

Meeting Minutes 2/27/23

THE FAYETTE COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS met on February 27th, 2023, at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Fayetteville, Georgia.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Tate, Chairman
Marsha Hopkins, Vice Chairwoman
Anita Davis
Bill Beckwith
Tom Waller

STAFF PRESENT: Deborah Bell, Planning and Zoning Director
Deborah Sims, Zoning Administrator
Chelsie Boynton, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
E. Allison Ivey Cox, County Attorney

1. Call to Order.
2. Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Oath of Office for Brian Haren.
4. Approval of Agenda.

Bill Beckwith made a motion to approve the agenda. John Tate seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

5. Consideration of the Minutes of the Meeting held on January 23, 2023.

Marsha Hopkins made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on January 23, 2023. John Tate seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

6. Election of the Chairman.

Marsha Hopkins made a motion to nominate John Tate for Chairman. Bill Beckwith seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

7. Election of the Vice-Chairman.

Anita Davis made a motion to nominate Marsha Hopkins as Vice-Chairman. John Tate seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

8. Election of the Secretary.

Marsha Hopkins made a motion to nominate Chelsie Boynton as Secretary. John Tate seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

9. Petition No. A-816-23, Apremier Properties Group, Inc, Owner, and Darrell Baker/ Principle/ Randolph Williams, LLC, Agent, request the following: 1. Variance to Sec. 110-170. Nonconformances, (1) Nonconforming structures. Request enlargement of a nonconforming structure: To allow an unpermitted addition to primary structure to remain. 2. Variance to Sec. 110-173. Transportation Corridor Overlay Zone, (2) S.R. 54 West (c) (2), to reduce the front yard setbacks from 100 feet to 30 feet for expansion to remain. The subject property is located in Land Lot 26 of the 7th District and fronts on Highway 54W and Tyrone Road.

Deborah Bell, Planning and Zoning Director stated at the time the staff report was written there were outstanding issues related to Environmental Health and Building Safety, the issues have since been addressed. She continued that though the applicant should have obtained the appropriate building permits, because the expansion is obtained under the roof of the structure it is not a significant increase in the non-conformity. She stated staff recommends approval. She stated at the time the structure was built it met setback requirements and became nonconforming with the widening of Highway 54.

Darrell Baker stated in July of 2022 they were asked to help resolve issues with regards to Old Hester's Grocery. He stated the new owner started new construction and improvements without a permit and was stopped by the County. He stated they have represented the gentlemen in real estate and zoning issues over the years and they were asked to step in. He added they met with the County and found out what needed to be done. He continued they requested variances in August of 2022 and they were granted. He stated they have been working with the County to upgrade his site and has variances to add a new canopy, diesel pump, and emissions station. He added they have intentions work with staff to come up with new elevations as well. He stated the structure of the convenience store has not enlarged. He expanded under an already existing roof that was once over a walkway.

No one spoke in favor or opposition.

Bill Beckwith asked if he needs the variance before he can move forward.

Darrell Baker stated they have asked the owner not to do any work until everything is in place.

Bill Beckwith confirmed there was no official stop work order.

Darrell Baker stated he met with Steve Tafoya and Leslie Nieber on site with the owner and made a commitment that nothing else would be done. He continued the owner has applied for building permits and further explained the extent the owner has gone through to provide the appropriate plans to the County.

Brian Haren asked Deborah Bell if the lot was currently considered a legal nonconforming lot.

Deborah Bell stated yes.

Chairman Tate asked if this variance request was a request that was originally heard last year.

Deborah Bell stated this is a new request. The previous request was related to the location of the fuel canopy and pumps. Deborah Bell further stated they are under a stop work order from Building Safety for the expansion.

Brian Haren asked if the front yard was on Highway 54 or Tyrone Road.

Deborah Bell stated both. It has two front yards, one for each road frontage with two different setbacks.

Bill Beckwith asked if Tyrone Road had been widened as well?

Deborah Bell stated Tyrone Road was realigned and a lane was added as intersection improvements.

Darrell Baker stated a turning lane was added.

Chairman Tate asked if the variance is for Highway 54 or Tyrone Road.

Deborah Bell stated it is for Highway 54. She added it doesn't increase the setback encroachment that exist on Tyrone Road side, only on the Highway 54 side.

Brian Haren asked if everything that is on the parcel now was legal before the widening of Highway 54?

Deborah Bell stated yes.

Chairman Tate state on that basis he would make a motion.

Bill Beckwith made a motion to approve Petition No. A-816-23, 1. Variance to Sec. 110-170. . Nonconformances, (l) Nonconforming structures. Request enlargement of a nonconforming structure: To allow an unpermitted addition to primary structure to remain. John Tate seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

John Tate made a motion to approve Petition No. A-816-23, 2. Variance to Sec. 110-173. Transportation Corridor Overlay Zone, (2) S.R. 54 West (c) (2), to reduce the front yard setbacks from 100 feet to 30 feet for expansion to remain. Brian Haren seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Items 10 – 18 were presented as one case by the appellant followed by the Planning and Zoning Director’s explanation of their decision. The appellant then gave their rebuttal.

Adam Webb stated he is the attorney for Atlantic Billboards owned by Mike Fitzgerald. He stated this is a small business trying to do something good for other small businesses in the County. He stated there have not been reasonable opportunities for small businesses to have targeted advertising. He continued there are only two billboards in the County. He stated his client is looking forward to working with the County and with the Board to make this a win win project. He then provided packets for the Board and asked Mr. Fitzgerald to say a few words. He then swore in Mr. Fitzgerald.

Mike Fitzgerald stated he’s built over 100 billboards in Georgia. He stated all of his advertisers are local business owners and the average rate to advertise on one of his billboards is \$400 a month. He stated most of the people that advertise are in the community where the signs are located and direct traffic to the business in the community. He continued that he has had to try alternate approaches and has come up with a plan with LED signs that allows for changing ads every few seconds and allow for more advertisers to get their word out at a lower price. He added you can also advertise for lost children and that law officials find these boards helpful when it comes to public emergencies. He stated he has a waitlist of advertisers and have negotiated leases with nine (9) different landowners. He added he believes the boards will be received well and he just built one with a stone base in Cleveland, Ga. He continued he can make the signs look very attractive and match the Fayette Pavilion. He concluded he believes they will be an asset to the County.

Adam Webb presented the packet he provided to the Board. He stated there are issues with the County’s denial that should induce the Board to reverse the denials and allow Mr. Fitzgerald to continue with this project. He added Mr. Fitzgerald is willing to settle with conditions. He stated the first condition is that the signs will be made available immediately to local law enforcement agencies for any public emergencies such as Amber Alerts, weather announcements, disaster evacuation guidance, and fugitive alerts. Secondly, he has agreed to allow the County to use each electronic face four (4) times a year for public messaging for holiday events, voting announcement, whatever the County needs to advertise. Lastly, he has agreed to build no more than five (5) of the nine (9) signs. Mr. Webb then presented the basis for his appeal. The first basis in the appeal is that the County violated the rules on the time limit. He stated time limits are required on sign permitting because it is a constitutional dimension. Signs are a mechanism of speech and speech delay is speech denial. He stated the County ordinance states has to be sent out in a certain number of days by a certain method. He continued if it doesn’t happen within 45 days, the permit has to be issued. He stated that Mr. Fitzgerald followed the County’s mandatory rule of submission of permits and uploaded his paperwork. He stated this was an extensive application and more extensive than any other application they found in the open records request. He stated he received an nine (9) emails, one for each application, stating they were successfully submitted. There was then back and forth with the County, 45 days later there was no denial. He stated the denial came a few days after. He stated the time limit was violated and the permit should be issued. He then presented

another case from Dekalb County, where Dekalb County did not issue the permits in accordance with its time limits and the judge ruled they must issue the permit. He provided this case document to the Board. The second basis was that the County ordinance states that notification to the applicant can be made by certified mail return receipt requested, by fax to the number provided on the application, or by hand delivery by the County Marshal's office on or before the 45th day after the Planning and Zoning Department receipt of the application. He stated the method of denial was not accurate. He stated it was delivered in a UPS packet. The third basis is that the sign regulations was not adopted properly for three (3) reasons. Any of these reasons are sufficient to discard and invalidate the County's sign regulations. The first is that at the time it was passed in 2011, the County did not have its internal zoning procedures passed and adopted in accordance with Georgia law. He stated the rules were not in place at the time the sign code was adopted. He stated because those were not in place it is a nullity. The second is the Georgia zoning law says you must advertise in a legal organ when you adopt a sign ordinance that regulates based on zoning or district which the County code does. He stated they asked for the advertisements and the County clerk could not provide them. He stated if the ads were not placed 15 to 45 days before the public hearing, it is a nullity. The third reason is that there was no public hearing to adopt the sign ordinance. He stated it was adopted on the consent agenda of the County commission on January 13th, 2011 with no discussion or no public hearing, this makes it a nullity. He continued that the sign ordinance is a nullity and any basis to deny the application is a nullity. The fourth basis is about the constitutional deficiencies found in the County code. He stated Georgia courts established that billboards cannot be banned. They can be designated to a certain part of the county but not banned. He continued, the County ordinance states "prohibited signs: billboards" and that is not allowed. He stated in 2004 there was a series of litigations involving Fayette County in Coffee vs Fayette County. This established a rule that applied to all sign ordinances in Georgia. He then explained the up and down of this case from Supreme Court, Georgia Court of Appeals, and County Court. He stated the County ended up having to issue the permits and write a check for damages caused and that is why the two billboards now exist on Highway 85. He stated his client does not want that type of dispute going forward but to move forward in a win-win fashion. The fifth basis is about the failure to adopt the internal zoning procedures. He stated he has previously covered this and won't address it in addition. The sixth basis is that the County's decision making has been shown to be discretionary. He stated one cannot have discretion in the realm of signs because that would undermine the First Amendment and freedom of speech. He continued once Mr. Fitzgerald submitted everything he begin to receive a series of reactions from County officials trying to avoid the applications. He stated the County says they have gone entirely online for the permitting but once he submitted the application he received an email that said submitted successfully and then was told no he needed to do things another way. He stated the County stated in the denial letters that Mr. Fitzgerald did not submit a survey, all nine (9) were denied based on not having a survey. He stated the ordinance nor application form require a survey. He stated they requested an open records for all the sign permits in the last three years and none had a survey prepared for the application. He added this shows that the County is trying to avoid this situation. Secondly, they denied six (6) of the applications because there was another freestanding sign on the parcel. He stated Mr. Fitzgerald committed any sign that is not otherwise exempt will be

removed as part of his process. He stated they have submitted five (5) applications to see the standard operation procedure in the County. He stated the County does not turn down sign applications because there is a freestanding sign on the parcel. He added they allow it to be replaced, upgraded, modified, etc. He stated the County added a third basis of denial in February based on size and height. He continued once you file an appeal, you cannot change the basis because it creates a moving toward. He then stated the conditions to be placed on the applications will alleviate legitimate concerns that others may have. He reiterated the signs will be immediately made available in emergencies for state messaging. Secondly, Atlantic will donate in perpetuity one space in the advertising rotation on each LED display installed to Fayette County free of charge for public service messaging up to four times each year for two weeks each time. Thirdly, Atlantic agrees that if all nine (9) of the applications are approved, Atlantic will choose four (4) applications to withdraw with prejudice as a result only five (5) will be installed. He concluded, Mr. Fitzgerald wants to work with the Board and the County and they do not have any interest in fighting with the County.

Deborah Bell stated she will begin with the timeline for the cases. It is the same timeline for each of the cases. She stated the timeline as follows: On October 6th, 2022 Mr. Fitzgerald submitted an application on Sages for mounted wall signs. On October 7th, Bernadette Eaden, permit technician, rejected the intake process because the applicant had not obtained the preliminary approval from Planning and Zoning. She stated the County ordinance states that all sign permits come to Planning and Zoning because not all sign permits require building permits so they don't all necessarily go through the Sages program. She stated when someone applies in Sages, it sends an auto generated emailed that states submitted successfully and then the permit technician reviews the application to make sure all the documents that are needed are in the packet before it's sent on for review by the appropriate staff. She stated the term "Intake Rejected" was used because it needed to first come to Planning and Zoning. She stated an email was then sent to the applicant with the explanation that "written approval from Planning and Zoning must be obtained for billboard. Once obtained please see our office." She stated she was told they did submit sign applications and she was anticipating Mr. Fitzgerald bringing the signs by the Planning and Zoning office. On October 25th, they sent Mr. Fitzgerald an email, after not hearing from him, to resubmit to Planning and Zoning so he could proceed with the permit process. On October 26th, Mr. Fitzgerald came in person and brought sign application packets for each of the nine (9) applications. On November 22nd, the letters of permit disapproval were sent in a single envelope to Atlantic Billboards, LLC, Mike Fitzgerald at his address via UPS Next Air with a signature required and expected date and time of delivery as Wednesday November 23rd. On November 23rd, at 10:31am the letters were delivered and signed for by Dean at the front desk. On December 6th, Planning and Zoning received a letter from Mr. Webb, the attorney for Atlantic Billboards LLC submitting a letter to appeal the decision of County staff regarding sign applications. Ms. Bell then introduced each sign petition.

Petition No. A-823-33 is an appeal for the sign at 3020 Hwy 138, parcel number 13050 1004. Planning and Zoning did not approve the sign due to the following factors: 1. The proposed sign exceeds maximum sign face area, the maximum height and the maximum structure height

that are permitted in non-residential districts for freestanding signs. 2. There is already a freestanding sign on the parcel and only one freestanding permanent sign is allowed on a single parcel. 3. The process for a sign permit application requires the sign permit be submitted to verify planning and zoning. The application materials must include a survey or plat showing the proposed location of the structure being permitted and distances from property lines or other structures. The site plan submitted was created on a screenshot of a public parcel map which doesn't provide an accurate enough depiction of the site and property lines to confirm that a proposed structure would be appropriately sited on the parcel. She stated the explanation in the letters was "there is already a freestanding sign located on this parcel so an additional sign is not allowed. Should the existing sign be removed a new freestanding sign that meets dimensional requirements could be permitted." She stated the ordinance section that explains the sign face area and requirements and size allowed for freestanding signs in non-residential districts was included. She stated they explained the general location of the sign seems to be acceptable but they do require site plans for accessory structures and signs be submitted on a survey with dimensions. She continued that public has property lines drawn in but the aerial photography is not take from top dead center. So when you draw something on there based on that, one does not get an accurate depiction. She stated anytime there is a structure that is two feet within the setbacks they require a foundation survey of some kind. For other freestanding signs, they require that those be drawn in on a survey. The sign location itself doesn't have to be stamped by a surveyor but they have to have something at scale that gives them accurate dimensions.

Petition No. A-824-23, 1934 Hwy 85 N, parcel 0552 035. The same three reasons were noted: 1. The sign exceeds the maximum sign face area. 2. There is already a freestanding sign on the parcel. 3. They require a site plan with more details.

Petition No. A-825-23, 165 Carnegie Place, parcel 055202 013. The same three reasons were noted: 1. The sign exceeds the maximum sign face area. 2. There is already a freestanding sign on the parcel. 3. They require a site plan with more details.

Petition No. A-826-23, 1807 Hwy 85 N, parcel 0552 003. There is not a sign already on the parcel so it noted: 1. The sign exceeds the maximum sign face area. 2. They require a site plan with more detail

Petition No. A-827-23, parcel 0540-007. 1. The sign exceeds the maximum sign face area. 2. This site contains a significant amount of flood plain and therefore has additional requirements. The sign is considered development per Fayette County's floodplain ordinance and the submitted site plan is insufficient to determine if there is floodplain encroachment there.

Petition No. A-828-23, 1202 Hwy 54 E, parcel 0532 003. 1. The sign exceeds the maximum sign face area. 2. This site contains a significant amount of flood plain and therefore has additional requirements. The sign is considered development per Fayette County's floodplain

ordinance and the submitted site plan is insufficient to determine if there is floodplain encroachment there.

Petition No. A-829-23, 1147 Hwy 54 E, parcel 0532 063. 1. The sign exceeds the maximum sign face area. 2. There is already a freestanding sign on the parcel. 3. They require a site plan with more details.

Petition No. A-830-23, 1139 Hwy 54 E, parcel 0532 042. 1. The sign exceeds the maximum sign face area. 2. There is already a freestanding sign on the parcel. 3. They require a site plan with more details.

Petition No. A-831-23, 907 Hwy 85 S, parcel 0517 123. . 1. The sign exceeds the maximum sign face area. 2. There is already a freestanding sign on the parcel. 3. They require a site plan with more details.

Ms. Bell then responded to the Mr. Webb's points about the time limit. She stated the sign ordinance does require that sign applications be submitted to Planning and Zoning. She stated Mr. Fitzgerald initially submitted the application to Building Safety as wall signs so the permit technician rejected the intake because it had not followed the correct process. Sages Gov sent the intake rejection notice via email to the email address provided in the application. She continued that notice advised the applicant to contact Planning and Zoning. She stated an incomplete application is not accepted. The time limit is triggered by the submittal of a complete application directly to Planning and Zoning. Ms. Bell then stated they have had problems with USPS since the pandemic, things come back without any signatures. She stated sometimes the cards come back and sometimes they disappear. She stated she elected to send them UPS overnight and to his email address so that they felt like they achieved substantial compliance by the methods of delivery. She continued, regarding the open records request and the ordinance adoption, based on the 2011 case, that was done as a clerical method to recodify the ordinance to relabel it. She stated the sign ordinance was adopted after a public notice was run on September 7th, 2005. She then introduced Exhibit 10, a copy of the newspaper advertisement and the publisher's affidavit from September 2005 following a public hearing before the Planning Commission on September 15th, 2005 and a hearing before the Board of Commissioners on October 13th, 2005 at which time the item was tabled. It was then adopted on November 10th, 2005. She stated Exhibit 11 is a certified copy of the Board of Commissioners minutes and accompanying exhibit items which include the sign ordinance. The text of that sign ordinance is in everything that pertains to staff's denial of these applications. She stated it is the same as the 2005 version as you would see today. She stated they did not distribute any denials based on prohibited sign language and they requested the copy of the survey for clarity because this a large structure. She then responded to the discretionary decisions. She stated they require site plans for stand alone signs. These need to be on a survey. They can hand draw and scale it in on a survey and that is what they needed for the signs and that is what is required for freestanding signs. She continued each individual case is an exhibit. A-823-23 is exhibit one (1), A-824-23 is exhibit two (2), A-825-23 is exhibit three (3), A-826-23 is exhibit four (4), A-827-23 is exhibit five (5), A-828-23 is exhibit six (6),

A-829-23 is exhibit seven (7), A-830-23 is exhibit eight (8), A-831-23 is exhibit nine (9). She stated these are all part of the agenda package.

Chairman Tate stated because there has been a lot of information provided this evening he believes it would be appropriate to table the decision.

Adam Webb stated he could do his rebuttal tonight or his law partner could present it next Monday. He also stated he could submit it in written form.

Chairman Tate stated he could present it tonight.

Mr. Webb stated the County is definitive on the time you receive the application. It says it is 100 percent online and submitted through Sages. He stated he's done a sign application that was submitted as an email and was told to submit on Sages. He stated they received the application and Mr. Fitzgerald received the successfully submitted email and that is when the clock starts. He continued the deadline was not honored and the ordinance states that the permit shall be issued. Secondly, the County substantially complied by sending the notice UPS. He stated substantial compliance works in other states but not Georgia. There is strict compliance in Georgia. He stated as to the zoning procedure law, to see the minutes. The sign ordinance chapter as it is now was adopted January 2011 and they didn't comply with the Zoning Procedures Law. He continued, they are sending you to 2005 to look at another code adoption. He stated that code was done away in 2011 and they are grasping at straws. He stated the Courts of Georgia say to let the landowner use their land as they see fit. He added if you want to stop that you have to do things exactly right. He stated looking back at this code from years earlier, it was enthralled in litigation with Mr. Coffee which led to the County losing three major decisions in the Court of Appeals of Georgia. He stated he heard the County making excuses and not following strict compliance of Georgia law. He then referred to the application being submitted as a wall sign. He stated on the application it states "wall/monument sign more than 36 square feet." He checked that because it was a monument sign greater than 36 square feet. He stated the County isn't acknowledging what their own form says. He concluded, Mr. Fitzgerald did everything right and played by the rules and the rules were violated. He stated his client wants to work with the Board and will be in attendance next Monday. He stated they have provided conditions they are willing to accept as well as the stone cladding or brick to improve the aesthetic. He then thanked the Board for their time.

Marsha Hopkins made a motion to table items 10-18 until Monday, March 6th at 3pm. Brian Haren seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

10. Petition No. A-823-23, Amazing Grace Evangelical International Ministries, INC, Owner, and Atlantic Billboards, LLC (Mike Fitzgerald), Agent, request the following: Appeal the decision of the Zoning Director to deny an application for a sign permit, per Sec. 108-28. - Denial, revocation and suspension. (d) Appeals. The subject property is located in Land Lot 199 of the 13th District and fronts on Highway 138, Highland Drive and Old Highway 138.

11. Petition No. A-824-23, Thomas M. Suggs, Owner, and Atlantic Billboards, LLC (Mike Fitzgerald), Agent, request the following: Appeal the decision of the Zoning Director to deny an application for a sign permit, per Sec. 108-28. - Denial, revocation and suspension. (d) Appeals. The subject property is located in Land Lots 248 and 249 of the 5th District and fronts on Hwy 85 N.
12. Petition No. A-825-23, Carnegie Place Holding, LLC, Owner, and Atlantic Billboards, LLC (Mike Fitzgerald), Agent, request the following: Appeal the decision of the Zoning Director to deny an application for a sign permit, per Sec. 108-28. - Denial, revocation and suspension. (d) Appeals. The subject property is located in Land Lot 233 of the 5th District and fronts on Carnegie Place and Hwy 85 N.
13. Petition No. A-826-23, MJE Properties, LLLP, Owner, and Atlantic Billboards, LLC (Mike Fitzgerald), Agent, request the following: Appeal the decision of the Zoning Director to deny an application for a sign permit, per Sec. 108-28. - Denial, revocation and suspension. (d) Appeals. The subject property is located in Land Lot 233 of the 5th District and fronts on Hwy 85 N and Plantation Road.
14. Petition No. A-827-23, Donald Scarbrough, Owner, and Atlantic Billboards, LLC (Mike Fitzgerald), Agent, request the following: Appeal the decision of the Zoning Director to deny an application for a sign permit, per Sec. 108-28. - Denial, revocation and suspension. (d) Appeals. The subject property is located in Land Lot 170 and 171 of the 5th District and fronts on Hwy 54 E.
15. Petition No. A-828-23, G & I Equities, LLC, Owner, and Atlantic Billboards, LLC (Mike Fitzgerald), Agent, request the following: Appeal the decision of the Zoning Director to deny an application for a sign permit, per Sec. 108-28. - Denial, revocation and suspension. (d) Appeals. The subject property is located in Land Lot 137 of the 5th District and fronts on Hwy 54 E.
16. Petition No. A-829-23, Ronald V. Wormuth, Owner, and Atlantic Billboards, LLC (Mike Fitzgerald), Agent, request the following: Appeal the decision of the Zoning Director to deny an application for a sign permit, per Sec. 108-28. - Denial, revocation and suspension. (d) Appeals. The subject property is located in Land Lot 137 of the 5th District and fronts on Hwy 54 E.
17. Petition No. A-830-23, 355 Group, LLC, Owner, and Atlantic Billboards, LLC (Mike Fitzgerald), Agent, request the following: Appeal the decision of the Zoning Director to deny an application for a sign permit, per Sec. 108-28. - Denial, revocation and suspension. (d) Appeals. The subject property is located in Land Lot 137 of the 5th District and fronts on Hwy 54 E.

18. Petition No. A-831-23, Michael Mehio and Crystal Mehio, Owner, and Atlantic Billboards, LLC (Mike Fitzgerald), Agent, request the following: Appeal the decision of the Zoning Director to deny an application for a sign permit, per Sec. 108-28. - Denial, revocation and suspension. (d) Appeals. The subject property is located in Land Lot 170 of the 5th District and fronts on Hwy 85 S.

Chairman Tate asked is there a motion to adjourn?

Marsha Hopkins made a motion to adjourn. Anita Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
OF
FAYETTE COUNTY



JOHN TATE, CHAIRMAN



CHELSIE BOYNTON, ZBA SECRETARY

