ORDER: DENY APPEAL FOR VARIANCE AT 409 RENTALS - PHASE II

An appeal was filed with the Board regarding the Planning Commission's denial of a variance request for 409 Rentals-Phase II. Motion was made by Kevin Frye, duly seconded by David Rikard, to deny the appeal of variance request for 409 Rentals – Phase II.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Supervisor Kevin Frye, voted yes Supervisor Jeff Busby, voted yes Supervisor David Rikard, voted yes Supervisor Chad McLarty, voted no Supervisor Mike Roberts, voted yes

After the vote, President Busby, declared the motion carried, this the 5th day of June 2017

Jeff Busly President

Board of Supervisor

Sherry Wal, Chancery Clerk



WILLIAMS ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, INC.

Professional Engineers | Professional Land Surveyors

May 25, 2017

Lafayette County Board of Supervisors 300 North Lamar Boulevard Oxford, MS 38655

Re: 409 Rentals - Phase II

Dear Lafayette County Board of Supervisors,

Williams Engineering Consultants, Inc. is submitting this letter as an appeal to the action taken on May 22, 2017 by the Lafayette County Planning Commission concerning a variance request for 409 Rentals – Phase II Development off of County Road 409 in Lafayette County. The Planning Commission delivered a negative vote to the variance request.

Comment #10 from the Site Plan Review stated, "It appears the 20 new units are clustered on less acreage than we require." That requirement is four (4) units per acre. This requirement is found in Article V, Section 5 – Part E of the Lafayette County Subdivision Regulations. Williams Engineering Consultants believes that due to the extreme varying terrain, attempts to minimize impact to the surrounding properties and existing terrain, and trying to maintain and keep the existing residential structures on site (including the two houses near this Phase of the development) that a variance to this section of code is warranted for this development.

Since the meeting, my client has agreed to reduce the number of units from twenty (20) to fourteen (14) in good faith. I have also included a drawing that shows the now fourteen (14) units sits on 3.5 acres. That is seven (7) buildings with two (2) units per building and one (1) bedroom per unit.

By granting this variance, it would allow the developer to reduce the overall impact of the site, retain more of the existing tree canopy, keep the two houses near this phase intact and unimpacted, as well as reduce the impact to all existing residences inside the development both during and after construction.

We appreciate your consideration.
If you have any further questions, do not hesitate to call.

Jeffery W. Williams, PE/PLS

