

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION met on October 5, 2017 at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Fayetteville, Georgia.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Haren, Chairman
Jim Graw
Danny England
Al Gilbert

MEMBERS ABSENT: John H. Culbreth, Sr., Vice-Chairman

STAFF PRESENT: Pete Frisina, Director of Community Services
Chanelle Blaine, Zoning Administrator
Patrick Stough, County Attorney

Welcome and Call to Order:

Chairman Haren called the Planning Commission Meeting to order. Chairman Haren introduced the Commission Members and Staff.

* * * * *

1. Consideration of the Minutes of the meeting held on September 21, 2017.

Al Gilbert made a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting held on September 21, 2017. Jim Graw seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0. John Culbreth was absent from the meeting.

Chairman Haren stated that we are one (1) member short all though we can still have a quorum even though we do not have a full board you still have the option if you so wish to request a tabling of your petition until the next public hearing. He said as we bring you forward for each of the petitions I'll ask you state publicly whether you wish to table it or continue with it and bring it forward.

PUBLIC HEARING

2. Consideration of Petition No. T-020-17, Verizon Wireless, Owner, and Jenna E. Lee, Agent, request a reduction of the requirements of Sec. 110-150. Standards for Telecommunications Antennas and Towers to develop a 185 foot Monopole Telecommunication Tower. The request is to reduce the tower separation requirement of one (1) statute mile to .7 miles. This property is located in Land Lot 129 of the 4th District and fronts on SR 85 and 85 Hwy Connector.

Chairman Haren asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of the petition.

Jenna Lee stated I am here on behalf of Verizon Wireless the applicant.

Chairman Haren asked do you wish to table or continue on with the petition.

Jenna Lee stated I wish to continue.

Chairman Haren said thank you and go ahead.

Jenna Lee stated I am here on behalf of Verizon Wireless the applicant for this matter. She said before you I passed out a physical copy of the presentation that we have up on the screen. She added that the packet before you gives you a brief outline of the property and the proposed tower and also the need for the proposed tower. She stated that the first slide is just some background information that provides statistics on the increasing demand and use for cell phones. She said as you all know we are increasing relying on our cell phones and mobile devices not only for phone calls but for gps, navigation, email, text, and most importantly emergency phone calls. She added this slide just gives you some statistics that are just stunning about the number of citizens that rely on cell phones for every day communication. She stated that the second slide provides an overview of the project as Pete mentioned on the summary Verizon is proposing a 185 foot tower with a five (5) foot lightening rod and it's located at the corner of Highway 85 Connector and Highway 85. She said the property is a little over 20 acres in size and is currently used by a nursery. She added typically under the County's ordinance a cell tower in this location would be administratively reviewed, but because our propose tower is less than one (1) mile from an existing tower we are before you to seek approval. She stated as it states on this slide the closest existing tower is .7 miles away and I will tell you a little bit more about that as we move through. She said the next slide is an aerial of the property it just gives you an idea of the placement of the tower on the site. She added the resolution isn't wonderful but as you can tell it's a heavily wooded site and the tower is placed on the site in a location to screen its view from adjacent right-of-ways. She stated we have some photos at the end that will show that. She said moving on to the next slide now we're getting into a few slides that are going to show you the need for the tower and why the existing tower that is .7 miles away won't work. She added that this slide shows a few of Verizon existing towers that are in this general part of the County, and Verizon's radio frequency engineers would describe this proposed site as a capacity site which means unlike some very rural areas where you might plant a tower just to improve coverage where there is no coverage in that part of the county or area; this tower is a little bit more complicated in that its actually needed to improve capacity of Verizon's other towers in the network. She stated all of these existing towers on this map are at capacity and one (1) or more of the antennas on those towers have already exceeded capacity. She said the result is that you have dropped calls, you have slower data speeds, and just in general poorer quality service in this area. She added we really wanted to narrow in on the portion of the search area that the engineers are actually trying to target; this portion of Highway 85 there is a lot of topography and terrain in this part of the County, and so this segment right here is under served and service is poor and as you know this is a highly traveled corridor in the County and so they are trying to target a specific area. She stated the placement of the tower is strategic in trying to offset those existing towers and then improve capacity, but also provide improvements to this part of Highway 85. She said this slide shows the existing tower; you can see that it is east of our proposed site along the Highway 85 Connector. She added I will have some more slides showing this but Verizon's radio frequency engineers looked at this tower very closely to see if there is anyway if Verizon could mount antennas on this tower instead of building a new tower and it just doesn't work to provide the improvements needed on Highway 85. She stated this map is very basic it shows coverage in the area without the site, the red is the area with poor

coverage and green is better coverage. She said the next slide shows this general area with the tower you see its greener; the next one again just to hammer that home you see on the left coverage without the site on the right coverage with the site and it gets better with the site, significantly better. She added if you look carefully you can see that it improves along that Highway 85 corridor pretty significantly. She stated these slides get a little more in the weeds; this shows the coverage improvements if we co-located antennas on that existing tower that's located .7 miles away; so you see that this not only shifts the new point of service away from those existing towers that are at capacity, but it would also shift at coverage area too far east from the Highway 85 corridor. She said on the next slide the radio frequency engineers prepared a couple of diagrams to explain why that is; why the co-location isn't effective in this area, the first one (1) shows that there is a lot of what they call clutter and terrain (clutter is trees and terrain is hills). She added there are a lot of topography in this area that blocks/interfere with signals given the existing towers height and location if Verizon mounted their antennas on top of that tower the signal from Verizon's antennas wouldn't be able to clear the conditions of this area to meet the service improvement needs along Highway 85 corridor. She stated that these diagrams show that with our preferred location the antenna height and placement can clear that topography. She said the next slide shows the actual impact on that stretch of Highway 85 that Verizon is targeting the first one (1) shows the red part shows what they would qualify as excellent service improves significantly, but if you look at the second square on the bottom if we were to co-locate on the bottom there's not as much improvement and that's of the LTE coverage. She added the next page is a lot of in the weeds information but it's helpful to illustrate a small shift in location and actually has a pretty big impact in this case; so, this one (1) shows AWS coverage with the propose tower and you will see that the red and green are the excellent and good coverage and that is significantly improved on Highway 85 if you look at the bottom one (1) there is zero excellent coverage and very little good coverage. She stated one (1) more slide this is just a general slide that Verizon's Engineers use that shows users demand; so this is just a snap shot in time that shows all the users on the network in that geography at a given time. She said the next couple of slides are some of the most important slides; we flew a balloon at the site, several times at the location. She added Verizon flew the balloon and produced these what we call photo sims, that show rendered where the tower is on the site to give you an idea of what the view would be from adjacent right-of-way. She stated that you can see as we flip through; the first two (2) slides you can see that there is no view from the right-of-way; the third slide is 2,560 feet west of the site and you can tell and it might be difficult to see but there is a tiny part right in the center right a little bit where you can see the antennas sticking out over the trees; the fourth slide shows no visibility of the tower. She said we appreciate your time and I would take any questions that you may have.

Chairman Haren asked if anyone present would like to speak against this petition. Hearing none, he asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of the petition. He asked any questions from the Planning Commission.

Al Gilbert stated I know a lot of people went by and could not spot the balloon because of the trees; what are you plans on trying to conserve trees in that area.

Jenna Lee replied that there is no plan to cut trees that aren't critical to cut to place the tower

there. She stated Verizon leases a very small area from property owners so Verizon would have no say in what the property owner says with their trees. She added that Verizon has no attention of cutting trees beyond what is necessary to place the tower on the site.

Chairman stated you said that this tower will improve capacity; how long do you estimate before this tower is at saturation.

Jenna Lee replied that's not a question that you can easily answer. She stated it would depend on a lot of things; how much users intend to use their phones while traveling in and around this area and I honestly don't know if there is an answer to that question. She said the network is constantly changing and the demands are constantly changing and increasing. She added the statistics at the beginning of the presentation illustrate each year we update those statistics and monitor them and there just creeping up year after year; so as demand increases that burden on the network grows. She stated that there isn't a firm time line I can say, hopefully for quite a while.

Chairman Haren asked if you do need to increase capacity in that location what would Verizon do; would they try to locate another tower or would they try to put more antenna.

Jenna Lee replied by far the amount of work Verizon does is swapping and upgrading antennas; so, Pete probably sees weekly applications to modify antennas maybe not Pete but the building department. She stated that building towers are a last resort that Verizon would work to upgrade antennas on all of their existing towers. She said this tower is design to accommodate other users so; other users would also co-locate on this tower to increase their own networks.

Jim Graw stated that this area as you are probably are aware of has a lot of historical significance to the County, and I'm not sure but would assume that Verizon has looked at other sites in the area that could accomplish your needs; could you tell me where in general those other sites are.

Jenna Lee stated I think our application package had our radio frequency engineer prepare an affidavit and we had a radio frequency report that had some more detail. She said that she doesn't know specifics and I can't tell you exact sites that they looked at, but again this geography and search area is unique because of the topography and terrain and because they are targeting this segment of Highway 85 that has poor service. She added that they looked at other properties in the area that could meet the service needs.

Jim Graw interjected how far away is the next site you could put the tower that would give you the coverage that you need for this area.

Jenna Lee replied there is not an existing tower that would give us that coverage.

Jim Graw asked there is no other place for the tower

Jenna Lee asked an existing tower or another site.

Jim Graw clarified a new site for a new tower.

Jenna Lee stated I don't know the answer to that question; you know there are a lot of factors that go into choosing and selecting a site primarily the site that will provide the most improvement, and so frankly there may not be another site. She said Verizon's engineers have the ability to target very accurately the best place to place it; and from that geography they then look around for properties that are either usually zoned appropriately for a tower; that's one of the major limiting factors, and another limiting factor is the use on the property and the property owners willingness to have a tower on their property and then topography and terrain challenges. She added in this case there is very little wiggle room because of the topography and terrain and because of the specific area we are trying to target and improve.

Jim Graw replied thank you.

Chairman Haren stated you understand we are not the approving authority we just recommend approval or disapproval.

Jenna Lee replied I do.

Chairman Haren asked any other questions. He stated if there are no questions can I have a motion.

Al Gilbert made a motion to recommend approval of Petition T-020-17. Danny England seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0. John Culbreth was absent from the meeting.

3. **Consideration of Petition No. 1269-17, Michelle Camper, Patrick Camper, Howell Richardson, and Melissa Phillips, Owners, and Randy Boyd, Agent, request to rezone 8.935 acres from A-R to O-I to develop an Educational Facility for gymnastics, cheerleading & dance. This property is located in Land Lot 39 of the 7th District and fronts on SR 54.**

Pete Frisina said Petitions 1269-17 and PR-064-17 are related and could be discussed together but they would need separate motions.

Randy Boyd said he would like to proceed with the rezoning request. He said the subject property was the Katheryn A Smith estate and is within the old H.L Newton subdivision plat recorded in 1965. He added the subject property consists of two lots, a 4.544 acre lot and a 4.391 acre lot that add up to 8.935. He stated the subject property is within the SR 54 Overlay District and Overlay Zone and is currently zoned A-R. He said the request is to rezone to O-I to develop an Educational Facility called the Gym Sports Academy for gymnastics, cheerleading & dance. He added the site plan indicates a gymnasium type building that is 100 feet by 220 feet which is 22,000 square foot building that requires 167 parking spaces. He stated the impervious area is about 2.68 acres or about 30 percent of the subject property and the existing house will be removed for the development of the property. He added that property to the east is zoned O-I,

property to the north and west is zoned A-R and to the southeast property is zoned O-I. He said Gym Sports has two co-owners, Igor Nechay and Marina Romanova. He stated their present facility is located in Tyrone and is about 10,000 square feet and they need to expand. He added the business is open Monday thru Thursday from 9:30 am to 7:30 pm and open Saturday 11:30am to 1:00pm and also run camps in the summer. He said this was a unique situation where he was able to visit the existing facility to see how it functioned and see the kids participating. He said their mission statement is to develop healthy, happy and confident children by improving the child's physical development in a positive, progressive and safe learning environment. He added that for the record he has letters of support from the property owner's to the west and a petition of support with 182 signatures.

Al Gilbert asked randy Boyd if he was aware of the recommended condition.

Randy Boyd said they were in agreement with the recommended condition.

Al Gilbert said he would read the condition into the record as follows: That the minor revision to the final plat be submitted and approved prior to the submittal on the site plan.

Chairman Haren asked if there anyone who would like to speak in favor of the petition.

Ilene Craner said she has been a resident of Fayette County for 11 years and customer of Gym Sports Academy for over nine years and she is here tonight with several others to support the petition to build a bigger facility in a more centralized location with adequate parking. She added that a larger facility would accommodate equipment and more stations thus achieving a higher intensity of instruction for all age groups. She stated the level of instruction provided by Gym Sports is in high demand and due to their current smaller facility there is a waiting list. She said this new larger facility and parking will allow Gym Sports to fill this demand. She stated that she had two children that attended Gym Sports and it is a great program.

Chairman Haren asked if there anyone who would like to speak in opposition of the petition. Hearing none he said he would bring it back to board.

Danny England asked if the owners had looked for any existing buildings that would meet their needs.

Randy Boyd said he did not know but the owners really want to build something that is designed for them and their academy.

Jim Graw asked if these two nonconforming lots are legal.

Pete Frisina said the lots were nonconforming.

Jim Graw asked if they are legal lots.

Pete Frisina said nonconforming means they are legal.

David Hughes said he will be the builder on the project and he and the owners had searched for both existing building and property and this property meets the owner's needs for the academy. He added that the business owners have a property in Peachtree City but it will not meet their needs for the facility they have in mind.

Jim Graw made a motion to recommend approval of Petition 1269-17 with one (1) condition. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0. John Culbreth was absent from the meeting.

4. **Consideration of Petition No. RP-064-17, Michelle Camper, Patrick Camper, Howell Richardson, and Melissa Phillips, Owners, and Randy Boyd, Agent, request to revise the Final Plat of Survey for H.L Newton to change the use on the property. This property is located in Land Lot 39 of the 7th District and fronts on SR 54.**

Al Gilbert made a motion to recommend approval of Petition RP-064-17. Danny England seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0. John Culbreth was absent from the meeting.

5. **Consideration of amendments to Chapter 110. Zoning Ordinance, regarding Sec. 110-79. - Accessory structures and uses.**

Pete Frisina said the amendments were the same as was presented in the last workshop with the exception of the definition of "Footprint." He stated that based on comments from the last Planning Commission meeting he had added language stating that Footprint would also include the area beneath a supported or cantilevered lean-to attached to the structure or building.

Chairman Haren asked if there anyone who would like to speak in favor of the petition. Hearing none he asked if there anyone who would like to speak in opposition of the petition. Hearing none he said he would bring it back to board.

Danny England made a motion to recommend approval of the amendments. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0. John Culbreth was absent from the meeting.

6. **Consideration of amendments to Chapter 110. Zoning Ordinance, regarding Sec. 110-149. - Planned Unit Development concerning Planned Residential and Business Development-Planned Unit Development (PRBD-PUD) zoning district.**

Pete Frisina said the amendments were the same as was presented in the last workshop.

Chairman Haren asked if there anyone who would like to speak in favor of the petition. Hearing none he asked if there anyone who would like to speak in opposition of the petition. Hearing none he said he would bring it back to board.

Jim Graw said that the couple who started the Planning Commission on the path of developing the PUD-PRBD is no longer interested in developing the property on Sandy Creek Rd. for residential/ business purposes and I feel there is no need to continue pursuing it. He also stated that I have made my

objections known on many occasions and there was no reason for me to go through them again since they are on the record.

Al Gilbert made a motion to recommend approval of the amendments. Danny England seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1. Jim Graw voted in opposition and John Culbreth was absent from the meeting.

Danny England made a motion to adjourn. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0. John Culbreth was absent from the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
OF
FAYETTE COUNTY**



BRIAN HAREN, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:


