

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION held a **Workshop** on April 3, 2003 at 7:45 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
Al Gilbert, Vice-Chairman
Bob Harbison
Bill Beckwith
Douglas Powell

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Kathy Zeitler, Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator (left 8:00 P.M.)
Pete Frisina, Senior Planner
Chris Venice, Director of Planning
Bill McNally, County Attorney
Ali Cox, Assistant 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.

* * * * *

1. Discussion of Proposed Amendments to the A-R Zoning District for clarification of agricultural sales and nurseries.

Kathy Zeitler explained that this amendment is a clarification of agricultural sales in the A-R zoning district, specifically for plant nurseries. She reported that Staff has had some problems with wholesale nurseries locating in A-R and then operating as retail nurseries. She advised that a wholesale nursery does not have to get site plan approval, but a retail nursery is required to get site plan approval. She stated that once the nursery finds out this information that they automatically become a wholesale nursery, but they do not operate as a wholesale nursery. Regardless of whether they are wholesale or retail, she confirmed that there needed to be places for customers and large trucks to park.

Mrs. Zeitler remarked that the current ordinance allows landscape planting materials (planted or potted) and the sale thereof, however it does not specify either wholesale or retail, only the sale thereof. She proposed the following amendment to address this issue: Growing of crops, gardens, landscape planting materials (planted or potted) and the sale of thereof, provided that all agricultural products are raised and produced on the premises. She stated that this would confirm the growing/selling of agricultural products on-premise. In order to address both wholesale and retail sales, she proposed the following amendment: Greenhouses and plant nurseries (including both wholesale and retail sales) provided all products sold are grown on the premises (no sales of related garden supplies).

Mrs. Zeitler stated that under Special Regulations in the A-R zoning district, it states what permitted uses are exempt from an approved site plan. She advised that seasonal sales of items such as Christmas trees, pumpkins, etc. would be exempt from site plan approval, however greenhouses and plant nurseries both wholesale and retail would require site plan approval.

Mrs. Zeitler explained that these amendments are for clarification purposes and should also assist with code enforcement at future nurseries.

Bill Beckwith asked why the ordinance required products to be raised and produced on the premises.

Mrs. Zeitler replied that the ordinance had always had this requirement in A-R because the intent is agricultural use of property and allowed sale of what is grown on the property.

Mr. Beckwith asked if plants could be purchased wholesale, trucked to a nursery, and then sold as retail.

Mrs. Zeitler said that the County wants to encourage the owners to have a true agricultural use. She remarked that a nursery could purchase some plants from another nursery and raise them on the property until sold.

Attorney Bill McNally advised that they would however be required to grow some plants on-premise.

Chairman Graw remarked that this should help with code enforcement. He asked how many nurseries are operating as retail that are to be wholesale.

Mrs. Zeitler replied that at least two (2) existing nurseries come to mind.

Chairman Graw asked if this should be advertised for the May or June Public Hearing since no applications were received for the May Public Hearing.

Chris Venice stated that the April 17th Workshop could be canceled and a Workshop held immediately after the May Public Hearing.

The P.C. concurred with Mrs. Venice and instructed Robyn Wilson to advertise the proposed ordinance amendment for the May Public Hearing.

* * * * *

2. Discussion of the Land Use Plan Map.

Pete Frisina recapped the comments/concerns from the previous Workshop as follows:

1. Staff stated that they are taking a more general approach to the land use plan and getting away from parcel specific land use.
2. P.C. voiced concern about the lack of commercial property indicated on the land use plan.
3. P.C. expressed concern about how to control commercial development desired for certain areas.
4. P.C. stated that L-C may be a solution.
5. Concern about only showing one (1) corner as nonresidential and the other three (3) corners as residential.
6. Discussion about providing commercial for the southern end of the County to keep people from driving into Fayetteville and Peachtree City and where would it be located.
7. Is there enough property land used as commercial for the next 20 years?
8. Discussion about the S.R. 54 East corridor.
9. Discussion about S.R. 54 West and Tyrone Road corridors and if this is a good location for commercial and how much and how large of an area should be commercial. Concern about overloading with convenient stores.

S.R.54 East

Mr. Frisina presented a map indicating S.R. 54 East. He stated he had studied the corridor and pointed out McCurry Park, Pit Stop, properties recently zoned to commercial, the veterinarian clinic, and the residential areas. He advised that there are homes which front on S.R. 54 East in the vicinity of Banks Road but everything else seems to be oriented onto a secondary street. He added that there are also some houses in the vicinity of Henderson Road which face S.R. 54 East. He said that there

are large tracts of agricultural zoned property. He pointed out the nonresidential and residential uses and properties at the intersection of Corinth Road and S.R. 54 East. He confirmed that the S.R. 54 East corridor does not lend itself to the same requirements as the S.R. 54 West corridor.

Al Gilbert stated that he did not have a problem with land use of O-I to Banks Road.

Mr. Frisina pointed out that there are existing houses on three (3) corners of this intersection.

Attorney Bill McNally suggested that the veterinarian clinic would be a good stopping place for O-I land use.

The P.C. concurred.

Mr. Frisina suggested to make those uses to be coordinated with residential uses to the rear.

Existing Commercial

Mr. Frisina presented copies of a map indicating the location of the existing convenience stores. He said that there are quite a few convenience/commercial locations in the County. He commented that at the last Workshop discussion was held about how to approach commercial, what type is wanted and how to control it. He presented a handout describing Neighborhood Centers, Community Centers, and Nonresidential Corridors.

Neighborhood Center

Mr. Frisina explained that the Neighborhood Center would provide for the daily convenience commercial and service needs of the surrounding residential area and the traveling public. He stated that the intent is to locate small scale business clusters at roadway intersections under strict control to avoid adverse impact on surrounding residential areas. He commented that the L-C zoning district may be a solution due to the maximum square footage limitations, however no one has developed under the L-C zoning district. He added that the recommended maximum site size is three (3) acres. He suggested that the L-C zoning district may need to be tweaked.

Community Center

Mr. Frisina explained that the Community Center would provide for the daily and weekly retail, office, governmental and service needs of the surrounding area and many neighborhoods. He added that these facilities will likely be anchored by a grocery store in combination with miscellaneous retail, office, governmental, and service establishments. He remarked that an example would be Peachtree East Shopping Center and the proposed development at S.R. 74 South at Redwine Road.

Nonresidential Corridor

Mr. Frisina explained that the Nonresidential Corridor would provide for retail, office, governmental and service needs of the County at large. He added that these corridors will contain a mix of retail, office, governmental, service establishments and light industrial uses. He remarked that examples would be S.R. 85 North, south of Fayetteville on S.R. 85 South where there is a strip partly zoned or land used, and S.R. 54 East between Fayetteville and McDonough Road.

Areas Considered for Neighborhood Center Designation

S.R. 54 East and Corinth Road: Existing: 2 acres zoned commercial (1 acre used commercial 1 acre vacant), 7 acres zoned O-I, and a Temple.

Proposed Land Use: 4 corners commercial with O-I to the west on both sides of S.R. 54 East.

S.R. 85 South and Bernhard Road: Existing: 3 corners zoned A-R and 1 corner zoned commercial.

Proposed Land Use: All 4 corners commercial.

S.R. 85 South and S.R. 74 South: Existing: Both corners along S.R. 74 South zoned A-R. Existing small building on S.R. 85 South zoned A-R. (Possible realignment of Padgett Road.)

Proposed Land Use: Both corners along S.R. 74 South as commercial.

Areas Considered for Community Center Designation

S.R. 138 and S.R. 314: Existing: 22 acres zoned commercial (7 acres commercial use, 7 acres office/business use, and 8 acres vacant).

Proposed Land Use: Both corners commercial.

S.R. 92 North and Westbridge Road: Existing: 29 acres zoned C-H and 13 acres with nonresidential use.

Proposed Land Use: Rectangular area inclusive of both corners of Westbridge Road, both corners of Rivers Road, and across S.R. 92 North commercial.

Tyrone Road and S.R. 54 West: Existing: 30 acres zoned commercial (approximately 12 acres used).

Proposed Land Use: Both corners of Tyrone Road as commercial. Commercial area encompassing area along both sides of S.R. 54 West from Huiet Road to Huiet Drive and to the north of Old Chapel Lane. Existing Mobile Home Park remains mobile home park.

S.R. 54 West (in the vicinity of Peachtree East Shopping Center): Existing: 60 acres zoned commercial, 27 acres used commercial, 33 acres office/services, and 13 acres office use.

Proposed Land Use: East side of S.R. 54 West as commercial. West side of S.R. 54 West as office.

Areas Considered for Nonresidential Corridor Designation

S.R. 54 East (from Fayetteville to McDonough Road): Existing: Hardware Store, City of Fayetteville Business Park, Vacant A-R, Small Business Park, Solid Waste Business, Vacant Commercial on west side and a Cemetery, Various Businesses, and Convenience Store on east side.

Proposed Land Use: Commercial on both sides of S.R. 54 East from Fayetteville to McDonough Road.

S.R. 85 North: Existing: Properties north of Fayetteville to Clayton County containing a mix of commercial and industrial.

Proposed Land Use: Both sides of S.R. 85 North as commercial. Properties behind commercial on west side of S.R. 85 North as industrial.

Conclusion

Chris Venice advised that from an academic standpoint land use is suppose to be general and not site specific. She stated that from the P.C.'s standpoint that they will not have as much direction as in site specific land use. She added that if someone files a petition and they have a great idea that the P.C. may want to approve it. She pointed out that with the proposed general layout, the P.C. would

have some leeway in considering those type proposals as opposed to being site specific and having to recommend denial.

Mr. Frisina cautioned the P.C. that if they did not want to see a parcel considered to be rezoned then do not indicate it as such on the land use plan.

Attorney McNally advised that if the property is land used that it also helps them to get more money for their property.

Mr. Frisina stated that verbiage may need to be added in the text or map for some areas to require development to be from the intersection outward. He added that the road or intersection should be the vocal point and development moving back.

The P.C. concurred and supported the concept of the neighborhood center, community center, and nonresidential corridor.

Mr. Frisina advised that Staff had discussed changing the residential designations on the land use plan.

Mrs. Venice confirmed that residential classifications will be addressed after the nonresidential classifications to decide how to define it, how to label it, how to list the range of density, and where to change density. She added that verbiage may need to be added to state what is anticipated for each residential label. She asked the P.C. to be thinking about how they would like to handle the density labels.

Bob Harbison suggested labeling the residential as low, medium, high, and agricultural to correspond with the residential zoning districts.

Attorney McNally advised Staff and the P.C. that when discussing residential density they need to consider infrastructure which is very important to tie in with residential density.

Chairman Graw concurred.

Mrs. Venice advised that residential density will be the main topic for the May Workshop provided the P.C. has completed nonresidential density.

* * * * *

Chairman Graw asked if there was any further business. Hearing none, Bob Harbison made a motion to adjourn the workshop. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0. The workshop adjourned at 9:10 P.M.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF
FAYETTE COUNTY**

ATTEST:

**JIM GRAW
CHAIRMAN**

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