

MINUTES

Valdosta-Lowndes Zoning Board of Appeals
Valdosta City Hall Annex Multi-Purpose Room
300 North Lee Street, Valdosta, Georgia
March 7, 2023, 2:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Nancy Hobby
John “Mac” McCall
Allan Strickland
Dr. Samuel Clemmons
Victoria Copeland
Marion Ramsey

MEMBERS ABSENT

John Hogan III
Nathan Brantley

STAFF PRESENT

Lauren Hurley
Denada Jones
Trinni Amiot

VISITORS PRESENT

Jennie Boyer
Sam Fletcher
Steve Miller
Tyler Graybill
Chris Posey
Mindy Medina

Agenda Item # 1: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman McCall at 2:30 pm. It was determined that a quorum of members was present.

Chairman McCall:

Let me call this March meeting of Valdosta, Lowndes County Zoning Board of Appeals to order. Everyone in attendance will sign in on the sign in sheet at the back of the room. Before we begin, I will explain the process for the meeting. I will call each case by the case name and case number. The city or county representing staff will come to the lectern to present the facts of the case. After presentation, the board may ask questions of the staff. Once the board has heard the case and asked all questions necessary of staff, we will move to hearing from either the applicant or the applicant's representation. After hearing from the applicant, we will hear from anyone else who wishes to express support for the case. Finally, we will move to hearing from anyone who wishes to express opposition to the case. Anyone addressing the board will please come to the lectern and give their name and address for record.

For clarity and respect, we ask that only the person at the lectern address the board and that the audience give them an uninterrupted chance to be heard. If there is important information that you feel we need to consider, then please come to the lectern when it is your turn. In the interest of time, though, the board

.....
asks that you keep your comments brief and to the point. Please do not come to the lectern only to restate the same information we have already been given by someone else. Once the board has had a chance to hear from all sides on the matter and ask any questions, we feel are necessary, then we will render a decision. If we do not feel that the necessary information is available to render a decision today, then we may decide to table the case for the next meeting. Please be aware that this board is here today only to address variance applications to the Zoning Code for Lowndes, County, and the City of Valdosta. This board has been given the power to render a decision. We cannot and do not have the power to address any other matters that are not covered by the Zoning Code of Lowndes County or the City of Valdosta. We will move to hearing from hearing the first case. VAR-2023-03, Lowndes County.

LOWNDES COUNTY CASES:

VAR-2023-03

All or part of Tax Map 0089-Parcel 062. A request from Sam Fletcher for a Variance to Table 5.02.01 (D)(9) of the ULDC as it pertains to the maximum floor area for accessory buildings. The subject property is located at 1800 Ridgecrest Street, Valdosta, Georgia in a R-1 (Low Density Residential) zoning district.

Trinni Amiot

Good afternoon. This is the Fletcher property at 1800 Ridgecrest Street, zoned R-1 (low density residential), the size is about one and a half acres. The applicant is requesting a Variance to Table 5.02.01(D)(9) of the ULDC (Lowndes County Unified Land Development Code) as it pertains to Maximum Total Floor Area for All Accessory Buildings. The applicant is requesting a total of four (4) accessory structures for a combined Total Floor Area of 3,110 square feet. If approved, the structures will be used for various purposes (greenhouse, shop, canning, etc.), and can be situated on the lot to blend in with the overall appearance of the surrounding neighborhood. The maximum total allowed floor area based on their lot size is 1,500 sq. ft., therefore a Variance of 1,610 sq. ft. is requested. TRC staff heard and considered this request during their regularly scheduled meeting and found no objections. Overall, staff is supportive of the variance request, and appreciates the proactive stance the applicant is taking to obtain the correct approval for the structures. Staff also supports the desire for the additional square footage of their accessory buildings to safely store and maintain their personal belongings, thus reducing the chance of theft or damage. For the accessory structure, to get that additional 500 sq. ft. they will have to have another acre. So, the fact that they have one and a half acres still limits them to that 1500 sq. ft. They did a survey not too long ago and combined two lots. So, they have a larger lot. Their accessory structure is going to go on the left. That's their combined lot. Their house is somewhere close to that. The primary purpose for these things is to enclose some of their ATVs, boats, golf carts, things like that. Staff is recommending approval.

Chairman McCall

Any questions for staff? Thank you. Will the applicant or the applicant's representation. wish to address the board.

Jennie Boyer

.....
My name is Jenny Boyer.

Sam Fletcher

I'm Sam Fletcher.

Jennie Boyer

We live at 1800 Ridgcrest Street. We appreciate your time, and we'll make our comments brief. We do believe that we provided a lot of the information that you need in the packet, with our letter of intent. Our goal with this request is to, as Trinni mentioned, build three accessory buildings on the property that will allow us to meet our needs for space before looking at the variance. We did look at alternatives, and we had two that we could have done under the existing code. Neither one of them really felt right to us. One is to attach the shop to the existing house. To us, that is what I'll call malicious compliance. It just does not meet the intent of the code. It would put everything on the south end of the lot. It's a very long, narrow lot. Two and a half lots we combined. So, we felt like that would be malicious compliance and really would not look how we or anybody wants that to look. The other option that we looked at was if we went behind us and attempted to purchase some more land from our neighbors, that was potentially an option. We're backed on one side by the industrial authorities that that's probably not an option for us. But directly behind on the south side, there are a couple of neighbors where potentially we could have gone. We did not ask them, but we could have gone and tried to get some land. It didn't feel right either for a couple of reasons. One is that it would then ultimately reduce their resale value because their lots would be smaller. Additionally, the back of our lot is wooded, so there's a row of trees between us and what we would, if we tried to do that, purchase it. The layout of what we're trying to do at all, it would have just made us legal under the code without having to come forward. So, looking at those options, we really felt like this was our best path forward to, you know, we want to be good stewards. We want to be good neighbors. You know, I work for the city. We live in Lowndes County. This house has been in his family since it was built. His sister lives right next door. So it's very important to us that we do this right. We looked at our long term and said, okay, with everything that we want to do, what will it take? We want to do everything at one time so that you guys have full information of what we want to do in the why this was our best path forward. So, with that, we are happy to take any questions you may have.

Trinni Amiot

I want to add that they went around and got signatures from their neighborhood.

Nancy Hobby

Will the shop go where you have already cut down two or three large pines?

Chairman McCall

Any other questions? Thank you very much. Anyone else here in support of the case? Anyone here in opposition to the case? Was your office contacted?

Trinni Amiot

No.

.....
Chairman McCall

Okay, unless there's any other questions? Would someone care to make a motion?

Marion Ramsey

We have a motion to grant the variance.

Chairman McCall

Do we have a second?

Allan Strickland

I'll second. We have a motion and second.

Chairman McCall

All those in favor? It is unanimous (5-0 vote). Thank you.

VAR-2023-04

All or part of Tax Map 0198-Parcel 006a. A request from Dollar General for a Variance to Section 4.07.07 (E)(9) as it pertains to Tree and Vegetation Protection (replacement trees). The subject property is located at Lakes Blvd, Lake Park, Georgia in a C-H (Highway Commercial) zoning district.

Trinni Amiot

Dollar General (Lake Park) is requesting a Variance to Section 4.07.07(E)(9) of the ULDC Tree and Vegetation Protection regulations as it pertains to replacement trees. The subject property currently consists of 3.1 acres; though the project will subdivide 1.86 acres for the store/parking lot and is located at the corner of Lakes Blvd and Oak Trace Rd, in a C-H (Commercial Highway) zoning district. There are a total of 84 trees that measure 8 inches or greater on the site. Two of the trees that were located are north of the property line and 4 are pine trees. There are 80 oak trees 8 inches or greater on site. Of those 80 oak trees, 43 must be removed to account for the building, parking, and associated land grading. These 43 oak trees make a total of 652 inches being removed from the site. The ULDC also requires that trees be planted in a manner that will provide adequate space for nourishment, light and maturation. The replacement trees will be planted with an average spacing of 20' to allow for healthy canopy growth. The number of proposed trees that can fit within these spacing criteria is 73. The proposed replacement trees consist of 40 - Bald Cypress at 6-inch caliper size, 18 - Over cup, Oak at 5-inch caliper size, 15 - Princeton Elm at 5-inch caliper size for a total replacement DBH of 405 inches. Because this is less than the number of inches removed, a variance to this requirement is being requested. Overall, staff is supportive of the variance request, because replacing a forest with a forest, and a building, and a parking lot, is impossible. Staff believes many of the existing trees are overgrowth, and that overgrowth does not allow for a healthy tree to prosper. Based on Criteria C, F, and H, staff recommends approval. They did their due diligence, and you just cannot put everything on that lot and replace it with all those trees. That's the tree that I want to go back with. It's a little different than the oak tree that we have. It's certainly not a pine tree. We're looking at different options. We have text amendments coming up that may be part of that first round of text amendments that some sort of true bank and some description so that you can develop your property and then contribute to the growth of trees in other areas.

.....
Chairman McCall

Maybe Lowndes County is different. I believe in the city of Valdosta; they designate by the type of tree down to specific types of oaks. If I remember correctly, because we've run into this before on certain development projects within the city. I'm not sure if the county does it, though. Like water oaks and things, scrub oaks and things like that are not but a live oak or red oak is classified as a tree that must be replaced. But you're saying the county in their ordinance does not designate between the types of oaks.

Trinni Amiot

if I remember this correctly, this section of our code was adopted in 2006. It's relatively old. It was written this one, one. The county engineer ran into a project where it was like, what do we do here? And he sat down with the county manager, and the county manager was like, say the truth here, else you don't have to do that replacement. Now it's probably up to his discretion, because once this gets in plan review, he'll have to look at things. If it's frugal, if it's a huge compared to a little live oak, I don't know how that works. But that will be something that he'll probably pick up and work out.

Chairman McCall

Okay, all right.

Chairman McCall

I know for a fact in the city they allow you to buy into the tree bank. There's no tree bank?

Nancy Hobby

I'd like to know who counted the trees and how they accomplished that, because more power to you.

Trinni Amiot

We have tried everything we can to make it.

Nancy Hobby

Trinni, when you just described a scrub oak, you did a scrub oak. I think of a scrub oak as just being a little treeling, something that's come up.

Trinni Amiot

That says about the viable growth of the tree, nourishment lights and maturation. There's no way you'll go back to the overgrown. There's no way anything in there is viable.

Nancy Hobby

It's a terrible environment.

Allan Strickland

.....
It'll take years, but eventually it will open under there and you'll have briars and that kind of stuff. Some of those trees die out because of shade.

Tyler Graybill

I'm here to answer any questions. Obviously, this property is on commercial land. We haven't had to rezone it. There's intent there. We have a good project, and this is just we know that the county is working. We're willing and able to always abide by any sort of tree program and say what we can. We are going to replant healthy trees that will grow in a new environment that's not potentially diseased. We're going to plant as many trees as we can while also developing it as commercial property. So, Pete and I will work with the county, and do everything we can. We're trying to plant everywhere that's not impermissible at this point.

Trinni Amiot

This is Tyler Graybill. He's the one that I've been working with as far as working with the development of this property.

Chairman McCall

Based on this plan, are you going to clear the whole property, or is the back half going to stay undeveloped?

Tyler Graybill

That's correct. Yes, sir. The back 1.38 acres will actually remain. Mac Mackey's, who we're working with on this project, he'll still retain that on it? I see no reason why he's going to do anything with it.

Chairman McCall

Okay, so it's just the front half piece. Okay, I see.

Nancy Hobby

Now. Do you represent Dollar General?

Tyler Graybill

No, ma'am, we represent Terramore Development, who is a preferred developer of Dollar General. They request us to build the stores in which they operate their business out. Every time there's a new Dollar General that comes into the county and there's a survey, it's probably more development.

Nancy Hobby

Are they closing the other one down the road?

Tyler Graybill

.....
Probably not. It is a completely different it's a different trade area. They're getting people west of 75 or east of 75 funneling in. That's their strategy. I don't see where another one would go. Personally, they surprise me sometimes, but I don't think that'll happen. With the way that the current tree ordinance is structured, very hard to develop anything. So we're asking for that variance, and we'll do good by anyone to put as many trees, healthy trees as we can.

Chairman McCall

When the survey was taken of this site, was everything just designated oak, or did they go through and designate what type of oak trees they were? Do you know if they designated water oak versus live oak or anything like that? We don't have a copy of the survey, so I can't tell from here.

Trinni Amiot

I don't think we had a tree survey that designated.

Tyler Graybill

Yeah, that's correct. I think they're just assigned as oaks. But as you're talking about the condition of it, I would be shocked if all of them a lot of oaks. But I could confirm.

Chairman McCall

That's the thing is, I understand the intent of the ordinance and everything, but if these are all just scrub and water oaks when the survey was taken, typically on a topographic survey, they would designate the trees, and they'd also designate caliper size of the tree or the diameter of the tree. Did they designate the diameters of the trees?

Tyler Graybill

Yes. So, the diameters of the trees, it would have to cross over a certain. Threshold to even be well, yes, anything over eight inches.

Chairman McCall

But I was wondering if there's like I said, I can't see the survey from here of the existing site that's there was it their letter content says.

Trinni Amiot

There is a total of 84 trees with eight inches or greater existing on the site.

Chairman McCall

Right. I'm just wondering if an eight-inch oak is a fairly small, especially scrubber water, but I'm wondering if we get into anything. Is there anything on site where we're talking about? Like a 36 or 48 inch diameter. Tree or larger, honestly. I mean, the survey would reflect the diameter. I've seen surveys that have 42-inch oak trees, and the diameter on the survey reflects the circumference.

Tyler Graybill

.....
So, all of these are relatively small according to the survey.

Chairman McCall

Right. Because I'm just looking at this and I think I understand that you're trying to meet as much as possible with the intent of the landscape ordinance overall but by the time you put so your over cuff oak that you're planning on putting on here? Do you know the canopy spread off the top of your head of what a mature over cuff is? You're probably talking about 20 to 30ft. Then you've got another 15 Princeton elms. I understand their intent to try and meet the requirements of the landscape ordinance, of the tree ordinance and everything here, but I would be concerned that they're almost overplanting the site.

Trinni Amiot

That would be a pleasant problem to have. I appreciate you.

Tyler Graybill

I kind of got where you're going. If this is one of those things where you wanted to approve it, we could work through approving the site design of the actual new trees. We're fully prepared to plant as many trees as we can, but as far as civil design and approval forward permitting, we can get a landscape. They could work through the landscape exactly as to where those trees are going to be as long as the variance is granted. But we're fully fine with getting this variance accepted and moving forward because. It is somewhat overbearing but like at this point we're okay.

Chairman McCall

All right. Any other questions for the applicant? Anyone else here in support of the case? Anyone here in opposition? Was your office contacted.

Trinni Amiot

No, sir.

Chairman McCall

Okay, unless there's any other questions. Would someone care to make a motion?

Allan Strickland

I'll make a motion to approve based on the paperwork presented with criteria.

Dr. Samuel Clemons

I have a motion second.

Chairman McCall

All those in favor? Yes, it is unanimous (5-0 vote). Thank you. We will move on to the last and third and last case of the day VAR-2023-05 Dairy Queen.

VAR-2023-05

All or part of Tax Map 0198-Parcel 141. A request from Dairy Queen for Variance to Table 5.04.05 as it pertains to standards for provisionally exempt signs. The subject property is located at 900 Lakes Blvd, Lake Park, Georgia in a C-G (General Commercial) zoning district.

Trinni Amiot

This is the same Dairy Queen that you all heard in December. They are asking for another variance. It's on Lake Boulevard. You can have a max of two sections and a maximum area of 24 sq. ft. or less and located in this place. So, staff believes that means you can have two boards. Those two boards total 24 sq. ft., not 24 sq. ft. each. That's what we were here for previously, and the variance was approved for signage on the building. They want a presale board, and they want a drive through media board with adder. So, we looked at that and looked at that and looked at that. We believe that the drive through media board with an adder is two-meter boards. That would be their second sign. After we did the analysis, their one sign with their adder has a base area of 48 sq. ft. Their menu board, pre show mini board with an additional 14 sq. ft., which brings their total media board at 62 sq. ft. If that was all they were asking for at 47 would have signed it. They want the additional one, which brings their total mini board to around 62 sq. ft. which is not allowed per the regulations. Now there was some confusion regarding who approved the permit. We believe inspections approved the construction, but not the sign. But, they put the sign up. So, I looked and I looked and I could not find any previous sign applications for these. I'm not saying they're not there. I just couldn't find them. So, we have no way of knowing if County Zoning approved these menu boards for other places, or if inspections gave them the construction approval and they just put them up. All we know is that that's what's around in the area. Overall, I'm not sure the Presale board brings anything to the table. I've been by there two or three times and traffic is always in the road. They're doing great business. People love their products. I think they're fine. I talked about maybe some kind of temporary banners or some sort of temporary this is the sale of the month. I think that could work. The other part of that, though, is the additional signs on the lot. I'm truly disappointed that we're back for another variance for signage.

Nancy Hobby

Where's this one? Do you know what the greatest number of square footage these are? (referencing the PowerPoint with exhibiting various menu boards for comparison)

Trinni Amiot

I would say that one is the largest.

Steve Miller

Chick fil a has the largest, and then Wendy's. Sonic is over by about six times the required that allows for footage. But Chick fil a has about 144 square feet double sided. So, they turn they have a breakfast

.....
menu and a regular menu, and there's two drive throughs. Wendy's is double sided, and all the McDonald's have a double drive premium menu.

Trinni Amiot

The code doesn't address double sided. That little section is what you get. Signs are also part of the text of the covenant. We realize that our ordinance is a little outdated, but this is what we have.

Chairman McCall

The previous case. It was brought before us if I remember. It had to do with not only the number of signs on the building on the property total, but the overall size. Do you happen to know how much off the top of your head what the I don't see does it say what we approved previously? As far as the total increase

Trinni Amiot

Generally, the county allows for one wall sign on a building, and they are asking for multiple wall signs.

Chairman McCall

All right. Any other questions of staff?

Dr. Samuel Clemons

So, there are other signs in the area that are much larger than what he's asking for.

Trinni Amiot

They're comparable. Some are probably larger; some are probably smaller. I think Steve actually has that measurement, but yes, that was also one of my struggles of what the area looked like as opposed to what they're asking for. I didn't have the job at that time, so I don't know what was approved. I couldn't find any.

Chairman McCall

Any other questions to staff.

Steve Miller

If you'll see the number at the bottom, that's the total square footage at each one of the restaurants. All the Wendy signs are the same. All the McDonald's signs are the same.

Chairman McCall

Thank you. With the applicant or the applicant's representation? Wish to address the board?

Chris Posey

I'm here to answer any questions that the board may have as far as.

Chairman McCall

.....
Could we get your name and address for the record.

Chris Posey

Yes, Chris Posey.

Chairman McCall

Did you all put in the application previously, or was it someone else for the one we heard in December. What was there a reason that the menus were not a part of the application?

Chris Posey

Not to my knowledge. We didn't know. In all honesty, a lot of the menu boards are being transitioned a lot of times from under the general contractor scope over to the sign company scope, as these boards are moving more into a digital format versus just a standard, quick build kind of a format. So that's one of the reasons why we're seeing those changes with that. There may not be actual sign permits with that, and that varies from municipality to municipality.

Trinni Amiot

One of the things we try to clarify when we go through commercial plan reviews is that signs are a separate project, because I know everything that comes through. There's confusion. People continue to think, well, my plans are approved. I'm good to go.

Chairman McCall

My understanding is a sign application is supposed to cover all signage on site, not just some of the signage that you think has an issue.

Trinni Amiot

That's true.

Lauren Hurley

Okay. But I can back that up. A lot of times we'll get packages for wall signs and then menu boards will come much later.

Chairman McCall

All right. Okay. Any other questions for the applicant? Thank you. Anyone else here in support of the case?

Steve Miller

Yes, I'm Steve Miller. I'm at 1701 North Patterson. I just I printed this where you could see that practically every fast-food franchise in the county of the city is outside of this ordinance. I mean, a new Dairy Queen just opened. A Chick fil a just opened in the past three weeks. If you all haven't seen any cases on that, then they are all outside of this ordinance. We feel like we should get this passed because

.....
it's allowed everywhere else. Every other franchise has multiple square foot over. So, you can see there's a factor. Chick fil a is three times over. Sonic is almost six times over. The allowed Wendy's is 2.4 times. That's on a 48 square foot, not a 24 square foot. Hardy's is 1.5 times over. McDonald's is 1.26, and we would be at 1.27 if we get our premium report.

Chairman McCall

Okay, any other questions.

Chris Posey

I'm just clarifying that the original sign package for the companies mini boards were purchased and done through a separate company. That's why they were not initially included on their original package.

Chairman McCall

Okay. Any other questions? Anyone else here in support of the case wish to address the board? Anyone here in opposition to the case? Was your office contacted? Unless there's any other comments or questions from the board, would someone care to make a motion?

Marion Ramsey

I will make a motion to accept the case as presented.

Chairman McCall

We have a motion to accept. Do we have a second?

Dr. Samuel Clemons

We have a motion, a second.

Chairman McCall

All those in favor? All those against? We have four in favor, one against. All right. Motion passes (4-1 vote). Thank you. That was the last case of the day. We'll move on to other businesses. Thank you.

Marion Ramsey

I'm just trying to get some clarity on sign regulations regarding county and city. My question is, since he did present some important evidence here where the signs are over the ordinance, what if somebody comes that wants a huge sign that's double the size of the larger sign that is here? If it's already a pattern of these signs being outside of the ordinance, how can we start to control that at any point?

Lauren Hurley

Our menu board or drive through ordinance where it pertains to drive through says that any sign can be 48 sq. ft. Separately, but 48 sq. ft. is a cap. Just like in the county, there's one line, one sentence that says that there's not any elaboration on that. I think 48 sq. ft. for a sign is large, especially when your car is

.....
right there. I haven't seen one that's gone over. I think there is an administrative variance route where if it's within a percentage of what is required or what is allowed, you can do an administrative variance. But for something that's like vastly beyond the scope of what can be considered administratively, then you all would hear it.

Allan Strickland

Yeah, the administrative it's a percentage. You can do 100 sq. ft. But they're asking for 115. Well, you can only give them 10% of both but if it's 100 square foot and they only need 109, then they can administratively allow that.

Lauren Hurley

I've never seen one of those either.

Allan Strickland

I have seen a time that they upgrade to a newer sign and sometimes they don't even get a permit and hope nobody catches it. Then they come in and say, well, but it's only this much more. If the structure does not change and they're just changing a face, they can manipulate that a little bit.

Lauren Hurley

If the structure does not change and they are just changing the face, you don't not have to buy a permit for simply a face change.

Allan Strickland

I've seen it firsthand; they'll tell you we're just changing out the signs. Well, they take everything down instead of leaving the frame and then it can come back in there and instead of being that big. That's one of the reasons that I fussed about signs for years, both city and county. They'll come to you and say, this is what we want to do for wall signs. Then they come in later and say, well, this fell through the cracks, or another company is doing it, and now we need to get some more variances for these signs.

Chairman McCall

Right. That's one of my concerns also, and especially on this case, was the line in the sand keeps getting drawn further and further. I'm not saying that they were trying to manipulate the situation, but it doesn't stop somebody from trying to manipulate the situation by submitting this thing here and then coming back a few weeks later and saying, oh, well now we're asking for this thing and now we're asking for this thing and keep changing it to me, especially if it's being built as a brand new facility or it's one of these situations that we see a lot around town where they're going in and completely renovating it and redoing it. The sign package ought to be submitted as a complete sign package. The thing is it is technically the owner that is submitting the sign package. I don't care who's building the signs on the site. It's not the people that's building the signs. It's not the company that's providing the signs. It's not the franchise company that's putting in the sign permit. It is the person that owns the piece of property that is putting in the sign permit. It is up to him or her or whatever the entity is to put it in as one single package. If you're buying sign A from this company and sign B from this company and sign C from that company. It

.....
ought to all be put together as one package and submitted one time for one consideration. I don't like the fact that that they can argue. I didn't have anything to do with that. I believe the owner must sign that application form. I understand that these people in here have a job to do, and they get paid to put signs in, but at the same time, they're not the one that's signing the permit. We've got one person in here arguing and another person that's putting their name on the line, and we're not actually speaking to that person. As you said, it sounds like there are things that are coming up that are being considered, and I know that that happens with the city whenever you all go through and review past cases and make updates to your ordinances. I would very much like to see some sort of enforcement under that it has to be submitted as one package, and that if it's not submitted as one package at the first, then I don't know what the recourse is there. But that kind of manipulation I would not like to see happen again, or happen not saying it did, but I would not like to see somebody have the ability to take advantage of that. Obviously, there are other things here that need to be considered about signage overall, like you said, the number of lines versus the number of boards, those sorts of things. There are other issues that we've seen come up here, and you're seeing it more and more where you see signage on a building that is more of an architectural feature of the construction of the exterior of the building, you know, where it's just a logo or something, but it doesn't have words associated with it. And does that technically qualify as signage, or is it just aesthetic portion of the building? I think there are different arguments that could be made there, so there there's other things that need to be looked at. But specifically here, I think the package submittal issue, it irks me a little bit. That can be done that way. I'm sorry for all that.

Marion Ramsey

No, that was good, because I was trying to get some understanding. That's very good.

Chairman McCall

Any other comments? Okay, minutes. I think everybody's got a copy or I've seen a copy of the minutes. Does anybody have any changes or corrections? If not, can we get a motion? We have a motion (Mr. Strickland). We have a second (Dr. Clemons). We have a motion. A second. All those in favor. It is unanimous (5-0 vote). Attendance review. We have Mr. Brantley and Mr. Hogan out.

Lauren Hurley

Mr. Brantley and Mr. Hogan have work conflicts.

Chairman McCall

Okay. Obviously, both of those are excused unless there's anything else. Thank you. All right. We are adjourned all.

Agenda Item # 5: Approval of Minutes – March 7, 2023

Chairman McCall asked if any edits were needed for the draft minutes. No changes or corrections were noted. Allan Strickland made a motion to approve these minutes as presented. Dr. Samuel Clemons seconded the motion and it was called and carried unanimously (5-0 vote).

Agenda Item # 6: Attendance Review

.....

Chairman McCall noted that only John Hogan and Nathan Brantley were absent from today’s meeting. Ms. Hurley stated that they contacted staff in advance, and therefore they will be considered an excused absence.

Agenda Item # 7: Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

John “Mac” McCall, Chairman

Date _____