

MINUTES
PERRY PLANNING COMMISSION
July 28, 2008
6:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order: Chairman Beeland called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

2. Roll:

Commissioners Present: Martin Beeland, Chairman; Paul Cosey; Jim Mehserle; Todd Barker; Terre Walker; Lawrence Clarington.

Commissioners Absent: Patricia Jefferson.

Staff Present: Mike Beecham, Director of Community Development; Barbara Crisler, Planning Technician.

Guests/Speakers: Lee Gilmour, City Manager.

Press: None Present.

3. Invocation: Commissioner Walker gave the invocation.

4. Approved July 14, 2008 Minutes as Submitted: Chairman Beeland recommended the minutes be approved as submitted. Commissioner Cosey motioned to approve the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Clarington seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

5. The Campaign Notice, per O.C.G.A. 36-67A-3: Chairman Beeland referred to the notice posted on the door of the City Council Chambers.

6. Informational Hearing:

1) Recommendation for Approval – Rezoning Application #R-08-008: Chairman Beeland presented a request from Kim Mullins, owner requests to rezone a total of 18.99 acres from City of Perry R-3, Multi-Family Residential District to City of Perry C2, General Commercial District for property located on Perry Parkway. Mike Beecham reviewed and explained the conditions of the application. Mr. Beecham pointed out this site was recently given approval and issued a land disturbance permit for a regional detention facility. There was a North Perry Drainage Study completed which recommended the consideration of a regional detention facility. This regional detention facility will serve several surrounding properties.

Chairman Beeland stated there was no one in attendance for comments in favor or in opposition. Comments were requested from the Commissioners and staff.

Commissioner Cosey asked if there would be a fence around it.

Mr. Beecham stated that a fence is required around all regional ponds four (4) feet or more in depth.

Commissioner Mehserle asked if the regional pond would be the property of the city.

Mr. Beecham stated one of the options would be for the city to accept ownership and maintain the facility but, currently there is only an easement for access capability. Chairman Beeland stated that one land owner should not expect to have the burden of the entire cost of the regional detention pond.

Mr. Beecham stated there would be a cost sharing mechanism in place for any property adding to the regional detention facility.

At this time, Commissioner Mehserle motioned to give a formal recommendation of approval to Mayor and City Council of the C2 rezoning request. Commissioner Walker seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

7. New Business:

- 1) Denial of an Appeal of the Architectural Design Standards that were approved at the June 9, 2008 Planning Commission meeting for the proposed Joanne's Florist located at 725 Carroll Street. Mike Beecham presented for discussion an appeal by the owner of the property, Bryan Fountain. The Commission approved the cooler addition request with three (3) conditions 1) the cooler shall be completely enclosed by a privacy fence; 2) the privacy fence shall be a shadow slat fence with top cap and the fence shall be at least as tall as the cooler; and 3) the cooler and fence must be painted to match the existing green building. Mr. Fountain wants to have the fence conditions, conditions 1 and 2 removed.

Mr. Beecham informed the Commission that the Downtown Development Authority discussed this matter at their meeting held on July 22, 2008. Mr. Fountain assured the DDA that the area around the cooler and in the back area of the store would be kept clean and free of debris. At that time, the DDA concurred with Mr. Fountain that a fence is not needed around the cooler located in the rear of 725 Carroll Street.

Chairman Beeland stated there was no one in attendance for comments in favor or in opposition.

The Commissioners discussed matters such as amending the height requirement of the fence, different locations for the fence, and amending the conditions of the fence requirement allowing the fence not to be erected for a period of time and determine if the area would be kept clean and free of debris.

After a brief discussion, Commissioner Cosey motioned to reaffirm their June 9, 2008 decision subject to the following conditions: 1) the cooler shall be completely enclosed by a privacy fence six feet (6') in height; 2) the privacy fence shall be a shadow slat fence with top cap; and 3) the fence must be painted to match the existing green building. Commissioner Barker seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Old Business: *Change in the Agenda*

- 1) Review for an amendment to the PLDO: Section 149 – Subdivision Perimeter Buffers. Mr. Mike Beecham informed the Commissioners' that at the July 15, 2008 City Council meeting, the Public Hearing was held for this amendment to Section 149 – Subdivision Buffers. Mr. Beecham informed the Commission, currently, the ordinance is written so that arterials streets must have a six (6) foot landscaped berm and a six (6) foot privacy fence. The Council decided to send it back to the Commission for you to review a couple of items. Those items included the following 1) Council wanted to know the

definition of a privacy fence is the one to be used for the subdivision buffers; or do you want to require a more substantial privacy fence in the buffer; and 2) the Council needs clarification on the berms for subdivision bordering an arterial street.

Mr. Beecham opened for discussion the revised changes that were discussed at the Council meeting.

Lee Gilmour stated what the Council wanted to know at the Planning Commission's Informational Hearing was it your intention to require a fence within the buffer off of arterials streets. If the Planning Commission felt there needed to be both, is there any particular location of where the fence needed to be within the buffer?

Chairman Beeland stated that in his opinion a fence should be erected with landscaping off of minor and collector streets. Along arterial streets we should require the landscaped berm.

Commissioner Cosey stated he remembered some of the pictures we reviewed at our joint meeting with City Council, when you have a six foot berm and require landscaping that would extend four feet high, or higher, a fence would not be required.

Mr. Beecham the reasoning behind the requirement of landscaped berms and landscaped fence areas is not only to reduce the noise from the street but also for the aesthetic appeal.

Commissioner Walker my interpretation of what we have decided was that off arterial streets we would require a berm or a fence with adequate landscaping but, not both.

The Commissioners' discussed the types of required fences, whether they would require a fence with a berm off arterials streets, or should we just require a landscaped buffer, and require a landscaped fence area off of minor and collector streets. The Commissioners' further discussed Section 149 and agreed to make the following changes: 1) the privacy fence should only be required on minor and collector streets; 2) a wood privacy fence would be required to have a top cap; 3) a landscaped berm is permitted in lieu of a privacy fence on minor and collector streets; 4) Section 149.2.6 should be renamed "Minor and Collector Streets" from "Privacy Fence" to make it compatible with Section 149.2.7; and 5) the material and type of fencing would be reviewed by the Commission during the preliminary plat approval.

After a brief discussion, Commissioner Cosey motioned to recommend the following changes to Section 149 to Mayor and Council: 1) the privacy fence should only be required on minor and collector streets; 2) a wood privacy fence would be required to have a top cap; 3) a landscaped berm is permitted in lieu of a privacy fence on minor and collector streets; 4) Section 149.2.6 should be renamed "Minor and Collector Streets" from "Privacy Fence" to make it compatible with Section 149.2.7; and 5) the material and type of fencing would be reviewed by the Commission during the preliminary plat approval.

Commissioner Walker seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

7. New Business: Cont'd.

2) Discussion for an amendment to the PLDO: Section 81.5 – Office Commercial District Amendment Application #A-008-0708:

Mr. Mike Beecham presented for discussion amending Section 81.5 – Office Commercial District. Several months ago we reviewed an OC, Office Commercial rezoning request, and at that time we considered changing the maximum size

requirement for buildings in an OC district. Mr. Beecham opened the discussion to the building size limitations in the OC district.

The Commissioners' discussed some possible size limitation requirements and concurred to have section 81.5 OC, Office Commercial district remain the same and possibly consider reviewing the maximum size requirement at a future date.

9. Adjournment: There being no further business to come before the Perry Planning Commission, Chairman Beeland adjourned the meeting at 7:10 P.M.

PERRY PLANNING COMMISSION ATTENDANCE SHEET

Monday

July 28, 2008

*****PLEASE SIGN IN*****

NAME:

ADDRESS:

| | |
|---------------|-------|
| 1. Lee Gilman | Perry |
|---------------|-------|

CHAIRMAN

SECRETARY
