

**THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION** held a **Workshop** on October, 16, 2003 at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Board of Commissioners Conference Room, Suite 100, Fayetteville, Georgia.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jim Graw, Chairman  
Bob Harbison  
Bill Beckwith  
Douglas Powell

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Al Gilbert, Vice-Chairman

**STAFF PRESENT:** Kathy Zeitler, Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator  
Chris Venice, Director of Planning/Community Development Division Director  
Pete Frisina, Senior Planner  
Bill McNally, County Attorney  
Delores Harrison, Zoning Technician  
Robyn S. Wilson, P.C. Secretary/Zoning Coordinator

**Welcome and Call to Order:**

Chairman Graw called the meeting to order and introduced the Board Members and Staff. He welcomed Buford Chandler and one (1) highschool student to the Workshop.

\* \* \* \* \*

**1. Discussion of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VI. District Use Requirements, Section 6-20. L-C Limited-Commercial District and Article VII. Conditional Uses, Exceptions, and Modifications, Section 7-1.B. Conditional Uses, Section 12. Convenience Commercial Establishment.**

Kathy Zeitler reminded the P.C. that they had discussed the proposed amendments in a previous Workshop and reached a consensus and had advertised the proposed amendments for a public hearing, however it was discovered that there was some confusion over the actual intent of L-C, whether it was to limit the uses or limit the hours and scale of the buildings or both. She explained that Staff had requested to bring this item back to a Workshop for further discussion. She advised that she had met with Chris Venice and Pete Frisina to discuss the revisions. She said that there were several uses proposed for L-C that were later considered not appropriate for L-C if it was really to be commercial of a limited nature. She confirmed that the proposed uses were mainly service uses such as professional and personal services, and uses which pertained to convenience for nearby neighborhoods.

Mrs. Zeitler reported that the following items were proposed to be added to architectural standards: hours of operation limited from 6:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.; no drive-thru establishments such as restaurants, banks or dry cleaners; building size limited to 3,000 square feet of floor area per building and 6,000 square feet maximum per lot. She added that access is proposed to be required at the intersection of major thoroughfares and front on both streets. She explained that these changes were necessary due to the limited commercial uses being in close proximity to residential areas at intersections designated as commercial.

Mrs. Zeitler pointed out that amendments were also proposed to the Conditional Use of Convenience Commercial Establishment in the L-C zoning district such as limiting the number of fueling stations to eight (8), the layout of the pumps in two (2) rows in front of the store; a canopy over the pumps of the same architectural character as the building, and attached to the building; and no car washes.

Bill Beckwith asked what was a laundry pickup station.

Mrs. Zeitler replied that it is a drop-off and pick-up location for laundry or dry cleaning, however the cleaning is usually done at another location.

Bob Harbison asked Mrs. Zeitler what permitted uses were removed from the L-C zoning district.

Mrs. Zeitler stated that the following uses were removed from the current ordinance: antique shop; arts/craft studio; dance school or studio; music teaching studio; and photography studio.

Mrs. Zeitler stated that the following uses were removed from the previously proposed revisions: bank; confectionary store; drug store; electronics repair; grocery store; locksmith; and retail stores.

Mrs. Zeitler advised that a delicatessen was incorporated into restaurant and financial institution was incorporated into office (business and professional).

Mr. Harbison asked Mrs. Zeitler to explain restaurant (take out only and limited to 12 or fewer seats).

Mrs. Zeitler replied that the restaurant would have some limited seating but was primarily take-out.

Chris Venice added that the “take out only” refers to disposable dinnerware.

Mr. Harbison suggested deleting “only” and “limited to”. He stated that if L-C was going to be limited to the proposed uses that there would never be any property rezoned to L-C.

Chairman Graw concurred. He said that the proposed amendments were making it more difficult for a developer. He remarked that he thought Staff was proposing amendments to kill the L-C zoning district. He added that L-C was to be a third commercial zoning district which may be appropriate for areas which were not appropriate for C-C or C-H. He stated that the County should be able to offer a developer a zoning district so the property owners right to a use on the property is not taken away. He reiterated that the L-C zoning district is intentionally being killed and he does not know why. He suggested that the previously proposed amendments could be tweaked. He added that he did not understand the revised intent of L-C.

Chairman Graw stressed that by limiting a three (3) acre tract to 6,000 square feet that the developer would be forced to subdivide the property and something worse would be developed.

Attorney McNally said that he thought everyone was a little confused as to what is trying to be accomplished. He stated that it would be foolhardy to make the L-C identical to uses allowed in other commercial districts. He explained that as different uses are discussed, they should think about what uses would be appropriate to go in an area where C-C or C-H zoning would be denied, but yet the nearby neighborhood could support some light commercial uses. He stressed that empty stores near residential areas are to be avoided. He confirmed that Staff was not trying to do away with L-C, but rather trying to envision what would be appropriate in areas where there is a large residential presence, where limited commercial convenience uses such as gas stations, beauty or barber shops, and dry cleaning businesses could locate with minimal impact. He explained that limited commercial should permit a very, very light commercial type of neighborhood businesses.

Pete Frisina commented that the primary anchor type use would be the gas station/convenience store with other small uses as accessory. He said that the yield is lost on lots over two (2) acres. He advised that he had reviewed Peachtree City’s L-C zoning district and the proposed ordinance is very similar. He added that Peachtree City’s ordinance allows convenience uses, personal services, and professional services.

Chairman Graw stated that he had a problem with financial institution/bank being deleted. He said that a bank or branch office was definitely a convenience for a neighborhood. He added that he would also like to see drug store/pharmacy added to the proposed amendments.

Mr. Frisina advised that a drug store like Eckerd or CVS would not locate in L-C due to the limited square footage requirement.

Attorney McNally said that the L-C zoning district needed to be less intense than the other commercial zoning districts.

Mr. Harbison replied that the level of less intense uses seemed to be the problem.

Mr. Frisina presented the P.C. with a survey of information pertaining to existing small commercial centers in the County and comparison photographs of existing gas stations in the area with no architectural standards and others with architectural standards.

The P.C. reviewed and discussed the various photographs of the existing commercial centers.

Doug Powell asked if uses such as a small pharmacy, ATM, hardware sales, watch repair, and fishing tackle sales were accessory uses that could be included within a Convenience Commercial Establishment.

Mr. Frisina replied that these type uses could be inside a convenience store if the language of items that could be sold in a Convenience Commercial Establishment was amended to include them.

Chairman Graw suggested that the language should be deleted because the County should not dictate what can be sold inside a convenience store. He added that financial institution should also be added back to the permitted uses in L-C.

Mr. Beckwith suggested adding "from all property lines" to the end of Section 7-1.B.12.f.

Mrs. Zeitler summarized the changes discussed and agreed upon as follows: Add Financial Institution, Hardware Store, and Sporting Goods Store to the list of Permitted Uses; revise Restaurant under Permitted Uses to read: Restaurant (take out and 12 or fewer seats); delete description of items that could be sold in Convenience Commercial Establishment; and add "from all property lines" to the end of the sentence in 12.f.

Chairman Graw instructed Staff to advertise the revised proposed amendments for the November 6, 2003 Planning Commission Public Hearing.

\* \* \* \* \*

**2. Discussion of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VII. Conditional Uses, Exceptions, and Modifications, Section 7-6. Transportation Corridor Overlay Zone, A. S.R. 54 West and S.R. 74 South Overlay Zones in the area of the Fayette Community Hospital.**

Kathy Zeitler advised that proposed amendments to the Land Use Plan for the area immediately adjacent to the hospital on the north side of S.R. 54 West were designating the area as Office-Institutional land use. She reported that this area was being called the Zone of Hospital Influence. She pointed out that this O-I area around the hospital will conflict with the residential architectural standards required in the S.R. 54 West Overlay, and therefore Staff was proposing to exclude this area from the S.R. 54 West Overlay. She stated that the area of hospital influence extends from the west side of Sandy Creek Road to the east side of Tyrone Road, and just on the north side of S.R. 54 West. She added that this area is where architecture should be compatible with the existing hospital/medical office development.

Pete Frisina pointed out the area of hospital influence on the Land Use Plan Map. He advised that this area included a proposed hospital expansion, a proposed high school, and a proposed bypass thoroughfare.

Chairman Graw said that it sounded like the intent is to try to get the buildings to be developed in this area to be the same architecture as the hospital rather than requiring them to be residential in appearance.

Doug Powell concurred.

Chris Venice remarked that there may be a request for large office parks with building 3 to 4 stories in height in this area. She said that this area is not going to be rural anymore.

Attorney McNally stated that the architectural standards were required along the corridor to protect the existing residential development on the south side of S.R. 54 West, however on the north side of S.R. 54 West there is the hospital and the proposed school so it is senseless to require a residential appearance on the future development.

Mrs. Zeitler added that by eliminating the conflict developers would have with residential architectural standards, that perhaps it would also decrease the number of annexations in this area.

Chairman Graw instructed Staff to advertise the revised proposed amendments for the November 6, 2003 Public Hearing.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chairman Graw asked if there was any further business. Hearing none, Bob Harbison made a motion to adjourn the workshop. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0. The Workshop adjourned at 8:20 P.M.

**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**OF**  
**FAYETTE COUNTY**

**ATTEST:**

---

**JIM GRAW**  
**CHAIRMAN**

---

**ROBYN S. WILSON**  
**P.C. SECRETARY**