

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION met on September 1, 2011, at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Board of Commissioners Conference Room, First Floor, Fayetteville, Georgia.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tim Thoms, Chairman
Al Gilbert, Vice-Chairman
Bill Beckwith
Jim Graw
Douglas Powell

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Pete Frisina, Director of Community Development
Dennis Dutton, Zoning Administrator
Robyn S. Wilson, P.C. Secretary/Zoning Coordinator
Phyllis Williamson, P&Z Administrative Secretary

GUESTS: Dan Davis, Civil Engineer of ISE
Ken Ward, Representative for the Property Owner
Greg Copeland of Domokur Architects
Ms. Jean Peck, Executive Director for Camp Southern Ground

Welcome and Call to Order:

Chairman Thoms called the Public Meeting to order. He introduced the Board Members and Staff and confirmed there was a quorum present.

* * * * *

1. Consideration of the Public Hearing Minutes of the meeting held on August 4, 2011.

Chairman Thoms asked the Board Members if they had any comments or changes to the Minutes. Al Gilbert made the motion to approve the Minutes. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0. Members voting in favor of approval were: Chairman Thoms, Al Gilbert, Bill Beckwith, Jim Graw, and Doug Powell.

* * * * *

2. Consideration of the Public Meeting/Workshop Minutes of the meeting held on August 18, 2011.

Chairman Thoms asked the Board Members if they had any comments or changes to the Public Meeting/Workshop Minutes. Jim Graw made the motion to approve the Public Meeting/Workshop

**September 1, 2011
PC Public Hearing**

Minutes. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0. Members voting in favor of approval were: Chairman Thoms, Al Gilbert, Bill Beckwith, Jim Graw, and Doug Powell.

* * * * *

3. **Pre-Recommendation Meeting for discussion of the Development Plan and Summary of Intent from Camp Southern Ground, Owner, and Dan Davis of Integrated Science and Engineering, Agent, request to rezone 494.35 acres from A-R to PUD-PRL to develop a camp facility to serve approximately 300 people between the ages of 7 and 16 years of age and will consist of multiple buildings and outdoor activity areas, including but not limited to, facilities for reception, administration, first aid, lodging, dining, general education, culinary arts, swimming, outdoor adventures, equestrian and agricultural activities that will support and accommodate overnight stays, plus six (6) single-family lots proposed for future residences. This property is located in Land Lots 1 and 32 of the 5th District and Land Lots 1, 2, and 3 of the 7th District and fronts on Ebenezer Church Road, Arnold Road, and Green Meadow Lane.**

Pete Frisina advised the PC the Pre-Recommendation Meeting is required prior to submittal of a rezoning application for a PUD to allow the PC to ask questions and make recommendations. He added the proposed amendments to the PUD-PRL were adopted by the BOC. He reported the rezoning application will be submitted on October 1, 2011, by noon to be heard by the PC on November 3, 2011, and before the BOC on December 15, 2011.

Ken Ward introduced Greg Copeland of Domokur Architects, Ms. Jean Peck, Executive Director for Camp Southern Ground, and Dan Davis, Civil Engineer of ISE. He said a Local Advisory Council has been assembled for the camp which consists of local individuals in the county.

Greg Copeland stated the camp is being developed based on the property owner's vision for a children's camp that will mainstream both typical and special needs children through program activities that integrate the groups. A brochure regarding Camp South Ground was distributed. He verified the goal is to support up to 250 campers with 50 support staff/counselors for a total of 300. He said there is a special needs focus for a small number of children, which is a critical part of the camp. He added 15 acres is dedicated to the equestrian program. He stated there will be an entrance/arrival area, welcome center, centralized parking area because you will not be allowed to drive within the camp, a living zone, a dining hall, program zone with activity areas, a maintenance zone, staff housing, including the existing newly renovated house, and the equestrian zone. He added a number of lakes and ponds are proposed for stormwater management ponds and program

PC Public Hearing

aspects. He said the primary focus of the camp is for the summer; however, there may be potential for weekend use and group rentals, but not a lot of use during week days. He noted the camp proper encompasses approximately 60 acres of the 494 acres of land so the vast majority of land will remain natural, and under conservation and wetland easement.

Chairman Thoms asked for information on the storm water facilities shown on the plan.

Dan Davis explained he had been overly generous with the number of proposed stormwater management ponds and not all of them would be required. He said they will be utilized for water quality control as opposed to water quantity control.

Ken Ward explained currently the south half of the wetland is in a conservation easement created prior to the purchase of the subject property. He said he has had a discussion with the County Administrator about placing an additional conservation designation over the wetlands for wetland credits for the County.

Jean Peck stated it had not been decided if campers are going to be required to pay a fee; however, no child will be turned away.

Jim Graw asked how many horses were planned for the retreat, how many acres would be reserved for the horses, if lighting was planned in the equestrian area?

Jean Peek said she owned five (5) horses which would be utilized at the camp; however, there should be no more than 10 horses and some lighting in the equestrian area.

Jim Graw stated one (1) acre per horse would be appropriate and he would like it to be indicated in the plan. He requested the lighting be placed and focused in such a way as to not adversely impact any residential areas.

Greg Copeland confirmed there would be at least 10 acres of pasture land for the horses, one (1) acre per horse, which would be indicated on the Development Plan and in the Summary of Intent.

Al Gilbert asked if a time limit, such as 10:00 PM, could be established for outdoor night time activities.

Greg Copeland added the children should be in their cabins by 10:00 PM.

Ken Ward replied a time limit for outdoor night time activities should not be a problem.

Pete Frisina presented the following items for discussion:

1. Conceptual Site Plan needs to be labeled Development Plan for rezoning submittal.
2. Entrance off of Ebenezer Church Road - private road vs. private drive – labeling is reversed.
3. Private road and Arnold Road (cul-de-sac) require preliminary plat, construction plans, and final plat.
4. Private road needs to be built to county standards and owned by homeowner's/property owner's association.
5. Tract #2 needs 100 feet of road frontage or 50 feet of frontage on a cul-de-sac.
6. Tracts #3 and #4 need 50 feet of frontage on proposed cul-de-sac on Arnold Road and need to spell out emergency access control to Arnold Road in Summary of Intent - needs Fire and EMS approval – paved – show and/or address access control mechanism.
7. Tracts #5 and #6 need 50 feet of frontage on existing cul-de-sac on Green Meadow Lane and need public hearings to be added to the subdivision and should be included with the rezoning public hearings and this will need a revised final plat.

Pete Frisina confirmed with the applicants that these tracts would not contain any shared activities with the PRL and will be solely residential lots. He recommended that the A-R residential requirements be applied except when the PUD-PRL requirements are more restrictive.

Al Gilbert remarked these lots may be in a perfect location for a full time maintenance man or full time camp director.

Doug Powell questioned the need for two (2) driveways on tracts #3 and #4.

Pete Frisina explained there are requirements in the Development Regulations which must be met, addressing the permitting of shared driveways regulated by the County.

Doug Powell expressed concern that Tracts #5 and #6 are being rezoned PUD-PRL but will be made a part of Rountree Place Subdivision, an A-R subdivision, with access from Green Meadow Lane which seems inconsistent. He stated that these tracts had a greater relationship with the A-R subdivision than the PUD-PRL.

Page 5
September 1, 2011
PC Public Hearing

Robyn Wilson confirmed you can have two (2) different zoning districts within a subdivision.

Pete Frisina explained he and Ken Ward had discussed this issue and in order to exempt Tracts #5 and #6 from the proposed rezoning, the lots would have to be surveyed and a new legal description created which would be time consuming. He further stated the applicant doesn't know exactly where these property lines need to be at this point so he recommended that the residential lots in the PUD-PRL be regulated by the A-R residential requirements and this would be stipulated in the Summary of Intent. He added an application to add two (2) lots to Rountree Place Subdivision had previously been approved but the Final Plat was never revised; however, this previous application was for larger lots in a different location on the subject property. He pointed out public hearings to add the lots to the subdivision will be held concurrently with the rezoning public hearings, but will require separate votes.

Ken Ward stated that the proposed lots were part of the proposed PUD property, currently under the same ownership, and due to their location in relation to the wetlands, they are more conducive to residential lots, not retreat uses, and it is the intent to restrict the lots to A-R residential requirements. He further stated that by bringing the entire tract in for rezoning at once it lets everyone know their full intentions for the property.

Doug Powell again expressed concern that Tracts #5 and #6 are being rezoned PUD-PRL but will be made a part of Rountree Place Subdivision, an A-R subdivision, and he thought it has the potential to cause problems or confusion in the future.

Bill Beckwith asked if the property owners in Rountree Place Subdivision had been contacted.

Jean Peck replied the property owners in Rountree Place Subdivision had been contacted.

8. Expand farm? – Organic farm area for PUD - The buffer should be maintained and not used for farming.

Ken Ward clarified the organic farm would not be expanded but the camp will have its own organic farm.

9. Label all buildings in terms of use.

10. Tracts #1 – #6 – are to be rezoned to PRL - do they have a relationship with the PRL (shared uses?) If not, the uses and restrictions on these residential tracts need to be strictly defined in the summary of intent – need to be A-R uses and restrictions – where the PUD requirements

Page 6
September 1, 2011
PC Public Hearing

are greater those requirements will be met on tracts #1 – #6 (perimeter buffer – no structure within 150 of an existing abutting road.)

11. Pool on tract #1 in buffer- needs variance to remain or will have to be removed.
12. Cell Tower – fall zone 180 feet – try to move courts to other side of pool – who owns and maintains the tower – what access provisions will they need?
13. What is the plan to keep cars from lining Ebenezer Road waiting to get into the camp during drop-off and pickup? - need a discussion of traffic control in Summary of Intent.

Pete Frisina expressed concern about controlling the traffic for pick-up and drop-off so cars do not end up backing up on Ebenezer Church Road.

Greg Copeland said the entry road is approximately 2,400 feet long before entering the camp. He stated in-days and out-days are the big days for traffic which can be sequenced over a three (3) hour period. He added children may also be bused into the camp. He remarked the parents are usually there for approximately one (1) hour. He added during the week traffic would be minimal and the staff cars will remain in the secondary parking lot in the maintenance area during the week.

Pete Frisina stated a gate will be placed somewhere in the entrance area for the security and safety needs of the camp and that creates the point where cars will begin to line up. He pointed out proposed Tract #2 needs to have clear ingress/egress on the proposed private road to Ebenezer Church Road and not be hindered by cars lining up to get in the camp.

Doug Powell stated Tract #2 is currently vacant and asked if the current driveway serving Tract #1 would remain on Ebenezer Church Road?

Ken Ward said they were evaluating whether the driveway for Tract #1 would remain on Ebenezer Church Road or access the new road, but the final decision had not been made yet.

Jim Graw commented if cars are lining up at the entrance, emergency vehicles need to have clear access to the camp.

Ken Ward confirmed there are two (2) accesses to the camp with a cul-de-sac planned for the end of Arnold Road, which is intended to have a controlled access for emergency vehicles. He advised he had already met with Fire and EMS and the Sheriff's Department about the requirements and utilization for the security gate on Arnold Road.

Page 7
September 1, 2011
PC Public Hearing

Doug Powell asked if a parking lot had been considered for Tract #2.

Ken Ward stated a parking lot is not being considered for Tract #2. He presented a traffic analysis for the project. He noted Ebenezer Church Road is a two-lane road with a speed limit of 45 mph; however, a left turn lane, a right turn lane, deceleration/acceleration lane will not be required. He presented two (2) photographs taken along Ebenezer Church Road in an east and west direction, and stated the need to remove some of the tree limbs to ensure adequate sight distance is provided.

Jim Graw and Doug Powell advised sufficient turn around areas should be installed with the security gates. Jim Graw also asked about emergency vehicle access through these main entrance gates.

Ken Ward acknowledged turn around areas would be accommodated and that they had met with emergency services and police and they would have access through an automated system that would respond to the siren.

Chairman Thoms asked for clarification on how detailed the Development Plan needs to be.

Ken Ward said the Development Plan will depict the general layout of the camp and the County will make a determination if this is an acceptable land use for the area. As the property is being developed detailed plans will be reviewed by staff for the final design and the details will be worked out at that time based on County regulations.

Al Gilbert stated if major changes are made to the land use pattern in the development, those changes would need to go back through the public hearing process for approval.

It was the consensus of the PC that, as long as, the issues were recognized, such as traffic control, emergency access, etc., and that the Development Plan and/or Summary of Intent made reference to the issues noting that solutions would come about through the site plan process that they felt this was appropriate. However, any major changes to the overall land use pattern in the development should come back through the public hearing process for approval.

14. Consider a perimeter setback for structures on the retreat portion– suggest a 100 from perimeter property line or 25 from perimeter buffer.

Pete Frisina pointed out most of the zoning districts require a buffer, when applicable, plus a setback measured from the buffer.

Ken Ward stated he did not feel a setback is necessary because everything is clustered within the subject property.

Page 8
September 1, 2011
PC Public Hearing

The PC concurred a setback is not necessary if the buffer will be a planted buffer for screening purposes.

Chairman Thoms stated he would like to see planting in the buffer that exceeds the minimum planting standards.

Ken Ward said they would agree to supplemental plantings within the buffer, where needed, due to the lack of existing vegetation to help screen the adjacent property owners from the camp.

Chairman Thoms requested the applicant to indicate the existing tree coverage area and the intent to save specimen trees.

15. Required parking shall meet all applicable requirements – need basis for number of parking spaces from land planner.

Greg Copeland said he had designed a number of other camps, one with a capacity of 220 with 40 parking spaces, another with a capacity of 300 with 73 parking spaces, another with a capacity of 800 with 83 parking spaces, and another with a capacity of 400 with 66 parking spaces, so the 98 parking spaces proposed for the camp should be overly sufficient. He stated field space could be utilized temporarily on drop-off and pick-up days. He added a turn around for cars entering the camp which should not be entering the camp will be developed.

Jim Graw asked if street lights would be provided and plans should include a way to minimize the impact on the surrounding properties.

Bill Beckwith stated some lighting would be necessary for traffic especially at the turn around locations.

Greg Copeland replied low level, low lighting, directional and pedestrian type lighting would be utilized.

Jim Graw recommended the Summary of Intent indicate that the circular drive, pedestrian paths, and parking areas be lit with low level lighting for safety purposes, and any lighting utilized in the equestrian area be oriented in a manner that does not impact any surrounding residential areas.

Bill Beckwith brought up the subject of the cell tower on the site.

Page 9
September 1, 2011
PC Public Hearing

Pete Frisina stated when it was discovered that a cell tower was already of the site, the ordinance amendments included a provision for a cell tower in the PUD-PRL zoning district. He said the plan

showed activity courts within the fall zone of the tower and he recommended moving them outside of the fall zone.

Greg Copeland said moving the activity courts would not be a problem.

Chairman Thoms asked how the access would be provided to the tower.

Ken Ward said the tower company has access to the tower from Arnold Road and that would be maintained during the construction of the camp. However, in the future the camp would like to work out access to the tower through the entrance gate for security purposes.

Pete Frisina said it was mentioned earlier that the camp was planned for about 250 campers and 50 staff and he asked if that was the maximum number the camp would reach.

Greg Copeland stated the camp would not start at that number but would work up to it over time.

Chairman Thoms recommended the Summary of Intent reflect this number so an increase in the number of campers and staff which could impact traffic, for example, has to come back through the process for approval.

Ken Ward said a limit on the number of campers and staff would not be a problem so that an expansion of the camp would go back through the public hearing process.

Chairman Thoms asked if an architectural theme had been chosen.

Greg Copeland replied the buildings will probably be very contemporary, reflective of the site itself, be designed to be fun for the kids, and focused around sustainable design with green architecture; however, no decision has been reached regarding how the buildings will ultimately look. He said he would prepare artist renderings of the proposed typical buildings.

Jean Peck said a tour of other camps is being planned but it would be difficult to pin down the architectural designs for the proposed buildings in a month.

Pete Frisina stated architectural drawings would be required for the rezoning submittal.

Chairman Thoms asked if green building principals would be utilized in the development such as LEED standards.

Page 10
September 1, 2011
PC Public Hearing

Greg Copeland said they were going to strive to meet LEED standards but would not be LEED certified due to the expense.

Chairman Thoms asked if this could be in the Summary of Intent so these standards are met.

Jim Graw asked what would be some of the things you would do with LEED standards.

Ken Ward said they would capture rainwater and use it for irrigation of certain areas, minimize pavement, minimize run-off, and construct an environmental center.

Al Gilbert stated he didn't want to lock them into these strict standards and did not want to regulate to that extent.

Ken Ward remarked language would be added to the Summary of Intent to state they are striving to meet LEED standards and list what is being planned. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that only those items that can be achieved be put in the Summary of Intent.

Al Gilbert asked if the camp could also be utilized for training for corporations.

Greg Copeland replied training for corporations could be a possibility on a day use basis in the off season.

Chairman Thoms asked if a fund raising event could be held at the camp and is it allowed in the zoning district.

Pete Frisina recommended Mr. Ward indicate in the Summary of Intent that the camp may also be utilized for adult group retreats and fund raising events.

Chairman Thoms asked if the adjacent property owners had been advised about the proposed camp.

Pete Frisina pointed out the area along Arnold Road contained residences that are the closest to the site.

Jean Peck replied the adjacent property owners had been advised about the proposed camp and none are opposed.

Chairman Thoms said the PC is very pleased with the proposed objectives and the camp will be a great service to the county.

Page 11
September 1, 2011
PC Public Hearing

Pete Frisina asked for clarification from the PC on the level of architectural drawings that will be required from the applicant. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that the general architectural character of the proposed structures needs to be submitted with the rezoning application

and the applicant needs to be aware that those general architectural styles will have to be reflective of the structures proposed for the site.

Ken Ward thanked the PC and staff for their time and consideration.

* * * * *

Chairman Thoms asked if there was any further business.

Pete Frisina reminded the P.C. of the Public Meeting/Workshop scheduled for Thursday, September 15, 2011, in the Board of Commissioners Conference Room, First Floor at 7:00 P.M.

There being no further business, Bill Beckwith made the motion to adjourn the Public Hearing. The motion for adjournment unanimously passed 5-0. Members voting in favor of adjournment were: Chairman Thoms, Al Gilbert, Bill Beckwith, Jim Graw, and Doug Powell. The Public Hearing adjourned at 9:16 P.M.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF
FAYETTE COUNTY**

ATTEST:

**TIM THOMS
CHAIRMAN**

**ROBYN S. WILSON
SECRETARY**