PUTNAM COUNTY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT



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

Minutes Thursday, May 8, 2025 ◊ 6:30 pm

Opening

1. Call to Order

Chairman Charles Gray called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

2. Attendance

Zoning Coordinator Angela Waldroup called the Attendance.

Present: Member William Rainey Jr., Member David Erickson, Member Harold Jones,

Chairman Charles Gray

Absent: Member Shad Atkinson

Staff: Attorney Adam Nelson, Director Lisa Jackson, Assistant Director Courtney Andrews,

Zoning Coordinator Angela Waldroup

3. Rules of Procedures

Chairman Charles Gray read the Rules of Procedures.

Minutes

4. Approval of Minutes- 4-3-25

Motion: **Member Rainey** made the motion to approve the 4-3-25 minutes

Second: Member Jones

Voting Yea: Member Rainey, Member Erickson, Member Jones, Chairman Gray

The motion was approved by a vote of 4.

Requests

5. Request by **Rodney Etheredge** for a side-yard setback variance at 123 Cedar Cove Drive. Presently zoned R-1R [Map 071A, Parcel 002, District 3]. Mr. Rodney Etheredge represented this request.

Mr. Etheredge stated that he and his wife bought the home two years ago and their desire was to retire and move here full-time. They need a two-car garage. The house was built in 1982 and encroaches 8 feet into the setback. They were originally going to build a screened porch in the back to align with the house but after speaking with Director Jackson, they moved the porch's location. It would no longer require a variance.

No one spoke in opposition of this request.

Staff recommendation was for approval of an 8.1-foot side yard setback variance, being 11.9 feet from the left side property line when facing the lake, specific to the garage addition only as shown on the enclosed site plan at 123 Cedar Cove Drive [Map 071A, Parcel 002, District 3].

Staff recommendation was for denial of an 8.1-foot side yard setback variance, being 11.9 feet from the left side property line when facing the lake, specific to the proposed

screened in porch and the deck addition as shown on the enclosed site plan at 123 Cedar Cove Drive [Map 071A, Parcel 002, District 3].

Member Jones asked Mr. Etheredge how the neighbors felt about the variance request.

Mr. Etheredge stated that his neighbors had no objections that he knew of.

Member Erickson asked for clarification on whether the screened porch required a variance.

Mr. Etheredge stated that the screened porch had been moved and would no longer require a variance.

Member Erickson asked staff if they were still voting on the screened porch.

Director Jackson confirmed that they would still need to vote because it was part of the original request.

Attorney Nelson stated that when you advertise for a particular variance, you have to take action on it. Once it has been advertised and brought forth, either you allow the withdrawal or deny. In this case, to make the record clear, they would grant the variance for the front and deny it for the back, which the applicant was okay with.

Motion: **Member Jones** made the motion to approve an 8.1-foot side yard setback variance, being 11.9 feet from the left side property line when facing the lake, specific to the garage addition only as shown on the enclosed site plan at 123 Cedar Cove Drive and deny an 8.1-foot side yard setback variance, being 11.9 feet from the left side property line when facing the lake, specific to the proposed screened in porch and the deck addition as shown on the enclosed site plan at 123 Cedar Cove Drive [**Map 071A, Parcel 002, District 3**].

Second: Member Rainey

Member Erickson stated that he would like to see a vegetative buffer between the structure and the neighbor.

Chairman Gray stated that he would need to make a motion to amend the original motion and add that as a condition and they would need to vote on that condition.

Attorney Nelson clarified that you could put a condition on a variance, but staff's report did not include the condition, and the current motion did not include the condition. If he wanted to add that condition, they would have to move to amend the motion to include the condition and discuss that first.

Member Erickson stated that he would not include the condition.

The board voted on the original motion.

Voting Yea: Member Rainey, Member Erickson, Member Jones, Chairman Gray

The motion was approved by a vote of 4.

6. Request by **Pamela Evans** for a side-yard setback variance at 319 East Riverbend Drive. Presently zoned R-1R [**Map 119B, Parcel 015, District 3**]. **The applicant is requesting to withdraw without prejudice.**

No one spoke in opposition of this request.

Staff recommendation was for approval to withdraw without prejudice at 319 East Riverbend Drive [Map 119B, Parcel 015, District 3].

Motion: **Member Jones** made the motion to approve the request to withdraw without prejudice at 319 East Riverbend Drive [Map 119B, Parcel 015, District 3].

Second: Member Rainey

Voting Yea: Member Rainey, Member Erickson, Member Jones, Chairman Gray

The motion was approved by a vote of 4.

7. Request by **Dennis and Rebecca Hitchcock** to rezone 11 acres at 109 Elmwood Road from R-2 to AG. [**Map 109, Part of Parcel 026, District 3**]. * **Mr. Dennis Hitchcock** represented this request.

Mr. Hitchcock stated that they were requesting a rezoning from R-2 to Agricultural. He read a small personal background of their life. They were interested in developing a small flower farm with gardens and a few chickens. They were not interested in having cows, livestock, or a junk yard. By choosing local flowers, you support local economies, reduce the environmental impact of transportation, and reduce carbon footprint. They are requesting that the front two acres remain residential and the rest to be zoned AG. He added that the homes across the street from them were zoned agricultural and two houses down from them on the same side are also agricultural. The rest of the homes are residential and located on the lakeside. All of their immediate neighbors signed a petition supporting and agreeing that the rezoning would not have an adverse effect on them.

Member Erickson asked if the applicant would be able to have a flower garden under the current R-2 zoning.

Mr. Hitchcock stated that under the USDA, they had to be zoned AG in order to sell their flowers.

Attorney Nelson listed the uses allowed in R-2 per the Putnam County Code of Ordinances. He clarified that the uses did not include the proposed use as presented.

Member Rainey asked if they would be selling and growing flowers.

Mr. Hitchcock responded yes and shared that his wife grows different types of flowers.

Member Rainey asked if they would increase traffic.

Mr. Hitchcock said no. They already own a small trucking company, and it wouldn't change anything that they are doing now.

Member Jones asked if trucking company business was run out of the home.

Mr. Hitchcock stated that the office was based out of the home. They don't have an 18-wheeler trucking company. They have a small hot shot trucking company that they run themselves. They have two trucks.

Member Jones asked Attorney Nelson if the current business is allowed under the current zoning.

Attorney Nelson stated that it was not a listed use. Accessory uses are allowed but we could talk to the applicant to see what was going on. Based on the letter of intent, the proposed use would be allowed in the AG district.

Member Erickson wanted clarification on how many acres would remain residential and how many would be rezoned to AG.

Mr. Hitchcock clarified that he went through a process to try to get his property placed in conservation and was told that he would need to rezone the property and he could not include the front portion with the shop.

The following signed in to speak in opposition of the request and were given 3 minutes each:

• David Skinner

Mr. Hitchcock used the remainder of his time for rebuttal.

Mr. Hitchcock referred to an exhibit that shows the properties that are already zoned agriculture in the area.

Member Erickson asked if there was an R-2 zoning around the area.

Mr. Hitchcock showed Mr. Erickson where the properties were located.

No further discussion.

Staff recommendation was for denial to rezone 11 acres at 109 Elmwood Road from R-2 to AG. [Map 109, Part of Parcel 026, District 3].*

Motion: **Member Jones** made the motion to deny the request to rezone 11 acres at 109 Elmwood Road from R-2 to AG. [Map 109, Parcel 026, District 3].*

Second: Member Rainey

Member Erickson stated that he was supportive of what they were wanting to do because he is from agriculture himself. He thought that it was a good thing but in this particular instance and based on the comprehensive plan that they are obliged to follow. The comprehensive plan has the property and surrounding properties displayed as residential. There are a lot of agricultural land in Putnam County that would be more well suited for what they were trying to do.

Chairman Gray asked if the separation of the front remaining residential and the back being rezoned to agriculture was a part of the original application.

Director Jackson confirmed yes.

There was no further discussion.

Voting Yea: Member Rainey, Member Erickson, Member Jones, Chairman Gray

The motion was approved by a vote of 4.

8. Request by **Joe Hudson and Lois Schell** to rezone 10.27 acres on Lakeshore Drive from AG to R-1. [**Map 056, Parcel 003027, District 4**]. * **Mr. Joe Hudson** represented this request.

Mr. Hudson stated that they wanted to rezone their property from AG to R-1. The final subdivision of the lots will be used to build homes.

Mr. Erickson asked for clarification on whether they were going to subdivide the property.

Mr. Hudson stated that they were going to sell it to someone who intends to sell off lots to build homes.

No one spoke in opposition of this request.

Staff recommendation was for approval to rezone 10.27 acres on Lakeshore Drive from AG to R-1. [Map 056, Parcel 003027, District 4].*

Motion: **Chairman Gray** made the motion to approve the request to rezone 10.27 acres on Lakeshore Drive from AG to R-1. [**Map 056, Parcel 003027, District 4**].*

Second: Member Rainey

Voting Yea: Member Rainey, Member Erickson, Member Jones, Chairman Gray

The motion was approved by a vote of 4.

New Business

Attorney Nelson stated that he wanted to explain the process and ability to communicate. He wanted to make sure they understood the processes and they were getting good feedback on the way staff works'. He clarified that specific to when it comes to communication regarding a pending zoning matter, once it is advertised, concerned citizens could come to them. Staff does their analysis based on what is in the code as to what you could or could not do. He encouraged the commissioners to communicate with staff if they liked for things to be done differently. We are confined by what the ordinance says we could or could not do but if they had particular information they felt staff did not have that they thought would be helpful to make the decision, it is important to tell staff and make sure that they are involved. He discussed being cautious when sending emails. He encouraged them not to discuss what they thought about upcoming matters in emails because it created a basis for a decision that the public did not get to hear. Individual commissioners can call one another and ask what the other thinks but they should avoid forming a quorum.

Chairman Gray asked if it would be okay to ask staff a question and copy the board members while making a statement saying "Information only please do not respond to this email"

Attorney Nelson confirmed that he could do that but clarified that whatever was put into writing could be subject to disclosure if someone asked for it and it would become part of the record. He gave an example.

Adi	ournment

Motion: **Member Rainey** made a motion to adjourn the meeting

Second: Member Jones

Voting Yea: Member Rainey Jr., Member Erickson, Member Jones, Chairman Gray

The motion was approved by a vote of 4.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:11 pm

Attest:	
Lisa Jackson	Charles Gray
Director	Chairman