

MINUTES

Valdosta-Lowndes Zoning Board of Appeals

Valdosta City Hall Annex Multi-Purpose Room

300 North Lee Street, Valdosta, Georgia

September 13, 2016

2:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Paul Alvarado
Nathan Brantley
John Hogan III
John "Mac" McCall

Satrina Plyler
Gretchen
Quarterman
Allan Strickland

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dr. Willie Houseal

STAFF PRESENT

Ted Bilak
Carmella Braswell
Tracy Tolley

VISITORS PRESENT

Charles Bennett
Jimmy Bennett
Cynthia Conner
Raymond Conner
George Gaumont
John Hall
Tyler Hamby
Jade Hamby

Tom Miller
Clayton Milligan
Becky Parr
Robert Parrish
John Pike
David Scott
Kay Scott
Ann Smith
Nathan Smith

Dorothy Young

Agenda Item # 1: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Strickland at 2:30 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.

LOWNDES COUNTY CASES

Agenda Item # 2: VAR-2016-14--- Letitia Baker (3941 Fender Road, Valdosta GA)

Mrs. Braswell stated that the applicant was en route to the meeting, but due to car issues, was not able to attend the meeting, and wanted the case to still be presented. Mrs. Braswell that this request for a variance was to the design standards for single family dwellings. The subject property consists of 50.55 acres and is located at 3941 Fender Road in a R-1 zoning district. The applicant wishes to replace a doublewide manufactured home with a singlewide manufactured home. (The doublewide manufactured home was recently destroyed by fire.) Table 4.01.03 (F) of the ULDC lists design standards for single family residences. The singlewide manufactured home does not meet the minimum design standards as they pertain to minimum building width, roof pitch, roof overhang, exterior siding, and skirting material; therefore, the applicant is requesting a variance to the design standards as they pertain to minimum building width, minimum roof pitch, minimum roof overhang, exterior siding, and skirting material. Mrs. Braswell stated the area was a mixture of site built homes as well as manufactured homes. Given the subject property's lot size, the existing development pattern, and the zoning pattern in this area, the TRC unanimously recommended for approval of the variance request to the design standards for single family dwellings.

Chairman Strickland asked if the proposed home would be placed near where the damaged home was. Mrs. Braswell stated yes, it would be.

There being no discussion, Chairman Strickland stated he understood Ms. Baker was unable to attend, and asked if anyone would like to speak in support of the application. No one spoke. Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition. No one spoke.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Strickland opened the floor for a motion. Mr. Alvarado made a motion to approve, citing criteria "d." Mr. McCall seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0.

Agenda Item # 3: VAR-2016-15---Tyler Hamby (7235 Ousley Road, Valdosta, GA)

Mrs. Braswell stated this is a request for a variance to the minimum lot width requirement. The subject property, located at 7235 Ousley Road, consists of 6.51 acres and is zoned E-A (Estate Agriculture). Table 4.01.01(G) of the ULDC requires a lot width of 210 feet on a parcel that is zoned E-A. This particular lot does meet that requirement, at 481 feet from the ROW line. However, the applicant wants to build a house closer to the ROW, at about 200 feet back from the ROW line. At that particular point, the parcel is approximately 200 feet wide; therefore, the applicant is requesting a variance of ten feet to the minimum lot width requirement. A majority of the lots are developed with scattered residential development and agricultural uses. The Lowndes County Health Department has confirmed that the location of where the house will be constructed is of sufficient width to accommodate an individual private well and sanitary needs, as the soils are better in this location than along the rear of the property. Staff feels the request will be in harmony and is compatible with the surrounding properties. As such, staff recommends approval of the ten ft. variance to the minimum lot width requirement as requested.

Mrs. Quarterman asked how the irregularly shaped lots became subdivided, official lots. Mrs. Braswell stated they met the lot width and size requirements. Mrs. Quarterman stated they did not meet the lot width requirements. Mrs. Braswell stated they did, just further away from the ROW.

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to speak on behalf of the application. Mr. Nathan Smith, 3890 Island Creek Road, realtor for the buyers and the sellers, spoke in support of the application. Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Hamby wanted to build his house in line with the nearby houses.

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone else would like to speak in support of the application. No one spoke. Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition. No one spoke. Chairman Strickland asked if anyone had contacted the zoning office. Mrs. Braswell stated that no one had contacted the office.

Chairman Strickland opened the floor for a motion. Mr. McCall made a motion to approve as presented, citing criteria "d." Mr. Alvarado seconded the motion. The motion was approved with a motion of 6 to 0.

Agenda Item # 4: VAR-2016-17--- Union Springs Subdivision, LLC (Union Road, Hahira, GA)

Mrs. Braswell stated that this is a request for two variances—a variance to the location of primary conservation areas (wetlands) and a variance to the minimum lot frontage requirement for developments located within a conservation subdivision. The subject property consists of 114 acres and is located on Union Road in Hahira. (This property was recently rezoned to R-A in February 2016 and granted a variance to the sanitary sewer requirements in June of 2016.) The ULDC provides minimum standards for the development of a conservation subdivision. The concept is to allow development on lands within the unincorporated areas of the county that have environmentally sensitive characteristics (such as wetlands or groundwater recharge areas). Conservation subdivisions allow clustering of residential development while the remainder of the tract that is environmentally sensitive is permanently protected by use of a legal instrument from any future development. This 114 acre subject property can traditionally develop lot sizes at a minimum of 2.5 acres that would allow potentially up to 45 lots. However, with the conservation subdivision concept, those 45 lots can be clustered and developed at a minimum of 10,000 square feet, while permanently protecting a minimum of 40% of the overall development to be used as open space. The first variance asks for relief regarding delineated wetlands being located on a few of the private lots—specifically, lots 15, 16, 22, 35, 36, 41, 42, and 43. The wetlands depicted on each of these lots equates to less than 1 acre—specifically, 0.70 acres. The second variance is to the minimum for road frontage requirements for lots within a conservation subdivision. The applicant is proposing two lots that do not meet the requirement—lots 15 and 16. Those two lots are proposed to have a road frontage of sixty feet rather than the eighty feet required, and is therefore asking for a variance of twenty feet. The applicant/developer is proposing to develop the subject property into larger residential lots, in lieu of smaller lot development. Staff is of the opinion that the developers have made efforts to protect and preserve the delineated wetland areas and have actually exceeded the ULDC's minimum requirement. While staff debated with the developer to reconfigure the lot lines, the developer desired straight lines as a marketability tool. Overall, the TRC is satisfied with the development as proposed and is recommending approval of both variances as the granting of the variances will not cause a substantial detriment to the public good.

Chairman Strickland asked what concerns there might be where the road goes through a portion of the wetlands. Mrs. Braswell stated Mr. Clayton Milligan, the applicant's engineer, would be able to answer that question. Mrs. Plyler asked if the wetlands had anything to do with the request for 60 feet of road frontage. Mrs. Braswell stated no, the wetlands had nothing to do with the request for 60 feet of road frontage. Mrs. Quarterman stated the lots

.....

were larger, and the applicant could rearrange the lots to meet the required 80 feet of road frontage. Mrs. Quarterman expressed concerns about the future property owners knowing they were buying lots with wetlands on them. Mrs. Braswell stated that she believed the wetlands would be marked on the plats for property owners to be knowledgeable. Mr. Brantley asked if the wetlands could be built in. Mrs. Braswell stated that the Corps of Engineers had standards for building in wetlands, and would work with the property owners if need be. Mr. Brantley asked if a driveway could be placed in the wetlands. Mrs. Braswell stated Mr. Clayton Milligan could address that question. Mr. Brantley asked if anything could be built in the wetlands. Mrs. Braswell stated that the Corps of Engineers determined what activities could take place in wetlands.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to speak in support of the application. Clayton Milligan, 3998 Inner Perimeter Road, Lovell and Associates, spoke on behalf of the application. Mr. Milligan stated that every other zoning district allowed 60 ft. road frontages, except for conservation subdivisions, which required 80 ft. minimum road frontages. This is the first time that a conservation subdivision has been developed since the ULDC was adopted, and the first time that it was noticed that conservation subdivisions required 80 feet rather than 60 of road frontage. Mrs. Quarterman asked what the frontage was on lot 14. Mr. Milligan stated it had been adjusted to reflect 80 feet. Mrs. Quarterman asked if the lot sizes could be adjusted to accommodate all lots having 80 ft. of frontage. Mr. Milligan stated it could happen, but the cul-de-sac might look odd. Mrs. Quarterman asked why conservation subdivisions required 80 feet of road frontage rather than 60 feet. Mrs. Braswell stated that it was based on a consultant's recommendation, and because conservation subdivisions were supposed to have smaller, clustered lots rather than bigger lots. Mrs. Quarterman stated that smaller lots should have more minimal frontage requirements than bigger lots. Mrs. Plyler stated that's what she had asked earlier, if the wetlands were what triggered the requirement for a 60 ft. road frontage rather than 80 feet. Chairman Strickland stated the requirement for 60 feet was a conservation subdivision requirement, rather than because of the wetlands. Chairman Strickland asked why the road was going through the wetlands. Mr. Milligan stated they got a jurisdictional determination from the Corps of Engineers to allow it to happen, and disturbed less than a tenth of an acre. Mrs. Quarterman asked about the lots with wetlands, if the property owners could place a driveway, or build a shed, in those wetlands. Mr. Milligan stated that no work could occur within those wetlands. Mrs. Quarterman asked where the driveways would go in the particular lots where the wetlands were at the front of the lots. Mr. Milligan stated that the lots were between 165 and 168 feet wide, and the wetlands occupied roughly half that, leaving room for a driveway. Mrs. Quarterman expressed concern about property owners down the line not knowing that there are wetlands on their properties and might develop further on the lots, in the wetlands. Mr. Milligan stated that if owners disturb the wetlands, there are consequences. Chairman Strickland stated it was his experience that complaints notified the proper officials of work in wetlands. Mr. Milligan stated that Lovell and Associates had worked with those who had done work in wetlands to rectify the situation, and it could be costly. Mr. McCall stated that Mr. Milligan had stated the delineation lasted for five years, and after five years, the property owners could have staff come out to see if wetlands were still in existence. Mr. Milligan stated that was true. Mr. McCall asked if it was common to have parcel lines crossing wetlands. Mr. Milligan stated it happened frequently. Mr. Brantley asked how, from an engineering standpoint, the area where the road crossed the wetlands would be treated. Mr. Milligan stated that they had designed a culvert for that specific area, and that stormwater was designed to flow under the road, rather than over the road.

There being no further questions for Mr. Milligan, Chairman Strickland asked if anyone else would like to speak in support of the application. There being no one, Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the application. John Pike, 6148 Hall Road, spoke against the application. He shared about 1200 feet of property line with this particular piece of property. He expressed concerns for the additional traffic that these lots would generate as well for potential displacement of wildlife such as quail. He also expressed concerns for higher taxes and drainage issues from development. He also expressed concerns about the roads being installed before hearing the variance requests. Chairman Strickland stated, that with some modifications, the developer didn't have to come in front of the ZBOA at all. Chairman Strickland stated that if the variances were denied, it would not necessarily kill the project. Mr. Hall stated he had visited the EPA's website and it stated that no discharge into wetlands would be allowed if a practical alternative existed. Mr. Hall expressed concerns again about placing the roads before submitting the variances and that he was not invited to the hearing about the septic tanks. Chairman Strickland stated that septic tanks were under the Health Department's jurisdiction rather than the ZBOA, and that if the lots didn't perk, the Health Department would not grant permits for septic tanks.

Ms. Becky Parr, 6208 Union Road, stated her property had wetlands as well. Ms. Parr stated the developer had already paved, and why would they have paved if there was an area of wetlands? Chairman Strickland stated they had permission from the US Corps of Engineers. Mrs. Parr asked why the roads had been paved before the variance hearing. Chairman Strickland stated that no variances were needed to pave the road. Ms. Parr stated her property

flooded on occasion, and that she still didn't understand why the developer was not required to get all approvals necessary, including for the variances, before paving the roads. Chairman Strickland stated he could not give a reasoning as to why the process was designed that way.

There being no one else to speak in opposition, Mrs. Quarterman asked what the size of the wetlands was that was at the root of the variance request. Mr. Milligan stated that the total acreage of wetlands in question was seven-tenth of an acre. Chairman Strickland asked Mrs. Braswell, if Lovell and Associates redrew the lines so that no variances were needed for lot frontage or because of the wetlands, could the development still occur? Mrs. Braswell stated that was true.

Chairman Strickland asked Mrs. Braswell if anyone had contacted her office. Mrs. Braswell stated that she had received a call in opposition. Mrs. Quarterman asked how much of the conservation subdivision had to be in conservation. Mrs. Braswell stated at least 40 percent, and this development exceeded that. Mr. McCall asked how much the development exceeded 40 percent. Mr. Milligan stated that 46 percent of this subdivision was in conservation.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Strickland called for a motion. Mrs. Quarterman asked if they could approach each request with a separate motion. Chairman Strickland said that, although the Board typically addressed several variances in one motion, it was possible to address each request with its own motion. Mrs. Quarterman stated she would like to see further discussion by the County regarding the 60 feet of lot frontage in a conservation subdivision.

Mrs. Quarterman made a motion to approve the variance to allow the variance for minimum road frontage for lots 15 and 16, citing criteria "d" with the condition that staff evaluate the conservation subdivision road frontage requirement for conformance within the ULDC. Mrs. Plyler seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 0.

Chairman Strickland called for a motion regarding the open space variance request. No one spoke. Chairman Strickland stated that, in the event that no motion is made, it is the same as denial of the variance. Mrs. Plyler stated that there were not many lots affected by wetlands, and that property owners could choose to purchase those lots or not, but that she agreed with Mrs. Quarterman, that many citizens would not be aware that wetlands existed on their property or what they could or could not do within the wetlands. Mrs. Plyler stated that property owners may struggle to get a mortgage on a property with wetlands, and would rather see the parcels redrawn rather than have a property owner be faced with wetlands on their property. Chairman Strickland stated there was the option to redraw the parcel lines to the point where no variance was needed. Mrs. Quarterman asked what the minimum lot size for a conservation subdivision lot was. Mrs. Braswell stated the minimum was 10,000 square feet, but for a lot requiring a septic tank, an acre would be needed.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to make a motion. Mr. Hogan made a motion to deny the variance to the location of primary conservation areas (wetlands). Mrs. Plyler seconded the motion. Mr. Hogan, Mrs. Plyler, and Mrs. Quarterman voted to approve the motion as presented, with Mr. Alvarado, Mr. Brantley, and Mr. McCall voting to deny the motion. There being a 3-3 motion, Chairman Strickland voted to approve the motion as presented; therefore, the motion was approved with a 4-3 vote.

CITY OF VALDOSTA CASES

Agenda Item # 5: APP-2016-05---Ray Conner (2602 Lakewood Dr., Valdosta, GA)

Ms. Tolley stated that Mr. Ray Conner was requesting a variance to LDR Section 218-7 (G) as it pertained to the setbacks for an accessory structure. The property is located at 2602 Lakewood Drive, zoned R-10, and consists of 0.36 acres. The applicant replaced an existing 20 ft by 16 ft carport (permitted in 1996, according to Lowndes County Q Public) with a taller 26 ft by 31 ft carport. The carport, used to house the family's RV, sits 13 feet from the western (rear) property line and is directly on the northern (side) property line. Accessory structures are required to be in the side or rear yard and at least 10 feet from the side and rear property lines. Therefore, the applicant is asking for a side yard setback variance of 10 feet. (While the structure is taller, it does not need a variance as it is not taller than the principal structure.) While staff understands the applicant replaced the structure very near where the previous structure was, and at the end of his driveway, staff found no hardship and therefore recommends denial of the variance request.

Chairman Strickland asked if there were any questions for staff. Mrs. Quarterman asked if the current structure was in the same place as the previous structure. Ms. Tolley stated she believed the current structure was close to where the previous structure was, but that when he removed the previous structure, he was required to meet today's setbacks with the new structure. Mr. Brantley asked how large the previous structure was. Ms. Tolley stated it was 20 feet by 16 feet, and the current structure is 26 feet by 31 feet. Mrs. Plyler asked if there were height requirements. Ms. Tolley stated yes, that the accessory structure could not be taller than the principal structure, which was not an issue in this circumstance. Chairman Strickland asked if the slab was an issue. Ms. Tolley stated it was not, that the slab could be placed/poured up to the property line. Chairman Strickland asked if the structure met the rear yard setbacks. Ms. Tolley stated it did. Chairman Strickland stated that if the variance was denied, Mr. Conner could still move the structure towards the interior of the property as long as he met setbacks. Ms. Tolley stated that was true, that he would need to get his permit and meet setbacks if the variance was not granted.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to speak in support of the application. Mr. Raymond Conner, 2602 Lakewood Drive, spoke in support of his request. He stated he and his wife, Cynthia, had lived in the house for 27 years. He placed the new structure on the slab, and is on the side yard setback line. Mr. Conner provided pictures for the Board to look at, as well as letters from neighbors in support of his regulation. He stated that he had spoken to his next door neighbor, Ms. Barbara Hacker, and would replace a privacy fence that had been removed, and he was not opposed to placing a buffer along the western property line. Mr. Conner stated that he understood that drainage was a concern, but that it wasn't any worse during the last storm than it was before the structure was placed, and that drainage would drain north. He stated that there was no damage from wind from the last storm that came through. Mr. Conner asked, that if the variance was not granted, and he moved the building to the point where it complied with setbacks, he would not have to replace the fence or plant buffering. Chairman Strickland stated that was true. Mr. Brantley asked about restrictive covenants. Chairman Strickland explained that restrictive covenants were private restrictions and enforced by the home owners' association rather than by city staff. Ms. Tolley stated that this property was in the residential parking overlay, and vehicles such as RVs were required to be parked either in the side or rear yard rather than the front yard.

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to speak in support of the application. Chairman Strickland noted the letters from the neighbors provided by Mr. Conner, and noted that they would be part of the minutes.

There being no one else to speak in support of the application, Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the request. Dr. George Gaumond, 2603 Lakewood Drive, spoke in opposition. Dr. Gaumond stated he was the home owners' association president and that the board opposes the variance request and that he lived directly across from the applicant's house. He stated the structure was too tall and that the concrete pad was too large, out of proportion, for the neighborhood. Dr. Gaumond stated he had heard many negative comments regarding the structure. He expressed concerns regarding the loss of land value.

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone else would like to speak in opposition to the request. Ms. Dorothy Young, 2603 N. Sherwood Drive, spoke against the request. She said she had sent in a letter and pictures in the belief that due to jury duty, she would be unable to attend the meeting. However, she was excused from jury duty and was able to attend. She stated that the impact of the structure was the greatest on her, given her location. She stated she could see the structure from her yard and inside her house as well. She stated that people had stopped to take pictures of the structure and knock on her door to ask about it. She stated she visited several city and county subdivisions, but did not see anything that was comparable to this particular structure. Mrs. Quarterman asked if she understood, if the board denied the variance, that Mr. Connor could move the structure, and as long as it was 10 feet from the side and rear property lines, it would be in compliance? Ms. Young stated it was still too tall. Chairman Strickland stated that the only reason this was in front of the Board was because of the side yard setback variance request, and that if he moved it to a place on the parcel where it complied with setbacks, he could have it without any special permission at all. Ms. Young stated that during the storm, the water came directly on her property. Chairman Strickland stated that the slab nor the structure had any impact on the drainage. Ms. Young stated she got more water with the taller slab. Mrs. Quarterman stated that, if the variance was not granted, Mr. Conner could place the structure on the property, and as long as it meets the setbacks, there is no problem. Ms. Young stated the height was still a problem. Chairman Strickland stated that the structure looked taller than the house because of her property sloping downward, but because the structure was not taller than the house, there was not a problem with the height. Ms. Young stated that her property values had dropped since this structure had been placed. Mr. Hogan asked Ms. Young if her issue was more the height than the setback. Ms. Young stated yes, that was true.

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone else would like to speak in opposition. David Scott, 2605 Rolling Hill Drive, spoke in opposition. He stated he saw the side rather than the back or front. Mr. Scott asked if a building permit was needed. Chairman Strickland stated it was. Mr. Scott asked if Mr. Conner got the building permit. Chairman Strickland stated apparently not, that the need for a permit fell through the cracks. Mr. Scott stated that if he purchased a RV of that size, he would store it elsewhere due to its size. Mr. Scott stated he would have asked if he needed a building permit, due to its size, and to find out the rules before he installed it, and the fact that no building permit was obtained should be considered in the decision making process. Mrs. Quarterman asked if Mr. Scott understood he could move it ten feet over, and no variance would be needed. Mr. Scott stated he was aware of that. Mr. Hogan asked if Mr. Scott's primary concern was the height. Mr. Scott stated yes, and that it almost certainly decreases property values. Chairman Strickland stated that one of the issues was the sloping nature of the ground in this immediate area.

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone else would like to speak in opposition. Forrest Williams, 2115 Pinecliff Drive, spoke in opposition. Mr. Williams stated that he thought there needed to be a fine involved for doing work without a permit, and that the Board should make him move the structure. Chairman Strickland stated that Mr. Conner would have to buy a permit and that there may be a financial penalty involved. Ms. Tolley stated she believed Mr. Conner was in court at this point, and was unaware of what fines if any might be imposed.

Mr. Conner approached the podium. He stated that the structure is level, that it does not slope, but that the slab is higher to make the structure level, due to the slope of the land. Mr. Conner stated he is willing to plant buffering. Mr. Brantley asked how long he had owned the RV. Mr. Conner stated he had bought it in May of 2016, and took delivery of it in June of 2016. Mr. Brantley asked where he parked it. He stated he parked it at another location, but for a few days, he parked it on the street, which was a problem because the streets are narrow. Chairman Strickland asked if this was the first RV he owned. Mr. Conner stated yes, but that he had borrowed a pop-up camper for a while.

Mrs. Plyler asked Dr. Gaumont how many people were members of the home owners association. Dr. Gaumont stated there were 319 parcels in the subdivision, and 63 were rentals, with 7 vacant or for sale, and 85 were members of the association. Mrs. Plyler asked if the association had a meeting with a vote about this specifically. Dr. Gaumont stated no.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Strickland asked if there was any contact to the zoning office. Ms. Tolley stated that other than the letters, there was no contact.

There being no further questions, Chairman Strickland opened the floor for a motion. Mrs. Quarterman made a motion to approve with three conditions—that the previous 6 ft opaque fence be replaced along the northern property line with a similar fence, that significant buffering, such as Leland cypress, be planted along the western side of the parcel and the southern side of the structure, and that the Engineering Department investigate the property to determine if the structure had adversely impacted the drainage and if the drainage required modification. Mr. Hogan seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 5 to 1, with Mr. Brantley voting against the motion.

Agenda Item # 6: APP-2016-06---Charles Bennett (2891 Green Meadow Drive, Valdosta, GA)

Ms. Tolley stated that Mr. Charles Bennett was asking for a rear yard variance for an addition to a house at 2891 Green Meadow Drive. The parcel is zoned R-15, consists of 0.52 acres and contains a single family residence. A permit was granted for an addition of a screened in room around a pool, which inadvertently flipped the side and rear setbacks. While the true side yard setbacks have been met, the rear yard setback was not—the addition is 15.87 feet from the rear property line rather than the required 25 feet. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a variance of 9.13 feet. Staff understands that a mistake was made, but the mistake must be rectified, either through a granted variance or modifying the addition to the point where it complies with setbacks. Staff reviewed the request and found no hardship, and recommended denying the variance.

Mr. McCall stated that, that if the contractor had followed the card, the contractor did not comply with the incorrectly listed side yard setback of 25 feet. Ms. Tolley stated that was correct, and that the structure did comply with the accurate side yard setback of ten feet. Mrs. Plyler asked if the zoning approval letter was correct. Ms. Tolley stated yes, that it was correct, and the setbacks were explained to the contractor by staff before he pulled the permit.

September 13, 2016

Valdosta - Lowndes Zoning Board of Appeals

300 N. Lee St.

Valdosta, Ga

Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Barbara Hacker, I live at 2600 Lakewood Dr. My residence is located next door to 2602 Lakewood Dr., the residence of Raymond & Cynthia Conner. My property is located north of Conner's and the property the variance would directly affect. I have no objections to the zoning variance being granted and the accessory structure that is located on their property. If the variance is granted Raymond Conner has agreed that he would re-build the six foot privacy along the same fence line that has existed between our properties. The privacy fence will run from the rear property line to the ramp for the auxiliary building.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Barbara Hacker". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Barbara Hacker

September 13, 2016

Valdosta - Lowndes Zoning Board of Appeals

300 N. Lee St.

Valdosta, Ga

Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Eloise Blanton, I live at 2605 Lakewood Dr. My residence is located across the street from 2602 Lakewood Dr., the residence of Raymond & Cynthia Conner. I have no objections to the zoning variance being granted and the accessory structure that is located on their property.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Eloise Blanton". The ink is dark and the signature is fluid and legible.

Eloise Blanton

September 13, 2016

Valdosta – Lowndes Zoning Board of Appeals

300 N. Lee St.

Valdosta, Ga

Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Salgado R. Jaimen, I live at 2604 Lakewood Dr. My residence is located next door to 2602 Lakewood Dr., the residence of Raymond & Cynthia Conner. I have no objections to the zoning variance being granted and the accessory structure that is located on their property.

Thank you,



Salgado R. Jaimen