

**THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION** held a **Workshop** on April 15, 2004 at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Board of Commissioners Conference Room, Suite 100, Fayetteville, Georgia.

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Aaron Wheeler, Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator  
Chris Venice, Director of Planning/Community Development Division  
Director  
Pete Frisina, Senior Planner  
Bill McNally, 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. He introduced and welcomed Aaron Wheeler as the new Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator. He also welcomed the Fayette County High School students.

\* \* \* \* \*

**1. Discussion of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding O-I (Office Institutional) Zoning District to allow for a percentage of commercial uses in O-I.**

Pete Frisina reminded the P.C. that Audrey Massey had requested allowances to the O-I Zoning District in the hospital area to allow some commercial uses which would be similar to the M-O Zoning District in the City of Fayetteville. He explained that the M-O Zoning District allows uses at a much greater intensity than what the County had anticipated. He confirmed that the affected area, known as the Fayette County Community Hospital District, which is north of S.R. 54 West, east of Tyrone Road, and west of Sandy Creek Road. He reported that the auxiliary permitted uses would be permitted in an office building with a minimum of 10,000 square feet but could occupy no more than a total of twenty percent (20%) of the total floor area of the building and be on the first floor of the building. He added that multiple auxiliary permitted uses may be permitted concurrently but may not exceed the twenty percent (20%) limitation. He noted that the auxiliary permitted uses would include a durable medical and rehabilitation equipment sales/rental, pharmaceutical sales, high turnover sit-down restaurant (no drive-thru or free standing facility), optical care center, gift shop, and floral sales. He added that signage would be addressed by the Fayette County Sign Ordinance. He said that he began the proposed amendments prior to his vacation, however during his vacation, Aaron Wheeler came on board and did some more work on it and did a very good job with the proposal.

Chairman Graw said that if a developer wanted to build two (2) 5,000 square foot buildings that he would not be permitted to have any auxiliary permitted uses. He asked if this was correct.

Mr. Frisina explained that you would need at least a 10,000 square foot building to allow partial service to these establishments, however they will have to be supported by customers from outside the office building as well. He presented photographs of existing buildings in the County consisting of 4,000 square feet to 12,000 square feet.

Al Gilbert commented that the County needs to come up with a way to accommodate an office park developed with six (6) to eight (8) buildings totaling 10,000 square feet or more instead of one (1) building consisting of 10,000 square feet.

Attorney McNally stated that when considering multiple buildings that you also have to look at what you don't want to happen. He said that the proposal was designed to allow the location of a commercial use inside of a building that has other uses. He cautioned that if the building was to get too small that you would not get the type of desired business.

Mr. Frisina remarked that based on the anticipation of the area being developed with larger buildings that Staff did not consider smaller buildings. He commented that he thought 10,000 square feet was a good starting place. He added that he would rather be conservative now than to open the door too wide initially because the ordinance can always be revised should the need arise.

The P.C. concurred.

Bill Beckwith asked if a maximum should be set for commercial uses.

Mr. Frisina replied that a maximum was discussed, however it was decided that the maximum would be set by the percentage of the size of the building.

Doug Powell suggested adding a pick-up/drop-off dry cleaners which would provide a use for the employees in the medical area.

Mr. Frisina replied that Staff did not want to include personal services in this area. He said that there is a commercial area planned at Tyrone Road which is a better location for personal services.

Chris Venice added that most companies provide a uniform service.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Graw instructed Robyn Wilson to advertise the proposed amendments for the May Public Hearing.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Agendas were signed for the high school students from 7:23 P.M. to 7:25 P.M.

\* \* \* \* \*

2. **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; B. S.R. 85 North Overlay Zone; and C. General State Route Overlay Zone.**

Chris Venice presented a table illustrating the three (3) overlay zones with the same topics addressed under each. She referenced the lighting section of the overlays and stated that Aaron Wheeler had provided a handout regarding light pollution which discusses "dark sky" certification. She stated that S.R. 54 West would be the most restrictive while S.R. 85 North would be the least restrictive.

Bob Harbison suggested to identify what "where applicable" means in regards to requiring a berm under Dimensional Requirements.

Mrs. Venice replied that a berm would be required as a condition of zoning depending upon the particular situation possibly dealing with sound or aesthetics.

**Page 3**  
**April 15, 2004**  
**Workshop**

Mr. Harbison stated the requirement would be clearer if it stated that a berm may be required as a condition of zoning when applicable.

Chairman Graw suggested adding the berm requirement to the S.R. 85 North Overlay Zone.

Attorney McNally advised that the berm requirement could be added to the S.R. 85 North Overlay Zone also because the berm requirement is basically to give developers notice that a berm may be required if needed.

The P.C. concurred.

Mrs. Venice referenced the Architectural Standards and reported that facade/siding were now defined as wood or wood textured vinyl siding, brick, or stone for the S.R. 54 West/S.R. 74 South Overlay Zone and the General State Route Overlay Zone and that "or similar material" had been deleted. She advised that brick, stucco, or stone would be allowed in the S.R. 85 North Overlay Zone.

Al Gilbert suggested adding hardy plank to the list of permitted facades/sidings in the S.R. 54 West/S.R. 74 South Overlay Zone and General State Route Overlay Zone.

Mr. Wheeler concurred.

Doug Powell suggested adding the verbiage "or facing any property zoned agricultural-residential or residential" under the S.R. 85 North Overlay for clarification.

Chairman Graw remarked that the end of the parenthesis was missing after S.R. 54 West under the S.R. 54 West/S.R. 74 South Overlay Zone.

Under Landscape Requirements, Mrs. Venice pointed out that provisions had been made to permit septic system placement and/or detention placement within the 50 foot front landscape area depending on the overlay zone as previously discussed.

Mr. Wheeler advised that he had stumbled across the "dark sky" information while preparing a Lighting Ordinance at a previous municipality. He commented that the handout gave examples of good and bad lighting fixtures and was for informational purposes only. He remarked that choosing the correct lighting fixture you could minimize "bleed over" and retain the lighting on-premise. He added that the handout also provides the name of manufacturers.

Mr. Harbison suggested that the ordinance should either address the specific type of fixture permitted or some kind of measurement of lighting on-site and focus on lumen on-site.

Attorney McNally stated that it is very difficult to control the intensity of lighting.

Mr. Wheeler replied that it would be easier to enforce the type of lighting fixture rather than measurement of lumen on-site.

Mr. Powell expressed concern that once lighting was addressed in nonresidential development that it would then creep over into residential development.

Mr. Gilbert suggested placing the burden onto the developer to hire a lighting expert.

Mr. Harbison said it is hard to tell someone not to light their property because lighting prevents crime. He added that he would be interested in seeing how other ordinances address lighting issues.

Mrs. Venice stated that Staff would continue to refine the proposal for further discussion at the May Workshop.

**Page 4**  
**April 15, 2004**  
**Workshop**

Chairman Graw asked if there was any further business. Hearing none, Al Gilbert made a motion to adjourn the workshop. Bill Beckwith seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0. The workshop adjourned at 8:00 P.M.

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

**ATTEST:**

---

**JIM GRAW**  
**CHAIRMAN**

---

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