

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION met on February 7, 2002 at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Public Meeting Room, First Floor, Fayetteville, Georgia.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Beckwith, Chairman
Jim Graw, Vice-Chairman
Bob Harbison
Al Gilbert
Douglas Powell

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Bill McNally, County Attorney
Kathy Zeitler, Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator
Chris Venice, Director of Planning
Ron Salmons, Director of Engineering/County Engineer
Delores Harrison, Zoning Technician
Robyn S. Wilson, P.C. Secretary/Zoning Coordinator

Welcome and Call to Order:

Chairman Beckwith called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance. He introduced the Board Members and Staff and confirmed there was a quorum present.

* * * * *

1. Consideration of the Minutes of the meeting held on December 6, 2001.

Chairman Beckwith asked the Board Members if they had any comments or changes to the Minutes as circulated. Al Gilbert made the motion to approve the Minutes. Bob Harbison seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

2. Consideration of the Workshop Minutes of the meeting held on January 17, 2002.

Chairman Beckwith asked the Board Members if they had any comments or changes to the Workshop Minutes as circulated. Vice-Chairman Graw made the motion to approve the Workshop Minutes. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

Chairman Beckwith explained to the audience that the Preliminary Plats on the agenda were to address the technical aspects of the subdivision of property which was already zoned, and only the technical aspects of the Preliminary Plats could be addressed by the public.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ONLY ON FEBRUARY 7, 2002.

3. Consideration of a Revised Preliminary Plat, Vickery Lane Subdivision, Brent Scarbrough, Owner, and Billy Brundage, P.E., Agent. This property consists of 173.23 acres with 46 single-family dwelling lots. This property is located in Land Lot 108 of the 5th District, fronts on County Line Road, and is zoned R-20.

Billy Brundage advised that the revised preliminary plat adds a third phase to Vickery Lane Subdivision which consists of proposed lots which would be larger than one (1) acre.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was any public comment regarding the technical aspects of the preliminary plat. Hearing none, he closed the floor from public comments.

Al Gilbert made the motion to approve the revised preliminary plat dated 01/25/02. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

4. Consideration of a Preliminary Plat, Shenandoah Estates, the estate of Mrs. E. H. Skinner - Jacqueline Toler, Executrix, Shirley R. Lassiter, and Land South, Owners, and Sean K.D. Hart, Agent. This property consists of 87.18 acres with 60 single-family dwelling lots. This property is located in Land Lots 199 and 200 of the 13th District, fronts on Hwy. 138 and Old Hwy. 138, and is zoned R-40.

Sean Hart explained that he was proposing to develop 60 lots on 87 acres. He requested approval of the preliminary plat as submitted including a 327 foot variance to the street length.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was any public comment regarding the technical aspects of the preliminary plat. Hearing none, he closed the floor from public comments.

Vice-Chairman Graw asked if there were any plans for amenities to be developed on the five (5) acres of recreation area.

Mr. Hart replied that there are no amenities proposed at the current time, however the recreation area will be deeded to the homeowners association.

Bob Harbison made the motion to approve the preliminary plat dated 01/25/02 with a 327 foot Variance to increase the maximum length of the proposed street from a maximum of 3,000 feet to a maximum of 3,327 feet. Chairman Beckwith seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

Chairman Beckwith called for a three (3) minute recess from 7:10 P.M. to 7:13 P.M.

* * * * *

Kathy Zeitler read the procedures that would be followed including the fifteen (15) minute time limitation for presentation and opposition for petitions.

THE FOLLOWING ITEM WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON FEBRUARY 7, 2002 AND BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON FEBRUARY 28, 2002.

5. Consideration of Petition No. 1088-01, Russell Welch, Owner/Agent, request to rezone 4.04 acres from A-R to R-72 to develop two (2) single-family residential lots. This property is located in Land Lot 42 of the 5th District and fronts on Homers Place.

Russell Welch stated that he wished to rezone 4.04 acres from A-R to R-72 to develop two (2) lots. He said that his niece, who is a single parent, wants to build a house on one (1) of the lots in order to be closer to her parents.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of the petition.

Debbie Welch, the niece, commented that she wanted to build on the subject property in order to be closer to her parents who would be within walking distance.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition of the petition. Hearing none and with no rebuttal necessary, he closed the floor from public comments.

Al Gilbert made the motion to approve the petition. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

6. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Development Regulations regarding Article III. Street Design Standards and Specifications, Section 8-52. Residential Access by the Engineering Department.

Ron Salmons advised that the primary purpose in the proposed amendments is to update the Development Regulations for consistency with the access requirements in the Zoning Ordinance. He noted that Section 5-13. of the Zoning Ordinance requires residential building lots to have at least 100 feet of road frontage, with this frontage to be used for access purposes to each lot. He confirmed that the Zoning Ordinance's lot frontage requirement was amended in August, 1999 to clarify that the lot frontage was for access purposes. He commented that essentially it required every lot to have its own driveway. He remarked that staff is recommending a revision to the Development Regulations to add an exception to this access requirement. He stated that the Committee which worked on the proposed revisions were the Engineering Department, Zoning Department, E.M.S., and the County Attorney. He explained the proposed revision as follows:

Upon determination by the Engineering Department that the sight distance requirements of Section 8-55. cannot be met for individual driveways, a maximum of two (2) lots may share a residential driveway. Shared driveways must meet all of the following conditions:

1. The width of the shared driveway shall be a minimum of twenty (20) feet and constructed of an all weather surface approved by the Engineering Department.
2. A permanent cross access easement agreement shall be recorded and the easement reflected on the plat of both properties.
3. The street address of each lot shall be clearly marked at the road frontage/curb cut and at the fork in the shared driveway.
4. Each lot must have a minimum of one hundred (100) feet of immediate road frontage.
5. The shared driveway must comply with the minimum requirements for sight distance contained in Section 8-55.

Mr. Salmons advised that this proposal would not take away any rights of the property owners. He stressed that this proposal would only impact new developments from the time of adoption forward. He added that it would not impact any existing shared driveways.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was any public comments.

Steve Porter stated that he had resided in Fayette County for the past 54 years and his parents moved to Fayette County in 1948. He remarked that his mother owned property between McDonough Road and Callaway Road which would be passed down to her children and grandchildren. He commented that Fayette County used to consist of farm land. He said that the proposed amendment would have a great impact on some of the older residents. He explained that he has six (6) brothers and sisters, and one (1) sister and one (1) brother have already built on the property. He confirmed that the property was landlocked but his mother has purchased an easement from Callaway Road. He went on to say that the proposal would not allow his children to build on his mother's property. He added that his mother could not buy more property for an easement. He asked what was the required right-of-way for a County road to be built.

Attorney McNally replied 60 feet. He advised Mr. Porter that if he was properly describing his situation that he would not be permitted to build on the subject property now, since a landlocked

piece of property is only allowed one (1) building permit.

Mr. Porter said that this meant the land which he was paying taxes on was unbuildable.

Attorney McNally replied that he was answering questions based on what he was hearing.

Doug Powell asked how wide was the easement.

Mr. Porter replied 25 feet.

Kathy Zeitler advised that Mr. Porter's issue is not related to the proposed amendment. She explained that each lot has been required to have 100 feet of road frontage since 1992. She confirmed that the problem was that the Porter's property is landlocked, and not a shared driveway issue.

Mr. Porter replied that he understood.

Joyce Russell asked for verification that any existing shared driveways would be exempt from the proposed amendments.

Attorney McNally confirmed that existing shared driveways were exempt from the proposed amendments.

Al Gilbert asked what would happen if four (4) lots had been platted and only two (2) lots contained dwellings.

Mrs. Zeitler advised that the plats would not indicate driveway locations, and the driveway issue would not even come up until an application for a building permit is submitted.

Attorney McNally added that shared driveways are not an issue on the preliminary plats that are reviewed and approved by the P.C. due to the fact that new subdivision streets are proposed.

Hearing no further comments, he closed the floor from public comments.

Bob Harbison made the motion to approve the proposed amendments. Vice-Chairman Graw seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

THE FOLLOWING ITEM WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON FEBRUARY 7, 2002 AND BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON FEBRUARY 14, 2002.

7. Consideration of Interim Objectives and Policies to the Fayette County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to be utilized in the development of a Capital Improvement Program by the Planning Department.

For the benefit of the public in attendance, Chris Venice gave a brief background of the project. She advised that the Board of Commissioners directed Staff to prepare a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) in conjunction with the normal operating budget process, which is scheduled for spring. She noted that the B.C.C. also directed that the C.I.P. be based on the County's Comprehensive Plan. She pointed out that this is because a C.I.P. and a Comprehensive Plan are mutually supportive. She reported that the Plan identifies areas suitable for development and the public investment they will require. She said that the C.I.P. translates these requirements into capital projects designed to support the goals, objectives, and policies of the Plan. She remarked that in this way, the necessary public facilities are available, or at least planned, in an appropriate time frame. She added that the

recommendations for public improvements made in the Plan are considered for inclusion in the C.I.P.

Mrs. Venice went on to say that tying the C.I.P. to the Plan requires that we formulate objectives and policies differently than in the past. She commented that it is now necessary to develop measurable objectives, establish levels of service and provide other more quantified elements in the plan. She remarked that the objectives and policies presented this evening are the result of County Departments thinking long-term about any capital improvement needs and identifying the levels of service and/or national standards that support those requests. She noted that the objectives and policies also reflect any changes discussed at the January P.C. Workshop, including adding definitions or clarification and correcting typos and omissions. She went on to say that the Plan policy does state that the feasibility and/or need for the storage of emergency materials should be investigated, however the affected departments noted that they did not foresee the need for the construction of an emergency fuel storage area.

Doug Powell asked how the County would handle the situation if the County was without power since generators must be manned and vehicles fueled with no emergency fuel storage areas.

Mrs. Venice replied that 9-1-1 is already on emergency generators. She remarked that Fire and Emergency Services and Public Works believe that they have sufficient fuel storage on site. She advised that in an emergency situation, the County can commandeer other storage areas if necessary. She added that with these powers, they did not feel it was necessary to be added into the interim objectives and policies.

Mr. Powell stated that he would like to know what is the total fuel capacity and how the County facilities would continue to operate in terms of a total power outage.

Mrs. Venice replied that she would be happy to research the information and have it available at the February Workshop.

Mrs. Venice confirmed that the proposed Interim Objectives and Policies will be utilized in the creation of the C.I.P. She advised that the P.C. will see the objectives and policies again, as well as, the objectives and policies for Land Use, Housing and Economic Development. She added that the entire plan will be revised and adopted in approximately a year.

Bob Harbison asked if information would be provided to the P.C. during the rezoning process if growth occurs and facilities are required.

Mrs. Venice replied yes but not on a monthly basis. She said that a department would be able to see how their particular areas are developing and it will allow them to compare the development with their level of service and then request the appropriate capital improvements project in the appropriate year. She added that when the entire review of the land use/comprehensive plan is considered, items such as water lines will be addressed and long range policies will be established.

Chairman Beckwith asked what would be presented next.

Mrs. Venice replied Economic Development Objectives and Policies, Housing Objectives and Policies, and possibly some of the Land Use Objectives and Policies will be discussed at the February Workshop. She added that discussion of possible land use changes will be discussed at the March Workshop.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was any public comments. Hearing none, he closed the floor from public comments.

Mrs. Venice asked that the P.C. consider approving the Objectives and Policies as Interim Objectives and Policies for use with this spring's C.I.P. submittals. She added that the Objectives and Policies

would be formally adopted as part of the County's plan when the entire plan review is complete.

Vice-Chairman Graw made the motion to approve the proposed Interim Objectives and Policies with the proposed change as presented to Community Facilities on page 5, Section 14.c. Bob Harbison seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

NEW BUSINESS:

8. Consideration of a public hearing date for the July public hearing. The Public Meeting Room is available on Tuesday, July 2, 2002 or Monday, July 8, 2002.

Vice-Chairman Graw made the motion to reschedule the public hearing from Thursday, July 4, 2002 to Tuesday, July 2, 2002. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was any further business.

Kathy Zeitler reminded the P.C. of the Workshop scheduled for February 21, 2002 in Suite 202A at 7:00 P.M.

There being no further business, Doug Powell made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion for adjournment unanimously passed 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:50 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION
OF
FAYETTE COUNTY

ATTEST:

BILL BECKWITH
CHAIRMAN

ROBYN S. WILSON
SECRETARY