

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION met on March 3, 2005 at 7:00 P.M. in the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue West, Public Meeting Room, First Floor, 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
Pete Frisina, Assistant Director of Planning
Delores Harrison, Zoning Technician
Dennis Davenport, Assistant County Attorney
Robyn S. Wilson, P.C. Secretary/Zoning Coordinator
Deputy Shawn Albea

Welcome and Call to Order:

Chairman Graw 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. He welcomed the students from Fayette County High School.

Chairman Graw announced that this would be Bob Harbison's last public hearing as he has resigned from the P.C. He added that a new member would be appointed by the B.O.C. and he/she would be present at the April Public Hearing.

* * * * *

1. Consideration of the Minutes of the meeting held on February 3, 2005.

Chairman Graw 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. Bill Beckwith seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

2. Consideration of the Workshop Minutes of the meeting held on February 3, 2005.

Chairman Graw asked the Board Members if they had any comments or changes to the Workshop Minutes as circulated? Bob Harbison made the motion to approve the Workshop Minutes. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

3. Consideration of the Workshop Minutes of the meeting held on February 17, 2005.

Chairman Graw asked the Board Members if they had any comments or changes to the Workshop Minutes as circulated? Bob Harbison made the motion to approve the Workshop Minutes. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0-1 with Doug Powell abstaining from the vote.

* * * * *

Chairman Graw explained to the audience that a Preliminary Plat was the subdivision of property which was already zoned and only the technical aspects of the Preliminary Plats could be addressed by the public.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ONLY ON MARCH 3, 2005.

4. **Consideration of a preliminary plat, Westside Park, M & M Communities, Inc., Owner, and Raymond Stiles, Agent. This property consists of 16 single-family dwelling lots on 44.81 acres. This property is located in Land Lot 164 of the 5th District, fronts on Stanley Road, and is zoned R-40.**

Ray Stiles of Franks & Associates requested approval of the preliminary plat stamped received February 23, 2005. He stated that the proposed subdivision consisted of approximately 44 acres with 16 single-family dwelling lots. He confirmed that there is approximately 19 acres of open space which the developer wishes to dedicate to Fayette County for greenspace.

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

Doug Powell asked about the two (2) lots fronting Stanley Road only.

Mr. Stiles replied that the two (2) lots were being developed under Riversprings Subdivision.

Al Gilbert made a motion to approve the preliminary plat. Bill Beckwith seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

Aaron Wheeler read 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 MARCH 3, 2005 AND BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON MARCH 24, 2005.

5. **Consideration of Petition No. T-014-05, Donald W. and Jane Smith, Owners, and Harry R. Stamper of Sprint PCS, Inc., Agent, request to construct a 180 foot Monopole Telecommunications Tower plus a 12 foot lightning rod. This property is located in Land Lot 33 of the 7th District, consists of 34.5 acres, fronts on Ebenezer Road, and is zoned A-R. Proposed tower does not comply with the 2 mile separation between tower facilities.**

Sean Cash confirmed that he had a Radio Frequency Engineer (RFE) to review the possibility of co-location on the Crown Castle tower as requested at the previous Public Hearing by the P.C. He referenced an affidavit prepared by the RFE which states that Sprint currently has poor coverage due to the lack of facilities. He stated that the Crown Castle Tower is 180 feet in height and even if the tower could be raised there would still be a lack of coverage with co-locating at 220 feet. He added that there are serious questions as to the structural integrity of such an increase in height which would be required to be lighted per FAA Regulations. He said that they had tried to comply with the two (2) mile separation requirement, however there is no property available.

Chairman Graw asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none (one person in audience), he closed the floor from public comments.

Bob Harbison made a motion to approve the petition subject to the recommended conditions. Al Gilbert seconded the motion.

Chairman Graw asked Mr. Cash if he agreed to all five (5) recommended conditions.

Mr. Cash replied yes sir.

Bill Beckwith asked what was the difference between the coverage area from the Crown Castle tower to the proposed tower.

Mr. Cash replied that the difference was significant. He presented four (4) maps: one propagation map reflecting the gap in Sprint's coverage to date; one propagation map reflecting coverage with the proposed tower; one propagation map reflecting the gap if Sprint were to be able to locate their antenna on an existing 180 foot Crown Castle tower; and one propagation map reflecting coverage of all the Sprint sites including the proposed tower.

Mr. Harbison stated that the proposed tower is 1.7 miles from the closest tower and one of the issues with constructing a tower is finding a place for locating a tower. He said that he didn't think a better place will be found to construct a tower and fill in the coverage gaps. He added that the construction of the proposed tower would also allow more carriers.

Chairman Graw stated that if Sprint could co-locate on the Crown Castle tower also that it would greatly fill in the coverage gap.

Mr. Harbison pointed out that the affidavit from the RFE stated that Sprint cannot get the need coverage by co-locating only on the Crown Castle tower. He added that by co-locating on the Crown Castle tower and constructing the proposed tower there is a possibility that they will get the desired coverage.

Mr. Beckwith asked Attorney Davenport if the County needs coverage in the area.

Attorney Davenport replied that, to his knowledge, the new system which is being implemented will provide very good coverage, however additional coverage may be needed.

Doug Powell asked where the tower would be constructed on the lot.

Mr. Cash replied to the back center of the lot approximately 804 feet from the rear property line.

Mr. Powell asked where the existing house was located on the lot.

Mr. Cashed pointed out the existing house on the lot which is 374 feet from the proposed tower facility.

Mr. Powell stated that he could not support the petition since the requirement was for a two (2) mile separation between towers. He said he wasn't serving on the P.C. when the ordinance was adopted. He added that there were numerous people in opposition at the previous public hearing who stated they located to this area of the County because it was country and did not want to be able to see a tower. He pointed out that the lessee will receive monetary benefits as will Sprint but the people in the area who have to look at the tower will not receive any monetary compensation.

Al Gilbert stated that he was serving on the P.C. when the tower ordinance was adopted and the P.C. tried to make their best effort to develop an ordinance, however they knew it would not fit every situation and there would be some exceptions which is why this petition is before the P.C. and the B.O.C. He said that the telephone and power companies would be allowed to be constructing right now because they have the right, however a telecommunications tower is looked at differently. He remarked that they do have to provide coverage for residents of the County for cell phone usage. He commented that telecommunication towers were like a school or fire station because at some point in time, somebody is going to be next door. He added that he did not have a big problem with the petition.

Mr. Harbison said he was also serving on the P.C. when the ordinance was adopted. He stated that the P.C. struggled with the tower ordinance more than any other. He remarked that the P.C. reviewed maps of existing towers and the P.C. thought that two (2) miles would be fair, however variances are necessary or there will be no further towers constructed because it is hard to comply with the two (2) mile separation. He commented that tower companies have no right to condemn property to allow construction of a tower but have to gain the property owner's permission. He added that this proposal was in the best interest to keep more towers from asking to be constructed.

Chairman Graw stated that he too was serving on the P.C. when the ordinance was adopted. He said that the P.C. talked to a lot of cell phone experts including engineers and that a two (2) mile separation was really stretching the limits and towers would not always be able to meet the requirement. He added that this may be one of those cases.

At this time, Chairman Graw called for the vote. The motion passed 4-1 with Doug Powell voting in opposition.

* * * * *

The agendas for the Fayette County High School students were signed from 7:33 P.M. to 7:35 P.M.

* * * * *

6. **Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Thoroughfare Plan, the Transportation Element of the Fayette County Comprehensive Plan, and Article III. Street Design Standards and Specifications, Section 8-47. Classification system, Section 8-48. Minimum right-of-way widths and dedication requirements 8-49. Roadway sectional composition standards by use and functional classification, 8-50. Design speed and grade, and 8-54. Acceleration and deceleration lanes of the Fayette County Development Regulations as presented by the Planning Department.**

Pete Frisina advised that the Planning Department, Engineering Department, and Public Works Department were proposing to revise the Thoroughfare Plan to reflect the functions of the roadways and the new alignments funded by SPLOST which were reflected in the Transportation Plan. He presented a copy of the Thoroughfare Plan adopted in 1985. He reported that since 1985 there had been three (3) minor amendments made to the Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Frisina stated that more detailed classifications of streets were being proposed. He explained that these classifications consisted of: 1) Major Arterial, which are all of the Georgia State Routes; 2) Minor Arterial, which provides traffic movement within and through the County; 3) Collector, which collects traffic from local and other county collector streets and provides a connection to arterial streets; 4) County Local, which provides access to adjoining properties and traffic circulation within a limited area; and 5) Internal Local, which primarily serves an individual development and provides traffic circulation within that development. He explained that he did not want an Internal Local street to be classified as high as a County Local street since an Internal Local street only serves the subdivision in which it is constructed. He also explained that he did not want a Major Arterial which is a State Route to be classified as high as a Minor Arterial such as Redwine Road. He added that the proposed Thoroughfare Plan also includes the proposed East-West Fayetteville By-Pass.

Doug Powell referenced page T-2, third paragraph from the bottom, and pointed out that "three categories" should be deleted and replaced with "five categories".

Mr. Frisina replied that he would make the correction.

In regards to the proposed amendments to the Fayette County Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Frisina explained that the existing three (3) categories of street classifications were deleted and replaced with the proposed five (5) categories of street classifications. He added that these revisions were necessary so that the Thoroughfare Plan and Comprehensive Plan will be compatible.

In regards to the proposed amendments to the Fayette County Development Regulations, Mr. Frisina explained that Phil Mallon on the Engineering Department had some housekeeping changes. He referenced the following changes:

Section 8-47. Classification system - Existing three (3) categories of street classifications were deleted and replaced with the proposed five (5) categories of street classifications. Add the following statement: Any street not indicated on the Thoroughfare Plan will be classified by the Fayette County Engineer.

Section 8-48. Minimum right-of-way widths and dedication requirements - Delete adopted date by the Board of Commissioners. Under Functional Classification, add "Major Arterial"; under Minimum R/W add "Per GDOT"; and under Minimum Pavement Width add "Per GDOT". Under Functional Classification, add "Minor" and delete "street" after Arterial and under Minimum Pavement Width, delete "based on 10 year ADT forecast". Under Functional Classification, delete "street" after Collector and under Minimum Pavement Width, delete "based on 10 year ADT forecast". Add "County Local" under Functional Classification and add 60' under Minimum R/W. Add "Internal" before "Local" and delete "street - Residential" after "Local" and under Functional Classification and delete "***" after "24" under Minimum Pavement Width. Delete "Rural residential without curb and gutter, permitted only in subdivisions consisting of 5 acre and larger lots" under Functional Classification and delete "60" under Minimum R/W and delete "24" under Minimum Pavement Width. Delete "Other local" under Functional Classification; delete "60" under Minimum R/W; and delete "24" under Minimum Pavement Width. Delete Average Daily Traffic (ADT) information and also all criteria listed under 8-48.(2) due to the fact that Public Works and Engineering Department do not utilize the ADT information.

Section 8-49. Roadway sectional composition standards by use and functional classification - (1) Add "/Local" after "Residential".

Section 8-50. Design speed and grade - Add "County" under "Local" under Street Classification; "10%" under Maximum Grade; "35" under Maximum Design Speed; and "1%" under Minimum Grade. Add "Internal" under Street Classification. Delete all criteria for Other local. Add "MPH" after each Maximum Design Speed.

Section 8-54. Acceleration and deceleration lanes - Add "County Local &" before "Collector" under Minimum Deceleration Lane Design. Delete "(Design speed - 45 mhp)" under Minimum Deceleration Lane Design and delete "(Design speed - 55 mph)" under Arterial.

Al Gilbert made a motion to approve the proposed amendments with the one (1) minor correction. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

7. Consideration of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Zoning Ordinance regarding Article VII. Conditional Uses, Exceptions, and Modifications, Section 7-1. Conditional Use Approval, B. Conditional Uses Allowed, 34. Self-Storage Facility as presented by the Zoning Department.

Aaron Wheeler advised that the proposed amendments were brought to Staff's attention by a member of the community which works in this particular field and was discussed at a previous Workshop.

Chairman Graw asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none (one person in audience), he closed the floor from public comments. He confirmed that the BOC had also requested the PC and Staff to review the ordinance for further amendments.

Bob Harbison suggested to delete "the overhang" and replace with "any overhang" under Section 7-1.B.34.,d.

Doug Powell asked Attorney Davenport if input should be taken from the public regarding the proposed amendments. He said that the P.C. took public input for the proposed ordinance amendments regarding an airplane hanger. He pointed out that this is the second time that a measurement has been placed on an ordinance which later had to be revised.

Attorney Davenport replied that the number was gained from public input.

Mr. Harbison explained that a builder of self storage facilities attended the February Workshop and gave some very good reasons why the amendment was necessary.

Mr. Powell replied that getting the public input was a good idea when an ordinance is updated.

Chairman Graw stated that the builder had explained that houses are larger in Fayette County and they have more furniture and more items to store which required over 425 square feet.

Mr. Powell said that he was absent at the February Workshop which is why he was asking the question.

Bill Beckwith made a motion to approve the proposed amendments with the one (1) change. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 5-0.

* * * * *

Chairman Graw asked if there was any further business.

Aaron Wheeler announced that the Workshop scheduled for tonight after the Public Hearing had been cancelled. He reminded the P.C. of the Workshop scheduled for March 17, 2005 at 7:00 P.M.

There being no further business, Bill Beckwith made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Doug Powell seconded the motion. The motion for adjournment unanimously passed 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:50 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION

OF

FAYETTE COUNTY

ATTEST:

JIM GRAW
CHAIRMAN

ROBYN S. WILSON
SECRETARY

