

Mrs. Quarterman asked if they were considering a variance to allow the previously existing nonconforming sign, and not anything substantially different. Mrs. Braswell stated that was true. Mrs. Quarterman asked if they could advertise whatever they wanted on the sign. Mrs. Braswell stated they could.

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone would like to speak in support of the application. Mr. B.K. Ison, applicant, 5980 Seville Road, Lake Park, spoke on behalf of the application. He stated he moved to the area in 1985, and his store had been at this location for many years. He employed 10-15 people, depending on the season. Mr. Ison stated his property was damaged in the hurricane, and he did not realize there were nonconformities related to the sign, and if he had known, he would have done things differently. Chairman Strickland asked if he did the work himself or if he hired someone. Mr. Ison stated he hired someone who worked for a sign company to work on the new sign. Mr. Ison stated he bought the materials and the worker did the work.

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone else would like to speak in support of the application. There was no response. Chairman Strickland then asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Robert Plumb, 1007 N Patterson Street, spoke on behalf of Alliance Coach at 5355 Mill Store Road, Lake Park. Mr. Plumb stated the sign was nonconforming before it was damaged and then replaced with a new nonconforming sign. Mr. Plumb stated he did not believe the ULDC supported allowing a variance to permit a nonconforming sign. He stated that the new sign was noncompliant with virtually every regulation. Mr. Plumb distributed pictures of the new sign. Mr. Plumb stated this was not a repair or maintenance job, and does not meet the criteria for granting a variance. Mr. Plumb stated that this sign blocked visibility of other signs. Mr. Plumb asked that, since the criteria for granting a variance were not met, that the Board deny the variance requests. Chairman Strickland asked Mrs. Braswell if ZBOA could grant a variance for a nonconforming sign. Mrs. Braswell stated that yes, the ULDC stated in Chapters 5 and 9 that ZBOA does have the authority to grant variances for such signage. Mr. Plumb stated that another factor to consider was that this business already had an existing freestanding sign to advertise its business on the property. Chairman Strickland asked if there was another freestanding sign on the property. Mrs. Braswell stated there was another smaller freestanding sign on the property.

Mr. Brantley asked if staff knew when the original nonconforming sign was constructed. Mrs. Braswell stated she did not know. Mr. Brantley asked when the sign regulations were adopted. Mrs. Braswell stated they were adopted when the Lowndes County Zoning Ordinance was adopted in 1972. Mr. Brantley asked if there was a permit for the sign. Mrs. Braswell stated that she was not aware of a local permit for the previous nonconforming sign. Chairman Strickland stated the sign may have pre-dated the 1972 Zoning Ordinance. Mrs. Braswell stated the regulations prior to the ULDC were more liberal — in that there were no height or separation requirements, and the maximum square footage for a freestanding sign was 750 square feet. Mr. Plumb stated that the goal of the nonconforming regulations are to eliminate or phase-out nonconformities, and this variance request does not support that goal. Chairman Strickland stated that the Board examined each case seriously and on its own individual merits.

Chairman Strickland asked if anyone else had any questions or comments. Mr. Ison stated that relating to the comment that his sign was blocking the Alliance Coach sign, he stated they have a large sign and that he had sold the property to them.

Chairman Strickland asked if there was any other discussion. There being no further discussion, Chairman Strickland called for a motion. Mrs. Quarterman made a motion to approve the 4 variance requests as presented, citing criteria "h" and "m." Mrs. Hobby seconded the motion and it was called and carried by the majority (5-1 vote). Mr. Alvarado voted against the motion.

Agenda Item # 3: VAR-2016-23 --- Maddie Jordan (Orr Road)

Mrs. Braswell stated that the applicant is requesting a variance to the lot frontage/lot access requirement. The subject properties are located off of Orr Road, in an R-A zoning district. Sections 4.04.03(D) and 6.01.02(D) of the ULDC require that lots shall have frontage on and direct access to public streets. The applicant is representing several properties that were created through the division of the family's estate. While a survey was performed in the early 70's to show the division, no survey appears to have been recorded. Therefore, the subject properties do not have frontage to or direct access from a public street but are accessed from a dirt path. Staff could not find any formal written agreement to substantiate an easement or use of the dirt access path. The applicant is currently trying to record a survey plat. After reviewing the request, staff's primary concern is that of public safety. TRC staff debated and was split on the recommendation. Overall, the TRC concurred that the request does not appear that