

SPALDING COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
January 31, 2012

The Spalding County Planning Commission held its regular monthly meeting on January 31, 2012 at 7:00 P.M. in Room 108 of the Spalding County Courthouse Annex. Members present were: Ed Johnson, Chairman, presiding; Janet Bailey; Bruce Ballard and John Youmans. Walt Glover was not present.

Also present were: Chad Jacobs, Community Development Director; Newton Galloway, Attorney and Yvonne Langford to record the minutes.

Mr. Johnson called the meeting to order and invited those present wanting to address the Board regarding any matter to sign in on the appropriate form.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Ms. Bailey nominated Ed Johnson. Mr. Ballard seconded the nomination.

There were no other nominations.

MOTION

Mr. Youmans made a motion to close the nominations and elect Mr. Johnson by acclamation. The motion passed on a second by Ms. Bailey with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Ballard and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion and Mr. Johnson abstaining.

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Mr. Ballard nominated Mr. Youmans. Ms. Bailey seconded the nomination.

There were no other nominations.

MOTION

Mr. Ballard made a motion to close the nominations and elect Mr. Youmans by acclamation. The motion passed on a second by Ms. Bailey with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Ballard and Mr. Johnson voting for the motion and Mr. Youmans abstaining.

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

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

Mr. Jacobs said the discussion will impact Amendment to UDO #A-11-08 and Amendment to UDO #A-12-01. This ordinance has allowed homeowners to build two dwellings on a piece of property and connect them by means of a breezeway. This makes it possible to have duplexes in single-family districts. The intent is to get language on the books that allow mother-in-law suites and eliminate the breezeway language. Mr. Galloway has said it might be possible to get a definition of a dwelling unit that would resolve the issue. People have taken advantage of the breezeway concept. A structure connected via a breezeway is treated as a single-family dwelling which lends itself to abuse. Mr. Galloway reviewed the proposed ordinance. In doing research, they found that on May 27, 2008 the Planning Commission adopted an ordinance defining a mother-in-law suite that was approved on June 26, 2008 by the County Commission. It is not in Mr. Galloway's copy of the code. Further research needs to be done

to determine if it is in the code. If it is in the code, it will need to be amended to make the changes that are being proposed. Mr. Galloway recommended no action on Amendments #A-11-08 and #A-12-01 until further research can be done.

MOTION

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

Amendment to UDO #A-12-01: 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. Youmans made a motion to table Amendment to UDO #A-1-01. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Ballard with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Ballard, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

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

Mr. Jacobs said this is an amendment to Architectural and Design Standards. Mr. Galloway has advised him there is a provision that the Industrial Development Authority is exempt from the ordinance and requests exceptions as a courtesy. There is language that directs that any façade of the building visible from the road has to be constructed of brick, stone or stucco type material. It cannot be a steel building. On large buildings, it can increase the cost considerably. It can have a large impact on being able to get industrial prospects to the community. The Industrial Authority has a façade ordinance requiring the office area to be brick. Usually the Development Authority standards exceed the count requirements. The Industrial Development Authority does not have to request approval for exceptions. They have historically requested approval because they want to work in cooperation with the county. If the county has a façade requirement that goes beyond what is necessary to satisfy the desired aesthetics, it will make it more difficult for the Development Authority. He would like to meet with the Development Authority to resolve any concerns prior to approving the amendment. Discussion was held regarding the impact this change in the ordinance might have on large industry.

MOTION

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

Amendment to UDO #A-12-03: Appendix K. Landscape and Tree Preservation Ordinance for Multi-Family, Commercial, Institutional and Industrial Developments – Section 105 – amend minimum plant requirements.

Mr. Jacobs said the ordinance requires that for every 2000 SF of impervious surface you have to provide one 2” caliper canopy tree, one 2” caliper under-story tree and for every 300 SF of impervious surface you have to have one three-gallon shrub. For a one-acre site, that would require 22 canopy trees and 22 under-story trees for a total of 44 trees. You would also have to have 145 three-gallon shrubs. On some of the smaller sites, you run into space problems with having to plant that quantity of materials. Landscaping is necessary, but there needs to be some consideration regarding the number being required. He is recommending that the number be reduced to one 2” caliper canopy tree for every 2500 SF and one 2” under-story tree for every 3000 SF and one three-gallon shrub for every 500 SF of impervious surface. Discussion was held regarding the need for quality and not quantity. The Board was in support of the change that was recommended.

MOTION

Mr. Ballard made a motion to approve Amendment to UDO #A-12-03. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Youmans with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Ballard, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

MINUTES

Ms. Bailey made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 25, 2011 meeting. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Ballard with Ms. Bailey, Mr. Ballard, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

ADJOURN

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

Ed Johnson – Chairman

Yvonne M. Langford - Recorder