

MINUTES

Valdosta-Lowndes Zoning Board of Appeals

Valdosta City Hall Annex Multi-Purpose Room

300 North Lee Street, Valdosta, Georgia

November 3, 2015

2:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Nancy Hobby
Dr. Willie Houseal
John "Mac" McCall

Satrina Plyler
Allan Strickland

MEMBERS ABSENT

Paul Alvarado
John Hogan III
Gretchen Quarterman

STAFF PRESENT

Ted Bilak
Carmella Braswell
Matt Martin
Tracy Tolley

VISITORS PRESENT

Vanassa Flucas
Cameron Hines
David Hines
Terry Hines

Scottie Orenstein
Bill Slaughter

Agenda Item # 1: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Strickland at 2:45 pm and it was determined that a quorum of members was present. Chairman Strickland thanked everyone for coming and reviewed the meeting procedures with those in attendance today.

CITY OF VALDOSTA CASES

Agenda Item # 2: APP-2015-08—David Hines (412 Cypress Street, Valdosta)

Chairman Strickland announced the case.

Ms. Tolley stated that David Hines is asking for a PELUC (Previously Established Land Use Conformity Certificate) to reestablish a 4 unit apartment complex in a Single family Residential (R-6) zoning district. The subject property, located at 412 Cypress Street, consists of 0.49 acres located at the NW corner of Cypress Street and Jones Street and contains a 2-story 5065 square foot building. Under today's LDR, multi-family uses are not a permitted use in R-6 zoning, as they were under the prior zoning ordinance. A previous tenant started, but did not finish, construction to renovate the structure into a personal care home. The applicant wants to utilize the structure as a 4-unit apartment building, but since it has not been operated as an apartment complex within the last six months, it is not able to function as such. The applicant had two choices—either a rezoning to R-M, or to request a PELUC. The chances of a rezoning are slim, so the PELUC is the preferred route. If the PELUC is approved, the applicant intends to do some interior remodeling, and would be required to install a parking lot with a minimum of 8 parking spaces. While the structure is the only multi-family complex in the immediate area, it was not an obtrusive presence and functioned with very minimal impact on the single family neighborhood surrounding it. That is due largely to the fact that it is a smaller complex, on a larger corner lot, and has ample vegetation. Staff supports the application, and understands that an expansion may have a negative impact on the neighborhood. Given that, staff recommends approval with three conditions—that approval is based on the submitted site plan, the building may contain no more than 4 units, and the structure may not be enlarged or add additional square footage.

Chairman Strickland asked the Board if they had any questions for staff. Mrs. Plyler asked if staff had heard any concerns from any neighbors. Ms. Tolley stated she did speak to one, who had concerns about buffering and lighting for the subject property and increasing traffic in the adjacent single-family neighborhood. The concerned citizen was present in the audience. Mrs. Hobby asked how the parking lot was going to be lit. Mr. Hines stated that there was already a pole light, which was going to be used.

There being no questions for the applicant, Chairman Strickland asked Mrs. Vanassa Flucas, 609 Jones Street, spoke of her concerns for the proposal. She owns 604 Jones Street as well, and has recently rented it out to two ladies and wants to make sure they are not impacted by the proposed use. She said she hoped that the safety of

the neighborhood would be maintained, and that the family who had owned the structure before utilized it as a single-family residence. She would like the parking lot to be placed in the rear of the property, and be screened through means of a fence so residents of this property cannot access her property at 604 Jones Street. She also wants to make sure that the lighting is ample for the parking lot.

Mr. David Hines, 500 E. Central Avenue, Valdosta, stated that they might add two more lights on the corners of the structure to aid in lighting the property and the parking lot. Chairman Strickland approached the projector to point out on the site plan where the pole light could go in the NW corner, and if pointed downward, the light would not pollute adjacent properties. Mr. Hines stated that there were trees that may affect the lighting if placed in that corner. Chairman Strickland stated that with careful placement, the trees would minimally impact the lighting. Mrs. Hobby stated that a privacy fence would serve as buffering as well as for some security between the subject property and neighboring property, and stated that a privacy fence should run from the utility communication box along the northern property line and along a portion of the western property line. Mr. Matt Martin stated that contractors would need room to maintain the box, so the fence should be close but not right up to the box. Chairman Strickland asked what the maximum height for a fence is. Ms. Tolley stated that the maximum height in a residential district for a fence is 8 feet in the side or rear yard, and 4 feet in the front yard.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Strickland opened the floor for a motion. Mrs. Hobby made a motion to approve the request with five conditions. (1) Approval is based on the submitted site plan.

(2) The building may contain no more than 4 units. (3) The structure may not be enlarged or add additional square footage. (4) A minimum 6-foot tall opaque wooden fence shall be erected and maintained along the entire north property line from about 1' west of the ATT utility box to the NW corner of the property, and then southward along the west property line at least to a point even with the rear wall of the structure on the subject property.

(5) A dusk-to-dawn security light shall be placed near the NW corner of the subject property for purposes of lighting the parking lot and rear yard area. The light shall be shielded so as to not overtly spill over onto adjacent properties. Mr. McCall seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 4 to 0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Agenda Item #3: Approval of Minutes: October 6, 2015

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone saw any needed corrections. There being none, Chairman Strickland opened the floor for a motion. Dr. Houseal made a motion to approve as presented. Mr. McCall seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

Agenda Item #4: Nomination of Chairman and Vice Chairman

Chairman Strickland stated it was time to nominate a Chairman and Vice Chairman for 2016 and opened the floor for nominations. Dr. Houseal nominated Mr. Strickland for Chairman and Mrs. Quarterman for Vice Chairman. There being no further nominations, the floor was closed.

Agenda Item #5: Adoption of 2016 Meeting Calendar

Chairman Strickland stated it was time to think about the 2016 meeting. Ms. Tolley presented the 2016 calendar, providing dates for the first Tuesday of each month. Ms. Tolley noted that in July, the first Tuesday fell on July 5, the day after a holiday, and the September 6 meeting fell after Labor Day. ZBOA determined that those particular meetings should be changed to July 12, 2016, and September 13, 2016, with all other meetings falling on the first of the month.

Agenda Item # 6: Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:21 PM.

/s/ Gretchen Quarterman
Gretchen Quarterman, Vice-Chairman

12-2-2015
Date