

THE FAYETTE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION held a **Public Meeting/Workshop** on Wednesday, June 14, 2006 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
Al Gilbert
Tim Thoms

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bill Beckwith
Douglas Powell, Vice-Chairman

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Williams, Assistant Director of Planning & Zoning
Dennis Davenport, Assistant County Attorney
Robyn S. Wilson, P.C. Secretary/Zoning Coordinator

STAFF ABSENT: Pete Frisina, Director of Planning & Zoning
Delores Harrison, Zoning Technician

GUEST PRESENT: Jack Smith

Welcome and Call to Order:

Chairman Graw called the Public Meeting/Workshop to order and introduced the Board Members and Staff.

* * * * *

Chairman Graw advised the preliminary plat applicant that three (3) affirmative votes would be required to approve the preliminary plat tonight and asked the applicant if he would like to proceed forward or table the preliminary plat until the July Public Hearing. Mr. Grover Kneece stated that he would like to proceed forward tonight.

- 1. Consideration of a Preliminary Plat, Jerl Estates, Grover Kneece, Owner, and Randy Boyd, Agent. This property consists of 158.536 acres with 4 single-family dwelling lots. This property is located in Land Lots 33, 34, and 64 of the 4th District, fronts on Bankstown Road, and is zoned A-R.**

Grover Kneece requested approval of the preliminary plat stamped received 05/26/06.

Chairman Graw asked if there were any comments.

Al Gilbert made the motion to approve the preliminary plat. Tim Thoms seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 3-0. Bill Beckwith and Doug Powell were absent.

* * * * *

- 2. Discussion of proposed amendments to the Fayette County Sign Ordinance regarding Division III. Non-Residential Districts, Section 5-32. Freestanding Signs, E. Temporary signage and Section 5-33. Wall Signs, A.4. Size/calculation as presented by the Planning & Zoning Department.**

Tom Williams explained that he was proposing an amendment which is a “housekeeping” item regarding Nonresidential Signs, Section 5-32. Freestanding Signs. He pointed out that the height limitation was not included in the adoption of the Sign Ordinance. He advised that nonresidential freestanding signs may not exceed four (4) feet in height as measured from the grade level of any adjacent streets.

Chairman Graw asked if there were any comments. Hearing none, he instructed Robyn Wilson to advertise the proposed amendments for the July Public Hearing.

In regards to Section 5-33. Wall Signs, Mr. Williams advised that he was proposing an amendment to increase the allowable wall signage from one (1) square foot per linear foot of the front length of the building or portion thereof occupied to two (2) square foot per linear foot of the front length of the building or portion thereof occupied. He explained that the previous ordinance allowed for 10% of the wall surface area.

Robyn Wilson advised that only 8% of the wall surface area was allowed for S.R. 54 West and S.R. 74 South under the previous ordinance.

Mr. Williams presented a drawing prepared by Pete Frisina indicating the allowable wall signage utilizing 1) the previous ordinance, 2) the current ordinance, and 3) the proposed amendment as follows:

- 1) Total square footage of wall - 2,926 square feet = 10% = 292 square feet for signage
- 2) One (1) square foot per 1 linear foot = 120 square feet for signage
- 3) Two (2) square feet per 1 linear foot = 240 square feet for signage

Mr. Williams pointed out that the two (2) square feet per one (1) linear foot was more equitable with the previous ordinance. He confirmed that he had reviewed several Sign Ordinances and most were utilizing one (1) square foot per one (1) linear foot for wall signs. He added that he found 15% being utilized, as well as, 10% when percentage was utilized.

Attorney Dennis Davenport advised the P.C. that when Pete Frisina, Robyn Wilson, Aaron Wheeler, and he were performing the review portion of the Sign Ordinance that considerable time was spent on this particular item prior to it's presentation before the P.C. He reported that there were two (2) schools of thought, going by percentage or going by square foot per linear foot. He said that the majority (3 out of 4) wanted the percentage instead of the linear foot; however, the thought was to not differentiate between windows and walls. He explained that the current ordinance actually provides incentive for glass fronts because it allows no more than fifty percent (50%) or thirty-five (35) square feet, whichever is less, of the total available advertising space (glass area) for display window signs plus a wall sign. He added that any visible sign inside a building within ten (10) feet of a window is considered a window sign. He confirmed that if you focus on percentage then you do not deal with glass vs. masonry and everyone gets the same amount of signage no matter what their building is constructed of. He said it is a problem telling one (1) owner with walls that he is allowed to have less signage (35 square feet) than the owner with walls and windows.

A discussion was held between Attorney Davenport and Robyn Wilson regarding deducting the windows out of the wall area to determine the size of a wall sign under the previous ordinance. Mrs. Wilson stated that the windows were not deducted from the wall measurement under the previous 10% calculation and Attorney Davenport said he thought it was deducted; however, he could be mistaken.

Chairman Graw asked how Staff arrived at the proposed two (2) square feet.

Mr. Williams reiterated that two (2) square feet per one (1) linear foot was more equitable with the previous ordinance.

Tim Thoms stated that the P.C. also discussed this topic at length. He said he remembers the P.C. being concerned about the clutter created by small window signs.

Al Gilbert commented that he would like to see a user-friendly Sign Ordinance.

June 14, 2006

Mr. Williams asked Attorney Davenport if a simple percentage of the entire building frontage was used, regardless of material, then a gross signage allowance could be used for a total of wall signs and window signs. He said that the gross area would then be assigned to wall signage and window signage as best suited the development.

Attorney Davenport replied that you could calculate a percentage but not a quantity. He explained that wall signage is restricted to one (1) sign so do you want to permit one (1) sign or have multiple signs. He added that the P.C. may want to consider a maximum size.

Mr. Gilbert commented that he had a problem restricting the number of signs. He reiterated that the ordinance needs to be good, right, simple, and user-friendly.

The P.C. concurred that regardless of the construction, they preferred the percentage calculation.

Jack Smith suggested to require 30% of the frontage of the building which would be easy to police and set the standard.

Mr. Gilbert stated that the P.C. needs more information. He suggested that Mr. Williams and Mr. Frisina to review and to compare the previous ordinance and the current ordinance and provide illustrations of each at the next Workshop. He added that he would be absent at the July 20, 2006 Public Meeting/Workshop.

Chairman Graw asked Mr. Williams to make the windows part of the wall surface area and calculate what would be allowed or basically calculate the total signage allowed.

Robyn Wilson advised that Doug Powell would also be absent; therefore, the July Public Meeting/Workshop may be rescheduled.

* * * * *

3. Discussion of Architectural Standards for Churches as presented by the Planning & Zoning Department.

Tom Williams commented that the proposed amendments addresses the roof design for churches County wide rather than just the churches in the Overlay Zones. He addressed the following amendment:

Section 7-1.B.8.

- h. All buildings, ~~other than storage buildings,~~ shall maintain a decorative facing on all exterior walls. ~~those portions of the buildings that face public streets and any property zoned residential or agricultural residential.~~ The decorative facing shall consist of brick, stone, stucco or similar building materials compatible with the area.

Tim Thoms stated that this proposed amendment was a major change.

Jack Smith asked if this would affect permanent modular structures.

Robyn Wilson replied that the modular structures would be required to have a decorative facade consisting of brick, stone, stucco or similar building materials compatible with the area.

June 14, 2006

Mr. Williams explained that items j.,(1), (2), and (3) were added as follows:

- j. Structures shall maintain an architectural character consistent with the local community. Roof design shall be compliant with the following requirements for either a pitched peak, mansard facade or flat roof with parapets. Elevation drawings denoting compliance with the following architectural requirements must be submitted as part of the Site Plan:**
- (1) A pitched peak (gable or hip) roof with a minimum pitch of four and one-half (4.5) inches in one (1) foot shall be the preferred design for each independent primary structure and independent accessory structure. Building wings thereof may have flat roofs with parapet walls provided that architectural elements are included that compliment the rooflines and façade of the primary structures.**
- (2) A pitched mansard roof facade with a minimum pitch of four and one-half (4.5) inches in one (1) foot can be used provided that a minimum height of eight (8) feet is provided around the entire perimeter of the structure. Building wings thereof may have flat roofs with parapet walls provided that architectural elements are included that implement the rooflines and facade of the primary structures.**
- (3) If a flat roof with a parapet wall is included in the design, either as the primary structure or as a wing of a primary structure the following requirements shall be met. No straight or curved line may continue more than twenty five (25) feet without severance by an architectural feature or change in alignment or curvature. The height of the parapet or an architecturally consistent visual screen shall be of a height at least twelve (12) inches above the highest point of any rooftop equipment and shall extend for the full perimeter of the roof top.**

Attorney Dennis Davenport suggested the following changes to the proposal:

- j. Structures shall maintain an architectural character consistent with the local community. Roof design shall be compliant with the following requirements for either a pitched peak, mansard facade or flat roof with parapets. Rooftop equipment may not extend above the height of the roof line of the parapet wall and/or mansard roof. Elevation drawings denoting compliance with the following architectural requirements must be submitted as part of the Site Plan:
- 1) A pitched peak (gable or hip) roof with a minimum pitch of four and one-half (4.5) inches in one (1) foot is required ~~shall be the preferred design~~ for each independent primary structure and independent accessory structure. Building wings thereof may have flat roofs with parapet walls provided that architectural elements are included that compliment the roof lines and facade of the primary structures.
- (2) A pitched mansard roof facade with a minimum pitch of four and one-half (4.5) inches in one (1) foot for at least eight (8) feet is required ~~can be used provided that a minimum height of eight (8) feet is provided~~ around the entire perimeter of the structure. Building wings thereof may have flat roofs with parapet walls provided that architectural elements are included that implement the roof lines and facade of the primary structures.
- (3) If a flat roof with a parapet wall is included in the design, either as the primary structure or as a wing of a primary structure the following requirements shall be met. No straight or curved line may continue more than twenty five (25) feet without severance by an architectural feature or change in alignment or curvature. The height of the parapet or an architecturally consistent visual screen ~~shall be of a height at least twelve (12) inches above the highest point of any rooftop equipment~~ and shall extend for the full perimeter of the roof top.

June 14, 2006

Robyn Wilson asked Attorney Davenport if there needed to be a statement added to the proposed amendments which would exempt churches from the architectural standards requiring a pitched roof if located in an Overlay Zone and require the proposed architectural standards instead since the ordinance requires the most restrictive requirements to apply.

Attorney Davenport asked why should churches be exempt.

Mrs. Wilson replied that it was difficult to make a church look residential since a church usually has its own architectural character.

Attorney Davenport stated that if a tract of land is in the Overlay Zone then the Overlay Zone will take precedence. He said that the Overlay Zone applies to all nonresidential development located on a State Route. He confirmed that the proposed amendments only address churches in the O-I, A-R, and residential zoning districts; however, if the property abuts a State Route then the Overlay Zone applies.

Mrs. Wilson remarked that if churches are to be exempt from the architectural standards of the Overlay Zone and have these proposed architectural standards apply instead then a statement needs to be added.

Attorney Davenport asked why would a church be exempt in the Overlay Zone vs. O-I since they are both nonresidential uses. He asked what would be the basis for the distinction.

Mrs. Wilson reiterated that it was difficult to make a church look residential since a church usually has its own architectural character.

Attorney Davenport replied that if the goal of the Overlay Zone is to make structures look residential in appearance then why is a church different from O-I.

Al Gilbert remarked that there is a church wanting to build on S.R. 54 West in the Overlay Zone and this is what brought about the proposed amendments.

Attorney Davenport said that you cannot exempt churches from the Overlay Zone. He stated that the proposed amendments do not apply to churches within the Overlay Zone. He asked why a nonresidential use of a church would get preferential treatment over the nonresidential use of an O-I building. He asked why the O-I building is required to be residential in appearance but the church is exempt. He stated that the challenge would be when an O-I building does not want to look residential in appearance and asked how they would be required to comply with the architectural standards of the Overlay Zone.

Chairman Graw stated that due to the size of the proposed church on S.R. 54 West it will be impossible to comply with the roofing architectural standards.

Attorney Davenport said that the church should not be located in the Overlay Zone. He stated that if you start exempting uses in the Overlay Zone from the application of the Overlay Zone then why have the Overlay Zone. He added that if you change the requirements for one (1) use you better change it for all of the uses.

Chairman Graw advised Attorney Davenport that the P.C. had asked Mr. Frisina to submit them something in writing to review regarding churches which is what is being discussed tonight.

Attorney Davenport reviewed photos of the proposed church on S.R. 54 West and said the size of the church is so much bigger than what a house would ever be; however, you can't ignore making nonresidential uses meet certain minimum standards based upon their size but allow a church which is a nonresidential use to be exempt. He reported that the B.O.C. recognizes that there is not going

to be future residential development along the corridors so you want to encourage some type of nonresidential growth but you don't want to negatively impact the existing residential properties. He added that the Overlay Zone was adopted requiring certain architectural standards such as being residential in appearance.

Mr. Gilbert commented that he thought that the P.C. was only going to discuss architectural standards for churches within the Overlay Zone and not for churches everywhere in the County. He said he did not want additional requirements for churches outside of the Overlay Zone.

Mrs. Wilson stated that at the June 1, 2006 Public Hearing excluding churches from the Overlay Zone was part of the presentation. She said that Mr. Frisina had stated that it was difficult to make a church look residential since a church usually has its own architectural character. She remarked that he advised the P.C. that he was proposing to exclude churches from the Overlay Zone architectural standards. She commented that the P.C. asked if a decision had to be made tonight about churches and Mr. Frisina replied that a decision did not have to be made tonight. She added that the P.C. had requested to discuss the exemption of churches from the architectural standards of the Overlay Zone at the June Public Meeting/Workshop. Mrs. Wilson said she would verify with Mr. Frisina about exempting churches from the architectural standards of the Overlay Zone and if she had misunderstood she would notify the P.C. and Attorney Davenport.

Chairman Graw suggested Mr. Williams further discuss churches in the Overlay Zone with Mr. Frisina, Attorney Davenport, and Attorney McNally. He said that this item needed to be discussed further at the July Workshop, which may need to be rescheduled due to two (2) members who will be absent.

* * * * *

Chairman Graw asked if there was any further business. Hearing none, Tim Thoms made a motion to adjourn the Public Meeting/Workshop. Al Gilbert seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed 3-0. Bill Beckwith and Doug Powell were absent. The Public Meeting/Workshop adjourned at 9:28 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION
OF
FAYETTE COUNTY

ATTEST:

JIM GRAW
CHAIRMAN

ROBYN S. WILSON
P.C. SECRETARY

