



**CITY OF FOREST PARK
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Thursday, March 16, 2023 at 6:00 PM
Environmental Courtroom- Planning & Community Development Building

Website: www.forestparkga.gov
Phone Number: (404) 366.4720

PLANNING BUILDING AND ZONING
785 Forest Parkway
Forest Park, GA 30297

MINUTES

BOARD MEMBERS: Andy Porter, Azfar Haque, Michael Clinkscales, Roderick Jackson, Donald Williams

CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME: Azfar Haque called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

ROLL CALL: A quorum was established.

Present: Azfar Haque, Michael Clinkscales, Roderick Jackson, Donald Williams

Absent: Andy Porter

Others Present: LaShawn Gardiner, Planning & Community Development Director; SaVaughn Irons, City Planner; Latonya Turner, Planning & Community Development Administrative Supervisor

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of February 16, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Roderick Jackson made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2023, meeting. Michael Clinkscales seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

2. **Case # CUP-2023-02-Conditional Use Permit, for 66 Barnett Road, Parcel # 13052C A020**, Forest Park, Georgia. Current Zoning (Light Industrial-LI). The applicant, Amanda Street, is requesting a conditional use permit to remove 6 antennas, 6 Tower Mounted Amplifiers (TMAs), 3 Remote Radio Units (RRUs), 3 A2 modules and 1 Cable and install 9 antennas, 3 cables and 1 DC9 on an existing self-support tower.

LaShawn Gardiner, Planning & Community Development Director, read the staff report stating that the applicant, AT&T, and its authorized agent Providence Real Estate Consulting is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to remove 6 antennas, 6 TMAs, 3 RRUs, 3 A2 modules, and 1 cable. Upon removal of the current equipment, the applicant will install 9 antennas, 3 RRUs, 3 cables and 1 DC9 on the existing self-support

tower. The applicant has housed equipment on the existing tower for several years which is approximately 180 feet.

Per Section 8-10-10, location of an antenna on an existing building, structure, or telecommunication facility may be issued to erect, repair, construct, relocate or maintain an antenna on an existing building, structure, tower, or monopole within the city provided that:

- (1) The existing building, structure, tower or monopole is fifty (50) feet in height or greater;
- (2) If an antenna is installed on an existing building or structure other than a tower, such antenna adds no more than twenty (20) feet to the height of the existing building or structure.
- (3) No advertising is permitted on the antenna or telecommunication facility;
- (4) If an antenna is installed on a structure or building other than a tower, the antenna and supporting electrical and mechanical equipment must be of a neutral color that is identical to, or closely compatible with, the color of the supporting structure or building so as to make the antenna and related equipment as visually unobtrusive as possible;
- (5) If an antenna is installed on an existing tower of any height, such antenna adds no more than twenty (20) feet to the height of said existing tower;
- (6) The antenna is not artificially lighted unless required by the FAA, FCC, or other state or federal agency of competent jurisdiction for safety purposes. Where required, the building inspector shall review available lighting alternatives and approve the design which would cause the least disturbance to the surrounding views.
- (7) The antenna meets or exceeds current standards and regulations of the FAA, the FCC or such governing agency with the authority to regulate telecommunication towers and antennas. If such standards and regulations are changed then the owner of the antenna shall bring such antenna into compliance with any revised standards and regulations within six (6) months of the effective date of such standards and regulations, unless a more stringent compliance schedule is mandated by the controlling agency. Failure to comply with this provision shall be grounds for the city to require removal or re-permitting of the antenna at the owner's expense;
- (8) The antenna complies with all current safety, design, structural, and wind loading standards of applicable building and technical codes adopted by the city, so as not to endanger the health and safety of residents;
- (9) The antenna is equipped with an anti-climbing device to prevent unauthorized access;
- (10) The antenna is set back from any adjoining residentially zoned property a minimum distance of two hundred (200) feet, as measured from the side of the existing building or structure which is closest to or facing the adjacent residential property to the boundary of a residentially zoned lot; and
- (11) The antenna is set back from all property lines a distance of fifty (50) feet.

1. **Would the proposed amendment be consistent and compatible with the City's land use and development, plans, goals, and objectives?** The proposed use is compatible and consistent with the City's land use and development goals and objectives.
2. **Would the proposed amendment tend to increase, to decrease, or to have no impact on traffic safety and congestion in the streets?** The proposal will not cause a significant impact on the transportation infrastructure.
3. **Would the proposed amendment tend to increase, to decrease, or to have no relationship to safety from fire and other dangers?** The proposed use will have no impact on community facilities.
4. **Would the proposed amendment tend to promote, to diminish, or to have no influence on the public health and general welfare of the City?** The proposed request to remove and replace equipment does not appear to be a detriment to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare if the Conditional Use Permit is granted.
5. **Would the proposed amendment tend to increase, to decrease or to have no influence on the adequacy of light and air?** No impact on light and air quality.
6. **Would the proposed amendment tend to cause, to prevent, or to have no influence on the overcrowding of land?** No.
7. **Would the proposed amendment tend to cause, to prevent, or to have no relationship on the population distribution within the city, thus creating any area so dense in population as to adversely affect the health, safety, and general welfare of the city?** The proposed use will not increase the population or density as to adversely affect the health, safety, and general welfare of the City.
8. **Would the proposed amendment tend to impede, to facilitate, or to have no impact on the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage, other public services, utilities, or facilities?** The proposed use will not cause any impact on the water/sewer and other utilities or other public services.
9. **Would the proposed amendment tend to be compatible with environmental conditions in light of surrounding developments? If compatible, what factors, if any, would diminish the value, use and enjoyment of surrounding properties?** The subject property value has no existing zoning restriction that would diminish the value and enjoyment of surrounding properties.
10. **Would the proposed amendment tend to promote, to diminish, or to have no influence upon the aesthetic effect of existing and future uses of the property and the surrounding area?** Granting a Conditional Use Permit would not diminish or have no influence upon the aesthetic effect of existing the future uses of the property and surrounding area.
11. **Would the proposed amendment have measurable adverse economic effect on the value of surrounding or adjacent property?** The use appears suitable for the nearby properties. There is no indication of any potential detrimental causes that would decrease the property value of surrounding or adjacent property.
12. **Would the proposed amendment create an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts?** The Conditional Use Permit would not create an isolated district.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT** to allow the removal and installation of equipment on an existing self-support tower in a Light Industrial (LI) zoned district.

Azfar Haque opened the floor for comments.

Amanda Street of Providence Real Estate Consulting, speaking on behalf of AT&T, stated that the proposal would benefit cellular service in the Forest Park area.

Azfar Haque closed the floor for comments.

Roderick Jackson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for 66 Barnett Rd. Michael Clinkscales seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

3. **Case # CUP-2023-03- Conditional Use Permit, for 1067 Forest Parkway, Parcel # 13049D A001,** Forest Park, Georgia. Current Zoning (Institutional Commercial-IC). The applicant, Alyson Hamm, is requesting a conditional use permit to operate Honey's Sweet Memories, LLC., as a small event venue.

SaVaughn Irons, City Planner, read the staff report stating that the applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to add and operate a small event, party and studio venue in which she will host small gatherings, bridal showers and banquets that will not exceed 40 people and only operate Friday through Sunday (Weekends). Presently, the space is utilized as a party supply store at 1067 Forest Parkway Ste. A. This property is in the Institutional Commercial District (IC). The intent of the IC district is to allow a land use category for offices, banks, and personal business services which can serve as a transitional area between residential and commercial districts. Currently the district does not allow event venues as a permitted use or a conditional use but does allow places of assembly as a conditional use. Examples of Public Assembly Uses are Arenas, assembly halls, auditoriums, concert halls, convention halls, dance halls, exhibition halls, gymnasiums, indoor theaters, pool or billiard halls, stadiums, and similar indoor amusement or recreation uses. This property currently houses a party supply store, bakery and a salon within the same parcel. West of the arterial street is Lorraine Pl. The street frontage for the parcel is Forest Parkway; west of the parcel is one residential home and a commercial/retail business, south of the parcel are residential homes, east of the parcel are residential homes and an office building, and north of the parcel are commercial businesses.

Per Section 8-8-90, one (1) parking space for each six (6) seats or total parking area equal to 3 times the gross floor area, whichever is greater. Where there are no fixed seats each 24 inches of bench or pew shall be considered 1 seat. Where there are no seats, benches, or pews, each 20 square feet of ground or floor area usable for seating shall be considered 1 seat. Upon observation from aerial photographs, it appears the applicant has sufficient parking with an approximate parking space count of 8. Suite A Square footage is 1,000. Property address is not a standalone building. Building has additional suites attached. The Minimum requirements for the front yard setback to Forest Parkway is 25 feet, the minimum side (east) setback is 15 feet, the side (west) setback is attached, and the minimum required rear setback is 30 feet.

1. **Would the proposed amendment be consistent and compatible with the City's land use and development, plans, goals, and objectives?** The proposed use is compatible and consistent with the City's land use and development goals and objectives. West of the parcel is within the Institutional Commercial District and contains a small residential structure and a CVS pharmacy, south of the parcel

are residential homes, east of the parcel are a mixture of small businesses, and north of the parcel is within the Downtown Mainstreet District and encompasses a variety of other businesses.

2. **Would the proposed amendment tend to increase, to decrease, or to have no impact on traffic safety and congestion in the streets?** The proposal will not cause a significant impact on the transportation infrastructure.
3. **Would the proposed amendment tend to increase, to decrease, or to have no relationship to safety from fire and other dangers?** The proposed use will not have an increase, decrease of the relationship to safety from fire and other dangers if event space attendee numbers are minimized. The proposed use can affect emergency access if there is an overflow of parking.
4. **Would the proposed amendment tend to promote, to diminish, or to have no influence on the public health and general welfare of the City?** The proposed development does not appear to be a detriment to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare if the Conditional Use Permit is granted.
5. **Would the proposed amendment tend to increase, to decrease or to have no influence on the adequacy of light and air?** The proposed use will not increase, decrease or have any influence on the adequacy of light and air.
6. **Would the proposed amendment tend to cause, to prevent, or to have no influence on the overcrowding of land?** No.
7. **Would the proposed amendment tend to cause, to prevent, or to have no relationship on the population distribution within the City, thus creating any area so dense in population as to adversely affect the health, safety, and general welfare of the City?** The proposed use will not increase the population or density as to adversely affect the health, safety, and general welfare of the City.
8. **Would the proposed amendment tend to impede, to facilitate, or to have no impact on the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage, other public services, utilities, or facilities?** The proposed use will not cause any additional impact on the water/sewer and other utilities or other public services.
9. **Would the proposed amendment tend to be compatible with environmental conditions in light of surrounding developments? If compatible, what factors, if any, would diminish the value, use and enjoyment of surrounding properties?** The subject property value has no existing zoning restriction that would diminish the value and enjoyment of surrounding properties.
10. **Would the proposed amendment tend to promote, to diminish, or to have no influence upon the aesthetic effect of existing and future uses of the property and the surrounding area?** Granting a Conditional Use Permit would not diminish the future uses of the property and surrounding area.
11. **Would the proposed amendment have measurable adverse economic effect on the value of surrounding or adjacent property?** The use appears suitable for the nearby properties. Applicant has discussed use with neighboring businesses. There is no indication of any potential detrimental causes that would decrease the property value of surrounding or adjacent property.
12. **Would the proposed amendment create an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts?** The Conditional Use Permit would not create an isolated district.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT** to allow a small event venue within the Institutional Commercial (IC) District. **WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. The applicant must adhere to the City of Forest Park, GA Zoning Ordinance Parking standards outlined in Section 8-8-90.
2. The applicant will provide a letter of approval/consent from neighboring businesses providing consent of type of business to ensure no disruption of the current tenant/businesses
3. The applicant will provide written policy to guest on limited parking spaces and advise that they are not allowed to park on side residential streets, RM residential district is south of parcel.
4. Maximum number of occupants in facility shall not exceed 40 persons at any time.
5. Violation of these conditions will result in the loss of the conditional use permit and associated business licenses.

SaVaughn Irons stated that the applicant did provide letters of consent from neighboring businesses. Michael Clinkscales asked Ms. Irons if she was saying that all the conditions had been met and Ms. Irons responded yes.

Alyson Hamm spoke and thanked staff for working with her. She stated that she wanted to provide a space for residents to gather, celebrate, and enjoy life. She stated that she had previously held events at her home.

Michael Clinkscales asked Mrs. Hamm if she had any problems with parking at the property. Mrs. Hamm responded no and stated that she plans to be respectful to the neighbors and surrounding businesses. Mrs. Hamm stated that it would be explicitly stated in her contract with clients that parking is limited and that either her or husband would be on-site to monitor.

Michael Clinkscales asked if the city had addressed the potential parking issue at the property. Ms. Irons stated that she spoke to Mrs. Hamm regarding parking. Ms. Irons stated that the surrounding businesses indicated in their letters of consent that they would be willing to share their parking spaces with Mrs. Hamm with proper notice. Mrs. Hamm also stated that her husband owns a business in a neighboring city and would allow use of his parking lot.

Azfar Haque asked Mrs. Hamm if she planned to have a kitchen and she responded no. She stated that she would utilize catering vendors.

LaShawn Gardiner stated that, if granted, the Conditional Use Permit could be revoked.

Michael Clinkscales made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for 1067 Forest Pkwy provided all conditions were met. Donald Williams seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT: Azfar Haque adjourned the meeting at 6:28pm.