

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION met on October 4, 2001 at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Public Meeting Room, First Floor, Fayetteville, Georgia.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Beckwith, Chairman
Al Gilbert, Vice-Chairman
Bob Harbison
Douglas Powell

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jim Graw

STAFF PRESENT: Bill McNally, County Attorney
Kathy Zeitler, Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator
Delores Harrison, Zoning Technician
Dave Borkowski, P.E.
Pete Frisina, Senior Planner
Robyn S. Wilson, P.C. Secretary/Zoning Coordinator

Welcome and Call to Order:

Chairman Beckwith called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance. He introduced the Board Members and Staff and confirmed there was a quorum present.

* * * * *

1. Consideration of the Minutes of the meeting held September 6, 2001.

Chairman Beckwith asked the Board Members if they had any comments or changes to the Minutes as circulated. Al Gilbert made the motion to approve the Minutes. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

2. Consideration of the Workshop Minutes of the meeting held on September 20, 2001.

Chairman Beckwith asked the Board Members if they had any comments or changes to the Workshop Minutes as circulated. Doug Powell made the motion to approve the Workshop Minutes. Bob Harbison seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0-1 with Chairman Beckwith abstaining due to not being present at the September Workshop. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

Kathy Zeitler explained the procedures that would be followed including the fifteen (15) minute time limitation for presentation and opposition for petitions.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 4, 2001 AND BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON OCTOBER 25, 2001.

3. Consideration of Petition No. 1085-01, Donald J. Davis and Donald Glen Davis, Owners/Agents request to rezone 1.9 acres from C-H to M-1 to develop a large truck repair and maintenance shop. This property is located in Land Lots 200 and 201 of the 5th District and fronts on S.R. 85 North.

Donald J. Davis presented photographs of the subject property. He said that the property was purchased in 1989 and had been used by a paving company with numerous trucks and equipment since 1978. He commented that he had visited the Zoning Department and found that the property

Page 2
October 4, 2001

was surrounded by M-1 zoning. He remarked that he was under the impression this whole time that the subject property was also zoned M-1. He confirmed that he owned and operated Clayco Sanitation from this location and utilized the property to repair and maintain his garbage trucks until 1996. He noted that his son had used the property since then to refurbish and paint trucks. Mr. Davis said he planned to either lease or sell the property to a party who wanted to do large truck repair and maintenance which requires M-1 zoning.

Al Gilbert asked Mr. Davis if he agreed to the recommended conditions.

Mr. Davis replied that he agreed with recommended condition #1. but objected to #2. and #3. He said that the subject property was exempt from the Watershed Protection Ordinance however, the condition would require him to comply with the ordinance which would take at least half of the land.

He referenced the photographs which indicated a string depicting the location of the watershed requirements. He also referenced the photographs of the adjacent property and added that the subject property has a 25 foot grassed area along the highway which is more than the adjacent property has. He said that a 50 foot landscaped area and relocating the parking to the rear of the existing building would be a hardship.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of the petition. Hearing none, he asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition of the petition. Hearing none and with no rebuttal, he closed the floor from public comments.

Bob Harbison asked if the landscaping is required whether or not it is a condition of zoning.

Kathy Zeitler replied that the landscaping would be required if a new building was being constructed and that the condition was added to help bring the site into compliance with the 85 North Overlay requirements.

Mr. Harbison said he was trying to sort out the watershed requirements prior to making a motion. He added that the uses allowed under the M-1 zoning district were more intense than those allowed under the C-H zoning district. He remarked that he was struggling with not applying the watershed requirements due to environmental concerns in regard to the creeks which the County is trying to protect.

Donald G. Davis stated that there are laws which apply and tanks would be required for antifreeze and oil recovery. He advised that anyone operating heavy equipment had to have these type tanks on-site and that they are required to show proof to the E.P.A. or E.P.D.

Mr. Gilbert advised the applicants that the property could be sold and that there are numerous uses permitted under the M-1 zoning district. He pointed out that once the property is rezoned that all of those uses would be allowed and there are other uses, other than the one (1) proposed, which could produce very intense environmental problems. He remarked that this condition is not directed at Mr. Davis but the property itself. He commented that the protection of Morning Creek had to be considered.

Mrs. Zeitler advised that if there are no watershed restrictions then he could possibly build within 25 feet of the creek.

Donald G. Davis stated that he understood the P.C.'s concerns but he has a problem with the condition when the property is exempt from the watershed requirements.

Bob Harbison made a motion to approve the petition subject to recommended conditions #1. and #2. and

deletion of condition #3. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

Page 3
October 4, 2001

4. Consideration of Petition No. 1086-01, Joe D. and Vasana S. Smith, Owners, and Attorney Chris Ramig, Agent, request to rezone 3.9915 acres from A-R to R-40 to develop one (1) single-family dwelling lot. This property is located in Land Lot 254 of the 5th District and fronts on South Kite Lake Road.

Kathy Zeitler advised the P.C. that the Smiths had requested a Variance from the Z.B.A. to reduce the side yard setback but their request was denied. She pointed out that they wanted a zoning district which would allow a side yard setback of 15 feet which is consistent with the R-40 zoning district that they requested.

Attorney Chris Ramig advised that the Smiths had purchased the property in April, 2000. He pointed out that the property was deeded to them at 4.3 acres at that time, however the property consists of 3.9 acres. He confirmed that the property abuts R-40 zoning to the south and east. He referenced the map prepared by Staff indicating the current surrounding zoning districts. He remarked that the existing house does not have a carport or garage. He said that the Smiths had sought a Variance but were denied. He pointed out that the A-R zoning district required a side yard setback of 50 feet which would not permit a carport but the R-40 zoning district required a side yard setback of 15 feet and would permit a carport.

Attorney Ramig referenced the Recommended Conditions and stated that the Smiths agreed with recommended condition #1. but objected to condition #2. He confirmed that the Smiths have no intentions of subdividing the subject property. He said that the Smiths questioned the dedication of property for right-of-way. He noted that South Kite Lake Road is classified as a Collector street but the road is not ready to be expanded. He said that the value of the property would be decreased due to the reduction of lot size.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of the petition. Hearing none, he asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition of the petition. Hearing none and with no rebuttal, he closed the floor from public comments.

Al Gilbert advised that the dedication of right-of-way is a common request for the County. He explained that without the dedication of right-of-way that there is a possibility that the road could be kept from being improved or widened. He said that it is a massive process to try to get land for additional right-of-way especially on a road where people have lived for a long time. He remarked that he understood the Smiths reservations.

Bob Harbison asked Mrs. Zeitler what was the side yard setback for R-70.

Mrs. Zeitler replied a minimum of 25 feet.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there were other property owners who had dedicated right-of-way along South Kite Lake Road.

Mrs. Zeitler replied that she did not know.

Chairman Beckwith noted that recommended condition #1. stated that the subject property will not be further subdivided. He said that the property if rezoned could be subdivided by law, and this condition was an illegal taking of the property since R-40 allowed a one (1) acre minimum lot size.

Mrs. Zeitler referenced the Owners' Letter of Intent stating that the subject property would not be subdivided and therefore the condition was a self-imposed condition.

Chairman Beckwith asked if the condition would not follow the property should the property be sold.

Mrs. Zeitler replied that the condition would run with the land regardless of ownership.

Page 4
October 4, 2001

Doug Powell made the motion to approve the petition subject to recommended condition #2. and the deletion of recommended condition #1. Bob Harbison seconded the motion.

Mr. Harbison asked Attorney McNally about restricting the property from being subdivided since the owner had self-imposed the condition.

Attorney McNally advised that if the property is rezoned to R-40 that the owner may do anything allowed under the R-40 zoning district. He added that the petitioner can make the commitment, however it would not be legally binding.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Beckwith called for the vote.

The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

Chairman Beckwith called for a short recess at 7:38 P.M. He reconvened the meeting at 7:43 P.M.

* * * * *

5. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Development Regulations regarding Article VIII. Off-Street Parking and Service Requirements, Section 8-216. Reduction of Parking and Maximum Lot Coverage and Section 8-225. Number of Parking Spaces by the Zoning Department.

Kathy Zeitler advised that the proposed amendments included deletion of the cap on parking due to the recent adoption of a maximum percent impervious for nonresidential zoning districts. She pointed out that a maximum fifty percent (50%) impervious for nonresidential conditional uses permitted in a residential zoning districts or A-R was also being recommended. She added that the formula to calculate parking for a church was also being revised back to the previous formula due to establishment of a maximum impervious surface requirement.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was any public comments. Hearing none, since Dave Hambrick was the only person in the audience, he closed the floor from public comments.

Al Gilbert made a motion to approve the proposed amendments as presented. Bob Harbison seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

6. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article V. General Provisions, Section 5-40. Standards for Telecommunications Antennas and Towers by the Zoning Department.

Kathy Zeitler advised that the proposed amendment was an item which had been omitted when the current tower ordinance was adopted. She explained that towers approved between 1996 and 1998 were not considered pre-existing towers and could add twenty (20) feet as a permitted use, but there was not a height limit stated in the current ordinance, and the height limit was included in the previous ordinance. She

pointed out that the proposed amendment would allow additional height to existing towers, provided that the tower did not exceed the established height for administrative approval for a tower at that location.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none, he closed the floor from public comments.

Page 5
October 4, 2001

Doug Powell made a motion to approve the proposed amendments as presented. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

7. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VII. Conditional Uses, Exceptions, and Modifications, Section 7-6. Transportation Corridor Overlay Zone by the Zoning Department.

Kathy Zeitler advised that the proposed amendments included the deletion of the S.R. 314 and S.R. 74 North Overlay Zones from the current ordinance and the addition of a new section which deals with transportation corridors other than S.R. 54 West and S.R. 85 North. She said that the amendments include the establishment of a transportation corridor overlay for all the state highway corridors with the establishment of architectural standards which require a harmonious blend with the natural surroundings and neighboring architecture rather than a residential look. She pointed out that the amendment also includes a list of materials and elements which are considered incompatible and inappropriate such as flat roofs and unfinished facades. She noted that the amendment also allows the developer some freedom in the design of the building. She went on to say that the architectural details and color schemes must be compatible with the surrounding architecture which applies equally to all of the state route corridors.

Mrs. Zeitler pointed out that she had added some verbiage per the PC's request at the last workshop, such as excluding the L-C zoning district and clarifying that architectural standards which are not desired referenced the facade of a structure, rather than the building materials.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none, he closed the floor from public comments.

Bob Harbison made a motion to approve the proposed amendments as presented. Chairman Beckwith seconded the motion.

Al Gilbert stressed that he had a real problem with the proposed ordinance. He said that this is one of those rules which he calls government intrusion into business. He stated that government sometimes steps beyond a role it was intended to perform. He remarked that we have got to have rules and regulations. He commented that he was involved in the S.R. 54 West Overlay but there were very specific reasons to develop the overlay for S.R. 54 West which was to maintain a free flow of traffic but we are now talking appearance. He stated that the people being hurt are the small business people in our community. He said that they are already fighting the big box stores and now he was afraid it would be even higher to operate in our County. He remarked that if any of the existing businesses suffer tremendous damages through some act of God then they are going to have to meet this ordinance even though they can ask for a variance. He asked if we should have such an ordinance if they are going to have to ask for a variance. He went on to say that he knew from living in this County for 24 years, working with civic clubs, and working with United Way, that when you need money the big box stores do not step forward because they don't live in Fayette County. He said that the small business man is the one who puts up the money just like when the play park was built. He commented that the ordinances seem to pick on the small business man. He stated that when he feels strongly about something, he is wrong to sit and raise his hand and say that this is alright because

this is not alright with him. He asked where the small business people were and said that they are still working. He continued by saying that this is one of those rules which will crop its ugly head up one day and somebody is going to say, why didn't I know about it. He responded that they were busy running their business competing against the big box stores and the County was looking after them. He ended by saying that he has a real problem with the proposed ordinance.

Mrs. Zeitler advised that the proposed amendments came about at the directive of the B.C.C. for consideration of establishing an overlay for S.R. 85 South, specifically architectural standards. She said that once the item was discussed at a workshop, it was noted that S.R. 54 East may possibly be

Page 6
October 4, 2001

another area to consider for an overlay. She remarked that it was felt by some P.C. members that all state route highways should be treated similarly, with overlay zones, which is how the proposed ordinance evolved.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Beckwith called for the vote.

The motion passed 3-1 with Al Gilbert voting in opposition. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ARC) INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS:

Pete Frisina explained the RDP Process to the P.C. He said that The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) adopted a Land Use Strategy in May of 2000 to implement the Regional Development Plan (RDP). He stated that the Land Use Strategy was amended to reflect the inclusion of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) and adopted by the GRTA Board in June of 2000. He noted that the purpose of the Land Use Strategy is to ensure land use policies represented in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and RDP will guide future development in the Atlanta region to the fullest extent.

Mr. Frisina explained that the RDP process consists of three (3) steps: (1) prepare a report as to how current local development policies comply with the RDP (completed in November of 2000); (2) outline proposals to amend development policies to comply with the RDP (completed in March 2001); and (3) investigate proposals and amend policies by January of 2002.

Mr. Frisina explained the RDP proposals as follows:

1. *Investigate the possibility of adopting applicable Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) standards. TND emphasizes pedestrian accessibility and the orientation of houses toward narrow, tree-lined, gridded or integrated streets.*

Mixed Use Development: Once allowed as a PUD, it was determined that projects in Fayette County lack the magnitude and density to support mixed use development within the project's boundaries. What has been proposed in the past was commercial development oriented outward to a major road to capture a larger market with a residential subdivision to the rear of the commercial development. A major policy shift to much less than one residential unit per acre would be necessary to accommodate the full range of mixed uses as presented in the RDP. This type of mixed use would include residential (single and multi-family), office and commercial uses within walking distance of each other or combined in the same structure. The RDP discusses density under its Best Housing Practices of 6 to 7 units per acre. Without a sewer system these densities are not feasible in unincorporated Fayette County. Our comprehensive plan policies state that this type of development works best in our cities which already have a concentration of density and in some cases, the sewer to serve high density mixed use development. Fayetteville is planning mixed use developments which are in line with these TND standards. Our comprehensive plan also states

that the character of the unincorporated county should be less dense and intense than the cities to maintain a sense of place.

Sidewalks: The Fayette County Development Regulations (Sec. 8-64) set standards for the construction and maintenance of sidewalks for those developments that choose to incorporate them.

Tree Planting/Protection: The Tree Retention, Protection and Replacement section of the Development Regulations identifies trees which have been determined to be of high value because of species and size. Nonresidential development must maintain a minimum tree density and residential road configuration must avoid these trees.

Public Gathering Area(s): Recreational facilities and public gathering spaces are allowed under current regulations for developments that choose to incorporate them.

Page 7

October 4, 2001

Summary: Mr. Frisina reported that there are residential developments that have incorporated some of these TND characteristics. He noted that High Grove has utilized sidewalks and houses set close to the street with large front porches. He explained that this promotes interaction among the residents and provides for safe pedestrian accessibility. He further noted that Horseman's Run has utilized a central green and several smaller parks as focal points, and sidewalks to facilitate pedestrian accessibility. He stressed that some of the elements of TND are possible under current regulations.

2. *Investigate the possibility of an ordinance amendment to allow reduced street widths for secondary subdivision streets with a limited number of homes (ten or less). Such an amendment would be in line with TND standards.*

Mr. Frisina explained that a proposal by the Engineering Department to reduce the required pavement width from 24' to 22' was recently rejected by the Board of Commissioners for reasons of vehicular safety and emergency vehicle accessibility. He said it was the consensus of the Planning and Engineering Departments to not pursue this ordinance amendment.

3. *Verify county ordinance that requires interparcel access for nonresidential development on major thoroughfares. Verify county policy prohibiting strip commercial development. Such ordinances and policies encourage accessible, compact development.*

Mr. Frisina advised that the Fayette County Development Regulations, Section 8-53(2), requires that "Interparcel access shall be required in order to facilitate movement between and among parcels adjoining arterial or collector streets to improve overall safety."

Mr. Frisina pointed out that the Fayette County Land Use Plan lists the control of strip-type development as an objective of commercial development. He commented that it further encourages the placement of commercial development be based on the theory of designated nodal development to reduce the sprawl of strip commercial development. He added that the Fayette County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan reaffirms these policies and objectives.

4. *A 1996 survey indicated that Fayette County residents were willing to drive longer distances for convenience (2+ miles) and weekly (7+ miles) shopping to help reduce commercial density. Conduct study to determine what percent of the unincorporated population lives within three miles of convenience shopping. This would encourage convenience commercial development at a scale appropriate for the unincorporated county.*

Mr. Frisina confirmed that approximately 94 percent of the County is within 2.5 miles of convenience shopping. He stated that the area least served is in the southern portion of the County and includes a large portion of the Town of Brooks. He added that the southern portion of the County is the most sparsely populated area in the County.

5. *Assist the Fayette County Development Authority where possible on their fiscal analysis*

study to determine the impact of buildout according to current land use and zoning. This study will indicate how much revenue would be generated by such a buildout scenario and how much the necessary services would cost.

Mr. Frisina advised that the Fayette County Development Authority and Georgia Tech are in the final stages of finishing this project.

6. *Work with Peachtree City (PTC) to complete the connection of Peachtree East Shopping Center, located on S.R. 54 East, to city cart paths. This would provide alternative means of access to this shopping center.*

Mr. Frisina reported that PTC applied to ARC for a Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) to retain a consultant for this project. He confirmed that this project was not selected by the ARC for funding

Page 8
October 4, 2001

through its Livable Centers Initiative (LCI). He added that a submission by PTC for an LCI Grant in 2002 is a possibility.

7. *Investigate the development of conservation subdivision regulations. This is a form of development that permits a reduction in lot area and bulk requirements with the remaining land area devoted to open space, active recreation, preservation of environmentally sensitive areas, or agriculture. This type of development can also on save infrastructure costs (reduction in utility extension costs, road length, maintenance, etc.).*

Mr. Frisina reported that the adoption of the C-S district also achieves one of the goals set forth in the County's Greenspace Program to permanently protect greenspace. He said that the adoption of this ordinance will keep us in good standing with the Georgia Greenspace Commission.

8. *Investigate the development of Historic Area Standards for historically significant areas of the county (e.g., Starr's Mill, Swain-Peebles House, Kenwood Road). The preservation of historic areas serves to stabilize adjacent and surrounding residential neighborhoods.*

Mr. Frisina advised that this amendment is similar to the historic section in the C-S zoning district. He confirmed that there are approximately three hundred structures in the unincorporated County that are identified in the Architectural Survey of Fayette County. He said that they are indicated on a map. He remarked that it is the intent of staff to check the location of these structures in relation to new development, notify the developer of the presence of a historic structure and ask the developer to evaluate the structure and consider using it as part of the development. He commented that the problem is these structures may not comply with the new zoning district because of heated square footage requirements or setbacks. He explained that if the structure is worth saving, this provides an avenue through the Z.B.A. for a developer to utilize the structure. He added that this procedure of notifying developers and the statement in the Zoning Ordinance is a pro-active approach to preserving these structures.

9. *Incorporate the Greenspace Program into the Comprehensive Plan. The character of new development should reflect techniques to preserve environmental quality and open space.*

Mr. Frisina confirmed that this acknowledges the Greenspace Program in the Comprehensive Plan and also achieves one of the goals set forth in the County's Greenspace Program.

10. *Review and/or refine regulations to protect environmentally sensitive areas as needed. Adopted ordinances include regulations for water supply watersheds, groundwater recharge areas, wetland areas, and flood plains. These regulations serve to protect the county's water supply, tree cover, natural habitats, open space, and other environmentally sensitive areas important to the county's future.*

Mr. Frisina explained that the Georgia Department of Community Affairs reviewed the Watershed Protection Ordinance, the Groundwater Recharge Ordinance and the Floodplain Ordinance as it addresses wetland protection. He confirmed that the Watershed Ordinance meets the Environmental Planning Criteria and requires no amendments. He explained that the Groundwater Recharge Ordinance and the Floodplain Ordinance require minor amendments. He added that this item would be discussed later in the presentation by Dave Borkowski.

8. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VI. District Use Requirements, Section 6-24. C-S, Conservation Subdivision by the Planning Department.

Pete Frisina explained that basically the C-S zoning district required review of a two (2) acre yield plan which determines the number of lots and the developer may design the subdivision utilizing one (1) acre lots while maintaining 40% of the property for conservation/open space which must be placed into a conservation easement to permanently protect the property as open space.

Page 9
October 4, 2001

Bob Harbison asked if the C-S zoning district would require the same review process as a PUD.

Mr. Frisina explained that it was a little bit different in that a C-S request would take an extra month for Staff to review the yield plan, whereas the PUD takes an extra month for the Pre-Recommendation meeting with the P.C. He added that the developer of C-S would be held to the concept/development plan approved by the B.C.C. just like a PUD development plan is, and any significant changes to that plan would require further public hearing approval.

AND

9. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article IV. Establishments of Districts, 24. C-S, Conservation Subdivision by the Planning Department.

Pete Frisina advised that should the C-S zoning district be adopted then it would have to be added to the list of zoning districts as listed in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there were any public comments on items #8. and #9. Hearing none, he closed the floor from public comments.

Al Gilbert made a motion to approve agenda items #8. and #9. as submitted. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

10. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VII. Conditional Uses, Exceptions and Modifications, Section 7-2. Nonconformances by the Planning Department.

Pete Frisina advised that there are approximately 300 historical structures identified on a map prepared in 1990 as part of the Architectural Survey of Fayette County. He said that it is the intent of Staff to check this map for structures when someone comes in for a rezoning or development. He stated that if a structure exists that the developer would be notified and requested to determine if the structure is worth saving or not. He remarked that if the structure is worth saving that Staff would work with the developer through the Z.B.A. to see if the structure could be utilized for such uses as a community center or possibly a residence. He pointed out that a lot of the structures do not meet the setback requirements of the zoning

district. He stressed that Staff would encourage the utilization of the existing structure but would not require its utilization. He went on to say that this amendment is a pro-active way of approaching protection of these historic structures.

Chairman Beckwith asked what would the procedure be should this amendment be approved.

Mr. Frisina replied that Kathy Zeitler would be reviewing the map for the existing structures.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none, he closed the floor from public comments.

Bob Harbison made a motion to approve the proposed amendments as submitted. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

11. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan regarding the Community Facilities Element by the Planning Department.

Page 10
October 4, 2001

Pete Frisina said that he was proposing a paragraph with a map to identify the greenspace areas and to acknowledge that the County is participating in the Georgia Greenspace Program. He added that this also fulfills one of the goals in the greenspace plan. He further added that the C-S zoning district is also one of the goals in the greenspace program. He stressed that this would put Fayette County in good standing with the Georgia Greenspace Commission.

Chairman Beckwith asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none, he closed the floor from public comments.

Doug Powell made a motion to approve the proposed amendments as submitted. Chairman Beckwith seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

12. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Development Regulations regarding Article XI. Groundwater Recharge Area Protection Ordinance by the Engineering Department.

Dave Borkowski stated that the proposed amendments were recommended by D.C.A. He explained that the deficiencies noted by the D.C.A. were: 1) minimum lot size issues; 2) an outdated manual was referenced; and 3) design requirements for a liner to be used for agricultural waste.

Al Gilbert made a motion to approve the proposed amendments as submitted. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

13. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Development Regulations regarding Article IV. Flood Plain Regulations by the Engineering Department.

Dave Borkowski stated that the proposed amendments were recommended by D.C.A. He explained that the deficiencies noted by the D.C.A. dealt with wetlands and a clarification which stated that even though

a project is not in the wetlands as per the National Wetlands Inventory Map that it does not relieve the owner of the property of any wetlands which are not mapped.

Doug Powell made a motion to approve the proposed amendments as submitted. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent.

* * * * *

Chairman Beckwith asked if there was any further business.

Kathy Zeitler reminded the P.C. of the Workshop scheduled for October 18, 2001 in Suite 202A at 7:00 P.M.

The P.C. wished Delores Harrison a "Happy Birthday".

There being no further business, Bob Harbison made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion for adjournment unanimously passed 4-0. Jim Graw was absent. The meeting adjourned at 8:20 P.M.

Page 11
October 4, 2001

PLANNING COMMISSION
OF
FAYETTE COUNTY

ATTEST:

BILL BECKWITH
CHAIRMAN

ROBYN S. WILSON
SECRETARY