

SPALDING COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
February 28, 2012

The Spalding County Planning Commission held its regular monthly meeting on February 28, 2012 at 7:00 P.M. in Room 108 of the Spalding County Courthouse Annex. Members present were: John Youmans, Vice-Chairman, presiding; Bruce Ballard and Walt Glover. Ed Johnson and Janet Bailey were not present.

Also present were: Chad Jacobs, Community Development Director, David Luckie, Executive Director of the Development Authority and Yvonne Langford to record the minutes. Zoning Attorney Newton Galloway was not present.

Mr. Youmans called the meeting to order.

Amendment to UDO #A-11-08: Lift from the table – Article 2. Definitions of Terms Used – Section 203:O – amend definition dwelling unit regarding attachment of dwelling.

MOTION

Mr. Ballard made a motion to lift Amendment to UDO #A-11-08 from the table. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Glover with Mr. Ballard, Mr. Glover and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Mr. Jacobs said there are some changes to the verbiage but essentially everything is the same with the definition of a dwelling unit except for the portion that was reviewed last month. It states that a “separate or additional dwelling unit shall not be connected by means of a structure such as a breezeway to an existing dwelling, single-family detached”. This language is being recommended in an effort to eliminate the duplexes that are being created with the current ordinance. Discussion was held regarding the abuses that are occurring under the current ordinance.

MOTION

Mr. Glover made a motion to approve Amendment to UDO #A-11-08. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Ballard with Mr. Ballard, Mr. Glover and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Amendment to UDO #A-12-01: Lift from the table - Article 5. AR-1 Agricultural & Residential – Section 503:C(17), Article 6. AR-2 Rural Reserve – Section 603:C(15), Article 7. R-1 Single Family Residential Low Density – Section 703:C(16), Article 8. R-2 Single Family Residential – Section 803:C(17), Article 10. R-4 Single Family Residential – Section 1003:C(16), Article 11. R-5 Single Family Residential – Section 1103:C(16) – amend to allow mother-in-law suites as accessory use.

MOTION

Mr. Glover made a motion to lift Amendment to UDO #A-12-01 from the table. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Ballard with Mr. Ballard, Mr. Glover and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Mr. Jacobs said this is the amendment to allow a mother-in-law suite. Mr. Galloway wanted to do some research to determine if there was a previous change that was never put in the UDO. The research was done, and it was approved by the Planning Commission for a mother-in-law suite, but when it went to the County Commissioners, it was approved on the first reading but was tabled indefinitely at the time of the second reading by a 5-0 vote. There has been no further action. Since it was never officially adopted, they would like to move forward with this amendment. There are some changes since this was tabled at the last meeting. The changes were made to make it clearer regarding where they will be allowed.

Mr. Ballard expressed concern regarding the size of the suites that are allowed. There are some homes that are of a size and property size that would allow for a larger unit than the 750 SF. It might be better to restrict it to a one bedroom, one bath that could be a larger size or if it could be a percentage of the main dwelling and not restricted to 750 SF. Where the houses are in an area zoned for smaller houses the 750 might be appropriate. Mr. Jacobs said he fully understood Mr. Ballard's concerns but they are trying to eliminate the abuse of the structure becoming a second dwelling.

MOTION

Mr. Glover made a motion to approve Amendment to UDO #A-12-01. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Ballard with Mr. Ballard, Mr. Glover and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Mr. Ballard said he is still concerned that with some houses the 750 will not be appropriate and will detract from the overall dwelling and landscape.

Amendment to UDO #A-12-02: Lift from the table - Appendix J. Commercial/Industrial Development Ordinance – Section 416 – amend Architectural and Design Standards.

MOTION

Mr. Ballard made a motion to lift Amendment to UDO #A-12-02 from the table. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Glover with Mr. Ballard, Mr. Glover and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Mr. Jacobs said this is the amendment for the architectural and design standards. It was tabled in order to work with in the Development Authority to attempt to establish criteria that would not be in conflict with the Industrial Parks. Mr. Luckie, Executive Director of the Development Authority, was present to discuss the covenants in the industrial parks.

Mr. Luckie addressed the Planning Commission regarding the industrial parks. He reviewed Griffin-Spalding Industrial Park, Green Valley Industrial Park, Hudson Industrial Park and The Lakes at Green Valley Industrial Park. He noted the covenants in each park are different. He discussed how the covenants were established for each of the parks and how they evolved with the tenants in each of the parks. He noted that the covenants in each park are different according to the market and project for each of the parks. He expressed appreciation for the potential opportunity to work with the Spalding County Community Development Department in establishing covenants and ordinances that are in harmony. The Development Authority is concerned about the appearance of the industrial parks. They have a Development Review Board that approves all of the exterior renderings, footprint of the buildings and landscape plans.

Mr. Jacobs reviewed the current ordinances. He said they would like to work in concert with the Development Authority and discuss criteria prior to approving an amendment.

Mr. Ballard said he feels it is important to work with the Development Authority to establish policies that can work together to help bring industry and increase the tax base. He would not like to adopt policies that would conflict with the industrial parks covenants and make it more difficult for them to attract industry.

Mr. Luckie said he appreciated the opportunity to work toward ordinances that are compatible.

MOTION

Mr. Ballard made a motion to table Amendment to UDO #A-12-02. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Glover with Mr. Ballard, Mr. Glover and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Mr. Jacobs said they will work with the Development Authority and bring this back to the Planning Commission when they are ready for approval.

Amendment to UDO #A-12-04: Article 2. General Definitions – Section 202: amend to add definition for Flea Market and Yard Sales.

Mr. Jacobs said this amendment is due to numerous complaints they have received regarding yard sales that do not end. They continue to go on every week-end. The county has nothing on the books to prohibit this. This is being presented to get ideas and comments from the Commission members but probably needs to be tabled to incorporate the comments received. He and Mr. Galloway have discussed this briefly and are not satisfied with the definition of the flea market as opposed to a yard sale. They want to establish an ordinance that is enforceable.

Mr. Youmans said his major concern regarding perennial yard sales is the liability of the parking issues and the dangers they create particularly on major highways.

Mr. Ballard said his concerns regarding yard sales is the fund raising yard sales that are held by not-for-profit organizations. These are usually held at churches or schools and not at residences as is being established in the ordinance.

Mr. Jacobs said that was a good point. The goal is not to be a “yard sale police” but to keep the abusers for being able to operate every week outside the intent of a yard sale.

MOTION

Mr. Ballard made a motion to table Amendment to UDO A-12-04. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Glover with Mr. Ballard, Mr. Glover and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Mr. Jacobs said there is going to be a rezoning application next month that is going to be interesting. It is a request from a church to locate in a PDD zone. PDD zoning is tied to a master plan, so they will have to zone away from the PDD to get to a church. It will be a rezoning, master plan and a special exception for the church. They have had numerous meetings and discussions trying to get them to select another property that would require less time for approval. They are insistent on this location.

MINUTES

Mr. Ballard made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 31, 2012 meeting. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Youmans with Mr. Ballard and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion and Mr. Glover abstaining because he was not present.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned on a motion by Mr. Ballard and a second by Mr. Glover with Mr. Ballard, Mr. Glover and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

Ed Johnson – Chairman

Yvonne M. Langford - Recorder