

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION met on November 19, 2015 at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Fayetteville, Georgia.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Graw, Chairman
Brian Haren, Vice-Chairman
John H. Culbreth
Al Gilbert
Arnold Martin, III

STAFF PRESENT: Pete Frisina, Director of Community Services
Dennis Dutton, Zoning Administrator
Chanelle Blaine, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
Patrick Stough, County Attorney

Welcome and Call to Order:

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

* * * * *

1. Consideration of the Minutes of the Meeting held on November 5, 2015.

Al Gilbert made a motion to approve the minutes. John Culbreth seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS

2. Consideration of a Minor Subdivision Plat of the Michael Mask Estate for Michael Mask consists of 2 single-family residential lots on 11.086 acres. The property is located in Land Lots 134 & 135 of the 4th District and fronts on Old Greenville Road.

Dennis Dutton stated that this was a Minor Subdivision Plat for a gentleman out of Gainesville, Georgia Mr. Michael Mask. He said that Mr. Mask was requesting to divide the tract into two (2) lots. He added that one is going to be sold for the construction of a single family home. He stated that Mr. Mask meets all the requirements needed for a Minor Subdivision Plat. He asked the board if they had any questions.

Chairman Graw asked what the contiguous area is for A-R.

Dennis Dutton replied two (2) acres.

Chairman Graw asked if there was anyone who would like to speak to the technical aspects. He then asked if the Planning Commission if they had any comments.

Brian Haren asked if the 40 foot easement on one (1) of the parcels is not included in the contiguous area.

Dennis Dutton replied that the triangle just outside is not included in the contiguous area.

Brian Haren asked if the easement was legally owned by the utility company.

Dennis Dutton replied that per his conversation with Al Gaskins there was nothing indicating that a deed was specifically recorded for this easement.

Brian Haren asked if there was a deed recorded would that make these two (2) separate parcels.

Dennis Dutton replied no.

Chairman Graw asked if the easement was still owned by Lot one (1) owner.

Dennis Dutton replied yes.

Chairman Graw asked if there were any problems caused by not having the deed to the easement.

Dennis Dutton replied that they could go back to the power company and have them record a deed. He added that a benefit of an easement is it prevents anybody from building in that area.

Chairman Graw asked if it caused any problems to the property owner.

Dennis Dutton stated that it's not cutting the property in half like it did for a previous homeowner. He said that homeowner did some research and was able to get the utility company to come out and state that the line was no longer active.

Arnold Martin asked what the names on the map referenced.

Dennis Dutton replied they represent different types of soils. He added that the soils would accommodate a septic system. He said that a soils map is required when applying for a subdivision plat.

Arnold Martin asked if there were certain soils that were not allowed.

Dennis Dutton replied that the soil scientist is labeling the suitable soil.

Al Gilbert interjected that the Environmental Health Department will give reports on soils to let the Planning Commission know which ones are good or bad.

Chairman Graw asked if there were any questions. He then asked for a motion.

Brian Haren made a motion to approve the minor subdivision plat. Arnold Martin seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

3. Consideration of a Minor Subdivision Plat of Brent Fayette, LLC for Brent Fayette, LLC consists of 9 single-family residential lots on 65.16 acres. The property is located in Land Lots 199 of the 4th District and fronts on Snead Road.

Chairman Graw asked if there were any questions from the public. Hearing none he then brought it back to the Planning Commission.

Chairman Graw asked why Lot number eight (8) doesn't have the special flood hazard area and the minimum finished floor elevation like Lot number nine (9).

Donna Black said there is not a special flood hazard area for Lot number (8). She added that the new ordinance states the minimum finished floor elevation must be added to the adjacent property, and it will be added to the plat that is recorded.

Chairman Graw then asked if there were any other questions.

Chairman Graw asked for a motion.

Brian Haren made a motion to approve the minor subdivision plat. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

- 4. Discussion of Amendments to the Fayette County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 110. Article V., Sec. 110-169. Conditional use approval., to eliminate buffers between the following Conditional Uses in a residential or A-R zoning district: Cemetery, human or pet, Child care facility, Church and/or other place of worship, College and/or university, Hospital, Private school, or Recreation centers owned by nonprofit organizations as so registered with the Georgia Secretary of State Office.**

Chairman Graw asked if anyone from the public would like to speak to this. Hearing none he brought it back to the Planning Commission.

Dennis Dutton stated this was a change to the ordinance for two (2) non-residential uses on residential property that abut each other. He added this ordinance change will allow schools, churches, etc. to remove buffers only on the sides that are adjacent to those two (2) properties. He asked the Planning Commission to make a recommendation for approval or denial to the Board of Commissioners.

Chairman Graw stated that the Planning Commission made the recommendation for the ordinance change over a month ago. He said the Board of Commissioners had some questions and sent it back to the Planning Commissioners for a relook. He added that the Planning Commission has relooked and has removed three (3) uses from the ordinance. He then asked Pete Frisina what the three (3) uses were.

Pete Frisina replied care-home, convalescent center, and nursing home.

Chairman Graw stated that they were taken out of the ordinance change.

Pete Frisina stated that three (3) uses were not in the original proposal and that they were in a different part of the ordinance. He said he added it in as a suggestion but the Planning Commission felt better with it taken out.

Chairman Graw asked if Patrick Stough had any comments to make.

Patrick Stough stated that the Planning Commission needs to be careful of chipping away too much of its conditional uses by creating exceptions to those conditions in certain situations. He added that it may be an issue with this particular change but if you continue to add exceptions like that it will undermine all of your conditions not just the ones we're changing now.

John Culbreth asked for an example on how the conditions will impact others.

Patrick Stough replied that the way conditions usually work is all you have to do is meet the conditions then you will get the use. He stated that what they're doing here is saying you have to meet the conditions unless

you meet this situation, and then you don't have to meet this particular condition. He added that he could not give a particular situation but it's more like a general undermining of the conditional use.

Pete Frisina stated that this has been talked about for a number of years, and that there are certain situations where these two (2) things meet. He said he understood Patrick's concern where someone can come back and say; they got an exception I want an exception. He added that it always puts us in a vulnerable position to treat something differently, but we need to find some way to not apply buffers. He stated that Dennis Dutton had written something under the General Provisions that would have been a wider scope. He added that it would have applied to buffers in every zoning category even in the industrial and other non-residential districts. He said by using this ordinance change they have brought it back in and have become very surgical in the approach.

Arnold Martin asked how other jurisdictions were handling this exact scenario.

Dennis Dutton said in one County in particular that he worked in they did not have buffers only setbacks. He also added that the cities were the same way. He said some cities he worked in had green belts, corridors, or a special buffer. He stated that Powder Springs was the closest one by putting requiring buffers.

John Culbreth asked what would be the impact if this was not approved.

Dennis Dutton replied that there is a church wanting to sell five (5) acres of its property to a school. He said the way the property is being cut creates a hardship for the church's property because they're cutting and reducing their buffer on that side, as well as, increasing the buffer and setback for the school.

Pete Frisina said it would be impossible for them to do it.

John Lee with Konos Academy stated that it shrinks the usable space by increasing the buffer and setback on each side.

Pete Frisina said they also had a building on the church site that couldn't meet it either once you subdivided the lot.

Chairman Graw asked what does this do to the current buffers between like uses.

Pete Frisina replied that it would technically eliminate them.

Chairman Graw asked if you can have parking within the current buffers.

Pete Frisina replied no

Chairman Graw asked what can be done within the buffers.

Pete Frisina replied you can have a walking trail, some of your storm water and septic can be used in the buffers, but you can't have any of the impervious surfaces.

Chairman Graw said if the ordinance change is approved by the commission the buffer would be eliminated. He asked if the church could expand by putting parking in the back.

Pete Frisina replied yes, but there would be a 50 feet setback that would allow for parking but no built structures can go in the setback.

Dennis Dutton said that church and the school would be separated by at least 100 feet instead of the 200 feet.

Chairman Graw asked if the uses could only put parking in that buffer zone.

Pete Frisina said within the setback not the buffer.

Arnold Martin asked if we are qualifying both the church and school as churches.

Dennis Dutton replied that they're both allowed in A-R district and are called non-residential uses.

Arnold Martin asked if there were any future impact for the school if they wanted to develop a church on the lot.

Pete Frisina replied that you can have a church and a school on the same property. He said it only becomes an issue when you want to divide the property.

Al Gilbert made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendments. Arnold Martin seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Pete Frisina stated the issues we have with conditional uses is that we try to keep them as strict as possible. He added that variances are not allowed for conditional uses. He said if variances were allowed for conditional uses they would be done on a case by case basis. He stated that the you want to create an ordinance that stands and does a good job but there needs to be somewhere in the ordinance that allows for these things to happen. He said that the ordinance could be changed to say that people could get a variance through the ZBA for conditional uses. He added that staff has always made minute changes to the ordinance instead of allowing variances for conditional uses.

Al Gilbert said over the years some churches request a variance for two (2) feet to put a building in.

Pete Frisina stated that the only churches eligible to go to the ZBA are those that are grandfathered and are non-conforming that can't meet any of these conditions. He added that these churches where here before the conditional uses. He said that there are non-conforming use, structure, or lot mechanisms that allow them to go before the ZBA because they have no other options.

Chairman Graw asked if these churches can take whatever it needs to before the ZBA, just not a variance.

Pete Frisina replied yes.

Patrick Stough asked if a church was in a district that considered it a conditional use could it come before the ZBA for a setback issue.

Pete Frisina replied no we don't allow them to apply. He said in the section of the ZBA it states we cannot allow a variance for lot size, lot width, road frontage, or any uses within the conditional use.

OLD BUSINESS

5. Discussion of the SR 85 and SR 74 intersection.

Pete Frisina said that he is trying to figure out how we're going to control the architecture. He said originally he had it when people came into rezone they would have to bring in elevation drawings, and these drawings would have to be reviewed by Staff, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Commissioners to see if they meet the architecture criteria set by the Zoning Ordinance. He stated he would like to craft the overlay district in such a way that allows the review to be done administratively. He said he would like to know their reaction to that. He then states that the commercial structures in the highway overlays are to look residential. He added that the residential look is to have a pitch roof, certain facades, and doors and windows with a grid pattern. He said that the reviews are all done administratively. He stated that what he is trying to do here is a little bit more specific.

Pete Frisina asked the Planning Commission to turn to page 20. He stated that transom, mullion, muntin, parapet wall, clapboard siding, and cornice are all terms that he will be using and will be a part of the requirements. He said section four (4) *Architectural Forms and Standards* talks about maintaining the historical and aesthetic character of the area. He stated that Starr's Mill is one (1) of the main structures here and it gives a little information about it. He added that he talks about two (2) other architectural styles that are reminiscent of this period, the One-Part Commercial Block and the Two-Part Commercial Block. He said the single story could be found on the square in Fayetteville and is called a One-Part Commercial Block and similar with multi-stories is called a Two-Part Commercial Block; the storefronts being the one (1) part and the upper level being two (2) part regardless to how many floors are on top.

Pete Frisina stated that Starr's Mill will be a building of influence and one of the architectural styles that we would allow for somebody to build. He said that it doesn't have to look like Starr's Mill, but we are going to pick the architectural characteristics of the mill and use them as a guide. He stated that the under Architectural Forms and Standards is a subsection (a) for the Starr's Mill that describes the structure and the materials used to construct it. He added that in the section it says the structure sits on a stacked stone pillar foundation. He then asked the Planning Commission is that something they would like to consider as an option; he also mentioned that no one does stacked stone anymore and that it would be an accent. He said the clapboard siding would have to resemble Starr's Mill. He asked is that something that we could live with for the Starr's Mill area.

Chairman Graw said that it would add to the cost.

Pete Frisina said that it would not be required. He then said we would allow it. He stated that if they put that in as an accent around the building then we want to see it replicated in the support structures of a gas canopy.

Chairman Graw said if someone wants to design a building with that stacked stone as an accent he doesn't have a problem with it.

Pete Frisina said that he would add it not as a requirement but as being allowed.

Pete Frisina stated that he went with 10 inches in one (1) foot pitch roof and clapboard siding. He mentioned that the color red is not a requirement and the two materials listed for the façade are wood and fiber-cement siding. He asked the Planning Commission if they wanted to allow a vinyl or metal siding that looks similar to this.

Arnold Martin asked if the metal material would be metal version of clapboard.

Pete Frisina replied yes and the same for vinyl.

Al Gilbert said that over a period of time the vinyl and aluminum siding starts to fade. He added that it cannot be painting once it fades.

Pete Frisina said he would leave it as is and not to include metal or vinyl.

Arnold Martin asked about roofing styles and does corrugated mean flat.

Pete Frisina replied that the new corrugated roofs and the old-timey roofs meet the intent.

Pete Frisina said at Starr's Mill all the trim and the muntins and the frames around the doors and windows are white and we would like to mandate that as well.

Arnold Martin asked if there would be any requirements for the door and window material.

Pete Frisina replied that he did not set any requirements for the windows and doors. He said that he did require a bulkhead underneath the windows because they did not want the windows going down to the ground.

Brian Haren then asked are we going to allow two (2) story commercial structures.

Pete Frisina replied that they are allowed but he doesn't know if anyone is going to do one.

Pete Frisina said if they want to do a covered porch we would want them to look like the covered porch on Starr's Mill but we're not going to mandate the pitch on it, but we do want it have this support structure, bannister. He added that if they put this on the front of a store we want to see a banister on that whole front and with a minimum opening of three (3) feet which does meet ADA.

Arnold Martin asked if there are any colors that we don't want painted in the area.

Pete Frisina said architecture requirements do not regulate building color.

Arnold Martin mentioned Charleston, South Carolina and the pastel color schemes used there. He stated that he did not know if it was a requirement. He then asked what if a wacky person wants to paint their building purple should we put something in here to protect from that.

Pete said he tried to stay away from that.

Patrick Stough stated that it would be a lot easier to define what colors are allowed than what colors are not allowed.

Chairman Graw stated years ago Peachtree City had something in their sign ordinance that defined the color of their signs as earth tones. He said that it's a very broad term but people know what earth tones are.

Pete Frisina said maybe some do and maybe some don't.

Chairman Graw asked Pete Frisina to put in some language regarding color choices.

Pete Frisina said that we would have to say these are the only colors you can use.

Brian Haren asked if any of the Historical Preservation documents discussed allowable color schemes.

Pete Frisina replied that he wasn't reviewing for that but he would take a look.

Patrick Stough said that a lot of those Historical Preservation areas often have an architectural review committee and it does become a subjective decision at that point.

Pete Frisina said he would try and find some color regulations. He said he would find and describe them.

Pete Frisina read part b *One-Part Commercial Block*:

One-Part Commercial Block: A popular commercial design from the mid-19th to the early 20th century. The one-part commercial block is a simple, one-story box with a flat or shed roof. Common façade materials consist of brick with decorative block, stone, and concrete accents. The focal point of front facade is the entrance and windows, consisting of a recessed doorway and display windows with a transom resting on a bulkhead (the lower panels on which the windows rest) framed by pilasters. Architectural features include a cornice, belt course and parapet wall.

He also read *Façade Material*:

Façade Material: Brick/brick veneer shall be utilized on all walls as the primary facade material comprising a minimum of 65 percent of the wall excluding doors, windows and associated framing. The remaining 35 percent of the wall may have the appearance of rough face decorative block, stone, and/or concrete accents.

Al Gilbert said that we're going to need to be careful with brick. He said that some of the old-timey brick looks good and some of the more modern brick doesn't look good. He added that the brick needs to have that used brick look to it.

Pete Frisina asked Al Gilbert to help him with that.

Pete Frisina showed photos for the entrance doors and windows.

Al Gilbert said that the windows don't have white trim around it.

Pete Frisina said that they're not required for this section only the Starr's Mill area.

Al Gilbert said that the windows look commercial and not residential.

Pete Frisina said that these will not look residential because these traditionally do not look residential. He stated that the windows on the square do not look residential.

Al Gilbert said that most of the windows on the square are made with wood.

Pete Frisina said they might be, but we're going to make this look the best we can. He added that he doesn't know if he wants to require them to have wood windows.

Al Gilbert said that he is not saying they have to be wood windows but the beige and tan trim looks commercial.

Pete Frisina said that he did put in there that no silver finish would be allowed. He said that it would be anything but anodized silver.

Pete Frisina asked Al Gilbert would we allow the thin brick veneer finish.

Al Gilbert stated that there is a siding available that are sheets. He said if it gives the appearance he doesn't have a problem with it.

Pete Frisina said that we don't know if we're going to get one (1) building or one (1) strip, but we're going to try and maintain a certain characteristics.

Brian Haren asked are we going to allow painted advertising on the side of buildings.

Pete Frisina replied that they are allowed to have whatever the sign ordinance says they can have.

Pete Frisina read part 2 *Entrance Doors and Windows*:

Entrance Doors and Windows: The entrance door and windows component shall consist of entrance door (s), display windows, door and window transoms and bulkhead. Door and window frames may be constructed with wood, metal, or vinyl. An anodized silver finish shall not be allowed for metal door and window frames. Transoms shall be a minimum of two (2) feet high and shall be separated from the windows and door by a mullion with a minimum width of four (4) inches. A minimum two foot high bulkhead consistent with the Façade Materials above shall be required.

Pete Frisina asked Al Gilbert if there were any other window frame materials that he could think of.

Al Gilbert replied that you have vinyl.

Pete Frisina asked if that was structure or cover.

Al Gilbert replied that your brick mold and jams are vinyl now.

Pete Frisina asked should we add wood, metal, or vinyl.

Al Gilbert replied yes. He added that the vinyl will cover any of brick mold or trim.

Pete Frisina read part 3 *Architectural Features*:

Architectural Features: A cornice is required. The cornice shall be a minimum of one (1) foot in height with a minimum projection of four (4) inches from the main façade. The projection may be gradual. A parapet wall is required along the front and side walls of the structure and shall be a minimum of two (2) feet in height.

Pete Frisina stated that he talked to the Building Official and one (1) foot in height can only come back so far with each course of bricks. He added that four (4) inches is about the best you can do in a foot. He asked the

Planning Commission if they thought that was too much going gradually to four (4) inches as you're coming out. He stated that four was the max.

Chairman Graw said that something less would be lost in the structure.

The Planning Commission agreed to four (4) inches being the max.

Pete Frisina said parapets are normally not done in the back of buildings because that's where all your water drains to.

Pete Frisina stated that the Two-Part Commercial Block is very similar to the One-Part Commercial Block. He said that the verbiage for number one (1) Façade Material and for number two (2) Entrance Doors and Windows are the same as One-Part. He stated that the only difference is number three (3) Upper Floor Windows and they shall be symmetrically positioned.

Brian Haren asked Pete Frisina you wouldn't allow for three (3) windows a brick face and then a fourth window.

Pete Frisina replied that each section has to be symmetrical.

Pete Frisina stated that number four (4) Architectural Features are pretty much the same as One-Part Commercial Block. He said that he would add a minimum projection of four (4) inches to the cornice. He added that this section adds a minimum projection of one (1) inch for the belt course. He stated that a belt course is that one molding piece of concrete or brick that creates a line between the first and second floor.

Chairman Graw asked if any of the projections were going to cause an issue with construction cost of the building.

Pete Frisina replied said he would hope not and that he talked to the Building Official and a Builder and they did not raise that concern. He added that the builder did have an issue with the roof pitch of 10 inches in one (1) foot. He said the builder told him to be cognizant if something ends up being fairly large that's going to be a big roof.

Pete Frisina showed the Planning Commission various period lighting styles.

Pete Frisina stated that the Planning Commission talked about requiring fencing in the 50 foot front landscape area. He said that 40 percent of the frontage has to have accent fencing. He stated that it could be a minimum three (3) foot high stacked rock wall or a minimum four (4) foot high fence with the appearance of wrought iron, split rail, picket, or rail horse fence. He asked if the Planning Commission if they were alright with those.

Arnold Martin asked if we are going to allow one section to do wrought iron, the other split rail, and the other picket.

Pete Frisina replied that he would assume a developer would do his own parcel and would do them all the same, but the one across the street may do something different. He said he would add that the fencing must stay consistent through the development.

Chairman Graw asked if Pete was sure he wanted a minimum of three (3) feet.

Pete Frisina replied that usually your rock walls fit into the ground more.

Arnold Martin agreed with Pete that they are usually three (3) foot in height when running down a property.

Pete Frisina showed the board photographs of fencing.

Chairman Graw asked if they need to put a maximum height.

Pete Frisina replied that if we set a minimum that usually what we are going to get. He added that developers are not going to spend more than they have to; nor are they going to take away from the appearance of the store by blocking the view.

Chairman Graw said that with stacked stone you are only going to get three (3) feet because it's so expensive, but the other fences can be higher than three (3) feet. He added that the other fences they could make higher than three (3) feet.

Brian Haren said that the fencing is only visual and that horses will not be kept in it. He added that they're going to go the minimum and keep everything proportion with everything going on in that area.

Al Gilbert said that you will see split rail fencing because it is the least expensive style.

Pete Frisina said that the PVC style fencing is less expensive too. He added that it's easy to replace and there is no painting required.

Pete Frisina stated that the language in the Gas Canopy section is similar to the other ones but it's different because we have three (3) different categories of buildings. He added that we want each of those to reflect that building. He read part f section 1 and 2 *Gasoline Canopy*:

1. Gasoline canopies may be attached to the principal structure as an extension of the structure/roof.
2. The vertical clearance under the gasoline canopy shall not exceed a maximum of 18 feet in height. The height of the gasoline canopy shall not be more than five (5) feet above the height of the principal structure.

Pete Frisina said that he looked at the height of a building with a 12 foot interior and 10 inches in one (1) foot pitch with a 30 foot length. He added that puts that structure height at 24 ½ feet. He added that if we go to a pitch of 10 inches in one (1) foot on the gas canopy it would be 30 feet high which would be six (6) feet higher than the store. He said he didn't want the canopy to overshadow the building. He stated that he lowered the pitch to four (4) inches in one (1) foot which brings the height of the gas canopy down to 23 feet. He said on the one part block commercial he used a 12 foot interior and a two (2) foot parapet wall which is a building height of 14 feet. A gas canopy will have an 18 foot vertical clearance and maybe a two (2) foot structure at the top which will equal a 20 foot height; which is a six (6) feet higher than the building. He suggested requiring a four (4) foot parapet wall on the building in this case so the difference is four (4) feet instead of six (6) feet

Chairman Graw asked what we did for the RaceTrac station down at Ramah.

Pete Frisina replied that we allowed the canopy roof pitch to be less than the building's roof pitch.

Chairman Graw asked why we reduced the canopy there.

Pete Frisina replied that it would have overshadowed the building. He added that the canopy height cannot be more than five (5) feet higher than the building.

Brian Haren asked why the minimum height for the interior is 18 feet.

Pete Frisina replied that we spoke to some of the RaceTrac people and they told him that contractors use large trucks with stacked material on the top. He said they were really pushing for an 18 foot clearance for this particular clientele.

Brian Haren asked if we expecting that level of activity down here.

Pete Frisina replied yes we're talking about a four (4) lane highway real soon.

Pete Frisina reads part (f) *Gasoline Canopy subsection three (3)*:

3. The gasoline canopy and support structure shall match the architectural character, materials, color and roof of the principal structure. Gasoline canopies, in conjunction with a convenience commercial establishment built in the architectural form of Starr's Mill, shall have a minimum roof pitch of four (4) inches in one (1) foot.

Pete Frisina stated he looked at the same pitch on larger structures. He said if you have a 40 foot building with 10 inches in one (1) foot roof pitch, the building would 28 feet six (6) inches high. He added if he went to 50 feet he would be at 32 feet eight (8) inches in height. He said he was told by a contractor that a lot of space is wasted when doing buildings that size. He mentioned the alternative of a mansard roof that would mimic the appearance of a pitch roof. He said they would look at the canopy characteristics for the one and two part commercial buildings.

Chairman Graw asked if the Fire Marshall wanted the canopy to not be attached the building.

Pete Frisina replied that at first he made that a requirement but has now worded it to say "may be attached". He said that the convenience store people don't want it attached and the Fire Marshall would prefer it not be attached.

Chairman Graw asked what if you put a parapet and slight sloping roof behind it.

Pete Frisina said he wouldn't have a problem with that.

Pete Frisina asked if they like this approach of an administrative review instead of the board reviewing architectural plans.

Chairman Graw said he would like to take a look at the first few architectural plans that come in and that he hopes things come out the way he envisions it.

Pete Frisina added that there will be language that says photos are on file at the Planning and Zoning Department to give people direction so they won't have to guess.

Arnold Martin asked for a time line.

Pete Frisina replied that he would like to get it to Board of Commissioners early next year. He said that this is the most intense overlay he has done. He added that this will consist of land use plan amendments, zoning amendments, and maps


The Planning Commission took no official action on this item and will continue the discussion at a future meeting.

Arnold Martin made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. Chairman Graw said the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 pm.

ATTEST:



**PLANNING COMMISSION OF
FAYETTE COUNTY**


JIM GRAW, CHAIRMAN

