

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION met on May 5, 2016 at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Fayetteville, Georgia.

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

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

Welcome and Call to Order:

Chairman Jim 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 April 21, 2016.

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

2. Consideration of amendments to the Land Use Element Text And Future Land Use Plan Map of the Fayette County Comprehensive Plan for the Starr's Mill Historic Overlay District in the area of the Intersection of State Route 74, State Route 85 And Padgett Road

Chairman Graw stated that we have spent three (3) years on this project. He said that staff has done a great job and that we have created a darn good plan.

Pete Frisina stated that we actually started in July 2015 in preparing these documents. He said that what we have done is look at the intersection in close proximity to Starrs Mill (S.R. 85, S.R. 74, and Padgett Road) and come up with basic land use changes. He stated the two (2) prominent changes are the Limited Commercial One (1) and a Limited Commercial Two (2) land use districts and they are also tied back to two (2) zoning districts of the same names. He added the only major difference is the convenience store with gasoline sales; L-C-1 does not allow it and L-C-2 does allow it. He stated the land use is identified as corner one (1), two (2), three (3), and four (4). He said that corner one (1) is the northwest corner, corner two (2) is the northeast corner, corner three (3) is the southwest corner and corner four (4) is the southeast corner. He added that they're recommending Limited Commercial Two (2) for corners one (1) and three (3), corner two (2) Limited Commercial One (1), and corner four (4) is the portion of the property that is still owned by the DOT. He stated that corner four (4) is bounded by the old road bed of

Padgett Road which has been realigned, and has a gas line running through it; it has been land used as Transportation, Communication, and Utilities. He said that the property west of corner one (1) has been land used Office Institution, and will act as a buffer for the residents to the north and south of it. He added that areas north on corner two (2) and south of corner three (3) will be land used for Low Density Residential as they border areas currently zoned for one (1) acre residential. He stated that there is a small portion of property where Starrs Mill is that will be land used as Transportation Communication and Utilities as it is owned by the Fayette County Water System. He said that there is verbiage in the text that supports everything we talked about.

Chairman Graw asked if anyone from the public would like to speak to the land use plan that they are proposing for that intersection.

Hearing none Chairman Graw asked if we were going to be considering the Office section in this land use also.

Pete Frisina replied yes.

Chairman Graw said that we have not talked about the zoning of that parcel like we have the others.

Pete Frisina replied that it will be straight Office Institutional. He said that it would follow under this Historic District.

Chairman Graw asked if it was going to have the same architectural standards as the L-C.

Pete Frisina replied yes. He added that the architectural standards are not contained within the zoning districts but within the overlay.

Brian Haren asked for clarification that the dashed line represented the overlay district.

Pete Frisina replied yes.

Arnold Martin asked if there was a general district area for the mill and church.

Pete Frisina said that only district that we are talking about controlling is the area within that dotted line. He added that the historic overlay will only control those properties.

Arnold Martin asked will there be any overflow from the Starrs Mill area and will there be any challenge from archeological groups based upon the history of the area.

Pete Frisina replied not that I am aware of. He said that we are not creating a district for preservation purposes; we are creating a historic district for development purposes and we are saying that the mill has that historic character we are trying to maintain.

Chairman Graw stated that this was just a title that we used for land use and zoning purposes.

Pete Frisina said the whole idea of this is to preserve that area, because of the influence of that structure. He added that it is a very important icon for the County. He stated that this is also the gateway into the southern portion of the County, and we want to make sure that the front door looks good.

Al Gilbert stated that Starrs Mill is the most photographic spot in the County. He said that it is the last pristine entry way into our County. He added that we have to protect it. He stated that we could leave it be and end up with things we wouldn't like to see. He said by being proactive we will be able to control what goes into that area and preserve the beauty of Starrs Mill. He added that the plan isn't perfect and they will be tweaking it over the years. He stated that staff and the Planning Commission have done a great job of putting this together.

Chairman Graw stated that he is somewhat concerned about Limited Commercial on lot one (1) and three (3). He said that he personally feels we don't need two (2) gas stations on opposite corners, because there are gas stations in Senoia about four (4) miles west, Peachtree City's gas station is four (4) miles north, and there is a gas station east on McBride. He stated that his second concern is safety because SR 74 has been widened and SR 85 will be widened soon. He stated that the gas stations will cause a lot of traffic especially on lot one (1). He added that the gas station on lot three (3) will be easier to get in and out of because it can enter and exit on Padgett Road. He stated that he doesn't feel that it is severe enough right now for him to vote no. He said that he thinks we have a fantastic development and he reiterated that he doesn't want to vote no because of his personal opinion about a gas station on one (1) lot.

Arnold Martin stated the he understood his concern, but doesn't feel the same way. He said that the gas stations on opposite sides of the street will help ease the traffic with one gas station getting customers in the morning and the other getting customers at night. He added that he finds it safer on the driver for them to pull into a gas station on their side of the road as oppose to using a turning lane for a gas station on the opposite side of the road.

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

3. Consideration of amendments to the Fayette County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 110., Article I – In General. Sec. 110-3. –Definitions, Article IV. - District Use Requirements, Sec. 110-145. and Sec. 110-146., Article V. - Conditional Uses, Nonconformances, Transportation Corridor Overlay Zone, and Commercial Development Standards, Sec. 110-169. Conditional Use Approval., Sec. 110-173. - Transportation Corridor Overlay Zone. (3) General State Route Overlay Zone, and Sec. 110-174. – Commercial Development Standards., concerning the proposed Starr's Mill Historic Overlay District and Overlay Zone.

Pete Frisina stated that this is the follow up to the land use changes we just looked at. He said that this is all of the backing ordinances we created with the zoning ordinance. He added that we

have beefed up the definitions that we had to create for these new zoning districts. He stated that we have created a new L-C-1 (Limited Commercial 1) and have taken the L-C district and amended it to now be Limited Commercial Two (2). He said that under the conditional use we went to the convenience commercial establishment and amended it to match what we're doing in the L-C-2. He added that under the Transportation Corridor Overlay State Route areas we have put it in as a new overlay so it was pulled out of the General State Route Overlay. He stated that we have created the new Historic District Overlay with architectural standards. He said that there is a section under the Corridor Non-Conformance chapter which was called Commercial Development Standards that was written some time ago that was specific to the area north of State Route 54, west of Sandy Creek Road, and East of Tyrone that was a hospital overlay area. He added that this particular area is no longer in the County, and is in the City of Fayetteville. He said that section will be taken out and using the section number to create the new Historic District.

Chairman Graw asked the public if they had any comments or suggestions regarding the zoning of the 74/85 intersection. Hearing none he brought it back before the Planning Commission.

Brian Haren asked if the visual representation of the standards will be provided.

Pete Frisina replied yes and that we don't want to put them in the ordinance, because the County Attorney has advised us not to. He stated that we have representations and they are well known. He said that we have set the standards within there even though we say it's a one (1) part commercial block or a two (2) part commercial block. He added that the visual representation shows people the general look of it.

Arnold Martin asked if there were any policies and or procedures that relate to potential developers that want to come forth with a rendering.

Pete Frisina replied that we already review architectural standards because we have them on all the highways. He said that it would follow that same procedure. He added that when someone comes in to develop a piece of property and submits a site plan to us we would then review those renderings based on these standards. He said we did set up something in here that allows them if they don't want to follow the standards to present something and go through a public hearing process. He added that it would come to us, to you, and then the board. He stated that it would be called the architectural option. He said they can go administratively and submit it through the site plan option (normal procedure) or they can go the other route.

Dennis Dutton stated that we are just recommending the amendments and not changing the zoning of any property.

Chairman Graw asked if there were any questions or comments.

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

4. Consideration of the proposed Color Palette for the Starr's Mill Historic Overlay District and Overlay Zone.

Chairman Graw stated that we have a book with specific colors that will be allowed in the Historic Overlay District.

Arnold Martin stated that in the original discussions of the palates we had a few renditions of the palate based on the copier that was used. He asked if we are using a standard and therefor being consistent with what we're showing people and what they may print off at home.

Pete Frisina replied that the color palate in the book is the only one and the pages were printed out on the same copier and then laminated. He said that this is what we will be using when everybody comes in. He added that the colors being used will be matched up to those in the book.

Marcus Pollard stated that he was a new resident of Fayette County and went over his background. He suggested using a color code for the color palate book, because light changes color over time.

Chairman Graw stated that we have addressed that particular issue already. He said that the book does not have color codes because they didn't want to show favor towards a particular company (i.e. Sherwin Williams, Glidden, and Benjamin Moore). He added that if anyone wants to develop in that area they will have to bring in their particular color and match it up against those colors in the book. He stated that staff will then make that determination on whether or not the color they submitted matches those in the book.

Brian Haren stated that we had that very same argument in past meetings; we have come to find out that there is no standard industry code number for particular colors. He said hot pink in Home Depot's computer may be 1234 but hot pink in Lowe's computer may be 6724. He added that we even tried embedding the CMYK values or the RGB values and that doesn't work either.

Mark Pollard stated that he and his girlfriend see colors differently and asked who would be the deciding authority on the colors.

Al Gilbert said if you look at the wood around the television set and desk; if someone were to come in and that color was in the book, they would more than likely get approved. He added that we are not trying to get an exact identical match, but we certainly don't want someone to come in with yellow when it's supposed to be orange.

Mark Pollard said that it just came to mind when he saw the different variations of the blue and brown colors.

Chairman Graw stated that the same has been done for the brick palate.

Arnold Martin recommended printing the color palates on acid free paper, because it helps to preserve the paper over time.

Brian Haren made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed Color Palette. John Culbreth seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

5. Consideration of the proposed Brick Palette for the Starr's Mill Historic Overlay District and Overlay Zone.

Chairman Graw asked if there were any comments from the public. Hearing none he brought it back before the Planning Commission.

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

6. Consideration of amendments to the Fayette County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 110. Article IV.-District Use Requirements Sec. 110-149 – Planned Unit Development- Planned Retreat and Lodge concerning Solar Farms.

Pete Frisina stated that we did meet with the representative from the solar company that will supply the solar panels to Camp Southern Ground at the last meeting. He said that this is a change to allow a solar farm in a PUD-PRL district. He mentioned that we did add the verbiage that said it will be a net meter facility only, which was the term that she used for a system that will supply power to that site. He added that the net meter means that some of the excess power can go into the grid, and when they pull power off the grid they will receive a credit. He stated that its purpose is not to produce power as a utility.

Chairman Graw asked if the public had any comments. Hearing none he brought it back before the Planning Commission. He stated that this is a solar farm for Camp Southern Ground and they will be totally independent of any other power source with the solar farm.

Pete Frisina stated that it will supplement their power; they will still be hooked up to a utility company pulling power.

Chairman Graw said that he asked her if they were going to be energy independent and she said yes.

Pete Frisina replied theoretically yes, but on days when it is not sunny they will still pull on power from the utility company.

Chairman Graw said when available they will still be energy independent. He stated that there was only one (1) item added and that was section (f) solar farm (limited to a net meter facility only). He asked if anyone had any questions or comments.

Arnold Martin asked if a solar farm was define as any entity that had more than three (3) panels.

Pete Frisina replied yes that it is the definition and it is still there.

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

7. Discussion of A-R Deer Processing, Wedding /Event Facility and Development Regulations

Pete Frisina stated that everything is staying the same; except for number eight's (8) exemption being put in for these two (2) agricultural uses. He said that when we passed the A-R Wedding/Event Facility we made amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to allow it, but fail to clarify certain things in the Development Regulations. He added that Environmental Management felt that they still needed to apply certain landscaping requirements, site plan requirements, and all these other things we didn't want to apply to an agricultural use but we think that the Deer Processing and the Wedding/Event Facility are fairly similar use. He said what we tried to under number eight (8) is to do these exemptions from a site planning requirements and some of the landscaping parking requirements; under i, ii, and iii we've come up with some different standards for parking in terms of limited landscaping. He added that he is still working with Environmental Management to make sure this is what they want. He stated that they made similar changes to the A-R Wedding/Event Facility. He said that he started to go through the Development Regulations making the acknowledgement of the exceptions saying, as otherwise accepted in the Zoning Ordinance. He added that while he was making changes in the Development Regulations he thought it would be good to make other housekeeping changes too. He stated in the packet under the section Recreational vehicles and boats (red is development regulations and black is the zoning ordinance) he would like to remove the red section and put it in the Zoning Ordinance. He said that it makes more sense to put everything under the zoning ordinance rather than having similar regulations in two (2) documents because you may miss something. He added that the verbiage, as otherwise exempted in the Zoning Ordinance that is for everything to match up in the Deer Processing and the A-R Wedding. He stated that we are also making a change on page eight Sec. 104-29. He said that the batter board and footing inspection is a practice has been in place since the early 80's. He added that we haven't had any problems with it but it is something that he felt uncomfortable with. He stated that what they are going to do now is go to a straight foundation survey. He said a developer brings in a site plan, we approved the site plan, and the developer sets the buildings on where they need to be based on that site plan. He added that it is the developer's responsibility to lay that foundation based on the site plan that has been approved. He stated that the site plan would have been approved with that foundation meeting all setbacks and buffers whatever else is required. He said that a developer can pour that foundation, but once it's poured a surveyor needs to verify that foundation meets all the requirements of the setbacks and buffers. He added that it is very good practice for that developer to have that surveyor lay that out before he pours the foundation. He stated that their batter boards are set by the surveyors, and gets us out of the position of pulling a tape.

Al Gilbert stated that it was a real problem many years ago and that he never felt comfortable putting a burden on the County.

Pete Frisina stated that many years ago a former Zoning Administrator went out to do a batter board inspection and everything met, but when the concrete guy got out there he said that I need to kick this out a foot or so. He added that buy kicking it out the foundation was over the setback. He said that we are now putting the burden on them and when developers want to build a house in this County they bring to us a site plan and it says here is where I'm building the house. He added that we look at that for the building permit process and we approve the building permit based on the location they have represented to us. He reiterated that once they pour the foundation they must get a surveyor to verify that the foundation meets all setbacks and buffers.

Chairman Graw asked if it's only been one (1) foundation survey that has been done incorrectly.

Pete Frisina replied only one (1) that he is aware of.

Chairman Graw asked what kind of problem did that one (1) cause and how far off was it.

Pete Frisina replied that back then the Zoning Administrator had administrative variance approval. He said the developer dug out a foot more than what was there so he could get the footings a little wider.

Pete Frisina stated another housekeeping change we're making is replacing all Stormwater Management with Environmental Management.

Al Gilbert stated that he would be ready to get this to a public hearing.

Pete Frisina replied that he still needs to get with Environmental Management and Public Works/Engineering to go over the changes. He stated that the sections highlighted in yellow he still needs to get input with the other departments.

Al Gilbert asked if he was just waiting on the items highlighted in yellow.

Pete Frisina replied yes and few house cleaning items.

Chairman Graw asked when the changes to the Wedding/Event Facility and Deer Processing will be coming before them.

Pete Frisina replied that he has to change both ordinances at the same time. He said he would be happy to get it to Public Hearing by July.

Chairman Graw stated that it seems to be a lot of minor changes to the ordinance. He said that the changing of the name to Environmental really doesn't change anything.

Pete Frisina said once he gets input from the other departments he will then bring it back before you and have the Public Hearing meeting in July.

Arnold Martin asked if those comments encompassed number eight (8) as well.

Pete Frisina replied no.

8. Discussion of Hens in Conjunction with Residential Use.

Pete Frisina stated that we have discussed this at one (1) of our meetings so far. He said we're basically looking to do the urban chicken zoning ordinance amendments. He read from the Keeping of hens in conjunction with residential use ordinance:

The number of hens allowed per principal dwelling unit is limited to three (3) and one (1) additional hen for each additional acre to a maximum of five (5) hens shall be allowed in the following zoning districts: EST, C-S, R-85, R-80, R-78, R-75, R-72, R-70, R-55, R-50, R-45, R-40, R-20, DR-15, RMF, MHP, PUD-PRD, PUD-PRL, PUD-PEF, O-I, C-C, C-H, L-C, M-1, M-2, and BTP. No roosters are allowed. No on-site slaughter is allowed. Hen houses/coops are allowed in side and rear yards only and shall be set back from all property lines a minimum of 50 feet. Hens shall be contained on the lot. The containment area shall be in side and rear yards only and shall be limited to no more than 40 percent of the lot.

He said by statute residents will not be able to claim a conservation use for their property. He said if anyone claims that they have more than 50 percent of their property containing hens we can say by ordinance you cannot do it.

Chairman Graw stated that he talked to Pete about the hen ordinance. He told the Planning Commission that the hens will be allowed in the residential districts. He said that his concern is for predators coming on to the property and hunting the hens. He added that he doesn't know the answer to that. He stated that his daughter lost some her chicks by large cats and a hawk. He said you can build a fence, but how big of a fence do you build, and do you even want to put a fence up.

Marcus Pollard stated that you can build a fence a couple of feet underground. He said that any predator that is land based will try and climb over the fence or try and go up under it. He added that the predators will give up trying to get to the chickens when the fence is buried underground. He stated that you can put a top on the fence or a tarp over it to prevent airbase predators from getting into it. He said that if you set up your pin or your 40 percent enclosure for the chickens like the ordinance requiring predators shouldn't be a problem.

Chairman Graw asked do we want to even approach the subject or do you want to consider something like this gentleman mentioned.

Arnold Martin stated that what Marcus Pollard mentioned definitely protects the chickens. He said that his issue is with attracting predators to the general public. He added that we are considering the life of hens but we should also think about children.

Marcus Pollard asked what kind of predators you are concerned about in our area. He stated that coyotes are usually not a danger to humans. He said they are only danger to small house animals. He added that he lived in Iowa for five (5) years and they had a large population of coyotes. He stated that when they saw coyotes on the property no one was afraid. He said the only time you should be fearful of coyotes is when they are roaming in packs or it's a deranged animal. He added that it will not change the risk if we brought chickens into the area.

Chairman Graw asked if foxes go after chickens.

Marcus Pollard replied yes.

Chairman Graw stated that we have a lot of coyotes in the area. He said that we have two (2) options do nothing right now or do something with the fencing.

Brian Haren asked if we can say in the code that the chickens must be housed in a predator resistant enclosure and not worry about defining what that is.

Pete Frisina replied that would be okay until someone asked what a predator resistant enclosure is.

Brian Haren stated that he sees predators as being a casualty of raising chickens.

Marcus Pollard asked why the number three (3) for chickens.

Pete Frisina stated that he saw three (3) in a lot of urban chicken ordinances some of them allow more but he wanted to start slow. He said that if a chicken lays an egg a day then three (3) chickens will lay seventy to eighty eggs a month. He added that it was a lot of eggs and if you're primary purpose is to lay eggs than that will do it. He said that you're not raising eggs for meat specifically; people really want the egg that's what they're raising them for.

Brian Haren asked if there were industry standards that say a chicken requires X amount of space.

Pete Frisina replied yes and it's about three (3) square feet or so, if you wanted to pin them in a tight space.

Marcus Pollard said according to some of the research he has done the bare minimum of space is one (1) square feet He added that it is better to have two (2) to three (3) square feet if you would like for them to roam around. He said that yes three (3) is an adequate number if you're doing egg production but there are other factors involved with owning chickens. He stated that his house is on a downward grade that slopes into a creek and with the water come bugs. He said that he does a lot of gardening and that chicken's help control the bug population. He added that without the chickens his only alternative is to spray chemicals on the grass and trees to decrease the bugs. He said he doesn't want to use the chemicals because they get into the water but it is his only option. He stated that he did a quick cursory overview of four ordinances the City of Atlanta, Clayton County, DeKalb County, and the City of Decatur. He said that the City of Atlanta allows up to 25 turkeys, chickens, bantams, or similar fowl; Clayton County has no limit designated in their County ordinances; DeKalb County allows for one (1) hen per 2,000 square

Page 11
May 5, 2016
PC Meeting

feet of property (22 chickens per acre of land); City of Decatur doesn't specify the amount of chickens you can have but you must have a minimum of four (4) square feet per animal. He added that three (3) seems like an arbitrary number.

Arnold Martin asked if the first two (2) were Atlanta and Clayton County.

Marcus Pollard replied yes. He said that in Atlanta's Ordinance Section 18-7 and 18-8 you can see the maximum number allowed.

Arnold Martin asked if there was any reference to the size of the lot. He said that he would assume it would be related to the size of the lot.

Marcus Pollard replied that it doesn't specify the acreage of the lot but it does say that you must be 50 feet from your neighbor's residence. He said for DeKalb County their minimum lot size is 10,000 square feet.

Chairman Graw asked what the minimum lot size is to have chickens.

Marcus Pollard replied yes and they're the ones that allow you to have one (1) hen per 2,000 square feet. He said the maximum you can have is one (5) hens on 10,000 square feet (the smallest allowable lot size).

Chairman Graw stated that here in Fayette County we have a zoning district called A-R (minimum five (5) acres) and in the A-R zoning the numbers of chickens are unlimited. He said that what they are mentioning tonight is the residential lots (1, 2, 3, and 4 acre lots). He added that this is new to them and what they are trying to do feel their way on this. He said that yes the number is a little arbitrary but we're always open to amending things in the future. He added that we start off usually on a conservative note to see how things work and then if we need to adjust we adjust. He stated that they have done this on numerous occasions and for many different things.

Marcus Pollard stated that he already sees a mistake happening because most people that acquire these chickens are going to go to Tractors, and the minimum number you have to buy is six (6). He asked how you will be able to buy the chickens if the ordinance says that only three (3) are allowed. He added that six (6) should at least be the minimum.

Brian Haren stated that we don't write zoning ordinances based on a commercial establishment package. He said that we have your neighbors to think about and reiterated that A-R lots have an unlimited number on the amount of chickens.

Marcus Pollard stated that out of the four (4) ordinances he has found they have all taken neighbors into consideration by making them a certain distance away from their neighbor's property line or the dwelling. He added that we could adopt some of the jurisdictions language into our ordinance to make sure that the residents are protected.

Chairman Graw asked if anyone else had any questions.

Arnold Martin asked Marcus how many chickens would you like.

Marcus Pollard replied his intent was to just get six (6) he doesn't want to have a farm. He said that he wants the manure for his garden, to kill some of the bugs, egg production, and to not have to use chemicals in his yard. He said 10 would help wipe out the bug population.

Chairman Graw asked if there was anything else. He thanked Marcus for coming in and said that we would be discussing it further in the future.

Chairman Graw asked Pete if we should consider the size of the lot for the number of chickens.

Pete Frisina replied saying we do that with horses. He stated for horses in a residential district you have to have three (3) acres for one (1) horse; and then you have to have an additional acre for every horse after that. He said that Mr. Pollard's question is would we be amenable to more than three (3) and if you wanted to go to something more than that you could go to a graduated schedule. He asked what the ultimate number of chickens we would like to see in a residential neighborhood. He added that this is where he always comes from, and when looking at some of the ordinance three (3) is the lowest range for most of the urban chicken ordinance. He said that he has seen urban ordinances that allow for four (4) and five (5).

Arnold Martin stated that it's about how many chickens are in a neighborhood. He said what if this becomes a trend. He added that this could become a nuisance based upon the amount of chickens in that neighborhood. He stated that we don't have a neighborhood like Serenbe where everything is natural and borderline farm. He said that to him is the bigger picture. He added that he doesn't know if there will be an entity that goes around and counts the number of chickens per neighborhood.

Pete Frisina stated that the Code Enforcement Officers are really excited about this ordinance. He said that in the City of Norcross they have a problem with roosters running all over the town and nobody is claiming whose they are. He added that the cops said that they don't have time to chase roosters all over the town. He said that when he lived in the City of Atlanta his neighbor who owned a five (5) acre parcel had chickens and goats. He added that the chickens for the most part stayed on his property. He stated that the chickens and rooster began to procreate rapidly and roost in neighbors shrubs. He said that the City came out and rounded up all the chickens due neighbor complaints. He added that we are starting slow and can look at using a graduated schedule if they want to; similar to how we do horses.

Al Gilbert said last week on the news a man was wondering a subdivision and was shot by a police officer because he tried to attack him using a rooster and a knife.

Pete Frisina said that is why we're not allowing roosters.

Brian Haren asked if the minimum lot size we're talking about for this is one (1) acre.

Pete Frisina replied the minimum lot size for Fayette County is one (1) acre. He added that within a one (1) acre subdivision you can have lots that are two (2) and three (3) acres because of the floodplain. He said that was number I saw that was the lowest and that is what I suggested as the start.

Chairman Graw stated that he liked the idea of a graduated schedule. He said they could start off with three (3) on one (1) acre; and I don't know what number you would put on two (2), three (3) and four (4) acres. He said that it is fair and we have the same concept with horses.

Marcus Pollard stated that the infestation of chickens in a neighborhood is a nice story, but we are not allowing for any roosters; so there won't be any reproducing. He said that whether or not roosters are playing a big part in the problem is nonexistent. He added that he doesn't want to hear roosters crowing at five (5) in the morning. He said that he is just here for the backyard chickens and there won't be any problems with reproduction from roosters because they are not allowed. He reiterated that three (3) was a very arbitrary number when City's like Atlanta let you have as many as you want. He stated that we are way more rural than the City of Atlanta where there is a lot less one (1) acre lots. He said he doesn't see the connection on how the neighboring counties differ from Fayette County and why three (3) is the maximum when every other counties allow so much more.

Arnold Martin stated that one (1) of thing you will hear so often with being a resident of Fayette County is, "preserving the way of life". He said that the Planning Commission is charge with the commission of figuring out ways to preserve what is very special here in Fayette County. He added that he moved here for a specific reason and it has separated Fayette County (good or bad) from some of the other areas that you mentioned. He stated that his background is in real estate and one of the biggest thing people are very much focused on is property values. He said that he is concerned about the needs of the citizens and want's to create ordinances that do not hinder but protect the people of Fayette County. He added that Mr. Pollard will be hearing more of what he said in various ways from other people as he continues to live in the County.

Chairman Graw stated that we will have more opportunities to discuss this some more. He welcomed Mr. Pollard to join in on those discussions. He asked Pete when they were going to have their next meeting.

Pete Frisina said the next meeting will be on the 18th. He added that he will not attend but Dennis and Chanelle will be there.

Chairman Graw asked will we be discussing the chickens at the next meeting.

Pete Frisina replied yes and maybe the A-R Wedding/Event Facility and Deer Processing will be on there too if he gets some more clarification from the other departments.

Chairman Graw asked him to bring us your recommendation about graduated schedules, lot sizes, and fencing at the next meeting.

Pete Frisina replied I think we should leave the fencing as is. He said the chickens will attract predators no matter what type of fencing you put out there. He added that the fence will prevent the chickens from being eaten but he doesn't have a good idea on that.

Dennis Dutton said the next meeting will be May 19th .

Al Gilbert made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Chairman Graw said the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 pm.

PLANNING COMMISSION OF
FAYETTE COUNTY



JIM GRAW, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:


