upon recommendation by the Historic Preservation Commission to the Zoning Board of Appeals when the parcel is located within a conservation overlay district, as outlined in Section 7.15, or within a designated National Register Historic District without a Local Historic Overlay, as defined in Section 13.3. The property is located within the Ardsley Park/Chatham Crescent Conservation Overlay District, which requires the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to provide a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for any variance requests. In this case, the HPC has already submitted its recommendation to the ZBA.

MPC Staff recommends **approval** of a variance to exceed the 125% minimum lot area requirement to allow an ADU to be built on the property.

After Mr. Morrow presented the Staff report, the Chairman called the Petitioner to come forward. The Petitioner was not present at the time they were called, the Board voted (Motion by Mr. Condon and seconded by Ms. Jones) to continue the item to the next month's meeting.

Ms. Jonita Aadlind, Property Owner called stating she was unaware of the rescheduled date today. She was affected by the recent hurricane and still does not have power. She has not had internet access, email, or anything. She requested that her petition be allowed to be heard today.

Mr. Condon made a motion to add 623 E. 48th Street back to the regular agenda, seconded by Mr. Plunk. The Board voted in favor and the Petitioner was allowed to come forward to be heard.

Ms. Jonita Aadlind, Property Owner, said she her and her husband would like to build a small ADU and is willing to answer any questions anyone might have.

Mr. Morrow presented the public comment that was sent in by the member of the public that tried to virtually join the meeting earlier. Mr. Morrow said there are some concerns listed such as parking and trash, excessive noise pollution, loss of privacy, overcrowding, community harmony, traffic, and safety concerns. Mr. Morrow said he spoke previously with the member of the public that sent in the list of concerns. They have a multiunit dwelling there, they may have tenants who are there with vehicles and there was concern for overcrowding, that is an investment context not just a single family.

Mr. Plunk said he wants to make sure that the members of the public's concerns were put on record and addressed as they are no longer online since the item was continued.

Ms. Helm stated she spoke with the members of the public the day before the meeting and since the couple was concerned about possibly not being able to log on to the meeting, for them to put all of their concerns in writing and they will be entered into public record.

Mr. Merriman stated the document would be entered into public records stating they are against the Petitioner's request.

Ms. Aadlind said there will be no parking issues. This will strictly be for her and her husband's use only. They have a very small house; this is extra space for her and her husband. Ms. Aadlind said she is a musician, a violinist, she needs an area away from the main house to practice. This will not generate any

more trash; it is just building a space so her and her husband can live comfortably in the small house they have. I do not know how this will be a loss of privacy, again, this is just her and her husband.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Merriman said ADU's are not inconsistent with this neighborhood. We do not know what the next owner will do but people are building these ADU's all the time.

Mr. Baugh said this is very close to conforming, 5% from 125 is almost a technicality, he does not see a problem with this.

Mr. Turner said obviously we cannot say what future use is, but he feels that from the public comments, they felt this would be an Airbnb and now what they have context of what this will be, he feels the neighbors will be satisfied.

Motion

Approval of a variance to exceed the 125% minimum lot area requirement to allow an ADU to be built on the property.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Betty Jones

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

[9. 311 W. Waldburg St | Variances to side yard setback, lot coverage, and footprint for an ADU | 24-004564-ZBA](#)

[📎 311 W WALDBURG ST_24-004565-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Report 311 W Waldburg.pdf](#)

[📎 311 W WALDBURG ST_24-004565-ZBA_SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION_.pdf](#)

[📎 Public comment, Jones, 311 West Waldburg Street.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director of Development Services/ Current Planning presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** stated the Petitioner requests the following variances:

1. To allow for a zero side yard setback for an ADU within the TN-1 Zoning District where a minimum of three feet is required; To allow for 67% total lot coverage within the TN-1 Zoning District where 60% is the maximum permitted; To allow for an ADU with a floor area that is 55% of the principal dwelling's footprint where 40% up to seven hundred square feet is the maximum permitted.

The subject property measures approximately 2,160 square feet in area (20 feet wide by 108 feet deep), per the Chatham County Tax Assessor. The property is zoned TN-1 (Traditional Neighborhood - 1) and the land use is described as a two-family townhome. The subject parcel is conforming in its zoning district as a townhouse use; however, the property contains a dwelling, originally constructed in 1900, and is legally nonconforming with regard to current side yard setbacks. The property is located within the Victorian Historic District. The Petitioner has made a request for a Certificate Of Appropriateness (COA) at the Historic Preservation Commission for approval of New Construction, Part I: Design Details to

construct an accessory dwelling unit at the rear of the property located at 311 W. Waldburg Lane. The Petitioner's intent is to build a five hundred fifteen square foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU). Since the existing principal dwelling is 935 square feet, the footprint of the ADU will equate to 55% of the area of the principal dwelling. The total lot coverage will be 67.13%.

The requested variance is inconsistent with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance but not the Comprehensive Plan. Accessory uses are intended to be diminutive in size relative to the size of the principal use on a lot. By practice, the Zoning Administrator has established a threshold of 50% for uses and structures intended to be regarded as accessory. The subject parcel is within a historic district where zero-foot setback development is common, however, this does not constitute a hardship in the context of a variance evaluation. There are no special conditions and/or circumstances that exist which are peculiar to the land, buildings or structures involved and which are not applicable to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district. The literal interpretation of the regulations would not deprive the Applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district. The variance is not required to make use of the subject property for the development of an ADU. An ADU with 40% building footprint in relation to the primary dwelling and within the required setbacks can be constructed on the property without variance relief of any kind. Approval of the variance would confer special privilege upon the property owner.

MPC Staff recommends **denial** of the following variances:

1. To allow for a zero-side yard setback for an ADU within the TN-1 Zoning District.
2. To allow for 67% total lot coverage with an ADU and principle dwelling within the TN-1 Zoning District.
3. To allow for an ADU with a footprint that is 55% of the principal dwellings' footprint within the TN-1 Zoning District.

Ms. Kim Campbell, Ethos Preservation, said the purpose is to build an off-street covered parking with an ADU. To do that and not vary the off-street parking requirements for the existing two dwelling units on this property, they are requesting three variances. The property, while common in parts of the norther Victorian District and the TN-1 zoning District does have more in common with those properties that are zoned DR. This row house was built in 1871 as opposed to later in that period. If this property were 2 1/2 blocks further north, it would be zoned DR-1 and would have many more surrounding properties that matched it, and they would not be requesting these variances today. The HPC did unanimously recommend approval of all three variances in the July meeting. They also approved the application for New Construction Small, Parts One and Two. Last year this Board granted a variance on this property to reduce the side yard setback from the main house that is existing from three feet to zero feet to allow us to rebuild what was present. This property had a severe fire, and a partial wall collapsed. We were required to come back for that variance to rebuild what was present. In terms of general consistency, we feel that these variances are consistent with the intent of both the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan. The general rule has been to consider something accessory if it is less than 50%, that is the rule, not the intent. They have kept the carriage house at two stories as opposed to the three-story principal dwelling on the property.

In terms of special conditions for this lot, the main house is existing non-conforming at a zero-side yard setback. Additionally, the width of the lot is non-conforming. Typically for attached single family homes you would have twenty-five feet in width on the lot. This lot is only twenty feet wide. If the lot were slightly larger again, and the house were built as it was, they would not need as many variances. We are attempting to fit two cars within the enclosed garage space. To do so we would have to have a side yard setback and a greater lot coverage than allowed. The Zoning Ordinance denies the owners the right to build covered parking, they cannot meet those requirements for two cars to fit, as required currently without some form of side yard setback and greater lot coverage. They are asking for these three variances to allow the owner to enjoy the same privileges as other owners within the TN-1 Zoning District. This is not strictly a financial consideration in nature.

Mr. Condon, Board member, said he lives in the Victorian District and is concerned about zero setbacks. There has been a bit of a rush to allow people to build ADUs on zero lot lines. The problem becomes when the person next door decides they want to build one on the zero -lot line as well. What we effectively are doing is taking away the rights of the neighbors on either side if you can build the entire width of a lot. Being in the business that I am in and many times trying to climb in between two Victorian

homes that, the eaves are touching each other, if there is a fire or such a thing, it is bad. Do you really need to run the full width of this lot because of the fact it takes away the rights of the neighbors on either side and potentially the neighbor in the back.

Ms. Campbell said in terms of how wide it has to be, in order to have a one-story garage, if you take away from the door shown, they are still asking for a side yard variance on one or both sides. When they add the ADU, they are pushing the maximum allowable to call this a two-car garage. This is a 14-foot door that they had to get approved by HPC for a Special Exception because garage doors are supposed to be no larger than 12 feet. We could not get two garages to fit into this area. It all comes down to this is only a twenty-foot-wide lot as opposed to twenty-five feet.

Mr. Condon said even if you build it twenty feet wide, the standard two car garage is 20 x 24. That does not include the side door that gets you to the second floor. It really does not accommodate two cars unless we are talking about a golf cart and a car. It seems like there is too much being stuffed into a small area.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jones said there is a letter that needs to be read.

Mr. Merriman read a letter from Mr. Hundsrucker that supports MPC Staff's recommendation for denial of the variances. He stated he remembers the night of the fire at the house and how it spread from that house to three to four others. Mr. Merriman said Mr. Condon brought up a good point that once this is built on the zero-lot line on the sides, the neighbors will not be able to do that. Ms. Jones agrees.

Motion

Denial of the following variances:

1. To allow for a 0' side yard setback for an ADU within the TN-1 Zoning District.
2. To allow for 67% total lot coverage with an ADU and principal dwelling within the TN-1 Zoning District
3. To allow for an ADU with a footprint that is 55% of the principal dwellings' footprint within the TN-1 Zoning District.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Betty Jones

Second: Stephen Plunk

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Benjamin Griffith	- Aye

[10. 774 Duffy Street | Variances for rear yard setback and lot coverage | 24-004566-ZBA](#)

[📎 774 E DUFFY ST_24-004566-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

[📎 Staff Report_SK.pdf](#)

[📎 774 DUFFY ST_RENOVATION PERMIT DOCUMENTS_.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director for Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** stated the Petitioner is requesting relief from nonconformity of the 20-foot rear yard setback standard and the 50% building lot coverage limit to renovate the existing building from a one-

story nonresidential structure to a two-story single-family home. The property is zoned TR-2 (Traditional Residential - 2) and has lane access from East Park Lane. The property class according to the Tax Assessor is Commercial and it was used as a church (built in 1940). The land development standards of the structure are non-conforming by the required setbacks and building coverage within the zoning district. The Petitioner intends to renovate the building by constructing a second-floor residential space and a first-floor garage and storage space on the existing building footprint. The requested relief from nonconformity is consistent with the intent of both the Zoning Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan, as outlined in Section 11.3, General Standards (Nonconformities) and Section 11.4 Nonconforming Uses and Structures since the establishment of the nonconformity in 1940 predates the Zoning Ordinance.

The literal interpretation of the regulations would not deprive the Applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district. The request is reasonable in the interest of adaptive reuse of a nonconforming structure. The relief from nonconformity is required to make use of the subject property for the proposed modification of the nonconforming structure.

MPC Staff recommends **approval** of the request for relief from nonconformity in support of adaptive reuse of the existing nonconforming structure.

Ms. Shauna Joye, Property Owner, said she has nothing to say but is here for any questions anyone may have.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, said this is a good use of the space. There are several commercial buildings that need to be repurposed into housing like this one.

Ms. Joye said she lives three houses down the street and discovered the property during a walk one day.

Mr. John Anagnost, City of Savannah Zoning Administrator, said in the photo that was shown, there was a driveway that was never permitted as a driveway. The previous use was a place of worship and thought would have been a pedestrian entrance and gathering space. The Applicant is proposing significant vehicle parking within the structure. If it is the will of this Board, the City would support a condition on any variance approval to restore that street lawn to grass, where it is in the Right of way (ROW).

Ms. Joye said that was something they planned to do.

Mr. Condon asked **Mr. Anagnost** if that condition needed to be part of the variance.

Mr. Anagnost said it would be helpful as they do not typically review ROW improvements as part of a building permit unless they go through a site permit process which this would not. They would need to apply for a separate ROW permit to make that improvement.

Motion

Approval of the request for relief from nonconformity in support of adaptive reuse of the existing nonconforming structure; with the condition that the applicant apply for a Right of Way permit to restore the street lawn.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Michael Condon

Second: Stephen Plunk

Stephen Merriman, Jr. - Abstain

Michael Condon - Aye

Stephen Plunk - Aye

Betty Jones - Aye

Armand Turner - Aye

Brad Baugh	- Aye
Benjamin Griffith	- Aye

[11. 1201 Bull Street | Appeal a ZCL | 24-004075-ZBA](#)

📎 [1201 BULL ST_24-004075-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

📎 [May 2024 ZCL](#)

📎 [Staff Report 1201 Bull Appeal.pdf](#)

📎 [August 18 2021 ZCL \(1\).pdf](#)

📎 [August 18 2021 ZCL \(2\).pdf](#)

📎 [Sept 22 2021 ZCL.pdf](#)

📎 [1201 Bull St_Parking Appeal_City Review Materials.pdf](#)

Mr. Edward Morrow, Director for Development Services/Current Planning, presented the Staff report. **Mr. Morrow** stated the Petitioner, Phillip McCorkle, Agent for 1201 Bull Street, LLC, is appealing a May 17, 2024, determination by the Zoning Administrator (or their designee) for the City of Savannah (21-004570-ZCL) for proposed inn and restaurant uses at 1201 Bull Street and 11 W. Duffy Street. The Zoning Confirmation Letter appealed, produced following an initial review of building plans for the site, and assigns an off-street parking requirement based on parking credits for the most recent prior use. The Petitioner has appealed the determination asserting that an earlier prior use carrying an equal or greater off-street parking requirement should further reduce or fully eliminate the off-street parking requirement in consideration of subsequent uses. The Zoning Administrator states there is departmental precedent for the determination of 'grandfathered' parking based specifically on the most recent prior use. MPC Staff recommends the matter be remanded to the Zoning Administrator for a determination consistent with a more expansive reading of the text.

The property at 1201 Bull Street consists of approximately 0.42 acres, is zoned TC-2 (Traditional Commercial -2), and contains two commercial structures built in 1940, per the Chatham County Tax Assessor. The larger of the two structures has a footprint measuring approximately 8,600 square feet and is described as a 'mixed retail' building. It contains a second floor measuring approximately 7,500 square feet. The smaller building measures approximately 5,540 square feet and is described as a storage warehouse. The property is within the bounds of the Victorian Local Historic District, but the buildings are not indicated as contributing on the District Resource Map.

The owner of the property began working toward the establishment of an Inn and Restaurant use within the existing structures located on the properties in 2021. Plans submitted to the City for review indicate three proposed tenant suites on the first floor and 15 guest rooms for lodging use on the second floor. The structures on the subject property were considered for proposed design modifications by the Historic Preservation Commission as early as August 25, 2021. MPC Historic Preservation Staff reported at the time that the initial Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) petition was continued to permit resolution of issues regarding the off-street parking requirement. In a Staff report dated October 27, 2021, MPC Historic Preservation Staff noted receipt of a letter from the City Planning and Zoning Liaison, dated September 22, 2021, which indicated that no off-street parking was required. The COA was recommended for approval and was granted by HPC. Zoning Certification Letters (ZCL) for the proposed uses were issued by the City's Department of Planning and Urban Design on August 18, 2021 (subsequently revised) and May 17, 2024, all under the same case/file number. The original ZCL issued August 18, 2021, indicates no off-street parking spaces are required for the proposed use. The revised ZCL also dated August 18, 2021, indicates that 7.25 off-street parking spaces were required. Another version of the ZCL with a date of September 22, 2021, referenced by the MPC COA Staff report indicates that no off-street parking spaces were required. The most recent ZCL, dated May 17, 2024, establishes a requirement of fourteen off-street parking spaces – three spaces for the second-floor inn at 1201 Bull Street and eleven spaces for the 11 West Duffy restaurant. Credit for Legally Nonconforming Parking Areas (Grandfathered Spaces) is determined in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 9.3.4.a.iv.

Upon review, MPC Staff finds that the Zoning Administrator likely erred in their interpretation and

application of the provisions regarding credit for grandfathered parking. Staff finds the language of Section 9.3.4.a.iv sufficiently vague so as to reasonably permit 1) an interpretation of the standard that would yield a parking determination consistent with the off-street parking requirement for the structure's original use under the requirements of the current zoning ordinance, or 2) a parking determination consistent with any previous duly permitted use of the building.

MPC Staff recommends the ZBA **remand** the petition to the Zoning Administrator for calculation of an off-street parking determination consistent with a more expansive reading of the provisions which awards parking credit consistent with that of the structure's most parking-intensive prior use.

Alternatively, considering the likely reliance by the Petitioner upon the Zoning Administrator's determination, the Board may consider overturning the 2024 ZCL and reinstating a prior 2021 determination of the Zoning Administrator.

Mr. Condon, Board Member, said it seems from a fairness standpoint, the Petitioner started three years ago working on a project based on information provided by the City of Savannah. To go back to them a few years later and be told, "that was wrong, now this is correct" just does not pass the fairness test. The other piece is when we talk about dealing with people, it is important that we work with people and treat them in a way that does not require them to go through this years later costing them hundreds, even millions of dollars. We must treat people fairly.

Mr. Jeff Notrica, the Petitioner, said he relied on 2021 letters from the City to get this done. He requested that the Board revert this back to the 2021 letters that a considerable amount of time and money were spent relying on.

Mr. Baugh, Board Member, said he would like to echo Mr. Condon's comments.

Mr. Plunk said he agrees with his fellow Board members. We need to be clear with the motion.

Mr. John Anagnost, City of Savannah Zoning Administrator, said the difference between the 2021 ZCL and the current ZCL, the old letter specifically references a floor area that is in the tax record for this property. Prior to 2020, the property tax card showed this building being divided into several different uses. Most of those uses represent retail spaces or restaurant spaces on the ground floor. There are some storage spaces on the upper floor. There is an office space, not clear where that is in the building, and then there is a sketch showing multiple residential showing a floor area of 1,674 square feet. That floor area is specifically referenced in the original ZCL in 2021 as the basis of no parking being required. The upper floor of this building is over seven thousand square feet. That is a substantial error to not account for over five thousand square feet of floor area when making a parking determination. That is the major source of the issue. The original letter for some reason used a much lower floor area as the basis of the parking calculation. When this was revisited, they had to account for the upper floor having over seven thousand square feet of area and what was on the floor.

For the 1201 Bull Street building, he stated he believed there is a solution that does not require a variance. He had been responding to the Applicant's property owner's assertion which has been consistent that there were fifteen apartment units in the upper floor and mainly using that as the basis of the ZCL for this building. The Petitioner's attorney, who was obtained at the beginning of this case but no longer representing him for this case, stated that there were seventeen apartments in the upper floor when they requested a ZCL in 2021. The City has a letter from an architect representing the previous owner in 2013, stating the renovation would involve developing the upstairs portion of the building as residential units and then requesting information about whether remote parking could be used to serve the parking requirements of that conversion to residential. There have been inconsistencies in the evidentiary record of what exactly has been in the upper floor of the building which lead raise to questioning the applicant's assertion that it was fifteen apartment units. If they account for the empty storage space that is reflected on the tax record as residual retail space of the Savannah Flooring Company, that can get them enough additional parking credit in the non-conforming parking provision to cover all the parking for the in-use. They can move forward with the in-use with no additional parking being required if we look at that space in that way. The in-use is possible even with the three-parking space requirement, using the loading area that is currently in between these buildings.

Restaurant use is a question that has been an issue with the credit for non-conforming parking areas

since it was adopted with NEWZO in 2019. (It is not written clearly what that means. As a caution, if the interpretation of that is expansive to say any previous use, and it is the applicant's choice, that does open a lot of possibilities. One example would be the proposed project that was at the NE corner of East Gwinnett and East Broad. That was historically a movie theatre and proposed to be redeveloped with apartments behind it and some retail or food hall space along East Broad. That applicant went through the same type of process of asking for a ZCL to establish parking based on credit for non-conforming parking areas. That building had a permit approved in the late 1970's to be converted to an International Food Relief Association, small office space, and the majority of the remainder of the movie theater was converted to warehouse storage. That was the basis that we used for that ZCL, that was the most recently permitted use. If we return to the movie theatre use that was established in the 1930's, they would be eligible for credit for a much larger amount of parking. Movie theatre parking is based on the number of seats in the theater, they would have gotten credit for dozens of parking spaces. That changes their whole project. That is an important question to ask in a larger context than this Board. If there are areas of the City where there are historic buildings that we think function well without parking, we should not be creating this Special Acceptation where we have to do extensive calculations and jump through hoops to figure out how much parking is required. It may be better to have a conversation about reducing the parking requirements across the board for those areas like done in the Victorian, Streetcar, and Downtown Districts. The Duffy Street case is a little more difficult. It gets to, yes, we accept the assertion of the applicant that there was a social club there but there have been two other uses since then which would have a lower parking requirement and that is what we based the calculation on.

Mr. Condon said if we were to push this off to the next meeting, are you confident that you and the Petitioner could get this resolved without the Board having to act.

Mr. Anagnost said for the Bull Street building yes, for the Duffy Street building, no.

Mr. Morrow said these are two separate applications, whoever, they are on the same parcel. They are addressed differently because of the frontages. They are not separate reports or assessments. The ZCL's speak to both properties individually. The underlying issue still remains. There will be two separate votes.

Mr. Merriman said the Petitioner based not having to have required parking on the letter which was based on the fact that was a large storage area or warehouse.

Mr. Morrow said the previous letters that were issued considered both of those. **Mr. Merriman** said but now what is on the top floor is 15 apartments, is that correct? That would have a very different parking requirement than what the letter was based on.

Mr. Anagnost said the current state of the second floor of 1201 Bull Street is open. There is one wall that passes through the center of the space. It has been completely gutted down to the sub floor. The basis of there being 15-17 apartments there, depending on whether you ask the property owner, the architect, or the attorney from two years ago, is them providing affidavits, there was a demolition permit issued in 2019, the scope of work listed in the demolition permit was removed interior walls. It did not note what the use was or provide an as built floor plan, it just said remove interior walls. The evidence that I looked at was what does the property tax record say, sketches that only showed 1,600 square feet of residential and the rest storage and office, address points from the address data base, only 3-4 listed aside from the retail store fronts along the street, and the number of units listed in the property tax record. There is no number of units listed. Typically, residential properties, if they are multifamily will have a number of units listed. Other than the affidavits from the Applicant and his architect, there is no formal documentation that suggests there were ever more than four apartment units in that upper floor and now it is gutted so we can't get evidence now. That is what the ZCL was based on.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Baugh said he is very familiar with the building. He had a contract on it and made a run at it in 2013. At the time he was working on it, the entire upstairs was residential. It was approximately 10-15 apartments.

Mr. Condon said he believes Mr. Anagnost when he said he could fix this without the Board having to do something. It is valuable that Mr. Baugh was in that building in 2013 and able to speak to what it was. Mr. Condon said he would like to continue this to the next meeting to give them a chance to iron out the

issues.

Mr. Morrow reminded the Board there is only one report and one assessment, the letters combined the two. There are two addresses because of frontage but the buildings are on one property. Mr. Anagnost said he was potentially able to resolve the 1201 Bull Street but not the 11 W. Duffy Street.

Mr. Condon asked for 11 W. Duffy Street, what is the proposed use?

Mr. Anagnost said a restaurant.

Mr. Condon said there is currently a restaurant on the Bull Street side of the building, and they want to put an additional restaurant in. Is that where meeting the parking requirement becomes an issue?

Mr. Anagnost said the credit for nonconforming parking areas provision allows credit for parking that would have been required of prior uses, but which was not provided. The customary approach to that from the Planning Department at the City of Savannah is to use the most recently permitted use that we can ascertain. If we cannot find any permitted use, we will go all the way back to whatever we think the building was originally constructed as. In this case, the Applicant himself has one of the most recently permitted uses which was a motor scooter sales and rentals business. They have the application form signed by the property owner and approved by the City. There is also a Code Compliance Report against the property owner for storing scooters in the Right of way on the sidewalk. There are also images from Google Street view where you can see the motor scooters for sale and the sign on the front of the building saying, Motorini. After that use, there was also an Art Gallery that was permitted. Do we base it on the most recently permitted use, or any use in the history of the building. If you look at the Sanborn map that was shown, it was listed as Venetian Blinds or Acoustic Equipment. So, should we go back to Acoustic Equipment as the use and who is making that decision. Is it the Applicant's decision or Staff's decision about which previous use to use.

Mr. Condon said the complication is the word "uses". It is understandable how that is extremely vague. It allows for an interpretation, "I'm going to pick and choose the one that I want" but that is not the fault of the applicant. Nor is it the Applicant's fault that the upper apartments were incorrectly labeled as storage space at 1700 square feet. Again, I fall back on the fairness issue. People spend millions of dollars with the expectation that they are going to be able to do something.

Mr. Anagnost said it makes sense regarding fairness. The other component for credit for nonconforming parking areas is, the intent of any provision in the Zoning Ordinance that deals with nonconformities is that the use being granted relief for being nonconforming is intended to have been a use that was legally established in the first place. That is the other big question, we do not have any permits in our records of these apartments, and they never were assigned addresses. That raises the question, were they legally permitted or were they constructed without permits. If they were constructed without permits, going back to the concept of fairness, to be fair to people who go through the proper channels and obtain a legal building permit, get addresses, and establish proper use, in fairness, they should gain the benefit of relief for nonconformities. A person who does something illegal and then asks for relief, should not be granted the same grace because they did not do it right in the first place.

Mr. Condon said he understands that but if someone buys a building and is unaware of the fact that the prior owner did the wrong thing, is that the new owner's burden, or the burden of the City to discover that fifteen families lived above a restaurant on Bull Street. The whole thing is very cloudy.

Mr. Merriman asked Mr. Morrow if there would be anything further talked about 11 West Duffy Street.

Mr. Morrow said no, there just needs to be separate votes for the two separate addresses.

Mr. Condon asked Mr. Morrow, with the Boards decision, it will say they are waiving the parking requirement based on the fact that we want the initial 2021 letters to be the letters that are being used.

Mr. Morrow said that is an option.

Mr. Plunk said if we remanded this go back to the Zoning Department does that mean they would just talk about it more or what?

Mr. Morrow said the idea was there would be a directive from this Board, based on its interpretation of that and to say please go back and review this in light of the new information that the word "uses" is unclear with regard to the most recent use or the original use. Give a new rendering in light of that fact.

Mr. Merriman said this is specific to this case. We are deciding whether or not we are going to uphold the original interpretation that the Petitioner received from the City, or we are going to remand it back to the Zoning Administrator and he will give a new interpretation that will stand or come back here for a dispute from that determination.

Mr. Condon said a third option would be to postpone this for three weeks to give them time to work things out. Mr. Anagnost has asked for the opportunity to work things out and I feel like we should give him that.

Mr. Anagnost said this would only be for the one building.

Mr. Merriman asked the Petitioner if after hearing this discussion he would like to come back to the floor.

Mr. Notrica said he relied on the 2021 letter. He appreciates Mr. Anagnost's work but this has gone a long way out of the way and did not need to be. He should be able to rely on a letter he got from the City that I spent a considerable amount of money and time to set up. I do not know what the issue prior to 2013 of whom did what permitting wise. He would like to get this adjudicated today. He has been slowed for over a year on this one issue. Not to mention the time he was slowed down by the HPC refusing to hear the issue until he got the 2021 letter that said he did have the required parking. This has been quite a burden, and he is not convinced three weeks will make a difference. He cannot put three parking spaces on this property. There is no way to put legal spaces between the two buildings plus it would disturb what he wants to do on the project overall.

Motion

The Board approved overturning the 2024 ZCL and reinstating a prior September 2021 (requiring 0 parking spaces) determination of the Zoning Administrator that most closely comports with proper application of the text of the Ordinance.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk

Second: Michael Condon

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Benjamin Griffith	- Aye

[12. 11 West Duffy Street | Appeal a ZCL | 24-004080-ZBA](#)

📎 [11 W DUFFY ST_24-004080-ZBA_APPLICATION.pdf](#)

📎 [Public comment Petition #24-004080-ZBA; 11 W Duffy.pdf](#)

📎 [August 18 2021 ZCL \(1\)_.pdf](#)

📎 [August 18 2021 ZCL \(2\)_.pdf](#)

📎 [Sept 22 2021 ZCL.pdf](#)

📎 [City Staff Comment.pdf](#)

[1201 BULL ST_21-004570-ZCL_LETTER_REVISED 2024.05.17.pdf](#)

[Staff Report 11 W Duffy Appeal.pdf](#)

[11 W Duffy St_Parking Appeal_City Review Materials.pdf](#)

See the meeting minutes for the item above (1201 Bull Street) these items were presented together.

Motion

The Board approved overturning the 2024 ZCL and reinstating a prior September 2021 (requiring 0 parking spaces) determination of the Zoning Administrator that most closely comports with proper application of the text of the Ordinance.

Vote Results (Approved)

Motion: Stephen Plunk
 Second: Michael Condon

Stephen Merriman, Jr.	- Abstain
Michael Condon	- Aye
Stephen Plunk	- Aye
Betty Jones	- Aye
Armand Turner	- Aye
Brad Baugh	- Aye
Benjamin Griffith	- Aye

XI. Other Business

XII. Adjournment

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