

MINUTES

Valdosta-Lowndes Zoning Board of Appeals
Valdosta City Hall Annex Multi-Purpose
Room 300 North Lee Street,
Valdosta, Georgia

Tuesday July 8, 2025, 2:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Nathan Brantley
Keith Godfrey
Allan Strickland
Victoria Copeland
Marion Ramsey

MEMBERS ABSENT

John “Mac” McCall
John Hogan
Nancy Hobby

STAFF PRESENT

Lauren Hurley
Margaret Torres
Trinni Amiot
J.D. Dillard

VISITORS PRESENT

Christopher Vu (Homeowner)
C Anthony Payton (Architect)
Chris Singletary
Ray Chavez
Alyssa Hight
Rodney Tenery (Prime Consulting)
Matthew Inman (Axis Engineering)
Kevin Hollis (Edward Jennings LLC)
Larry Sanders (Arrow Engineering)
Florine Wilcox
Aaron & Kizzy Slydell
Pat Denmark (homeowner)
Levette Vangates
Steven Russell

Ralph Freeman
Coleman Hollis
C. Franklin
Lakesha Thomas
Jerome Tucker
Demetrice Thomas
Felicia Allen
Felicia Doe
Pam Brewer (Choices For Life)
Ronald Griffin
Mitchell Brice

CALL TO ORDER

Allan Strickland

Calling of meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. and explanation of meeting process to all those in attendance.

CITY OF VALDOSTA CASES:

APP-2025-10-Christopher Vu (2035 Oakdale Drive.) Request for Variance to LDR Section 214-1 Standards Applying to All Districts in the R-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zoning District. The subject property is located on 2035 Oakdale Dr in Valdosta GA (all or part of Tax Parcel 0082A 103).

Lauren Hurley presented case of request for variance to rear setback in R-10 zoning district. She explained that the applicant received a stop work order from the Inspections Department for building structure. She explained that the R-10 district requires 25ft setback from rear property line and the structure is within that 25ft setback. The applicant is requesting variance of 12 ft. Lauren Hurley shows pictures to the board for reference.

Allan Strickland asked for clarification if a patio must adhere to setback standards.

Lauren Hurley stated that it does not.

Nathan Brantley asked for clarification of the structure.

Lauren Hurley explains that the structure was built onto the rear of the home.

Marion Ramsey asked if the owner was aware that he was encroaching into the rear setback.

Lauren Hurley explained that when the owner received the stop work order, he came into the office for zoning approval and was made aware at that time that he was encroaching and that was what led to the variance application. She stated that Zoning was recommending denial due to there being no hardship.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any other questions for staff. Then asked if the applicant would step forward.

Christopher Vu explained that he was building a storage room and apologized for starting it without permits. He stated that he just needed it to store his things that he did not have room for in the house.

Marion Ramsey asked the applicant when he was applying for the permit if the contractor let him know that he was encroaching.

Christopher Vu stated that he was building it himself.

Nathan Brantley asked was the addition was.

Christopher Vu stated that it is a storage room, and the entrance is from the outside.

Allan Strickland asked there was anyone in support. Then asked if there was anyone in opposition.

Pat Denmark (2101 Oakdale Dr) stated that she wanted to make sure that no one would be living there.

Christopher Vu stated that it was just a storage room and that no one would be living there.

Allan Strickland asked staff if there were any calls to the office.

Lauren Hurley stated that just people asking what the variance was.

Allan Strickland asked if anyone would care to make a motion.

Marion Ramsey made a motion to grant the variance siting criteria that no one will occupy the structure. Victoria Copeland seconded the motion. Vote: 4-0 unanimous

LOWNDES COUNTY CASES:

VAR-2025-08-Chris Singletary Request for a Variance to Table 5.02.01 (D)(9) of the ULDC as it pertains to the maximum floor area for an accessory building and Section 4.01.02 E as it pertains to building setback and height standards. The subject property is located at 5385 Val Del Road (all or part of Tax Parcel 0069 012A).

Trinni Amiot presented case for 2 variances for the subject property. One for the setback requirements and one for the size requirements for an accessory structure. She stated that the applicant has 2 acres that was created by family ties in E-A zoning. The applicant previously had an admin waiver when the property was A-U zoning but was rezoned to E-A when the County rezoned and the current accessory building no longer meets current setback standards. She explains that the applicant is allowed to run a home occupation out of an accessory structure in agricultural zoning. He is requesting to add onto the existing accessory structure and run his home occupation out of it. She stated that the applicant's wife is having health issues, and he would like to be closer to home. She also stated that TRC recommends approval.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any questions or comments for staff. He then asked if the applicant or applicant's representation there who would like to address the board.

Chris Singletary stated that his wife has stage 4 breast cancer and would like to move his business to his house so that he can run his business and take care of his wife. He stated that when his building was built, the property lines were closer and was told by his grandfather to build it where it is. He stated that his grandfather gave him the land, so he built it there.

Trinni Amiot spoke up and stated that the building was appropriately placed, and that the applicant went through the proper channels to place it closer to the property line.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Allan Strickland asked for clarification that the addition will be to the existing building and if it would be encroaching any more onto the property line.

Chris Singletary stated that the building was built a little crooked and that it actually goes out and the addition will actually be further away from the property line.

Allan Strickland asked if anyone else had any questions or discussions. He then thanks the applicant. He then asked if there was anyone in support who would like to speak. He then asked if there was anyone in opposition who would like to speak. He asked staff if their offices were contacted. He then asked if anyone would like to make a motion on both variance requests.

Nathan Brantley made motion to approve siting criteria D, K & M. Marion Ramsey seconded motion. Vote: 4-0 Unanimous.

VAR-2025-09-Kesha's Kiddie Care Request for a Variance to Section 4.03.08 of the ULDC as it pertains to standards for childcare learning centers, nurseries, schools, and preschools and Chapter 5.01.00 as it pertains to standards for home occupations. The subject property is located at 4930 Whitewater Road (all or part of Tax Parcel 0171 192C).

Trinni Amiot presents case for request for 2 variances. One for daycare facilities and the other for home occupations. She explains that the applicant's zoning allows home childcare which allows for 18 children, but home occupation limits the number of children to 6. Trinni Amiot explains that she is split zoned and when the applicant started, she only had 6 children. She also explains that in her zoning, you cannot operate a home occupation in a freestanding accessory structure so at that time, they made her connect it by a breezeway. She is now wanting to expand to 18 children but cannot do that under home occupation, so she is requesting that variance. Trinni Amiot explains that the applicant is now wanting to be a child learning center and as such would have to be in a freestanding building so because it was done right the first

time, she now has to ask for variance to not have to tear down the breezeway. Trinni Amiot also stated that there will be some additional standards that she will have to meet for fire and for the inspections department, but she is aware of that. Trinni stated that overall, the TRC recommended unanimous approval. Trinni also stated that if approved, they would discuss possible parking and any buffering that may be required.

Nathan Brantley asked if the applicant would still be residing there in the front part and if the rear building would be large enough to accommodate 18 children.

Trinni Amiot stated that she was saying yes and that she did not think the applicant would have gotten this far if it was not. She stated that the applicant still has to meet the Bright from the Start guidelines so that would have done that before she went through zoning.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any further questions for staff.

Nathan Brantley asked why the zoning looked the way it does.

Trinni Amiot stated that there is R-A to the south and she believes that the applicant just bought that and added it to her lot. Trinni also stated that they would like her to rezone, but she is not required to. She also stated that there are a lot of split-zoned properties. Trinni then addressed the applicant and asked her if that was what happened, and she stated that it was.

Allan Strickland then asked if there were any other questions for staff. He then asked for the applicant to step forward for any questions that may need to be addressed.

Kesha Tomlinson stepped forward and Allan Strickland asked her if there was anything she wanted to add to what staff had said. She stated that she thought staff had said everything.

Allan Strickland then asked if she will be required to have more parking with the increase of staff and children.

Trinni Amiot stated that if approved, she would be meeting with staff to address the site and what would be required. She stated that there is some improvement already there and she may need to do some more, but they would meet with Engineering and Inspections to make sure she has what she needs.

Nathan Brantley asked about the drop off procedures for the daycare.

Kesha Tomlinson described the drop off and pick up procedures for the daycare.

Allan Strickland asked if there are any other questions for the applicant. He then asked if there were anyone in support of the applicant who would like to speak.

Anthony Peyton the architect came to the podium and stated that he will address the parking and traffic flow on site for the applicant.

Allan Strickland asked if he was confident that he could make the site work to accommodate the needs of the applicant.

Anthony Peyton stated that he was.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any questions for him.

Allan Strickland then asked if there was anyone else in support of the case who would like to speak.

Several people came one after the other to the podium to speak in support of the case. Catrina Sermons owns the property next door, and she stated that she supported her adding more children. Jerome Tucker spoke that he supported her adding more reliable jobs and childcare for the area. Ralph Freeman gave his support for her commitment to caring for children. Felicia Allen stated that she is a parent who sent her children there and that she is also an educator at Clyattville Elementary and stated that there are several children who ride the bus to the applicant's daycare from school.

Allan Strickland asked if there was anyone in opposition. He then asked if anyone would care to make a motion.

Keith Godfrey made motion to approve as presented. Marion Ramsey seconded the motion. Vote: 4-0 Unanimous.

VAR-2025-10-Hamilton Green Townhouses Request for a Variance to Chapter 4.06.02 (B) of the ULDC as it pertains to minimum project setbacks. The subject property is located at 4600 and 4618 Bemiss Road.

Trinni Amiot presented case of townhouses that were built in PD zoning district with 30 ft buffer to the residential neighborhood beside them. She stated that the townhouses had patios to the rear. The builder went in after the finals were passed and enclosed the back patios with screened in rooms which now encroach on the buffer.

Allan Strickland clarified that as the patio, they did not have to meet the setback requirement, but as an enclosed screened room that they do.

Trinni Amiot stated that was correct.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any questions for staff. He then asked if the applicant or applicant's representation would like to speak.

Matt Inman stated that he was the Engineer on the project. He hands the board the elevation pictures to the board. He stated that the builder was trying to make the outside space nicer for families to be able to sit outside and provide a nicer recreation space for them.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any questions

Trinni Amiot stated that they had a meeting with the applicant about it and it is 10 feet. She also stated that they tried to do it administratively but was not able to.

Matt Inman stated that he still felt like they had enough room in the rear for separation from the neighbors behind.

Allan Strickland asked if there was anyone in support who would like to speak.

Larry Sanders with Arrow Engineering stated that he was in support of what was done.

Allan Strickland asked if there was anyone else in support. He then asked if there was anyone in opposition of the case.

Aaron Slydell stated that his property is behind these, and his back yard looks into the rear. He stated that there is currently no screening or fencing and some areas where the buffer is smaller. He also stated that he did some research and has not seen anything like this. These are 2 story townhomes looking directly into his back yard. He stated that he is trying to see what they can do as citizens to make sure they are not encroached upon. He stated his concern for privacy and safety in the neighborhood. He showed a picture the staff and stated that there are 5 lots that are affected. He stated that he spoke with about 3 of the 5 neighbors and they have the same concerns that he does. He again showed visuals to the board of the property with natural tree line buffer and distances.

Marion Ramsey asked for clarification that his main concern is not the structure itself, but privacy instead.

Aaron Slydell stated that the structures are 2 story and with that, privacy into the homes and yards behind them become an issue. He stated that he has done some research and there are some buffer requirements. He stated he feels that the builder did the porches on purpose just because he knew he could ask for a variance to the regulations.

Allan Strickland clarified that variance requests are available to everyone, and they are entitled to ask. He stated that if it was written in stone that they cannot do it, then the applicant would not be there. He then asked Trinni Amiot if there is a buffer requirement.

Trinni Amiot stated that there usually isn't a buffer requirement between residential to residential. She stated that because it is PD, they do have the 30 ft requirement, but as far as plantings, they generally do not require it between residential zoning.

Aaron Slydell stated that he knew the City and County are different when it comes to screening. He stated that D R Horton is building another development not far from this one and he is concerned they will do the same thing. He stated that in this instance, there is only 15 ft distance from the property line in some cases.

Trinni stated that normally questions on screening and buffering are handled during the rezoning process. She addressed Mr. JD Dillard to ask if there were any conditions on that.

JD Dillard stated that with this development, the landscape buffering is existing that meets minimum buffering requirements between residential lots. He stated that the buffering requirements could be reduced if a 6ft fence is put up, but he stated that addition of a fence would damage the existing trees that are on site.

Aaron Slydell stated that he would suggest not touching the oak trees. He stated that he felt that those made the property line.

JD Dillard stated that that is how the developer addressed the buffering requirement by leaving the oak trees. He stated that standard PD denotes no buffering requirements from residential to residential. They cannot build any closer. He stated that with the last 2 hurricanes, that may have taken out some of the natural buffering.

Aaron Slydell stated that the trees being taken were from land clearing and not from the storms. He questions the new development and whether they will be cutting into the buffer.

JD Dillard stated that they would not have a buffering requirement, but a setback requirement of 30 ft is standard. He showed on the overhead that the red areas were where the encroachment by adding the porches were and not the others. The standard is a 30 ft setback, and they are now at 20ft, so they are asking for relief from the setback standard.

Aaron Slydell stated that with new apartments being built, how are the existing houses neighboring them being protected.

Allan Strickland stated that would be a question to direct to the zoning people or the County Commissioners. He stated that was beyond their purview and can only look at whether the variance is a possibility. He stated that if he and other concerned citizen wanted to discuss that with the County Commissioners or Engineering, they could, but the board can only go by the rules that they have and cannot make rules for them. He stated that if they ask their opinion, they can give it.

Aaron Slydell stated that he understood that the board is ready to grant variances anyway.

Allan Strickland stated that that was not necessarily true. He stated that there are times that variances get turned down and modified. He stated that just because someone comes for a variance does not mean they are automatically approved and if the variance is not granted, then they would need to do something else to fix the building.

Aaron Slydell asked if the safety aspect gets handled by the board.

Allan Strickland stated that they are there to talk about the variances that are requested within the rules that they have to work with. He stated that they do not make the rules, they can only look at it. He also stated that sometimes, you cannot ask for a variance. Then sometimes, variances can be asked for and the board looks at both side and try to weigh both sides and see whether or not a variance is feasible. He again reiterated that variances are not automatically granted just because one is asked for.

Nathan Brantley stated that what he was bring up is a very good point. He further explains the difference between a buffering requirement and a setback requirement to the homeowner and restates that currently there is no buffering requirement between 2 residential zoning districts that are side by side. He also explains that ZBOA cannot go outside of the zoning requirements. He explains that this is something that the County Commissioners would have to take steps to change.

Aaron Slydell asked what is the 30ft buffer in PD

Allan Strickland stated that is a 30ft setback and then explains the difference between a buffer and a setback. He explains that in this case, it is the setback requirements that they are asking a variance to.

Marion Ramsey explains that the contractor may have been taking the neighboring properties into account when he built the porches by giving both the residents and the neighboring properties more privacy by enclosing them. He explained that if the contractor had not enclosed them, they would have been wide open, and he would not

have had to come for a variance. He stated again that he feels the builder might have taken that into account when he enclosed the porches.

Allan Strickland stated that the builder is here getting a variance for a roof and a little wall. He then explained that the open-air patio met the setback requirements, but because he enclosed it and built a roof over it that it became a setback issue and not a buffering issue, so he had to come and ask for a variance. He again explained to Mr Slydell that if he has issues not pertaining to that, then he needs to address that with the County Commissioners or the zoning if he doesn't agree with the rules they have.

Allan Strickland then asked if there was anyone else in opposition who would like to speak.

Steven Russell asked what measures he could take for privacy in his own back yard.

Allan Strickland stated that he could put up a privacy fence. He stated that there is a limit of 6 or 8 feet

Trinni Amiot stated that it is 8ft in the rear and 6 ft on the sides.

Allan Strickland stated that if he wants to put up a fence to shield his property, he is able to do that.

Steven Russell then asked if he was able to put up a shed.

Victoria Copeland stated he would have to meet his setbacks.

Trinni Amiot stated that setbacks for an accessory structure are 10ft on the side and rear.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any other questions or anyone else in opposition who would like to speak.

Allan Strickland then asked if someone would care to make a motion.

Marion Ramsey made a motion to approve as presented. Keith Godfrey seconded the motion. Vote: 4-0 unanimous.

VAR-2025-11-HWY 84 Storage Request for a Variance to Chapter 4.07.07 (H)(4)(B) of the ULDC as it pertains to Tree and Vegetation Requirements and Chapter 6.03.03 (D) as it pertains to Potable Water System Requirements. The subject property is located at 2273 US Hwy 84 West (all or part of Tax Parcel 0088C 011B).

Trinni Amiot presented case stating applicant is requesting 3 variances. One to the tree and vegetation ordinance, one to the requirement to connect to water and sewer and one to design standards for self-service storage setback requirements. She stated that they now have a tree bank, and you can request a variance to 25% of that. She stated that the applicant will still have to pay into the tree bank, but it will not be at 100% if granted. The second request is to the connection to County utilities. She shows on the map his existing lot and the flag lot to the rear is where he is wanting to go. She stated that at the moment, there are 2 water lines. One is approximately 1600 feet from water connection on his side of the road and the other is across the road at approximately 550 feet and would have to bore under Hwy 84 to get to that one. She then shows new development on the map that will be connecting to County utilities and the Elk's Lodge which is beside it will get a stub out. They have stated that they would like to connect so that brings the water within about 600 feet to this location. She then stated that the last request is to the setback standards for storage. She stated that at the moment, they are on 2 separate parcels. She stated that if he were to combine the parcel, then the interior setbacks would go away. She stated that TRC heard all of these requests and ultimately recommended denial on all three.

Allan Strickland asked if he were to replat the property that this would solve the setback issue.

Trinni stated that this would solve one of the issues, but he would still have the water to deal with and if he clears any trees, he will either have to replant them or pay into the tree bank.

Allan Strickland asked if he does not cut anything down then he won't have to.

Trinni stated that they are showing approximately 340 specimen inches.

Allan Strickland states that it is 340 caliper inches that he is proposing to cut down. He stated that if he reduces what he cuts down, then he reduces what he pays in. He also stated again that if he replats it into one property then he doesn't have the setback problem with the two property lines.

Allan Strickland asked if there are any questions for staff.

Nathan Brantley asked if he does get a variance on the water line if he would have to put a well in.

Mitch Brice spoke up from the audience and stated that there is a well on the property.

Trinni Amiot asked if he is on his property or the property in front of it.

Mitch Brice stated that it is on his property.

Trinni asked if it is on the rear property.

Mitch Brice stated that is correct.

Allan Strickland asked if he was supplying water to anyone else.

Mitch Brice stated that the people on the property in front of him have an agreement with him to be able to use the well for as long as they need it.

Allan Strickland asked if they bring water as close as they are talking that he would want to tie onto the County water.

Mitch Brice stated that he would not be interested in paying to have it brought to him, but if they brought it to him then he would tap into it at that point. He stated that it is a growing area, and it is only a matter of time before that happens, but he stated that he currently has water on the property and doesn't feel he should have to tap in.

Nathan Brantley asked if the County has plans to connect water lines out there. He stated that usually the County loops them together. He stated that there are water lines here and there but are not connected together.

Trinni Amiot stated that she was not sure.

JD Dillard spoke up and stated that in some cases they have looped water lines. He stated City water is in an area to the East, so you get into an area of service delivery strategy. The new development is expected by the end of the year which would bring the water line 500 feet closer. He stated that he would still be within the 1000-foot requirement to connect. He stated that the cost to connect could be shared between the 3 businesses there.

Allan Strickland asked for clarification that the only real reason for this property needing water is for bathrooms and possible irrigation or hoses.

JD Dillard stated that is correct. He stated that staff does recognize that mini storage is a low water user. But the requirements are that if they are within 1000 feet of water connection that they are required to connect. He stated that running down Hwy 84 West is further but is probably a cheaper option.

Allan Strickland asked if there are any other questions for staff.

Nathan Brantley asked in the prior variance for the same thing if that was on the same property for the same thing.

Trinni stated that she believes it was for an auto mechanic

Nathan Brantley asked was nothing done.

Trinni Amiot stated that nothing was done in a year.

Allan Strickland stated that after a year, it goes away.

Nathan Brantley confirmed that the variance was granted.

Allan Strickland stated that it was granted at that time due to it being a very low water use mechanic's shop.

Nathan Brantley asked if the variance would apply to both tract 1 & tract 2

Trinni Amiot stated that it would be for the rear tract.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any other questions for staff. He then asked if the applicant would come forward.

Mitch Brice stated that he is the owner of Hwy 84 Self Storage and is looking to expand his business onto his other lot. He stated that most of the trees on the lot are in bad shape and that he is in fear of the hurricanes causing them to fall onto his buildings. He is also concerned about not being able to accommodate fire trucks in case of a fire. He stated that there is a transmission line going through the property that causes some challenges. He stated again that there is a well on his property, so he doesn't feel the need to connect to County water. He stated that he may be interested when water is brought closer to him when further development happens. He then showed pictures of trees on site and proposed plans to the board. He stated that Rodney Tenery or Larry Sanders could speak on his behalf as to the condition of the trees.

Lauren Hurley asked for clarification on what the variances were for.

Trinni clarifies what all three variances are for.

Allan Strickland clarifies that if lots are combined that the setback issue goes away between the existing lot and the flag lot and states that it could alleviate one of the problems, but he would still have to deal with taking down trees to do what he wanted to do.

Mitch Brice stated that is correct. He referred back to the photos that he gave the board stating that they are not valuable trees. He stated that no one from the highway can see those trees. He stated that if the trees were not there, he feels there would be more of a flow to the property.

Allan Strickland asked if he was to be granted the variance and combine the property and reduce by 25%, would he be willing to pay into the tree bank or plant back the necessary tree replacements.

Mitch Brice stated that he is willing to plant some trees, but he has been working on this for quite awhile and the tree bank was not in effect then.

Marion Ramsey asked him if he has considered combining the lots.

Mitch Brice stated that he had not thought about it until now.

Marion Ramsey directed toward Trinni Amiot asked her to give some advantages of combining the 2 parcels

Trinni Amiot stated that it would eliminate side yard setbacks

Mitch Brice stated that the front of the property that fronts Hwy 84 is the valuable part of his property and the middle and rear are not as valuable.

Trinni Amiot clarifies where he is proposing the new building.

Allan Strickland asks if there are any further questions for the applicant. He then asks if there is anyone in support who would like to speak

Larry Sanders with Arrow Engineering went back to the layout and quoted the ULDC about damaged trees. He stated that there is a Georgia Power high transmission line running through which causes physical constraints on the property that the applicant cannot help which gives him limited use of the property. He stated that Lowndes County require paving which will cause trees to die. He stated that he felt it was unfair considering the neighboring property has not been required to connect to the water. He stated that he is asking for consideration.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any questions or comments.

Marion Ramsey asked if he was aware the design would encroach on the setback

Larry Sanders stated that the current plan is conceptually drawn. He may decide to combine the lots, but they are asking for a reduction in setback.

Lauren Hurley stated she had a question for the County and asked if the County had an arborist that would go out and survey the trees to see what trees could be reduced.

JD Dillard stated that the County does not have an arborist. They would need to have a tree surveyor go about and look at the trees on site to determine what trees were diseased and could be removed and then they would be able to see at that time how many would require replacement.

Larry Sanders asked JD Dillard if he was developing the site, if he would require him to pave over the root system of trees.

JD Dillard stated that if he were replacing trees they would be required to be living for 6 months.

Allan Strickland stated that everyone receives the same amount of consideration. He stated that they can only go by the rules and regulations that are in place to make their ruling. He stated that sometimes they are able to work with them and sometimes they are not.

Larry Sanders stated that he knew the process and had been there before.

Allan Strickland asked if anyone else would like to speak.

Rodney Tenery stated he did a topographic survey and boundary survey on the property and a tree survey on the property. He stated that the majority of the trees are being considered specimen trees when the majority of them are not. He stated that the majority of them have disease, rot or decline and that several of them have bound up root systems. He stated that was the main reason why he was there and to answer any questions they may have. He stated in addition there are trees that have storm damage and the ones that can be saved would have to be trimmed back so much that they would not have much crown left. He also stated that paving over the root systems of trees is not advantageous for the trees to thrive.

Nathan Brantley asked what a specimen tree was.

Rodney Tenery stated that to him it would be the tree would be a good viable specimen of a tree to be in place that would be growing healthy and reproducing.

Nathan Brantley asked how that is determined.

Rodney Tenery stated that he believed it is figured solely by diameter inches.

Trinni and JD Dillard stated that there are certain species.

Nathan Brantley asked if the condition of the tree taken into account.

Rodney Tenery stated not that he was aware of.

JD Dillard stated that the ULDC stated to maintain mature healthy trees. He stated under the old system, a tree survey was taken, caliper inches were calculated to remove, and a permit pulled with Engineering to remove and that was it. Under the new regulations, there are 4 species that were identified as protected to preserve mature and healthy trees.

Nathan Brantley asked who counts them. He asked who makes the determination that there is 340 caliper inches.

Rodney Tenery stated he reported how many trees were on site and what the diameter inches were, but he stated that he assumed the Planning Department did that.

Trinni Amiot stated that she is not sure.

Rodney Tenery stated that his survey should have shown how many trees where on site and so it would be just math adding up the inches. He stated that he did not take into account whether or not those were healthy trees. He stated that he just has to show that the tree is there.

Nathan Brantley asked if he had done an analysis and determined a number of caliper inches.

Rodney Tenery stated that he has not done that at this time. He stated that he has gone out and evaluated and looked at the trees.

Marion Ramsey asked if in his opinion that there were trees that were recommended to not stay there. He also asked if he believed that the 340 inches would be reduced.

Rodney Tenery stated that he did believe so and that if as a professional if he were to write a report and sign it, that the number would be reduced.

Allan Strickland directed question toward Nathan Brantley and stated from a legal standpoint if they should postpone for 30 days or later due to the ambiguity of how many trees, if they are viable trees. He stated that they should get the information of exactly how many trees and what condition they are in from a certified forester and if the tree is in decline instead of them trying to make a decision with not enough information.

Nathan stated that making a decision based on the variance request that has been made. He stated that the variance request is for a reduction of 25% of the 340 caliper inches. He stated that if they want them to consider a lower number of caliper inches then they need to have that data put together and present to them. He stated that he feels with the information that they have, there is no choice but to continue.

Mitch Brice spoke and said that the pictures he presented were taken the day before and you could see that some of the trees were combined and coming from the same root system.

Victoria Copeland also stated that they cannot reduce the number with the information that they have currently.

Allan Strickland stated that they cannot just cut the number down arbitrarily without accurate information.

Mitch Brice asked if they needed a report submitted to them.

Nathan Brantley stated that if someone gave them something showing what trees are specimen trees and the number of trees based on the ULDC then that would give them a number to base their decision on.

Trinni Amiot stated that he may not even need a variance if he can prove what he has.

Allan Strickland stated that once they deny the variance that he cannot come before them again for a year. He stated that it would have to be a significant change in order for him to come back. He suggested coming back with a tree count and a report showing the actual number to look at.

Mitch Brice stated he would be willing to do that.

Allan Strickland asked if someone would care to make a motion.

Nathan Brantley make motion to table until the next meeting. Marion Ramsey seconded the motion. Vote: 4-0 unanimous to table to next meeting.

VAR-2025-12-Alyssa House Request for a Variance to Chapter 5.03.02 (D)(3) of the ULDC as it pertains to Accessory Dwellings and Table 5.02.01 (D)(9) as it pertains to maximum number of accessory buildings. The subject property is located at 5725 and 5717 Ivey Lane in Hahira GA (all or part of Tax Parcel 0067 068).

Trinni Amiot presented case of 2 variances. One to location to accessory dwelling and second to the location of accessory structures. She stated in E-A zoning you can have an accessory dwelling. Code states in order to have an accessory dwelling, it must be beside or behind the main structure and they both have to be behind the build line. She stated that when the applicant came in to talk about doing family ties, they noticed there are several sheds on the property which were there when he bought the property. There is a limit unless you are farming of how many accessory structures you can have. She stated that he was unaware of that when he bought the property. Since the applicant was asking for a variance to the location, they went ahead and added that to it. She showed pictures to the board of his current house and how the house it turned. She also showed the location of the proposed accessory dwelling which makes them appear to be beside each other. When placed, it would be in front of the build line which is the variance request.

Nathan Brantley asked if it were behind that line, it would not be a problem.

Trinni Amiot verified that was correct. She stated that they do have some alternative locations, but they are not fond of those. She then showed visuals of their current accessory structures. She stated that TRC heard this and recommended approval for the accessory structures and denial for the location of the mobile home.

Nathan Brantley asked where the location of the septic tank for the mobile home be.

Trinni stated she was not sure.

Nathan Brantley asked if it was wherever the Health Department would approve it to be.

Trinni stated that was correct.

Allan Strickland stated that the Health Department would determine whether they could share the well and whether they would let them tie into the septic tank system. He also stated that they would determine if the current system would be large enough to accommodate adding the new home on and if not, they may make them install a larger one or expand the current drain field.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any questions for staff. He then asked if the applicant would come forward.

Ray Chavez stated that in doing the home that way, they not only considered the neighbors, but it is more aesthetically pleasing. He stated that his house was the first one out there and was put on that angle. All the other houses came after his. He stated that they went to their neighbors first to make sure they were okay with what they were doing before they went to try and get a permit. He stated that by utilizing the other locations on site, they would have to uproot their current septic system and install 2 separate systems. He was told that one of those areas would not perk. He stated that the other area would have to dig across an asphalt driveway and through trees so that would financially not work. He stated that the area where they want to place it has been perked and it will perk, and the structure will have its own septic. They would share the well. He also stated that the reason they do not want to go further back toward the woods is because their grandchild is autistic, and they are afraid of them wandering. He stated that they are doing this to help their daughter and her children to be closer with family. He stated that they are well away from the neighboring lines and front lines.

Allan Strickland clarified that moving it to the left and back is where it gets into the driveway and trees.

Ray Chavez confirms that is correct.

Allan Strickland asked for clarification on the overhead of the locations.

Ray Chavez showed on the overhead what locations would not work and why.

Allan Strickland stated he was just trying to make the board understand why the locations would not work

Ray Chavez stated that they lost nearly 30 trees with the first hurricane and 40 with the second. They have had a lot of cost in trees and cannot afford to have to remove more.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any other questions. He then asked if there is anyone else who would like to speak in support.

Alyssa Hight stated that she is currently living with her family. She stated that they have run through many different scenarios to place the mobile home on the property and the proposed spot is where it makes the most sense.

Allan Strickland asked if there were any other questions. He then asked Trinni if the County office had been contacted.

Trinni Amiot stated that no one had contacted them.

Allan Strickland asked if anyone would care to make a motion.

Marion Ramsey made motion to grant variances as presented. Keith Godfrey seconded the motion. Vote: 4-0 unanimous

OTHER BUSINESS:

Meeting Minutes:

Nathan Brantley made motion to approve meeting minutes as presented. Keith Godfrey seconded motion. Vote: 3 in favor-1 abstain. Motion approved.

Term Expiration:

Lauren Hurley also addressed staff to notify them that board member John Hogan's term was up in June to make them aware so that they could take proper steps to fill his seat.

Attendance Review:

John "Mac" McCall-vacation-excused

Nancy Hobby-had appointment out of town-excused

John Hogan-personal business-excused

Adjournment:

Meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'John MacCall', written over a horizontal line.

John "Mac" McCall, Chairman

8-5-25

Date