



# PUTNAM COUNTY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

117 Putnam Drive, Suite B ♦ Eatonton, GA 31024

Tel: 706-485-2776 ♦ 706-485-0552 fax ♦ www.putnamcountyga.com

## Minutes

The Putnam County Planning & Zoning Commission conducted a public hearing on Thursday, July 05, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. in the Putnam County Administration Building, 117 Putnam Drive, Room 203, Eatonton, Georgia.

### Opening

#### 1. **Call to Order**

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

#### 2. **Attendance**

Mr. Jonathan Gladden called the roll.

#### **Present:**

Chairman James Marshall, Jr.

Member Tommy Brundage

Member Alan Oberdeck

#### **Absent:**

Member Frederick Ward

#### 3. **Rules of Procedures**

Mr. Jonathan Gladden read the Rules of Procedures.

#### 4. **Approval of Minutes - June 7, 2018**

Motion to approve made by Member **Oberdeck**, Seconded by Member **Brundage**.

Voting Yea: Chairman Marshall, Member Brundage, Member Oberdeck. **All approved.**

5. Request by **Lynn Busing**, agent for **John, Ryan & Lauren Busing** for a rear yard setback variance at 125 Mags Path. Presently zoned R-1. [Map 103D Parcel 122]. **Mr. Lynn Busing** represented this request. He is requesting a 49-foot rear yard setback variance, being 51 feet from the nearest point to the lake to construct a (24'x24') 576-square foot pavilion. **Mr. Busing** stated the home was built on the property in 2013 and in 2015 the adjoining lot was purchased. He stated there were originally no plans to build on the lot. When the seawall was constructed Georgia Power informed them that there was an active beach there that needed to stay open. **Mr. Busing** stated that since the area is used for water recreation, they have decided it would be nice to have an accessory building located there. A portion of the building will be

used as storage while the front portion will be used as a pavilion. He stated he wanted the building to be 24x24 but it might expand to be a little larger. **Mr. Busing** stated Ms. Jackson and staff suggested a 30-foot variance which is acceptable to him, but if there is a way to be closer to the lake the building would look more functional being closer to the water. He stated the building would be designed to resemble his house. In addition, he stated Chapel Springs subdivision gave their approval for the design. **Mr. Marshall** stated he had visited the property with Ms. Pennamon and Ms. Jackson and he had no problem with the request.

Staff recommendation is for approval of a 30-foot rear yard setback variance being 70 feet from the nearest point to the lake.

Motion to approve made by Member **Oberdeck**, Seconded by Member **Brundage**.  
Voting Yea: Chairman **Marshall**, Member Brundage, Member Oberdeck. **All Approved.**

6. Request by **Anne Sciarrone, agent for David Culpepper** for a side yard setback variance at 276 S. Steel Bridge Road. Presently zoned R-2. [**Map 114A Parcel 059**]. **Request to withdraw without prejudice.**

**Staff recommendation is for approval to withdraw without prejudice.**

Motion to approve made by Member **Oberdeck**, Seconded by Member **Brundage**.  
Voting Yea: Chairman Marshall, Member Brundage, Member Oberdeck. **All Approved**

7. Request by **Greg Waddell, agent for Ricky T. & Donna R. Garmon** for a side yard setback variance at 102 Shoreline Court. Presently zoned R-2. [**Map 084A Parcel 069**]. **Mr. Greg Waddell** represented this request. The applicants are requesting a 7-foot side yard setback variance, being 13 feet from the left side property line and a 4-foot side yard setback variance, being 16 feet from the left side property line when facing the lake to construct a (26x28) 728 square foot garage. He stated in order to build the garage it would place one corner of the proposed structure 13 feet from the property line which would result in the need for a 7-foot variance. While the other corner would require the structure being 16 feet from the property line which would result in the need for a 4-foot variance. He stated the garage could not go behind the house because that would block one of the egress windows.

**Staff recommendation is for approval of a 7-foot side yard setback variance being 13 feet from the left side property line and a 4-foot side yard variance being 16 feet from the left side property line when facing the lake.**

Motion to approve made by Member **Oberdeck**, Seconded by Member **Brundage**.  
Voting Yea: Chairman Marshall, Member Brundage, Member Oberdeck. **All Approved.**

8. Request by **Greg Waddell, agent for Kent and Marlene Matson** for a side yard setback variance at 157 Southshore Road. Presently zoned R-2. [**Map 056B Parcel 202**]. **Mr. Greg Waddell** represented this request. The applicants are requesting a 9-foot side yard setback variance, being 11 feet from both side yard property lines when facing the lake to construct a (49x50) 2,450 square foot house and a (32x24) 768 square foot attached garage. He stated in order to be 100 feet from the lake while not interfering with the septic system it would cause the structure to need a right and left side 9-foot variance being 11 feet off both the right and left side property lines. **Mr. Oberdeck** stated he had doubt about the 11 feet from both property lines, his concern being if this was enough space to get a big piece of equipment

down to the lake. **Mr. Waddell** stated he could fit equipment through there, up to and including a small bull dozer.

**Staff recommendation is for approval of a 9-foot side yard setback variance being 11 feet from both side property lines.**

Motion to approve made by Member **Oberdeck**, Seconded by Member **Brundage**.

Voting Yea: Chairman Marshall, Member Brundage, Member Oberdeck. **All Approved.**

9. **Mr. Craig S. Alvarado** represented this request. He stated he is planning to move to the area full time and is wanting an 8-foot side yard variance being 12 feet from the left side property line when facing the lake to construct a garage. **Mr. Alvarado** stated his proposed garage would be in line with his neighbors. He stated that if the garage was placed further down on the property, the land drops off and would make it more difficult to build. If the structure was kept in the front there is an island of trees that would have to be removed which **Mr. Alvarado** stated he was trying to avoid. **Mr. Alvarado** stated the projected drawing displayed was not correct and he changed it since then. He stated that it was 14 feet on the part closer to the road and not what was displayed. **Mr. Marshall** stated the staff recommended to prevent further encroachment that **Mr. Alvarado** move the structure over an additional two feet. **Mr. Alvarado** stated that would put the garage on top of the driveway. **Mr. Alvarado** stated that the commission had just given another applicant 11 feet and he is just asking for 4. Ms. Jackson reminded **Mr. Alvarado** that each property is unique. **Ms. Jackson** stated at the site visit after measuring it would not have put the structure on the driveway. **Mr. Alvarado** disagreed and stated he originally was going to put it where Ms. Jackson stated and a variance would not be needed, but since it would have been on top of the driveway he needs the variance. He stated there was plenty of room on the right side or he could move the structure further down the property, however the terrain would not be as flat and there would be a zigzag pattern of buildings as opposed to keeping everything in line. **Ms. Jackson** asked **Mr. Alvarado** if there was a possibility of where he placed the stakes not being exactly accurate. **Mr. Alvarado** stated that could be a possibility due to his tape measurer. **Ms. Jackson** stated that she would amend staff recommendation from approval to be 14 feet from the left side property line when facing the lake instead of 12 feet, due to the fact that the property might not have been staked off accurately. She stated as long as **Mr. Alvarado** was two feet off the side of his driveway the commission could work with him. **Ms. Jackson** asked the commission members if they were okay with that, they all agreed. **Ms. Jackson clarified** that now **Mr. Alvarado** would have an additional two feet as opposed to what he originally requested.

**Staff recommendation is for approval of a 8-foot side yard setback variance being 12 feet from the left side property line when facing the lake.**

Motion to approve made by Member **Oberdeck**, Seconded by Member **Brundage**.

Voting Yea: Chairman Marshall, Member Brundage, Member Oberdeck. **All Approved.**

10. Request by **Phillip G. & Maureen K. Phifer** for a front, side and rear yard setback variance at 126 Winfield Drive. Presently zoned R-2. [Map 111A, Parcel 125]. **Request to withdraw without prejudice.**

**Staff recommendation is for approval to withdraw without prejudice.**

Motion to approve made by Member **Oberdeck**, Seconded by Member **Brundage**.  
Voting Yea: Chairman Marshall, Member Brundage, Member Oberdeck. **All Approved.**

## **New Business**

## **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned 7:10 p.m.

Attest:

---

Lisa Jackson  
Director

---

James Marshall, Jr.  
Chairman