

The variance, if granted, will satisfy the necessitated requirements of the ULDC and allow for the recordation of the survey plat within the Superior Court Clerk's Office. The TRC (Technical Review Committee) reviewed the variance request and there were no adverse comments or conditions recommended. The Committee found that there was a substantial hardship as called for in the requirements for the granting of variances.

Chairman McCall asked if the applicant would like to speak on behalf of the application. Mr. Josheua Neeley, 1704 Glenview Drive, stated he would not speak on behalf of his application. Chairman McCall asked if anyone would like to speak in support of the application. No one spoke. Chairman McCall asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the application. No one spoke. Chairman McCall asked if anyone had contacted staff. Mrs. Tulloch stated no one had contacted staff. There being no questions or discussion, Chairman McCall called for a motion. Mrs. Quarterman made a motion to approve the variances as presented, citing criteria "d." Vice Chairman Strickland seconded the motion. The motion was called and carried unanimously with a vote of 5 to 0.

**Agenda Item # 3: VAR-2019-06 — Emily Butler (7715 Enoch Lake Circle, Lake Park)**

Chairman McCall announced the case. Mrs. Tulloch stated that the applicant, Emily Butler, is requesting a Variance to Section 5.02.01(E)(I) of the ULDC (Lowndes County Unified Land Development Code) as it pertains to standards for accessory structures (location). Mrs. Tulloch stated that Lowndes County Codes Enforcement is involved in this particular instance. The subject property is located at 7715 Enoch Lake Circle, Lake Park, Georgia, in a R-1 (Low Density Residential) zoning district. Section 5.02.01(E)(I) of the (ULDC) provides that, unless otherwise provided, accessory structures shall be located only in a side or rear yard of the lot on which the principal building is located. The maximum lot width of the subject property is 69.75' feet. The ULDC requires that an accessory structure be located a minimum of twenty feet (20') off both side yard property lines (North and South lot lines) and ten feet (10') off the rear yard property line (East Lot line) within a R-1 zoning district. However, in this scenario, the rear yard setback will not apply as the rear property line extends into the waterbody approximately 1,110' feet. The landowner stated the rear yard is too narrow to situate her (10' x 20'= 200' square feet) accessory structure in the rear yard. The same would block her view of the lake and affect the aesthetics of her property. Therefore, a variance to Section 5.02.01(E)(I) of the ULDC is requested to the permitted location of an accessory structure in the front yard within a R-1 (Low Density Residential) zoning district. The subject property is located in a well-established residential area – Enoch Cove Subdivision Sections I and II. The properties located in the immediate area average (98'-120') feet or more in lot frontage and lot width. Mrs. Butler's lot appears to be considerably narrow in comparison to other lots within the subdivision. The TRC (Technical Review Committee) reviewed the variance request and no negative comments were given. The Committee found that there might possibly be some hardship scenarios in this area as it is called for in the requirements for the granting of variances.

Chairman McCall asked if there were any questions. Mr. Brantley asked which accessory structure was in violation. Mrs. Tulloch stated that it was the building closer to the road. Mr. Brantley asked how long the accessory structure had been there. Mrs. Tulloch stated she had asked the applicant, and the building had been there for approximately 2.5 years. Mrs. Tulloch stated that the applicant had recently lost a spouse, and her family moved her into the house. Mrs. Tulloch stated that the applicant had spoken to her neighbors, who appeared to approve of the accessory structure at the time. Mr. Brantley asked if this accessory structure needed a permit. Mrs. Tulloch stated it needed a permit. Mr. Brantley asked if it had gotten a permit. Mrs. Tulloch stated it had not. Mrs. Tulloch stated that the applicant had been informed that a permit would be required, depending on the outcome of the case. Vice-Chairman Strickland asked how this arrived in front of the ZBOA. Mrs. Tulloch stated a complaint was given to