

**BOARD
OF ADJUSTMENT
DESTIN CITY HALL ANNEX CHAMBERS
WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 2026
5:30 P.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Weidenhamer called the Board of Adjustment Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m., on Wednesday, May 4, 2026, at Destin City Hall Annex Chambers.

2. ROLL CALL & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Present:

Tom Weidenhamer
James Moomaw
Lance Johnson
Allan Osbourne
Ross Haynes
Stephanie Rowe

Absent:

Staff Present:

Kim Montgomery, Deputy City Clerk
Jesse Hernandez Senior Planner
Chris Rush Planner
Kim Kopp City Attorney

4. AGENDA APPROVAL:

Chairman Weidenhamer asked if there needed to be any changes to the agenda. The City Attorney announced that she needed to provide the new members with a review of the Sunshine and Public Records Law. Chairman Weidenhamer approved the agenda with the addition of the Sunshine and Public Records Law presentation.

➤ **Sunshine Law and Public Records:**

- Ethics
- Sunshine Law
- Public Records Law

She then proceeded to lay out the foundation of the above items covering the following:

- Code of Ethics
- Government in the Sunshine Law
- Public Records Law
- Robert's Rules of Order
- Quasi-Judicial Hearing Procedures

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- **February 4, 2025 Minutes**

Motion to approve the February 4, 2025 minutes as written was made by Vice Chairman Johnson with Board member Moomaw providing the second. Motion passed 6-0.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

- **Case No. PZ 2026-48 35000 Emerald Coast Parkway Variance – This item was continued to June 3, 2026.**

Case No. PZ 2026-57, 21 Pine Ridge Trace - Mr. Craig Shultz

Mr. Chris Rush Planner, presented the variance request for property located at 21 Pine Ridge Trace and explained that the applicant is requesting a Variance for relief from the following:

- Land Development Code Section 7.12.08, Table 7-3
- Specifically, a reduction of the required 20-foot front setback along Trail Court to 13 feet.
- The property is a corner lot within the MDR-V zoning district.
- Corner lots require two front setbacks under the Land Development Code definition of front yard setback.
- Size: 0.16 acres
- Zoning: Medium Density Residential Village (MDR-V)
- Future Land Use: Medium Density Residential.
- The subdivision was originally designed for townhomes.
- Five-foot setbacks were established in the original plat configuration.
- The city had vacated a 30-foot environmental preservation area west of the property.
- Additional land was granted to the applicant's lot by a Vacation of Right-of-way of an environmental preservation area that ran down the middle of the back of the property.
- The applicant could potentially construct the addition on the west side if all LDC requirements were met.

Mr. Rush stated that staff did not receive any public comments regarding the request, however, staff recommends denial since the request does not meet all six of the requirements in order to grant said Variance.

❖ **Applicant Presentation – Craig Shultz**

- The applicant Mr. Craig Shultz explained:
 - The requested addition would provide additional living space for his growing family in a house that has two bedrooms and two baths.
 - Because of the current economy, the family wishes to remain in the neighborhood rather than relocate.
- The proposed addition included:

- A bedroom
 - An office
 - Potential storage space for electric bikes and other items.
- Mr. Shultz stated:
 - The lot configuration made expansion toward the rear impractical.
 - The property is located adjacent to a dead-end cul-de-sac with no utilities running along the requested variance side.
 - He referenced nearby properties with similar setback conditions and stated neighboring property owners did not object to the proposal. The applicant explained:
 - The requested addition would provide additional living space for his growing family in a house that has two bedrooms and two baths.
 - The family wishes to remain in the neighborhood rather than relocate.
 - The proposed addition included:
 - A bedroom
 - An office
 - Potential storage space for electric bikes.

According to Mr. Schultz:

- The lot configuration made expansion toward the rear impractical.
- The property is located adjacent to a dead-end cul-de-sac with no utilities running along the requested variance side.
- The applicant referenced nearby properties with similar setback conditions and stated neighboring property owners did not object to the proposal.

Mr. Hernandez spoke of the unusual subdivision layout that was originally intended for townhomes and how when the decision was made at some point to not continue building the townhomes, however, the subdivision was never replatted, so the setbacks stayed the same.

- Existing neighborhood conditions and nonconforming structures.
- The former environmental preservation area was originally in place as a buffer from the airport and over the years, the homeowners built nonconforming structures into it.
- Variance requests are evaluated individually based on the six variance criteria.
- Existing nonconformities do not automatically justify additional variances.
- Existing structures within formerly protected environmental areas.
- The practical configuration of the home and cul-de-sac.
- Concerns regarding future variance requests related to boat storage or additional site modifications.

Chairman Weidenhamer opened the hearing for additional public input, with no one coming forward to speak, he closed the public and made the following motion:

Chairman Weidenhamer made the motion to approve the Variance Request PZ-2026-57 located at 21 Pine Ridge Trace, with Board member Rowe providing the second.

In discussion, the board members discussed:

- The unusual subdivision layout was originally intended for townhomes.
- Existing neighborhood conditions and nonconforming structures.
- The former environmental preservation area and its prior use.
- Board member Osborne questioned whether:
 - Granting the variance would establish precedent.
 - Potential impacts on neighboring property values and future appraisals.
 - Would the request create a special privilege not available to other property owners.
- Mr. Hernandez clarified:
 - Variance requests are evaluated individually based on the six variance criteria.
 - Existing nonconformities do not automatically justify additional variances.

With no additional input from staff or the Board members, Chairman Weidenhamer called for the vote and the motion passed 4-2 with Board members Osborne and Haynes dissenting.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Adopted and approved this 3rd day of July 2026.

Tom Weidenhamer
Tom Weidenhamer, Chairman

Kim Montgomery
Kim Montgomery, Deputy City Clerk