

**THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION** held a **Workshop** on November 6, 2003 at 8:30 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Public Meeting Room, Fayetteville, Georgia.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jim Graw, Chairman  
Al Gilbert, Vice-Chairman  
Bob Harbison  
Bill Beckwith

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Douglas Powell

**STAFF PRESENT:** Kathy Zeitler, Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator  
Chris Venice, Director of Planning/Community Development Division Director  
Dennis Davenport, Assistant County Attorney  
Delores Harrison, Zoning Technician  
Robyn S. Wilson, P.C. Secretary/Zoning Coordinator

**Welcome and Call to Order:**

Chairman Graw called the meeting to order and introduced the Board Members and Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

**1. Discussion of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VII. Conditional Uses, Exceptions, and Modifications, Section 7-6. Transportation Corridor Overlay Zone, A. S.R. 54 West and S.R. 74 South Overlay Zones, 6. Landscape Requirements; B. S.R. 85 North Overlay Zone, 5. Landscape Requirements; and C. General State Route Overlay Zone, 9. Landscape Requirements.**

Kathy Zeitler explained that in the Overlays, a 50 foot landscape area was required along the right-of-way along of the state route highway, and no impervious surfaces could be in that 50 foot area. She advised that not all 50 feet of the landscape area had to be vegetation however. She reported that the developers want to put septic systems and detention ponds in this 50 foot landscape area. She said that the proposed amendments are consistent for all the overlays and are intended to clarify this issue by stating where the vegetation should be located and what else could be put in the landscape area. She said that the proposed amendments include: the 50 foot landscape area shall include staggered vegetation planted on top of a three (3) foot berm located within 25 feet of the S.R. right-of-way. The remainder of the landscape area may be utilized for other purposes such as detention and/or septic areas. She pointed out that this area must be kept as a pervious area and that the overlay requires the impervious area to be a minimum of 50 feet from the right-of-way. She added that this proposal established an area where the landscape needs to be placed and clarified what else can be within the landscape area and where it can be located. She remarked that this is basically a housekeeping item to clarify the ordinance and should be a win/win situation for everyone.

Bill Beckwith asked if the berm was supposed to restrict the view of the septic area or detention pond area.

Mrs. Zeitler replied yes, as well as, parking areas in front of the building on the site.

Al Gilbert stated that this should be good for septic systems.

Mrs. Zeitler advised that the septic should be located between the building and the landscape berm and should not affect the landscaping.

Chris Venice confirmed that this is a planted landscape strip required along the street frontage, not a required buffer.

**Page 2**  
**Workshop**  
**November 6, 2003**

Bob Harbison asked if the three (3) foot berm could create a problem with water runoff and is there any allowances for exceptions.

Mrs. Zeitler replied that the Engineering Department would address water runoff and that the berm would not be steep but gently sloped and there would be a depth of 25 feet to work in. She advised that the berm does not have to be continuous and that there could be several berms in order to help address drainage. She said that any exception would be reviewed by the Engineering Department.

Chairman Graw asked why Staff was requiring a berm.

Mrs. Zeitler replied that the intent of the berm was to have the landscaping more visible which would be similar to the look of the Emory Clinic and would hide parking areas, detention ponds, and septic areas.

Mr. Harbison suggested adding the verbiage that a berm would not be required if deemed by the Engineering Department that the berm would create drainage problems.

Mrs. Venice stated that developers are anti-berm but if you allow a detention pond to be located in the 50 foot landscape area that a berm is necessary.

Mrs. Zeitler commented that a developer could seek a variance to this requirement and a provision could be added for an exception by the County Engineer when warranted due to issues such as drainage problems.

Attorney Davenport asked if the berm would be required along the entire length of the landscape area.

Mrs. Zeitler replied yes, unless the Engineering Department makes changes.

Attorney Davenport asked what happens when the berm hits the side property line.

Mrs. Zeitler explained that the berm would not go all the way to the side property line because there is a 10 foot side yard landscape strip or a required buffer there and the berm would end or taper off at that point.

Mr. Gilbert suggested Staff consult with the Engineering Department to get their input.

Mrs. Zeitler replied that she would get with the Engineering Department for their comments. She asked if the P.C. wanted to hold another Workshop to discuss the proposed amendments or advertise the proposed amendments for the December 4, 2003 Public Hearing.

Chairman Graw instructed Staff to advertise the proposed amendments for the December 4, 2003 Public Hearing.

Chairman Graw asked if there was any further business.

Mr. Gilbert asked that lighting standards be addressed.

Mrs. Zeitler advised that she had researched other lighting ordinances, however it will not be able to be enforced without the proper equipment to measure lighting.

Mr. Gilbert suggested requiring a lighting plan to be certified by an Engineer instead of purchasing the equipment to measure lighting.

Mr. Harbison said that you cannot tell someone to have low intensity lighting without having guidelines and measurements.

Mrs. Zeitler advised that it would take some time to prepare a lighting ordinance, and that Staff would seek direction from the B.O.C. to see if they are also interested in the development of a lighting ordinance.

The P.C. concurred.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chairman Graw asked if there was any further business.

Bob Harbison advised that he would be absent at the December 4, 2003 Public Hearing.

Hearing no further business, Bob Harbison made a motion to adjourn the workshop. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 4-0. Doug Powell was absent. The workshop adjourned at 8:55 P.M.

**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
  
**OF**  
  
**FAYETTE COUNTY**

**ATTEST:**

---

**JIM GRAW**  
**CHAIRMAN**

---

**ROBYN S. WILSON**  
**P.C. SECRETARY**