

**Planning Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
September 19, 2017**

**I. Approval of August 15, 2017 Minutes**

H. Mallon made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 15, 2017 meeting. F. Zeidler seconded the motion approved 5-0.

**II. Conditional Use Permit**  
a. none

**III. Rezoning**

a. **Public Hearing:**

**B. Butcher to rezone 380 Seavy St from R40 to Residential Historical.**

D. Rimi explained that the applicant is requesting this rezoning to construct a home at 380 Seavy St. The applicant would like to rezone the entire parcel and divide it into two separate parcels. The square footage requirement of 2000 sq. ft. for a home in the R 40 zoning classification conflicts with the size of the home that the builder is looking at constructing. The builder is wanted to construct an 1800 square foot home that would be able to comply with the setback requirements of 60 feet in the front, 20 on each side and 40 in the rear of the property.

J. Pendley, the builder explained that the homeowner on the adjacent parcel to this property on Johnson St. currently owns this property and the plan is for her to use the portion of the parcel on Johnson Street for her home and the Seavy St. property would be developed by him.

J. Preece opened the public hearing for comments.

Paula Campbell, 356 Johnson St., explained to the Planning Commission that she can remember about 10 years ago, while she was in the beauty parlor, hearing that someone wanted to do something with their property near here and the city wouldn't allow it. She stated that it wrong to have not allowed them, in the past, to do something but now in the future allowing it.

Diane Cleveland, Seavy St, stated that she is disappointed that this variance is being considered for this property. The city is giving variances on square footage, setbacks it is unfair that the city is doing this now and

would not do it in the past. In 2001, when her father past away, she missed a deadline for rebuilding a house that burnt down and now they are handing out variances to anyone that requests one.

Mr. Simmons, the city manager stated that if you are saying it is unfair then not to allow the variance, are you saying since they did things unfair in the past the current citizens need to be punished and not to allow them to have variances.

Ms. Cleveland stated that maybe unfair was not the correct language, she is just concerned that the city is being over developed and the ordinances are being ignored.

Mr. Shell, Morgan St, explained that the city is getting out of control with allowing variances. He sold a portion of property to someone and they got a variance and built a huge house on it. He was told that he could not build on that size parcel, but then they gave someone else a variance to build on it. He has been here for ages and the city is getting away from what it was and he is very upset to see how it is being over developed.

J. Preece closed the public hearing section for this item.

J. Pendley explained that the style of the home that will be developed is the same as the house on the corner or Johnson and Middle.

The Planning Commission voiced concerns over the lot fronting Johnson not being zoned the same as the lot adjacent to it on Johnson Street.

S. Shelby made a motion to recommend approval of the preliminary plat and a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning with the condition that the parcel facing Johnson St. remain R 40 and the property facing Seavy Street be rezoned to Residential Historical. H. Mallon seconded the motion; approved 4-1 with J. Preece voting against the motion.

b. **V. Boswell to rezone 291 Morgan Street from R40 to Residential Historical**

Mr. Boswell explained that during the process of building his home he mistakenly built over his setbacks. He is asking for the rezoning because the setbacks under the Residential Historical are more in line with the way he built his home.

Ms. Rimi explained that the home is built 27 feet from his property line and under his current zoning classification his setbacks are 40 ft. from the property line. The rezoning would take care of the issue with the front setbacks. The rear setback will still be 3 feet over the property line. This can either be resolved by having Mr. Boswell apply for a variance or if the administrative variance procedure is approved the staff would be able to grant him a variance.

J. Preece opened the public hearing for comments.

No public comments were made.

J. Preece made a motion to table the rezoning until the rear setback can be resolved. S. Barker seconded the motion; approved 5-0.

#### IV. Plat Review

##### a. Keg Creek Landing- Conceptual Plat

Steve Moore, from Moore Bass Engineering explained that he was representing this project. Mr. Moore stated that this project is now a combined project from two projects that were previously reviewed, one is the Seavy Hills that was shown by Nathan Dockery and the other was the Cleveland Project which was brought in front of you by Richard Ferry. During those meetings, the applicants had a lot of feedback from the Planning Commission and it was taken into consideration when the revisions were done. Mr. Moore explained that the development consists of 248.0 acres and 356 lots consisting of 4 pods, pod A -106, pod B- 79 homes pod C-135 homes and pod D- 36 homes. Mr. Moore also explained that there is a portion of the parcel on the other side of Highway 85 that is 29 acres, which would be donated to the city. The R-40C zoning requires 40% open space, the changes that were made was to incorporate the open space into the project so now each home, except for one or two, backs up to open space and the project contains approximately 50% open space. Each pod meets the open space requirements as a standalone and as a combined unity. One of the other items that was requested was to have amenity centers for the subdivision, this can be utilized by all the homes in the development and there will also be an amenity center for the senior which would consist of picnic tables, pavilion and barbecue grills. The buffering concerns were also addressed the previous shown was 50 feet buffer and it has now been enlarged to 100 feet and this would be a planted and landscaped buffer.

H. Mallon asked if the senior area would have a pool.

S. Moore stated that right now it does not but that would be up to the developer.

S. Moore stated that pod A would be on 50 'X 125' lots, pod B 80' x 136' lots, pod C 80 x 136 lots, and pod D would be 90' x125' lots, and again the open space would be touching most of these lots. Mr. Moore explained that due to previous concerns that

the city had of the entrance being too close to the highway the developer has moved the entrance back to line up with the entrance across the street.

Mr. Moore explained that what is being proposed for the density bonus is the improvement of the intersection of Highway 85 and Seavy street, this would include the donations of the right of way. This is consistent with the city's Transportation Improvement Project plan that was on the books since the early 2000's, the other item is the donation of a 29-acre tract of land on the south side of Highway 85, this has a value of 600,000 donation to the city.

J. Preece explained that he is concerned with the amount of traffic that will be brought into the city.

L. Wendt explained with the size of the project this intersection would need to be completed, just due to the increase of traffic from the subdivision.

S. Baker stated that he does not want to see the same thing that happened on Rockaway Road with Heritage Point.

D. Rimi explained that the city has plans to widen Seavy Street and the city recognized the need for the improvements to the intersection before the subdivision was proposed.

F. Zeidler stated that he is still concerned with the density of the project, since the density is above what is currently allowed and he appreciates that the applicant has taken their concerns into consideration when redesigning the project. Another concern would be the golf carts trying to access Seavy Street to either cross the street or to go into town,

Mr. Moore explained that the density bonus that was given to Traditions of Senoia was 1.8 and to Tinsley Ponds was 1.3 this project lies in the middle of these two. This project would be golf cart accessible which will reduce some of the automobile traffic.

L. Wendt stated that it would double the amount of golf carts coming into town.

S. Barker stated that the applicant has made some great strides in revising this project. S. Barker asked the staff if there was a way to have the traffic study examined by the city's engineer.

D. Rimi stated that the traffic study can be done prior to the preliminary plat and it would then have to come back to the Planning Commission when the preliminary plat is voted on.

L. Wendt stated that this project does not look like any other project in the city.

**F. Zeidler asked staff if the city is widening Seavy Street to a four-lane road.**

**D. Rimi stated that no it would still be a two-lane road.**

**J. Preece asked Diane Cleveland, the seller of the property, what kinds of trees are in the right of way. Ms. Cleveland stated that she was not sure.**

**L. Wendt asked if there was a possibility of getting access from Highway 85?**

**S. Moore stated that it would be too close to Seavy St.**

**J. Preece asked why the subdivision is laid out the way it is?**

**S. Moore explained that when developing this project, they took the approach to protect the landscape of the land, this design reduces the amount of grading that needs to be done.**

**S. Barker made a motion to recommend approval of the conceptual plat with the traffic study to be done prior to the preliminary plat. H. Mallon seconded the motion; 0 in favor and 3 in opposition. (F. Zeidler, L. Wendt and J. Preece)**

**V. Site Plan Review**

**a. Legacy Christian Church.**

**S. Barker recused himself.**

**D. Rimi introduced this item by informing the Planning Commission that the applicant has met all the regulations for the site plan. The parking was increased and when the church was originally constructed they had planned for the school to be built, so the storm water was already calculated and was addressed at the time the church was built.**

**J. Preece opened the item up for public comments, none were made. J. Preece closed the public hearing section for this item.**

**F. Zeidler made a motion to recommend approval. H. Mallon seconded the motion approved 5-0.**

**VI. Ordinances**

**a. Public Hearing:**

**Text Amendment to the City of Senoia Zoning Ordinance to allow for Administrative Variances.**

**D. Rimi explained that an administrative variance would just be applied to encroachments into setbacks of less than 10 percent of the original setback. An**

example would be if a building had a 50-foot setback and they requested to encroach it by 4 feet and there are no other extenuating circumstances the staff would be able to approve the variance. This is beneficial to the citizens since a variance fee would not be needed and they would not need to wait for a public meeting.

J. Preece opened the item up for public comments, none were made. J. Preece closed the public hearing section for this item.

H. Mallon made a motion to recommend approval of the administrative variance.  
L. Wendt seconded the motion; approved 5-0.

**VII. City Planning**  
a. Permitted Use

D. Rimi explained that the staff and legal are still working on these revisions and it will be placed on an agenda when completed.

**VIII. Adjourn**

H. Mallon made a motion to adjourn the meeting. S. Barker seconded the motion; approved 5-0.