

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 4, 2018

The Putnam County Planning & Zoning Commission conducted a public hearing on Thursday, January 4, 2018 at 6:30 PM in the Putnam County Administration Building, 117 Putnam Drive, Room 203, Eatonton, Georgia.

1. Call to Order

Mr. John Marshall, Jr., Chairman, called the meeting to order.

2. Attendance

Mrs. Karen Pennamon called the roll.

Present: John Marshall, Jr., Chairman, John Langley, Vice-Chairman, Alan Oberdeck, Frederick Ward

Absent: Tommy Brundage

Staff Present: Lisa Jackson, Karen Pennamon, and Jonathan Gladden

3. Rules of Procedures

Mr. Jonathan Gladden read the Rules of Procedures.

4. Approval of Minutes – October 5, 2017

Motion for approval made by: Alan M. Oberdeck

Seconded by: John Langley

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
John Marshall, Jr.	x			
John D. Langley	x			
Alan M. Oberdeck	x			
Frederick Ward	x			

5. Request by Howard McMichael, agent for Aaron Burgess for a rear yard setback variance at 100 West Riverbend. Presently zoned R-1R. [Map 119C, Parcel 054].

Mr. Howard McMichael, agent for Aaron Burgess represented this request. **Mr. McMichael** stated he is requesting a 23-foot setback variance, being 77 feet from the nearest point to the lake to construct a 3,500-square foot house. **Mr. McMichael** stated there is a ravine on the property where Old Spivey Road used to be. He stated this resulted in an odd building site which requires a variance. **Mr. McMichael** stated **Mr. Burgess** owns both lots and wishes to put homes on each. He stated that he thought it would be best to ask for variances on both lots at the same time. **Mr. McMichael** stated debris will float back into the ravine from the lake, and he is tentatively planning on a sea wall to prevent this. **Mr. Oberdeck** stated the ravine is a unique feature of the lot. **Mr. Langley** stated he had visited the property with **Mrs. Pennamon** and **Mr. Ward** and did not have a problem with the request. No one spoke in opposition to the request. Staff recommendation is for approval of a 23-foot setback variance, being 77 feet from the nearest point to the lake. **Mr. Oberdeck** made a motion for approval. **Mr. Langley** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of a 23-foot setback variance, being 77 feet from the nearest point to the lake.

Motion for approval made by: Alan Oberdeck
 Seconded by: John Langley

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
John Marshall, Jr.	x			
John D. Langley	x			
Alan M. Oberdeck	x			
Frederick Ward	x			

- Request by **Howard McMichael, agent for Aaron Burgess** for a rear yard setback variance at 101 East Riverbend. Presently zoned R-1R. [Map 119C, Parcel 055].*

Mr. Howard McMichael, agent for Aaron Burgess represented this request. **Mr. McMichael** stated he is requesting a 23-foot setback variance, being 77 feet from the nearest point to the lake, to construct a 3,500-square foot house. He stated one of the lots has a ditch that is located on the right-hand side of the property. **Mr. McMichael** stated this request is similar to the previous one on the adjacent property that was just spoken on. **Mr. Marshall** stated he assumed **Mr. McMichael's** comments would be the same as that of the previous item. **Mr. McMichael** concurred. No one spoke in opposition to the request. Staff recommendation is for approval of a 23-foot setback variance, being 77 feet from the nearest point to the lake. **Mr. Langley** made a motion for approval of staff recommendation. **Mr. Ward** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of a 23-foot setback variance, being 77 feet from the nearest point to the lake.

Motion for approval made by: John Langley
 Seconded by: Frederick Ward

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
John Marshall, Jr.	x			
John D. Langley	x			
Alan M. Oberdeck	x			
Frederick Ward	x			

7. Request by **Douglas L. & Jean W. Oakes** for a side yard setback variance at 114 Little River Run N. Presently zoned R-2. [Map 058A, Parcel 141].

Mr. Douglas L. Oakes represented this request. He stated he is requesting a 4.09-foot setback variance, being 15.10 feet from the right-side property line when facing the lake to construct a 20 x 30 addition and a 6 x 30 porch onto the existing house. **Mr. Oakes** stated he purchased the lot in 1999 as a weekend retreat, and recently had decided to downsize and move to Putnam full time. **Mr. Oakes** stated the cabin currently on the property is only 875 square feet, which is too small for their lifestyle and is why they are requesting to add on an addition. He stated the addition would be 2 stories and 1,200 square feet. **Mr. Oakes** stated in building the addition the north-east corner would be 4.9 feet inside the side setback line, so a variance would be needed. **Mr. Langley** stated he had visited the property with **Mrs. Pennamon & Mr. Ward** and has no problem with the request. No one spoke in opposition to the request. Staff recommendation is for approval of a 4.09-foot setback variance, being 15.10 feet from the right-side property line when facing the lake. **Mr. Langley** made a motion for approval. **Mr. Oberdeck** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of a 4.09-foot setback variance, being 15.10 feet from the right-side property line when facing the lake.

Motion for approval made by: John Langley
 Seconded by: Alan Oberdeck

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
John Marshall, Jr.	x			
John D. Langley	x			
Alan M. Oberdeck	x			
Frederick Ward	x			

8. Request by **Carl D. & Lillian Carter** for a side yard and rear yard setback variance at 194 Jackson Road, SE. Presently zoned R-1. [Map 086B, Parcel 047].

Mr. Carl D. Carter represented this request. **Mr. Carter** stated he is requesting a 2-foot setback variance, being 18 feet from the right-side property line when facing the lake and a 60-foot variance, being 40 feet from the nearest point to the lake to construct additions to both sides of the existing 24 x 36 square foot house and add a 52 x 12 deck in the rear. He stated he had

purchased the property in July of 2012 as a second home, but in the last 6 months has relocated to the property full time. **Mr. Carter** stated the house is an A frame style being 24 x 36 or total of 864 square feet. He stated he is hoping to expand the home to accommodate additional living space. **Mr. Carter** stated the original structure was built in 1978 with the deck being located 49 feet from the face of the lake. He stated the evaluation of the projected addition would require three variances. **Mr. Carter** stated the first variance requested was on the south-west side where he wished to extend the house 16 feet. He stated this first variance would place the addition 18 feet from the property line, hence the 2-foot variance being requested. **Mr. Carter** skipped to his third variance which would meet the 20-foot requirement on the side of the property however, the face of the structure to the lake would be 79 feet hence, the 21-foot variance requested on that side. He stated after visiting with staff that the point discussed was the second variance he is requesting. **Mr. Carter** stated variance number two from the point of the new deck would be approximately 40 feet from the water. He stated he wanted to offer an alternate to variance two. **Mr. Carter** then passed out copies of his proposal to the commission. He stated page two of seven on the handout showed the original as built drawing of the structure that shows the corner of the deck at 49 feet to the closest point to the lake. **Mr. Carter** stated the south side is where the 16 feet would be added. He alternate request can be found on page six of seven. **Mr. Carter** stated he is proposing to construct the deck in a way that the full radius of the deck will be square with the building, this would make the closest point to the lake at 51 feet. This would amend his variance request to a 49-foot variance being 51 feet to the nearest point to the lake, and this would be 9 feet less than originally requested. **Mr. Langley** stated that he had visited the property with **Mr. Ward** and **Mrs. Pennamon** and shared his reservations about the distance of the deck to the lake. **Mr. Langley** then stated he was very pleased with this revised plan and thought it was a better solution to what **Mr. Carter** wanted to do, and was okay with the request. **Mr. Ward** and **Mr. Oberdeck** were also okay with the request. **Mr. Marshall** read the staff recommendation which was for approval of a 2-foot setback variance, being 18 feet from the right-side property line when facing the lake and a 50-foot variance, being 50 feet from the nearest point to the lake on the left side when facing the lake and a 21-foot variance, being 79 feet from the nearest point from the lake on the right side when facing the lake. **Ms. Lisa Jackson** stated she had spoken with **Mr. Carter** today and explained to him that the staff was wanting to keep the proposed addition in line with the existing house which is roughly 39 almost 40 feet from the lake and encouraged **Mr. Carter** to reduce that side so the structure would not be getting any closer to the lake. **Mr. Marshall** recognized **Mrs. Ruby Nixon** who signed in to speak against the request. **Mrs. Nixon** stated that if the request was only for two feet she did not have a problem with the request. **Mr. Langley** made a motion for approval. **Mr. Ward** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of a 2-foot setback variance, being 18 feet from the right-side property line when facing the lake and a 50-foot variance, being 50 feet from the nearest point to the lake on the left side when facing the lake and a 21-foot variance, being 79 feet from the nearest point from the lake on the right side when facing the lake.

Motion for approval made by: John Langley
Seconded by: Alan Oberdeck

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
John Marshall, Jr.	x			
John D. Langley	x			
Alan M. Oberdeck	x			
Frederick Ward	x			

9. Request by **R. Greg Waddell, agent for Christopher & Karen Baumann** for a side and rear yard setback variance at 121 Cold Branch Lane. Presently zoned R-2. [Map 112A, Parcel 009].

Mr. R. Greg Waddell, agent for Christopher & Karen Baumann represented this request. **Mr. Waddell** stated the applicants are requesting an 8-foot setback variance, being 12 feet from both side property lines and a 15-foot setback variance, being 85 feet from the nearest point to the lake to construct a 36 x 62 (2,736) square foot house with a 24 x27 (648) square foot attached garage. He stated the applicants are intending to replace the existing manufactured home on the property. **Mr. Waddell** stated it is a pie shaped lot with an existing driveway, wells, and septic lines. **Mr. Langley** stated he had visited the property with **Mr. Ward** and **Mrs. Pennamon**. **Mr. Langley** stated due to the restrictions, especially regarding the wells that he agreed with the request. **Mr. Langley** also asked if the wells were required to be sealed. **Mr. Waddell** stated that one of the wells would be sealed. No one spoke in opposition to the request. Staff recommendation is for approval of an 8-foot setback variance, being 12 feet from the both side property lines and a 15-foot setback variance, being 85 feet from the nearest point to the lake. **Mr. Langley** made a motion for approval. **Mr. Oberdeck** seconded. **All approved.**

Staff recommendation is for approval of an 8-foot setback variance, being 12 feet from both side property lines and a 15-foot setback variance, being 85 feet from the nearest point to the lake.

Motion for approval made by: John Langley

Seconded by: Alan Oberdeck

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
John Marshall, Jr.	x			
John D. Langley	x			
Alan M. Oberdeck	x			
Frederick Ward	x			

10. Request by **Clara Stogner** for a side yard setback variance at 163 Lakeview Drive. Presently zoned R-1.[Map 102C, Parcel 018].

Request to withdraw without prejudice

Staff recommendation is for approval to withdraw without prejudice.

Motion for approval of the request to withdraw without prejudice made by: Alan Oberdeck
 Seconded by: John Langley

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
John Marshall, Jr.	x			
John D. Langley	x			
Alan M. Oberdeck	x			
Frederick Ward	x			

11. *Request by Rick McAllister, agent for Patricia A. Wilson & M. John Wilson & ET AL at Tract A, 151 Collis Marina Road to rezone 25,264.80 square feet (.58 acres) from R-1 to RM-2[Map 104B, Parcel 014]. **
12. *Request by Rick McAllister, agent for Mary Ellen Peebles Revocable Living Trust at Tract B, 149 Collis Marina Road to rezone 26,571.60 square feet (.61 acres) from R-1 to RM-2[Map 104B, Parcel 013]. **
13. *Request by Rick McAllister, agent for Estate of Claude P. Duncan at Tract C, 147 Collis Marina Road to rezone 20,037.60 square feet (.46 acres) from R-1 to RM-2[Map 104B, Parcel 012]. **

Items 11, 12, & 13 were discussed together. **Mr. Rick McAllister, agent for Patricia A. Wilson & M. John Wilson & ET AL; agent for Mary Ellen Peebles Revocable Living Trust; agent for Estate of Claude P. Duncan** represented this request. **Mr. McAllister** stated that the applicants are requesting to rezone the three parcels from R-1 to RM-2 to combine with the adjacent 1.43-acre parcel which is zoned RM-2 (Map 104B, Parcel 011) for a total 3.08 acres. He further added that the developers are proposing to construct 18 townhouses and a 2,500-square foot amenity building within this development. **Mr. McAllister** stated the three parcels are located between a currently owned RM-3 town home development and an undeveloped RM-2 zoned property. **Mr. McAllister** stated that the concept plan included in the packet illustrates what the applicants will accomplish with the rezoning request. He stated under the proposed RM-2 zoning the Putnam County standards require a front setback of 30 feet, a side setback of 20 feet, and a rear setback of 20 feet except for Lake Oconee where the setback is 100 feet. **Mr. McAllister** stated the setbacks for the future development have been illustrated in the concept plan which is included in the application packet. He stated the applicants would not be asking for any type of variance with this project, and all the proposed units would meet the setback requirements for the district. He stated the total combined area for the proposed rezoning would encompass 3.08 acres and the density for RM-2 zoning is 6 units per acre. Therefore, the 3.08 acres would allow for a total of 18 units. **Mr. McAllister** further explained the proposed parking and ingress/egress displayed in the concept plan are all in line with Putnam County design standards. He stated the type of development being proposed allows for

condensing of building area which has the benefit of having remaining land use serve as common open space. Moreover, the proposed concept plan allows for approximately 50 percent of the site being available for landscape areas, wooded areas, and open space. **Mr. McAllister** also referenced the Putnam County/City of Eatonton 2007-2030 Comprehensive Plan which indicates the proposed area as mixed residential use and the proposed land use by the applicants fits into this category of mixed residential. The existing sewer and water infrastructure in this area is served by Piedmont Water, and the packet includes a letter by Piedmont Water allowing for service in the proposed project. Furthermore, **Mr. McAllister** stated he contacted the original designer of the pump station that serves the area and he initiated a separate study that confirms the pump station has capacity for this proposed development. In addition, all the required onsite construction of sewage, water, and roads will be provided by the developer at no cost to the county. **Mr. McAllister** stated there was further detailed information with potential traffic impact located within the agenda package and he would welcome any specific questions that the Commission might have. At the request of **Ms. Lisa Jackson**, he met with **Fire Chief Hill** to develop a site plan that adhered to the specific criteria for emergency vehicles and response; once the two developments are connected there will be even better access for emergency vehicles and turn around radius for those vehicles. **Mr. McAllister** closed with his appreciation for the consideration of promoting quality development within Putnam County. **Mr. Carl Anderson** spoke in opposition to the request. **Mr. Anderson** stated the last time the property was developed he accepted everything that was being proposed and he lost fifty feet of his land, five trees, and water runoff adversely effected his property (Map 104B, Parcel 010). **Mr. Anderson** stated he wanted to make sure a buffer was included in the development plan for this request to prevent him from losing anymore of his property or trees. **Mr. Marshall** asked for clarification on where his property was located. **Mr. Anderson** stated his property abuts (Map 104B, Parcel 011). **Mr. Marshall** stated he appreciated **Mr. Anderson's** input and the Commission would try to be sensitive to his concerns with the recommendation. **Mr. Marshall** asked if the recommendation would need to be revised to include a buffer and abatement for runoff. **Ms. Jackson** replied that this inclusion would come in the preliminary review however, the buffer requirement was already included in the staff recommendation. **Mr. Marshall** asked **Mr. McAllister** if the packet included an elevation of the properties. **Mr. McAllister** stated no but the developers are considering continuing the area that is seen on the other side of the lot; however, issues with topography could prevent the continuation and make for a lower level of elevation. He stated the current site plan created uses a 24x72 footprint, and since this would be a townhome community it would not be flat like the Waterfront Development which is adjacent. **Mr. Oberdeck** stated he had visited the property and observed the layout of: (Map 104B, Parcel 014), (Map 104B, Parcel 013), (Map 104B, Parcel 012) however, he had not observed the property at (Map 104B, Parcel 011). **Mr. McAllister** stated on (Map 104B, Parcel 011) it did look as if some type of excavation had occurred at some point in the past by the previous owners. **Mr. Oberdeck** stated he thought the proposed development would be a good addition to the area. **Mr. Langley** asked **Mr. McAllister** if the property had been accurately surveyed. **Mr. McAllister** responded yes, that the survey provided had been done by a licensed surveyor; **Mr. Langley** also asked if **Mr. Anderson** would be able to see where the survey lines are. **Mr. McAllister** responded he would as they were staked off. **Mr. Marshall** stated the project was well thought out and the presentation excellent. **Mr. Marshall** further stated he was going to combine the three requests discussed into one vote. **11)** Staff recommendation is for approval to rezone 25,264.80 square feet (.58 acres) from R-1 to RM-2 with the following conditions: (1) the .58 acres must be combined with the adjacent parcels: Map 104B, Parcel 013; Map 104B, Parcel 012; and Map 104B, Parcel 011, and the .58 acres cannot be used or sold as a standalone

parcel, (2) a 15-foot wide landscape buffer, shall be established adjacent to all single-family residential zoned property, (3) this rezoning shall be conditioned upon the resurveying and the recordation of the plat as stated in Section 66-165(e)(3) of the Putnam County Code of Ordinances. **12)** Staff recommendation is for approval to rezone 26,571.16 square feet (.61 acres) from R-1 to RM-2 with the following conditions: (1) the .61 acres must be combined with the adjacent parcels: Map 104B, Parcel 014; Map 104B, Parcel 012; and Map 104B, Parcel 011, and the .61 acres cannot be used or sold as a standalone parcel, (2) a 15-foot wide landscape buffer, shall be established adjacent to all single-family residential zoned property, (3) this rezoning shall be conditioned upon the resurveying and the recordation of the plat as stated in Section 66-165 (e)(3) of the Putnam County Code of Ordinances. **13)** Staff recommendation is for approval to rezone 20,037.60 square feet (.46 acres) from R-1 to RM-2 with the following conditions: (1) the .46 acres must be combined with the adjacent parcels: Map 104B, Parcel 013; Map 104B, Parcel 014; and Map 104B, Parcel 011, and the .46 acres cannot be used or sold as a standalone parcel, (2) a 15-foot wide landscape buffer shall be established adjacent to all single-family residential zoned property, (3) this rezoning shall be conditioned upon the resurveying and the recordation of the plat as stated in Section 66-165 (e)(3) of the Putnam County Code of Ordinances.

Mr. Oberdeck made a motion for approval. **Mr. Langley** seconded. **All approved.**

11) Staff recommendation is for approval to rezone 25,264.80 square feet (.58 acres) from R-1 to RM-2 with the following conditions: (1) the .58 acres must be combined with the adjacent parcels: Map 104B, Parcel 013; Map 104B, Parcel 012; and Map 104B, Parcel 011, and the .58 acres cannot be used or sold as a standalone parcel, (2) a 15-foot wide landscape buffer, shall be established adjacent to all single-family residential zoned property, (3) this rezoning shall be conditioned upon the resurveying and the recordation of the plat as stated in Section 66-165(e)(3) of the Putnam County Code of Ordinances.

12) Staff recommendation is for approval to rezone 26,571.16 square feet (.61 acres) from R-1 to RM-2 with the following conditions: (1) the .61 acres must be combined with the adjacent parcels: Map 104B, Parcel 014; Map 104B, Parcel 012; and Map 104B, Parcel 011, and the .61 acres cannot be used or sold as a standalone parcel, (2) a 15-foot wide landscape buffer, shall be established adjacent to all single-family residential zoned property, (3) this rezoning shall be conditioned upon the resurveying and the recordation of the plat as stated in Section 66-165 (e)(3) of the Putnam County Code of Ordinances.

13) Staff recommendation is for approval to rezone 20,037.60 square feet (.46 acres) from R-1 to Rm-2 with the following conditions: (1) the .46 acres must be combined with the adjacent parcels: Map 104B, Parcel 013; Map 104B, Parcel 014; and Map 104B, Parcel 011, and the .46 acres cannot be used or sold as a standalone parcel, (2) a 15-foot wide landscape buffer shall be established adjacent to all single-family residential zoned property, (3) this rezoning shall be conditioned upon the resurveying and the recordation of the plat as stated in Section 66-165 (e)(3) of the Putnam County Code of Ordinances.

Motion for approval made by: Alan Oberdeck
Seconded by: John Langley

Commissioner	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	RECUSE
John Marshall, Jr.	x			
John D. Langley	x			
Alan M. Oberdeck	x			
Frederick Ward	x			

ATTEST:

 Lisa Jackson
 Director

 John Marshall, Jr.
 Chairman