

PUTNAM COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION



117 Putnam Drive, Suite B ♦ Eatonton, GA 31024
706-485-2776 ♦ 706-485-0552 fax ♦ www.putnamcountyga.us

Thursday, January 07, 2016

The Putnam County Planning & Zoning Commission conducted a public hearing on Thursday, January 07, 2016 at 6:30 PM in the Putnam County Administration Building, 117 Putnam Drive, Room 203.

Present: James Marshall, Chairman, John Langley, Tommy Brundage, and Alan Oberdeck.

Staff Present: Lisa Jackson, Karen Pennamon and Jonathan Gladden

Absent: Yvonne Hardy

1. *Call to Order*

Mr. James Marshall, Jr. called the meeting to order.

2. *Attendance*

Mr. Jonathan Gladden called the roll.

3. *Rules of Procedures*

Mrs. Karen Pennamon read the rules of procedures.

4. *Approval of Minutes - December 3, 2015*

Motion for approval made by: Alan M. Oberdeck

Second by: Tommy Brundage

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
Brundage, Tommy	X			
Langley, John D.	X			
Marshall, James P.	X			
Oberdeck, Alan M.	X			

5. *Request by James S. & Lee Anne Purvis for a side yard setback variance at 188 Forest Hill Drive. Presently R-1. [Map 111A, Parcel 093].*

Mr. Clay Rucker, agent for James S. & Lee Anne Purvis, represented this request. **Mr. Rucker** stated that the applicants are requesting a 5-foot variance, being 15 feet from the right side property line when facing the lake. He stated that the applicants would like to build a 3318 square foot house and an attached 25x28 two-car garage. **Mr. Rucker** stated that due to the location of the old demolished septic system they have to construct the house closer to the front of the lot near the road. He added that the lot narrows toward the front. **Mr. Langley** stated that he had visited the site with Ms. Jackson and Mrs. Pennamon. He said that a variance is needed to construct the garage and he has no problems with the request. **Mr. Oberdeck** stated that he had visited the site and had no problems with the request. No one spoke in opposition to this request. Staff recommendation is for approval of a 5-foot variance; being 15 feet from the right side property line. **Mr. Langley** made a motion for approval and **Mr. Oberdeck** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of a 5-foot variance; being 15 feet from right side property line.

Motion for approval made by: John D. Langley

Seconded by: Alan M. Oberdeck

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
Brundage, Tommy	x			
Langley, John D.	x			
Marshall, James P.	x			
Oberdeck, Alan M.	x			

6. *Request by Derek Welch, DreamBuilt, LLC, agent for Jim Huth for a side yard setback variance at 152 Misty Way. Presently R-1R. [Map 103D, Parcel 006].*

Mr. Derek Welch, agent for Jim Huth submitted a letter to the Planning & Zoning Commission requesting to withdraw without prejudice from the January 7, 2016 agenda. **Mr. Oberdeck** made a motion for approval to withdraw without prejudice and **Mr. Brundage** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval to withdraw without prejudice.

Motion for approval to withdraw without prejudice made by: Alan M. Oberdeck

Seconded by: Tommy Brundage

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
Brundage, Tommy	x			
Langley, John D.	x			

Marshall, James P.	X			
Oberdeck, Alan M.	X			

7. Request by **Larry G. Hall**, for a side and rear yard setback variance at 225 Fawnfield Court. Presently zoned R-1. [Map 070A, Parcel 002].

Mr. Larry G. Hall represented this request. **Mr. Hall** stated that he has owned this property for approximately 13 years. He stated that he had a financial hardship in the past and never pursued building a house on the property. **Mr. Hall** added that he had intended to request a variance in the past but did not know the proper procedures. He stated that this is a peninsula lot which is surrounded on 3 sides by the lake. **Mr. Hall** is requesting a 40-foot variance, being 60-feet from the nearest point to the lake. He stated that he would like to build a 50x60 house and a 24x36 garage. **Mr. Hall** stated that the proposed house will be built in the middle of the lot which is the best suitable location for it. He added that he has spoken to **Mrs. Kathryn Hill** at the Health Department and has his approval for the septic system. **Mr. Oberdeck** stated that he had visited the property and had no problems with the request. He commented that it is a very beautiful lot and putting a house there is a great idea. **Mr. Langley** stated that he had also visited the site with **Ms. Jackson**. He commented that someone did an excellent job staking off the proposed location of the house and garage. **Mr. Hall** responded that he had put the stakes down. **Mr. Langley** stated that he had no problems with the request. No one spoke in opposition to the request. Staff recommendation is for approval of a 40-foot variance, being 60 feet from the nearest point to the lake. **Mr. Oberdeck** made a motion for approval and **Mr. Brundage** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of a 40-foot variance; being 60 feet from the nearest point to the lake.

Motion for approval made by: Alan M. Oberdeck
 Seconded by: Tommy Brundage

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
Brundage, Tommy	X			
Langley, John D.	X			
Marshall, James P.	X			
Oberdeck, Alan M.	X			

8. Request by **Steve & Kim Pearce** for a rear yard setback variance at 108 Sebastian Drive. Presently R-1R. [Map 101B, Parcel 044].

Mr. Steve Pearce represented this request. **Mr. Pearce** stated that they are requesting a 29.6-foot variance, being 70.4 feet from the nearest point to the lake. He stated that they would like to place a swimming pool and pool deck behind their house. **Mr. Pearce** stated that the existing house is approximately 95 feet from the lake. He said that have looked at different design plans and decided on a longer elongated pool that will be raised up on a pool deck with a retaining wall

all around it. **Mr. Pearce** stated that they want to make it look as esthetically pleasing as possible. He added due to the location of the existing house and septic system this is the best suitable location to build the pool and deck. **Mr. Oberdeck** stated that he had visited the site and has no problems with the request. **Mr. Marshall** asked if they had gotten approval from their Homeowners Association for this request. **Mr. Pearce** stated that they wanted to get the approval from the County before submitting their plans to the Homeowners Association for approval. No one spoke in opposition to this request. Staff recommendation is for approval of a 29.6-foot variance, being 70.4 feet from the nearest point to the lake. **Mr. Oberdeck** made a motion for approval and **Mr. Langley** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of a 29.6-foot variance; being 70.4 feet from nearest point to the lake.

Motion for approval made by: Alan M. Oberdeck
 Seconded by: John D. Langley

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
Brundage, Tommy	x			
Langley, John D.	x			
Marshall, James P.	x			
Oberdeck, Alan M.	x			

9. *Request by **Gerald Brewer** for a side yard setback variance at 132 Little River Trail. Presently zoned R-2. [Map 057A, Parcel 152].*

Mr. Gerald Brewer submitted a letter to the Planning & Zoning Commission requesting to withdraw without prejudice from the January 7, 2016 agenda. **Mr. Langley** stated the reason for the withdrawal is for lack of information as to where the property lines are located. He added that this will give the applicant time to establish where the property lines are. **Mr. Langley** made a motion for approval to withdraw without prejudice and **Mr. Brundage** seconded. **All approved.**

Motion for approval to withdraw without prejudice made by: John D. Langley
 Seconded by: Tommy Brundage

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
Brundage, Tommy	x			
Langley, John D.	x			
Marshall, James P.	x			
Oberdeck, Alan M.	x			

10. *Request by **JP Capital & Insurance, Inc.** to rezone .94 acres at 108 Briarpatch Road, N.E. from R-2 to C-1. [Map 096B, Parcel 062].**

Mr. Jeremy Crosby and Mr. Bryan Jones, agents for JP Capital & Insurance Inc. represented this request. **Mr. Crosby** stated that they would like to rezone .94 acres at 108 Briarpatch Road from R-2 to C-1. He stated that they had addressed the board last month concerning a future boat storage similar to the adjacent property. **Mr. Crosby** stated that they had met with **Ms. Jackson, Mr. Oberdeck, and Mr. Langley** at the location site and they had walked the site together. **Mr. Crosby** stated he would be glad to answer any questions from the board. **Mr. Jackson Jones** was recognized and began to speak in opposition to this request. **Mr. Jackson Jones** stated that he resides at 116 Briarpatch Road which is adjacent to the property in question. **Mr. Jackson Jones** stated that after he saw the rezoning sign on this property he decided to come to the meeting to find out how it would affect his property. He stated that he had not seen a plat of the property and asked how this proposed change would affect his property once it is graded down. **Mr. Jackson Jones** stated his property is on a hill and the lot next to him is also on a hill. **Mr. Jackson Jones** inquired if the property in question would be graded down to street level and if the plans were available for him to review. **Mr. Crosby** stated that the property in question is located at 108 Briarpatch Road. He said there is an adjacent lot, 114 Briarpatch Road which is number 11 on the agenda and they plan on placing a 50-foot landscape buffer at this spot, and they also intend on leaving the where the existing trailer is now. **Mr. Crosby** stated on 114 Briarpatch that they are not looking at grading that down, and are planning on leaving the existing elevation and leaving the buffer intact. **Mr. Crosby** stated there were already several large trees on the property line and are planning on leaving those in place along the property line as well as the 50 ft. landscape buffer all along that side. **Mr. Jackson Jones** asked if the manufactured home at 114 Briarpatch Road will remain on the property and if so, what type of buffer will be between his property and the proposed location and manufactured home. **Mr. Crosby** stated that the manufactured home would speak more to request 11. **Mr. Crosby** stated there are two lots there. Item number 10 is the lot before the trailer at 108 Briarpatch. **Mr. Crosby** stated the manufactured home on the next lot can't stay if it is rezoned to commercial land unless it was used as an office or something of that nature. **Ms. Jackson stated** that was correct. **Mr. Crosby** followed up again for clarification by asking if the manufactured home is used as an office it could stay but if it was used as a residential structure it could not. **Mr. Marshall** stated that was correct. **Mr. Jackson Jones** asked if it would be graded where the manufactured home is sitting. **Mr. Crosby** stated no grading at all at that location. **Mr. Bryan Jones** then stated they didn't even intend for the rezoning of the residential lot at 114 Briarpatch Road. **Mr. Bryan Jones** continued by stating when they previously came to the board they were just looking for the rezoning of the other lot, however when they came before they requested that we rezone the additional lot with the buffer of trees, shrubs, and so forth. **Mr. Bryan Jones** stated their goal was never to move the manufactured home. **Mr. Jackson** stated that his concern is that his property is on the top of the hill and if they grade down on the lot problems could arise. **Mr. Bryan Jones** stated they would not leave him on a pedestal or dig in next door to him on that lot, this is not their intention. **Mr. Brock Kaufman** spoke in opposition to this request. He stated that when the new convenience store was constructed the concrete pad caused a lot of water to come down on the road, even for days after a rain. The aforementioned can cause a lot of water to collect on the asphalt between the storage building and current store and this is concerning. **Mr. Kaufman** said he had concerns about the amount of trailers that are currently parked there on the weekend that stretch up and down the road. **Mr. Kaufman** stated that with most boat storage places that he is aware of there are usually no trailers on the premises. **Mr. Kaufman** asked if building another marina would the applicants have another 50 or 100 trailers on the property? **Mr. Kaufman** also stated there is an issue with a ton of traffic as well as people speeding in and out of the exit near the storage buildings. **Mr. Kaufman** asked

would there be another exit that could be accessed behind the marina onto the private road. **Mr. Marshall** responded no. He stated the staff recommendation states, all parking for the additional building would be serviced by the existing drive on the existing building. He said there will not be any traffic coming on the street by the new site at all. **Mr. Kaufman** asked about the boat trailer situation, he stated that others in the community trailers were not allowed, so now the current situation exists that when guests come in there are just a large amount of boat trailers visible.

Ms. Jackson stated that with the C-1 zoning there is no outside storage display, so besides loading and unloading everything has to be stored on the inside not outside of the building. **Mr. Kaufman** thanked the board. **Mr. Palmer** spoke in opposition to this request. He stated that they have to turn in from Hwy 44 and have a small entrance. **Mr. Palmer** stated that when turning in to the private entrance at their store there is a big hole and drop off that stays full of water. He said from time to time the road is blocked when someone is pulling in or out with a boat trailer or large truck. He stated the situation arises where they will be sitting on Hwy 44 unable to turn in and the traffic turning out cannot either due to the traffic flow. **Mr. Marshall** stated the general congestion seems to be an issue. **Mr. Palmer** stated yes it was, as is the safety of their customers. He also stated he also has concerns about all the water coming off the lots of the two properties down the gully across his back yard and into the lake and he has already spent a good deal of money trying to control that issue. **Mr. Palmer** stated that these are the negatives concerns that he sees and was hoping the rezoning would not add to those concerns and instead help ease them. **Mr. Palmer** also added that during the summer on the water where the bridge is located in the area the traffic to try to access the bridge is crowded to get in and out. He stated that he assumed this rezoning would just add to that issue as well as to the extra boats in the cove, and once again those were the negatives he associated with the request. **Mr. Marshall** thanked him and asked if there was anyone else that would like to address the issue, if there was any time left. **Ms. Jackson** stated there was roughly a minute left. **Mr. Marshall** asked **Mr. Jones** if he would like to add anything in that minute. **Mr. Jackson Jones** asked what type of buffer would be put in as they already hear a lot of noise from the boats. **Mr. Jones** stated he was curious what type of buffer would go in behind the manufactured home and the building that would be built. **Mr. Crosby** stated Cyprus or something of that nature depending on the recommendation of their landscape architect on how to best reduce the noise. **Mr. Jones** stated he had been there 20 years have enjoyed their lot and realize they cannot stop progress but would like it as peaceful as possible, and thought some type of buffer would help with the noise. **Mr. Marshall** stated the staff recommendation was for approval but pointed out that it had changed since the discussion from the first meeting. **Mr. Marshall** stated the staff recommendation was for approval with the following conditions: 1.) no structure shall exceed 30 ft. in height from grade at the lowest point, 2.) No more than 35% shall be covered with buildings, 3.) All public access shall be established through the parking lot of the existing storage facility, 4.) Parking shall be located on the side closest to Hwy 44, 5.) A 50 foot undisturbed vegetated/tree buffer shall be established and maintained around the property line where it abuts any residential property, 6.) There shall be a densely planted screen buffer along the front property line on Briarpatch Road, and 7.) There shall be no outside storage or display at any time. **Mr. Oberdeck** made a motion for denial with the following reasons: 1.) the proposed use would adversely affect the value of the property nearby in the subdivision. 2.) The proposed use is not supported by new conditions not anticipated in the comprehensive plan. 3.) The added congestion of a commercial property on the intersection of Briarpatch Road and Hwy 44 which would impact the owners of the 43+ properties served by Briarpatch Road. 4.) The increased boat traffic which can cause

congestion in the cove and through the two bridges leading to the main water which will affect the owners of properties in that area. 5.) Setting a precedent for not following the comprehensive plan for Hwy 44 and encroaching into the other subdivisions along the Hwy 44 corridor. **Mr. Marshall** asked if any other commissioners would like to comment. **Mr. Langley** stated he had mixed emotions concerning the request. He said the area in question is sensitive and within that particular area planting a seed of more commercial development would not serve the area well. **Mr. Langley** seconded **Mr. Oberdeck's** motion for denial. **Mr. Brundage** voted for denial. **Mr. Marshall** voted against motion for denial. **Denied.**

Staff recommendation is for approval with the following conditions: 1.) No structures shall exceed 30 feet in height from grade at lowest point, 2.) No more than 35% of the lot shall be covered with buildings, 3.) All public access shall be established through the parking lot of the existing storage facility, 4.) Parking shall be located on the side closest to Hwy 44, 5.) A 50 foot undisturbed vegetated/tree buffer shall be established and maintained along the property line where it abuts any residential property, 6.) There shall be a densely planted screen buffer along the front property line on Briarpatch Road, and 7.) There shall be no outside storage or display at any time.

Motion for denial made by: Alan M. Oberdeck
 Seconded by: John D. Langley

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
Brundage, Tommy	x			
Langley, John D.	x			
Marshall, James P.		x		
Oberdeck, Alan M.	x			

*11. Request by **William B. Jones** to rezone 0.94 acres at 114 Briarpatch Road, from R-2 to C-1 [Map 096B, Parcel 063].**

Mr. William B. Jones represented this request. **Mr. Jones** stated that he is requesting to rezone .094 acres at 114 Briarpatch Road along with the adjacent parcel from R-2 to C-1, to construct a similar storage structure as located two parcels over toward Greensboro Hwy/Hwy 44. He stated that they had originally requested rezoning this property for an add on to this proposed building. **Mr. Jones** stated that they are still requesting a rezoning to do some type of expansion. He said that it may not be what they initially anticipated but it will give them the opportunity to expand and enhance the operation. **Mr. Jones** stated that this will be an asset to the County. He said the residents in the area find that there is a need for it. No one spoke in opposition to this request. Staff recommendation is for denial. **Mr. Oberdeck** made a motion for denial and **Mr. Langley** seconded. **Denied.**

Staff recommendation is for denial

Motion for denial made by: Alan M. Oberdeck
 Seconded by: John D. Langley

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
Brundage, Tommy	x			
Langley, John D.	x			

Marshall, James P.	x			
Oberdeck, Alan M.	x			

12. *Adjournment*

ATTEST:

James Marshall
Chairman

Lisa Jackson
P&D Director