

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION met on September 17, 2020 at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Fayetteville, Georgia.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John H. Culbreth, Chairman (via *teleconference*)
Danny England, Vice-Chairman
Brian Haren
Arnold Martin (via *teleconference*)

STAFF PRESENT: Pete A. Frisina, Director of Community Services
Chanelle N. Blaine, Zoning Administrator
Howard L. Johnson, Planning & Zoning Coordinator

Welcome and Call to Order:

Chairman Culbreth called the Planning Commission meeting to order.

1. Consideration of Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on September 3, 2020.

Brian Haren made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held on September 3, 2020. Danny England seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS

2. Consideration of a Minor Final Plat of Brent Fielder Estate. The property will consist of three (3) lots zoned R-70, is located in Land Lot(s) 50 & 51 of the 7th District and fronts on Sandy Creek Road.

Chairman Culbreth asked if there was anyone present that would like to make a comment.

Pete Frisina replied no.

Chairman Culbreth asked is there any discussion my members of the Commission. He said please everyone note this agenda item has changed from four (4) to three (3) lots.

Brian Haren said the question that I have for staff, is this request in compliance with the land use plan?

Chanelle Blaine responded yes.

Brian Haren replied Chanelle do you know what the zoning is?

Chanelle Blaine replied R-70.

Brian Haren responded I mean for the lots that are immediately to the south that are on the other side of Lake Road and Sandy Creek.

Chanelle Blaine replied no I don't but I can look it up.

Brian Haren responded okay, can you?

Chanelle Blaine replied okay, just a second.

Arnold Martin asked so are they just consolidating the lots to make it more useable.

Chanelle Blaine responded they are bringing the lots into compliance, so originally it was just one lot, the flag shaped lot and they had those two houses there as well, but the houses were built before the zoning ordinance was established. She added so they are wanting to sell one of the lots and so in order to sell it, so we told them they have to bring everything into compliance.

Brian Haren replied okay, so don't bother to looking it up. He added so this is almost just housekeeping.

Chanelle Blaine responded yes.

Chairman Culbreth asked are there any further questions. He said if not, the Chairman will entertain a motion.

Brian Haren made a motion to recommend approval of the Minor Final plat of Minor Final Plat of Brent Fielder Estate. Danny England seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

OLD BUSINESS

4. Discussion of the Fayette County Sign Ordinance

Pete Frisina said since Laverne Jones was here and to prevent him from having to sit through a long-winded discussion, I would like to talk about Item #4 first, which is the Fayette County Sign Ordinance. He stated to get the discussion started, I have sent out a model ordinance on LED sign brightness and these were taken from an ordinance that was dealing with the large LED billboards. He said I put it in for discussion because it has all of the units of measurements, nits, lumens, foot candles. He explained I don't know one from the other but these are the three basic measurements you have for the brightness of light that we need to consider if we are going to put some kind of limit on the brightness of the sign. He concluded one of the things that I felt was interesting, but I don't know if this will hold true to all signs, is that the signage has a greater brightness in the daytime as it does in the nighttime, because in the daytime, you have sunlight that you are competing with for the sign to be seen and then at night you have

the darker sky or the darkness, you don't need to have the sign as bright.

Pete Frisina also stated I have since been doing some more research and I have found some other restrictions. He said what I did find is that Fayetteville has a restriction for sign brightness and they also have some restriction on brightness in general on non-residential sites. He added their sign brightness is 20 foot candles at 10 (ten) feet away from the sign. He explained that you have to measure that with the light meter, so you will notice that I put a light meter cost here of \$1500 to \$2400. He noted I have since spoken to Peachtree City, which also has a brightness limit which I think they apply mainly to the entire City of non-residential sites, as opposed to just signage. He explained they are using a light meter that costs somewhere around \$200 they said that works just fine for Code Enforcement, so we will look into that for what we are doing. He concluded again, I am just trying to start this conversation and I think instead of LED sign brightness, we will be just looking at sign brightness in general.

Pete Frisina asked, Laverne, do you have any feelings about what would be a good foot candle, lumens, and nits. He added one is as good as the other, you think?

Laverne Jones replied I don't know, however when I am buying LED lights, nobody asks. He said the vendor provide what they have and most of those meet the federal standards. He added the big billboards I know nothing about because we are not allowed to have them here except in the County and I am not getting many requests for them in the County.

Pete Frisina responded my understanding is that Fayetteville has a limit on the brightness of the sign. He added my understanding from talking with them, there is not a standard that the sign has to meet until there is an issue and then they go out and measure. He asked if you have a sign that you have that is built, what dictates the brightness, let's get away from the LEDs, let consider your typical lighted sign. He questioned is it the wattage of the light source inside, is that adjustable by putting different sized lights in there?

Laverne Jones replied typically we use to have florescent light fixtures and they were all florescent light fixtures used on signage and recently we started going with LEDs, and neon has almost gone away. He explained so if you have neon signs, we are trying to get people to switch them over to LEDs, which are 1) more comfortable and 2) a lot less expensive to operate, and they are not the fire hazard that we had with neon. He added so we are leaning on telling people that we don't even work on neon anymore. He noted I can't get the wire for it anymore, some of the transformers have been discontinued. He concluded neon is going away and people aren't going to be using neon, and they were brighter than florescent, with the LEDs we used to put multiple rows of LEDs to get enough brightness to light the sign.

Pete Frisina asked Laverne is that an internally lit sign.

Laverne Jones replied yes, that is correct.

Pete Frisina said so basically an internally lit sign means that you have a lens with a message on it that is translucent with a light source behind it.

Laverne Jones replied that typically they have a white face because we are not allowed to have clear faces and that is diffusing it a little bit, not much but it is. He explained so most recently, the LED companies are now coming out with different kinds of LEDs which take less rows of LEDs to light the same area up, so it less expensive for them to build them. He concluded it's less expensive for us to buy them and that is what is driving the cost down.

Pete Frisina asked when you put in a LED strip, is it set to a certain brightness or wattage.

Laverne Jones replied correct.

Pete Frisina also asked are some of those adjustable?

Laverne Jones replied no, not that I know of, they are all 12 volts. He added I don't know of a variable that can turn-up that voltage. He explained I am sure if you turn up that voltage, it probably will increase the brightness of it, but I don't know of a power supply that comes from the sign suppliers that are more than 12 volts, there may be one but I don't know.

Pete Frisina asked can you buy strips that are pre-built to have different brightness or are they just all one standard.

Laverne Jones replied I believe they are all the same.

Pete Frisina responded so what really controls it is not the so much the different strips it, is the amount of strips you would put in.

Laverne Jones replied that not increasing the light, it allows you to get more light in an area. He added if you have it thin strips it is going to show dark spots in between and a good example of that is J&R Clothing's sign. He concluded if you look at it at night you can see the LEDs through it.

Pete Frisina asked is that one out there by the Zaxbys.

Danny England replied yes.

Laverne Jones replied look at signs at night, the problem there is since it has a red faces it should have a red lights in it. He explained red lights are dimmer than white lights, and now the white lights are showing through his signage. He concluded whoever did that sign should have installed red lights, not white.

Brian Haren stated Pete, I do know that with LEDs lights you can vary the brightness based on the applied voltage, because we do it at the airport. He added there are other ways to knock it back, red lights tend to be less intense that white, and white is the most intense, but really it's the lens that is applied. He added you can vary the intensity by varying the voltage. He said, I think at the end of the day, we don't care how you achieve the result, the result must be that you meet the standard. He noted that we will make sure the standard is achievable, like in the

picture that I showed you, that light just floods into our subdivision. He concluded I really am looking forward to talking to Fayetteville about it because I bet that no one has gone out there to do a brightness test on the development.

Pete Frisina responded what I got from Fayetteville is they don't check it unless someone asks.

Brian Haren responded I will ask.

Pete Frisina responded I will be interested to see how it comes out. He said I think that will be a good benchmark for this so I will give you the phone number tomorrow. He added also I send an email out to the members of the Planning Commission to drive by and take a look for themselves. He noted this is in the area Brandywine and Highway 54.

Pete Frisina asked are they made with a white lens.

Brian Haren replied it depends on the sign, because on that structure, I get the sense there are different types of signs that is in place there. He said some of it gets turned off at night. He added there is an electrical plumbing supply outlet there and they are dark at night, then you go to the other end of that strip mall and boy it like they are shining a spotlight in your face.

Pete Frisina replied again we do have Peachtree City and Fayetteville have regulations that do address the brightness.

Brian Haren asked do they have the same standards.

Pete Frisina replied no, I don't think so but I will look at it again. He noted Fayetteville has the ordinance for signage but they also have a standard for a sight in general. He said it says to some degree under the sign ordinance, also see this other section. He explained I think Peachtree City looks at it from a sight perspective to the degree that the sign may or may not contribute to the brightness.

Danny England said there are a lot of places where we permit projects where we have to calculate the sight lighting as part of our permitting process. He said we have to have the math for that completed, but exterior sight signage is usually not figured out yet. He added it's usually just the math on pole-mounted lights and things like that, sometimes the sight signage isn't included in that in the number. He concluded I don't know why Peachtree City does it that way.

Arnold Martin asked with any of these types of lights, is there ever a concern about the amount of heat that they generate? He noted I know neon lights used to generate tons of heat, I am assuming LEDs generate a lot less. He added is heat ever taken into consideration that is generated from the lights.

Pete Frisina replied I have not found anything that talks about that, I would assume most

signs are using either fluorescent or LED right now. He added incandescence or neon is probably not used and I think fluorescent and LEDs are going to not produce that much heat. He concluded I guess if you saw a sign with too much heat the lenses would melt.

Danny England replied you would see some old signs and the lens would melt, if the ballast went bad or something. He added I think if we're going to adopt a standard, we would probably use a foot candle, which is lumens per square foot. He explained then we can start to look at the area of the sign and if lumen is just an amount of intensity, a small sign can put out more or less than a large sign, depending on how they have it set up, so if we're looking at trying to get in front of this from a permitting standpoint, if at some point in the future we're saying okay, you've got a 32 square foot sign, so you can't put out more than x foot-candles because we can do the math. He concluded this would be easier and this maybe not need the meter as much, if they have something submitted as part of the sign permit that actually said it not going to produce more than 30 foot-candles.

Pete Frisina asked is the estimate then based on the size of the sign, is that really what goes into the equation of figuring it out or can you just use light meter and say this is too bright?

Danny England replied so, yeah, you can use the light meter, and it would tell you this is the intensity of the light coming out of the sign. He suggested if you could set a standard that uses a foot candle, then you could take into account the area of the sign too. He concluded it might just be helpful than just always reading the intensity.

Pete Frisina asked okay, so do you have an examples of an equation or have you come across that sort of thing.

Danny England responded we do get some signage stuff in the City of Atlanta, which we usually punt to the signage guys because it gets pretty intense. He noted I do think they require some math on lighting levels as part of that. He said so let me see if I can dig one of those up.

Pete Frisina responded we don't want to make it too math-intensive.

Danny England replied well, it's no different than a building permit, it pretty simple. He explained if you have it set as an area, just about everybody knows how big their sign is, so then it is easy to calculate it.

Pete Frisina what we can do on ours is use the maximum sizes, so we can look at that basis and assume that no one can have a larger sign than that. He said that I will get with you to help develop some of this and I am look at some of the other ordinances as well. He concluded again this was put out here because it was the first thing that I ran across.

Brian Haren replied I think it is a good start.

Pete Frisina asked have you ever run into a situation where the brightness is determined by the

time of day.

Danny England replied no I have not seen that before, a lot of LEDs lights are difficult to dim for control so they are just on or off. He added so that might be something that plays into that.

Pete Frisina said I think the reason this has the daytime and the night-time is this was looking at LED billboards, which is judging against the sky.

Danny England replied obviously during the day, you would need twice as much than during the night, I can see that. He added that might be a situation where that billboard just has another set of lights that come on and they turn them off, but you can't really necessarily scale it up and down, but that would make sense in that scenario.

Pete Frisina said alright, I will I will do some more research.

Pete Frisina asked is foot candle, do you think, the best measure of unit of measure?

Danny England replied I do but everybody talks lumens now with light fixtures, but I think if you are talking signage, since we do have a maximum area, it seems like we should tag amount of the light to area of the sign.

Pete Frisina replied I will keep working on this, we will settle on foot candles for our unit of measurement, we will reach out to Fayetteville about how they do their enforcement and then we will move on.

Arnold Martin asked can you define a foot candle please, I am not familiar with that term.

Danny England replied I think the technical definition of a foot candle is one lumen per square foot. He explained if you say a light emits a 100 lumens, then if you had that light and used every square foot in a 32 square foot sign and you would do the math, and say wow that's a lot of light. He added a lumen is just a measurement for light intensity so it just smears that out by square foot. He added it is used in signage as a calculation, where as a light fixture uses just has how many lumens a light fixture produces.

Arnold Martin responded thank you.

5. O-I and the SR 54 Special Development District

Pete Frisina said okay let's move on to the next item for discussion, and that is the discussion of O-I and the State Route 54 Development District. He said that I sent you out some information today and what I am going to start out with is the SR 54 West Special Development District. He noted I am looking on page one (1) under Office / Business and Building Contractor Phase. He explained you can see where we talked about changing the standard from 20 percent to ten (10) percent and I have added a little verbiage in there that talks about the content

associated with inside storage. He said it shall constitute ten (10) percent of the total building footprint area proposed for internal access storage structure, excluding the footprint of a separate vehicle, boat and trailer storage, which I need to update as well. He further explained we talked about the ten (10) percent now being required being based on the footprint of the storage facility and what I got from the last meeting is we don't want that to be detached from the storage facility. He noted it says here that the office space may be located within the footprint of the internal storage facility. He explained the footprint is generating the total amount which is derived by the ten (10) percent or an equivalent amount that can be moved outside of the footprint but still in an attached portion of the structure. He said it cannot be detached and it has to be attached.

Pete Frisina said okay, the question is what constitutes an attachment, if I say attached, I hope people would understand that it will be attached by some wall. He added I am looking if anybody has any suggestions, I am open to it, and otherwise I can leave it as it is. He concluded you can move it outside of that footprint but we still want it to be attached to the structure. He asked is everybody good with that.

Arnold Martin replied yes.

Pete Frisina said what I sent out today is under small numeral five (5), and so the question that came to me was about vehicle storage building, and so the question to me was, if this is an internal access storage facility can the vehicle storage building be external access. He noted that each of the spaces that will be dedicated to storing your building will have its own door and you will store that. He added that was my vision when I was conjuring this up. He explained now the one gentleman we talked to the other day is basically doing a sub-level area, which is mainly fully enclosed with individual parking areas, not those individually walled off sites. He said again that's now the same kind of thing that I had envisioned is a different way of doing it. He said I am going to ask you Brian since you are an RV owner, in terms of storing your RV, were you thinking of an open storage where there is not a walled-in area around your RV or were you thinking it was an individual storage kind of room.

Brian Haren responded I don't think it matters, I really think it is what the developer thinks the market will bear.

Pete Frisina explained this structure under this category has to be fully enclosed so either it's fully enclosed similar to what Vincent proposed with two entrances in a space or what the other people talked about is looking at it as a fully-enclosed structure. He added so either way is good if you don't have a problem with an external access.

Brian Haren said that access should not be visible from the road.

Pete Frisina replied I am thinking that access may be difficult the way some of these have to be laid out, you are probably going to see a bay door where the individual bays are.

Brian Haren responded those bay doors should not face the front of the structure.

Danny England responded we have it restricted now where it can only be in conjunction with internal access self-storage facilities. He added I would think if we are doing one of these things and we are going to have this, this will probably wind up being on the back, every time. He concluded we should probably stipulate that it can't be in the front.

Pete Frisina said it is very difficult in my opinion, if you look at the site like we are looking on Highway 54, basically on a rectangular site, when you are driving down the road you are seeing a different angle. He added it is almost impossible to say you can't see the side.

Danny England replied I think we just say it can't be in the front, because it is either going to be behind or on the sides.

Pete Frisina said I think if you make sure it is directly to the rear of the principal storage units.

Arnold Martin asked if it is a rear, does that anyway restrict turning radius, we are talking RVs.

Danny England replied that's for their civil engineer to figure out.

Brian Haren responded there is CADD software that will automatically calculate that for you.

Arnold Martin said okay.

Pete Frisina said every site is going to be different, at least it will add something that it will be located to the rear of principal. He added I also added is the term recreational vehicle and or trailer storage. He said structure shall only be used for these vehicles. He explained what we don't want is somebody to say hey, I will rent one of these storage facilities out and do something different with them and allowing them to be externally accessed. He said I will add verbiage here that it will be to the rear. He concluded the question is in terms of this section, only the State Route Special Development District if I make the change and get that to the rear, are we ready to go the public hearing on this portion of the ordinance.

Danny England, Brian Haren and Arnold Martin all simultaneously responded I think so.

Pete Frisina said what I will do is add some language to roman number small five (5), and I am going to advertise this for October. He added the other thing we need to work with Danny England is to look at the Overlay which is attached here but doesn't have any changes. He noted we will start looking at the architectural standards. He explained that if we end up changing the architectural standards for the Highway 54 West Overlay, we will probably change it for the others. He explained the whole idea when we put this together was, the County was looking the architecture in the non-residential portion of the incorporated County to be different than those in the City. He noted the residential standard or character for the most part was not getting large building in the County and the original overlay was only on State Route 54 and has since spread out with different overlays in different areas. He said the whole idea was create some kind of since of place by adding a similar roof or other similar design characteristics, so the big

buildings that we see are where we are right now. He concluded the only reason the mansard came about was because we ran into was that building on State Route 74 South, when that one came in it was large enough that the pitched roof became an issue structurally.

Brian Haren asked which one was that.

Pete Frisina stated that if you go down State Route 74, close to Redwine Road where the animal shelter is, it is the Colonial Office Buildings. He added when that first came in to us, we said that it had to meet the standard, structurally not a good idea. He explained when we came up with the aspect of allowing a mansard roof that was plausible at that time. He said I will send everybody a list that I gave Danny of some different buildings in the County, I would encourage you to go out and look at those and see the differences in what had happened in terms of the mansard roof. He explained I am going to get with Danny and we are going to try to hammer out something for the much larger structure and then try to figure out what kind of standard we want when that comes into play. He added what kind of architecture embellishment we would want to achieve the kind of look and character for the unincorporated County. He stated again I think the only threshold we have right now for the mansard is if the building is large enough that a pitched peak roof is not structurally possible or if it is a two-story structure. He explained once you get past those two thresholds, you don't have to use the fixed pitched roof, you can use the manifold which mimics the fixed-peak to a degree. He said I'd like to have something when we do allow it. He concluded we can set some kind of standard to create some kind of sense of place or character for the County.

Chairman Culbreth said okay, any questions, Pete.

Pete Frisina said I have another thing I want to bring up. He added this is somewhat outside of what we're talking about tonight, but it still deals with Hwy 54 and I'd like to get your feedback if this is something we need to talk about a little more. He said I understand that you have three (3) sets of things either in the County's Land Use Plan or the Code that deals with State Route 54. He noted you have a SR-54 Overlay use which is part of the Land Use Plan and the Land Use Element. He said that is the discussion of what it is, why we did it, and the recommendations for office use along State Route 54. He concluded then you have the State Route 54 Overlay Zone, which sets standards for whatever it may be for that over and above the base zone, it could be setbacks buffers, architectural standards, and so forth.

Pete Frisina said we have a third thing we introduced, which is embedded in the Office-Institutional zoning district, which is called the State Route 54 West Special Development District. He added now we have these three (3) things that seem to mesh to some degree, but not all. He explained so, I am dealing with a piece of property and some individuals asking how to develop a piece of property and when does the Highway 54 Overlay come into play and when it doesn't. He said so what we're looking at now is a large piece of property coming in with rezoning on SR-54, it is zoned O-I, but the development pattern of the property, since it sits on the corner, is that it will be sub-divided in the future. He noted while some of it will follow the overall masterplan of how to be developed, in time, the first phase will be to take a parcel and to sub-divide it, and it will not touch Highway 54, but it

will be in that initial zoning, but you have some things in play here that have set precedence.

Pete Frisina noted we had a development early in the county on SR-54 before we had the Special Development District that was rezoned at the corner of SR-54 and Flat Creek Rd on the NE corner. He added it came in as an eight (8) acre parcel with double frontage, which means that it touches both corners. He explained it was then subdivided into four (4) parcels, three (3) of which only have frontage on Flat Creek Trail, and the other parcel has double frontage on SR-54 and Flat Creek Trail. He said by bringing it in under that zoning, the eight (8) acres, what happens is when you subdivide it, that carries those restrictions to the other parcels, even though they no longer have frontage on SR-54, so they get both the benefit of the corridor, but they also have the regulations.

Pete Frisina said now technically, if someone came in on SR-54 and Flat Creek Trail, and they did not have restrictions of Hwy 54 overlay. He asked So, do you think that this is a proper way for this property to be developed in that first phase, which will not be touching Hwy 54, but will be part of your rezoning that is on Hwy-54? He also asked do you think this is the case, given that it has happened in that one small office complex on Flat Creek Trail. He concluded, it is a philosophical question.

Danny England replied it is.

Pete Frisina said as I was looking through this while talking to the people, originally they were coming in looking for a piece of property off Hwy-54. He concluded I said to the people, yes, you do not have to have that restriction, but you don't get all of the benefit because the area's already Land Use for O-I, but it's not in an overlay district.

Brian Haren So what are those benefits?

Pete Frisina said well under this, you get an internal access door, that's the whole idea. He said look at where it says under the Special Development District, the following area identified in the comprehensive plan is a SR-54 West Overlay District, and that's your land use, then you go back to that and say what is that? He explained the State Route 54 Overlay District encompasses those areas in unincorporated Fayette County along State Route 54. He stated my vision is those properties that face State Route 54. He concluded this is something that I have been talking to people about, and I said that this is something that I'm going to run by the Planning Commission.

He asked is this something you guys want to look at, I can send you some literature and have you look at it.

Arnold Martin: I'd like to.

Brian Haren responded yes, I would.

Pete Frisina replied what I will do is, I will send you all, the three (3) sections of our Code

and Policy guides. He explained two (2) of them, the Special Development District and the Overlay District, you already have. He added so, I will send you the final plat of that property on Flat Creek Trail.

Pete Frisina asked so the issue is, is that a proper way to do this, If anything, you would have to bring the entire property in, because then that entire property is tied all the way through and the restrictions carry all the way through no matter how you subdivide it.

Brian Haren stated when you subdivide it, you change the legal description of the parcel.

Pete Frisina replied oh yeah, you have to go through a platting process. But the re-zoning is on the entire parcel. You don't get out of the restriction by subdividing.

Brian Haren Okay.

Pete Frisina said it's one of these things where you both get the benefit and the restrictions. He added you don't get to say "wow, I'm going to subdivide it, now I'm going to get architectural controls". Now you're still subject to the overlay requirements.

Brian Haren Okay.

Pete Frisina replied I will get that stuff sent out to you and I will also look at the one thing to put the vehicle storage in the rear of the main structure. He said I will shoot that out tomorrow and I will go ahead and see if I have enough time to advertise.

Brian Haren asked is it just one public hearing here, before it moves (to the Board of Commissioners)?

Chairman Culbreth asked are there any comments on the public hearing?

Pete Frisina replied John, this meeting is not being live streamed, because we don't have any live hearings.

Chairman Culbreth responded you have it listed here on the agenda, okay, that's fine.

Pete Frisina continued I have enough time to get to add in tomorrow to run next Wednesday for us to have the overlay Special Zoning District for us to vote on, on October 1st, and it can go to the Board of Commissioners for final approval.

Chairman Culbreth Are there any comments or questions?

Danny England replied I think we're done.

Chairman Culbreth said I can entertain a motion for adjournment.

Pete Frisina interjected I just want to mention one thing, we have two re-zonings also for October 1st.

Danny England & Brian Haren both replied okay.

Pete Frisina said that's it John.

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

Chairman Culbreth said a motion is in order for adjournment.

Arnold Martin made a motion to adjourn. Brian Haren seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:52 PM.



JOHN H. CULBRETH, SR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:



HOWARD L. JOHNSON
PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY