

Chairman McCall asked if anyone else would like to speak on behalf of the application. Mr. Ben Futch, 5443 Danieli Drive, stated he did not mean to be repetitive, but at least half of the lots were under water due to the lake. He stated he built this particular house, and the front faced the lake. The road had always been a private road, and there were twenty-year covenants that did allow accessory buildings. He stated that Ms. Butler's structure was not a metal structure.

Chairman McCall asked if anyone would like to speak behalf of the application. Bobby Fletcher, 7739 Enoch Lake Circle, stated he had no issues with the request.

There being no one else to speak in support of the application, Chairman McCall asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition of the request. Denis Brady, 213 Ravine Dr., Matawan, NJ, spoke in opposition. Mr. Brady purchased the property from Mr. Futch, and owns the property next door. The Dimicks bought the property in a nice neighborhood with a weak HOA next door to a property with an absentee home owner. The Dimicks placed their dog run partially on his property, and cut down trees that landed partially on his property. Mr. Brady complained to Zoning to get it taken care of. Mr. Brady lodged complaints regarding the structure, which is what prompted the cases in front of the Board. He stated the HOA failed him, and he hopes the Board does not fail him. Mr. Brady stated that Mr. Dimick worked in the construction industry, and should be aware of construction rules. Mr. Brady stated that these structures were in violation of zoning laws and inspection laws, and he was concerned about his property values. He respectfully requested that the Board require these structures be removed. Mr. Brady asked Mrs. Quarterman what she saw when she drove by. She stated she saw a boat and a RV, with the structure in question. Mr. Brady stated there were actually two RVs on the property. Mr. Brady asked where the structures would end. Mrs. Quarterman stated she saw at least six others that appeared to be in violation as well. Mr. Brady stated he thought the structure was on the property line.

Mr. Brantley asked Mrs. Tulloch what the setbacks were for an accessory structure. Mrs. Tulloch stated that it would be twenty feet off of the side parcel lines and 10 feet off of the rear. Mrs. Tulloch stated the rear property line was in the water. Mr. Brantley asked how far the structure was off of the property line.

Chairman McCall asked if anyone else would like to speak in opposition to the request. Ann Sumner, 8085 Enoch Lake Circle, spoke in opposition. Ms. McCartney asked who decided where the front and rear property lines. She stated she had only been in charge of the HOA for one year, and the structures were in violation of the HOA covenants. Mr. Brantley asked if the covenants had been renewed. Mrs. McCartney stated they technically did expire, and the HOA was still legal due to new Georgia legislation. Mr. Brantley asked if the HOA had taken any action. Ms. McCartney stated they had not.

Chairman McCall asked if anyone else would like to speak in opposition to the request. Marge McCartney, 8069 Enoch Lake Circle, spoke. Ms. McCartney stated these two cases are very different from one another. She stated, that in the first case, it would be difficult for her to move the building to the back of her property near the lake in the first case. Ms. McCartney stated this second case is in violation because it is a self-contained storage unit, and there has been few attempts to maintain the area. Ms. McCartney stated it was a matter of whatever was aesthetically pleasing to the HOA, and it depends on who is on the Board. Chairman McCall stated the Board could not address any covenant issues.

Mrs. Quarterman asked if they could store a RV in their front yard. Mrs. Tulloch stated they could. Mrs. Quarterman asked Mrs. Tulloch if this was attached to the house, would it be allowed? Mrs. Tulloch stated it would be considered an addition and permitted. Mrs. Hobby asked if there was a limit on the number of RVs. Mrs. Tulloch stated there was no limit because they would be considered as personal vehicles but that the RV was not allowed to be connected to water or power. Mrs. Hobby asked if this was in violation because it did not meet setbacks. Mrs. Tulloch stated she was not given these cases