

PUTNAM COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION



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

Thursday, November 05, 2015

The Putnam County Planning & Zoning Commission conducted a public hearing on Thursday, November 05, 2015 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.

Absent: Yvonne Hardy

Staff Present: Lisa Jackson & Karen Pennamon

1. *Call to Order*

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

2. *Attendance*

Mrs. Karen Pennamon called the roll.

3. *Rules of Procedures*

Mr. Jonathan Gladden read the rules of procedures.

4. *Approval of Minutes - October 1, 2015*

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			

5. *Request by **Gary A. Henderson** for a side yard setback variance at 112 Riverside Drive. Presently zoned R-1. [Map 102B, Parcel 053].*

Mr. Gary Henderson represented this request. **Mr. Henderson** stated that when their house plans were drawn, he thought the side yard setback requirement was 10 feet instead of 20 feet. He stated that he is requesting a 6-foot side yard variance, being 14 feet from both side yard property lines to build a house. **Mr. Henderson** added that this is a narrow lot which is only 109 feet wide and the proposed structure is 3687 square feet. **Mr. Marshall** stated that the original variance request is for a 5-foot side yard variance. **Mr. Henderson** stated that the 5-foot variance would fit too. **Mr. Marshall** asked if there would be any problems with the septic system because of the shape of the lot. **Mr. Henderson** responded there are no septic issues and his septic permit has been approved. **Mr. Langley** stated that he had visited the site with **Ms. Jackson** and **Mrs. Pennamon**. He said that after measuring the proposed location of the structure, he felt that the measures were skewed by a foot because he measured 14 feet instead of 15 feet. **Mr. Langley** stated that he thought that was the reason for the change on the variance request. **Mr. Henderson** stated that since he is not a surveyor he may not have placed the stakes in the right place. He stated that he had submitted a new drawing and letter of intent which shows the change from a 15-foot side yard setback to a 14-foot setback. He added that he is probably going to reduce the house size due to the cost. **Ms. Jackson** asked what size he would be reducing it to. **Mr. Henderson** stated that his current footprint is 3700 and it is probably going to be 3300 square feet. **Ms. Jackson** asked him if he would be comfortable asking for 15 feet on each side or something less. **Mr. Henderson** stated that he had asked for a little less but 15 feet would be fine. **Mr. Steven Peterson** spoke in opposition to this request. **Mr. Peterson** stated that he lives on the right of **Mr. Henderson's** property and has been there since 2007. He stated that he believes that when someone is designing a house on a 109-foot lot they should stay within the boundaries in the covenants. **Mr. Peterson** stated that when he built his house they had some problems on the right side and had to get a 5-foot variance which puts his house 15 feet from the side property line. He stated that 30 feet will be too close to his existing house and he was concerned about fire safety. **Mr. Peterson** added that he was also concerned about the property value being affected because of building these houses too close together. He added that there are no other houses in this neighborhood that are this close to each other. **Mr. Peterson** stated that they built their home to have a country setting and do not want it to turn into an army barrack looking situation. **Ms. Jackson** asked how close he thought **Mr. Henderson** would be to the property line. He stated that he would be going over 5 feet. **Ms. Jackson** stated that 20 feet is the minimum setback requirement and **Mr. Henderson** is asking to be 15 feet instead of 20 feet. **Mr. Peterson** stated that this would make this structure 30 feet from his house. **Ms. Jackson** stated that he was also 15 feet from the side property line but was saying that **Mr. Henderson** should be 20 feet instead of 15 feet. **Mr. Peterson** said yes and that he would like to see that because of esthetics. He added that the structure would block the view of the lake from both houses. He stated that his opinion is that if **Mr. Henderson** is building a house this size he needs to move back closer to the road. **Mr. Langley** stated that the layout of **Mr. Henderson's** lot where the stakes are in line with the footprint of his house. He added that it is desirable on their part to make sure houses complement each other and asking **Mr. Henderson** to move his house closer to the road would be counter to that. **Mr. Peterson** stated that it would give them both a better view. **Mr. Ray Ward** spoke in opposition to this request. **Mr. Ward** stated that he lives at 116 Riverside Dr. on the left side of **Mr. Henderson's** property. He stated his house was built in the 1980's and is 14 ft. off the side property line. **Mr. Ward** stated that if **Mr. Henderson's** request was granted it would be too close to his house, especially in the case of a fire. He also stated that being that close together would hurt resell value. **Mr. Ward** stated that if any work needed to be done on the seawall or back yard it would be difficult for trucks to make their way between the homes. **Mr. Marshall** stated that it seems to him that both houses have been granted variances in the past. **Mr. Ward** stated when he bought the house it was in its

current position. **Mr. Marshall** stated that a variance would have been required to get it in its current position so there is a fairness question to take into account as well. **Mr. Ward** stated once again that his problem is being able to get around to the back of the house because there is no leeway on the other side of his property. **Mr. Marshall** asked Mr. Henderson if he would like to rebut. **Mr. Henderson** rebutted that he understood their concerns but his setback would have no ramifications on Mr. Ward's ability to get a truck to the back of his property. **Mr. Henderson** stated that the house plans show that the garage which is 26 feet wide is the only part on Mr. Ward's side that will be 15 feet, the rest of the house will be over 20 ft. from the property line. **Mr. Langley** asked to discuss the objections raised by the neighbors. **Mr. Marshall** said that his position on the matter was that both of the neighbors have received variances and everyone out there has very narrow lots, some as close as 10 feet due to the way the subdivision was laid out. **Mr. Langley** stated he wanted to point out that it does not affect Riverside Drive directly but the properties alongside Thunder Road are closer than 24 feet from side to side. **Ms. Jackson** stated that Mr. Ward's property is on the left side facing the lake and when looking at the property, it appears that his house might have been a little closer than 14 feet. **Mr. Ward** stated it was 14 feet when he bought the house. **Mr. Marshall** stated that the staff recommendation is for approval of a 5-foot rear yard variance, being 15 ft. from both side property lines. **Ms. Jackson** made a point of correction stating that it should be a side yard variance. Staff recommendation is for approval. **Mr. Oberdeck** made a motion for approval and **Mr. Brundage** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of a 5-foot side yard variance, being 15 feet from both side property lines.

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			

6. *Request by **Hugh Pitts**, agent for **Steven Kollross** for a front and side yard setback variance at 141 Sequoia Court. Presently zoned R-1. [Map 102A, Parcel 033]. **Item removed from agenda.***

7. *Request by **Paul & Deidre Slifko** for a side yard setback variance at 144 Copelan Landing Drive. Presently R-1. [Map 104A, Parcel 082].*

Mr. Paul Slifko represented this request. **Mr. Slifko** stated that they are requesting a 10-foot side yard variance, being 10 feet from the left side property line to place a 16x24 custom built shed. He said they originally had the driveway coming into the center of the lot but after repositioning it closer to the side property line, this placed the proposed shed closer to the side property line. **Mr. Slifko** stated that this will give them a curved driveway entry instead of a straight entry. He said that the proposed location is far enough from the driveway and there are no mature trees there. **Mr. Slifko** added that they would like to preserve as many mature trees as

possible. He said that there is a natural culvert that runs under the road and all the way down to the lake. **Mr. Oberdeck** stated that he had visited the property and saw where the driveway is located but he feels that they can move the shed over to meet the 20 foot requirement. **Mr. Langley** stated that he had visited the property with **Ms. Jackson**. He said that after taking measurements of the proposed location for the shed he also feels that there is enough space to move the shed the shed to another location. **Mr. Langley** stated that this may mean adjusting the location of the driveway, if it is going to be too close to the building. He explained that if the Planning & Zoning Commission has the option for code compliance it is something they have to adhere to. He added that there is a clump of smaller trees to the right of the driveway facing the house where they can put the shed with the removal of one tree. **Mr. Marshall** also stated that whenever they can they must comply with code. No one spoke in opposition to this request. The staff recommendation is for denial. **Mr. Oberdeck** made a motion for denial and **Mr. Langley** seconded. **All approved.**

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		

8. *Request by Lorene McRae for a conditional use at 394 Glenwood Spring Road. Presently R-1R. [Map 050, Parcel 004001].**

Mr. Grady Clemons represented this request. **Mr. Clemons** stated that he is a native of Eatonton. He stated that they are requesting to rezone this property for a conditional use for a community event center. **Mr. Clemons** stated that reasons for this request are as follows: 1) The existing building on the property was once used as a commercial nightclub and later turned into a restaurant. 2) The applicants are paying commercial taxes and insurance on this building every year. 3) This property is zoned R-1R which is residential but the applicant would like to use the building for a commercial use. 4) It would benefit the community and the owners because various activities would be held there. 5) The community will have a venue and dining facility to host weddings, banquets, family reunions and other similar activities. 6) The revenue from activities could be used to help the applicant pay the taxes, insurance and upkeep of the property. **Mr. Clemons** thanked the Planning & Zoning Commission for considering their request. **Mr. Marshall** stated that the staff recommendation is for approval with conditions: 1) Owners shall present a parking plan, prepared by a design professional which shall be approved by the Planning Director and executed prior to the issuance of a business registration; 2) Guard Rails must be installed along side of the property where it abuts the river; 3) There shall be no parking in the county right-of-way or the side of Clemons Road; 4) Hours of operation shall not exceed 12 midnight. **Mr. Clemons** asked how far away from the building did he have to install the guard rails. **Mr. Marshall** informed him that he would need to consult with **Ms. Jackson** to find out what is required. He added that the layout of the parking plan will also determine where the guard rails have to be installed. **Ms. Jackson** stated that it would need to be from the start of the

property line in front of the building to include the parking area. She said that all of this needs to be there for safety reasons especially in the front yard because there is nothing there to prevent anyone or a vehicle from going over the edge. **Ms. Jackson** made a point of correction that **Mr. Clemons** is requesting a conditional use and not a rezoning as he had stated. **Mr. Langley** explained how a conditional use would apply to this property. **Mr. Marshall** expressed that the community event center is an excellent idea and he believes it will bring activity and revenue into Putnam County. No one spoke in opposition to this request. Staff recommendation is for approval with conditions. **Mr. Oberdeck** made a motion for approval with staff recommended conditions and **Mr. Langley** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of a conditional use for a community event center at 394 Glenwood Springs Road with the following conditions: 1) Owners shall present a parking plan, prepared by a design professional which shall be approved by the Planning Director and executed prior to the issuance of a business registration; 2) Guard Rails must be installed along side of the property where it abuts the river; 3) There shall be no parking in the county right-of-way or the side of Clemons Road; 4) Hours of operation shall not exceed 12 a.m./midnight.

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. *Adjournment*

New Business: Ms. Lisa Jackson and the Planning & Zoning Commission discussed the verbage changes that the Board of Commissioners made to the rezoning request for Eagles Rest at Cuscowilla, LLC. She also discussed the upcoming G.A.Z.A. Conference held February 4-5, 2016 in Athens, Georgia. Ms. Jackson informed the board that this meeting would conflict with the board meeting on February 4, 2016. The Planning & Zoning Commission voted unanimously to reschedule the February 4, 2016 meeting to February 9, 2016. Mr. Marshall congratulated and acknowledged Ms. Jackson for receiving her Masters Degree in Public Administration.

ATTEST:

 James Marshall
 Chairman

 Lisa Jackson
 P&D Director