

TYRONE TOWN COUNCIL MEETING WORKSHOP

MINUTES

February 03, 2022 at 5:30 PM

Eric Dial, Mayor

Gloria Furr, Mayor Pro Tem, Post 4

Linda Howard, Post 1

Melissa Hill, Post 2

Billy Campbell, Post 3

Brandon Perkins, Town Manager

Dee Baker, Town Clerk

Dennis Davenport, Town Attorney

Also present was Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner.

Mayor Dial called the meeting to order with limited seating and broadcasted on YouTube Live at 5:30 pm, this was followed by the invocation. The public was invited to watch.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. INVOCATION

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS: *The first public comment period is reserved for non-agenda items. Comments are limited to three (3) minutes. Please state your name & address. Comments that require a response may not be answered during this time. The Council or staff may respond at a later date.*

V. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made to approve the agenda.

Motion made by Council Member Campbell, Seconded by Council Member Howard.
Voting Yea: Council Member Hill, Council Member Furr.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA: *All matters listed under this item are considered to be routine by the Town Council and will be enacted by one motion. There will not be separate discussion of these items. If discussion is desired, that item will be removed from the consent agenda and will be considered separately.*

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

IX. OLD BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

1. Workshop discussion regarding Sec. 113-137, Town Center Architectural Design Considerations. Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner

Mr. Trocquet was present via Zoom. He shared that a lot of recommendations for change to the ordinance were made through the 2018 Zoning Assessment, the UGA study, and the LCI study. Most of which was for the Town Center Mixed-Use zoning classification.

The Planning Commission worked through a lot of technical information as a whole for downtown and added a quality growth layer, similar to the Hwy 74 overlay.

Mr. Trocquet stated that one of the changes was to retitle Section 113-134 from, Town Center Architectural Design Considerations, to Town Center District Overlay. He shared that the Town Center Overlay intended to follow the boundary of the Town Center and In-Town Residential Character Area. The main areas and ideas were additional standards which consisted of parking, streets and sidewalks, site/setback standards, and architecture.

He stated that regarding parking, Council could consider allowing on-street parking, a parking bank option, bicycle and golf cart parking requirements, and curb cuts approved by the Town Engineer. Extra oversight particularly on Senoia Road and Commerce Drive. Council Member Campbell asked for clarification regarding a parking bank. Mr. Trocquet gave the example of a business located within that area. If the business were only allowed twenty parking spaces and the lot would not allow room for all twenty, the owner would pay a fixed cost for the remainder of the spaces. He compared the parking bank to the Town's tree bank. When a developer was unable to add all trees into their landscape plan, the remainder would be transferred to the Town to be planted. With the parking bank, the Town would be able to obtain funding to provide additional public parking. It would also allow more flexibility for the owner. He added that parking requirements had previously changed for a reduction in required parking spaces within the parking ordinance. He asked for Council's input regarding the parking bank. All agreed, regarding the parking bank.

Mr. Trocquet then moved on to streets and sidewalks. Considerations for streets and sidewalks were to discourage cul-de-sacs, conform to street type examples, encourage street grids, account for multi-use trail connectivity requirements, and require street trees. The emphasis was placed on traffic management, and discouraging cul-de-sacs. He added that downtown walkability and mobility would require different types of streets. It would allow for sidewalks and multi-use trails. The LCI created street typologies that were most appropriate for downtown. New developers would be asked to build their streets as close to the examples as possible.

Mr. Trocquet stated that regarding setback standards, Council could consider the following, reducing setbacks for C-1 and reducing minimum acreage requirements, allowing property owners greater flexibility. Most of the current downtown business owners were zoned C-1. Most of the lots were smaller and non-conforming, which were known as legacy lots. The typical C-1 standards were mostly for larger lots, not downtown-type lots. If the C-1 downtown standards were changed, it would allow for reduced acreage, and setbacks, which could allow more flexibility to the owner. It would also allow more flexibility to building heights, which would still be limited to three stories.

He also shared that discussions with the Planning Commission consisted of screening exterior storage and requirements for dumpster pad enclosers.

Planning Commissioners spoke of eliminating all exterior storage but agreed on screening as the alternative. The storage could remain if covered by landscaping or an opaque fence. He added that most businesses downtown did not have exterior storage, which was more common within the industrial type zoning.

Council Member Campbell inquired about the maximum height for a building downtown. Mr. Trocquet stated that it was regulated by the zoning district, however, it was mostly 35 ft.-40 ft. Mayor Dial asked why dumpster screening was debatable, why would anyone want them exposed? Mr. Trocquet shared that by viewing the ordinance, the goals were to improve downtown while giving business owners more flexibility. Dumpster pad enclosures were an added cost to property owners, with the argument that it would be worth the cost to shield the dumpster. There could also be a requirement for the dumpster to be placed behind the building.

Mr. Trocquet moved on to the building and architecture standards which included, regulation of façade materials, colors, architectural features such as porches, regulating garage doors, and roof materials and pitch. Council Member Campbell shared his concern regarding roof materials, in light of the recent fire downtown. He shared that all commercial roofs should not be made of tin or metal, as they were difficult to penetrate with water in case of a fire. Mr. Trocquet stated that he would reflect that change.

Mr. Trocquet shared the Planning Commission takeaways. Council could consider having the Planning Commission issue certificates of appropriateness for architectural facades with site plan approval, do not limit the number of materials used in architecture, and add clauses regarding maintenance. Another suggestion was to create an architectural review board but that was most prevalent in larger cities. Planning Commission also suggested to not limit architectural materials. The current version of the ordinance suggested using no more than two types of materials for the construction of the building, which was too limiting. They also wanted to add in requirements for maintenance of the buildings downtown.

He shared that the Planning Commission also suggested removing horizontal massing requirements and explicitly mention screening solar panels on roofs. Finally, they suggested that street-facing garage doors be located behind the principal structures or homes. It should not be facing the street to be a primary feature of the home.

A discussion began regarding the ordinance and its suggested changes.

Mr. Trocquet restated the title change and added that a few changes were also made regarding the Purpose and Intent Sec. 113-134 (a). The changes would better describe the emphasis on aesthetics, parking, roads, and grid patterns. He then moved to (c) Façade requirements. He added that the current ordinance listed brick, brick veneer, stone, natural wood, and/or cement-based wood siding as required architectural materials. He stated that (f) was added stating, exterior materials shall be natural in appearance, with preference given to brick; such materials shall be wood, wood siding, stone, stucco, or to contemporary materials and details closely replicating such traditional materials. He stated that the Planning Commission preferred the listing as it added more flexibility. The materials could be replicated but still, be representative of the natural materials.

Council Member Campbell agreed that it covered most materials that were required. Mayor Dial posed the question that it could lend to the use of materials such as vinyl siding. Mr. Trocquet stated that the Planning Commission would still have the ability to approve or deny the architectural materials. If a broad side of a building was designed with vinyl that simulated wood, the Planning Commission could ask for different materials. He added that it also left room for new materials that looked good such as board and batten. The current wording would lend to fewer changes made to the ordinance.

Mayor Dial shared his support and added that we also need to guard in the other direction, from a possible slippery slope. Council Member Furr suggested removing the verbiage. Mayor Dial shared that he believed the language suggested the builder use better materials, not cheaper. We need to protect ourselves. Mr. Trocquet shared that the Town could list certain approved materials, all others would need to be approved by the Planning Commission on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Davenport offered that anytime discretion was used, unforeseen consequences usually arose. If the language, “or other materials that resemble” was used, it opened doors to subjectivity. If you use discretion after the fact, it could cause problems. He suggested listing what was acceptable and adding to the list when new acceptable materials came along.

Mr. Perkins informed Council that some ordinances refer to a fee schedule, he suggested the approved façade materials be a part of a listing that could be changed separately from the ordinance. Mr. Davenport stated that fee schedules changed regularly over time, exterior materials would not change as frequently. Mr. Trocquet clarified that Council wished to have brick, brick veneer, stone, natural wood, and cement-based wood such as HardiePlank siding. Most agreed that stucco should not be a part of the list of accepted materials. Mr. Trocquet stated that the list could be 80% of the building materials, other materials could be used as accents, such as the stucco/type (EIFS) on the corners of the new Town Hall, it was used only as an accent.

Mr. Trocquet moved to (5) (d) 1, building & site requirements. Planning Commission suggested removing section (a) regarding the shape of the building. He shared that the provision was fairly common, however, it would add another layer of review regarding the calculation of horizontal massing measurements.

Mr. Trocquet moved to (5) (d) 2 regarding roof material and pitch. He shared that he could add the provision of not allowing tin or metal roofing to the section, per Council Member Campbell’s request. He added that roofing materials should be dark and in harmony with surrounding buildings. Flat roofs should include parapet walls and should screen any rooftop materials, solar panels, and equipment.

Mr. Trocquet reviewed section 6 stating “dumpster pad enclosure is required”. All agreed. He added that the fence should not be a chain-link fence but an opaque in color made from higher quality materials that were listed. He added that number 4 read, “exterior storage requirements shall not apply to seasonal displays or advertisements of goods placed out only during business hours”. He added that some businesses already did this during business hours, this language would allow them to continue.

He then continued to section (e) parking, garage, driveway, and access requirements. He stated that one of the main topics would be detached and attached garages.

One of the items that were often critiqued on small residential lots were highly visible bland, garage doors. He shared that the LCI study addressed that the garage doors should not be the main feature of a home. They should not face the street or they should be located directly behind the principal structure/home, he shared a few renderings. Alley access would also solve the on-street parking issue. He added that detached garages should have decorative doors and should not face the street in the downtown area. Mr. Davenport asked for clarification regarding the detached garage placement.

He asked where a detached garage should be placed on a corner lot. Would the owner be required to apply for a variance? Mr. Trocquet stated that the owner would need a variance or they could have an attached garage that did not face the street. Mr. Davenport asked what would be considered behind the structure, behind the building line, or behind the entire structure? Mr. Trocquet stated the intent was for it to be placed in the rear yard, behind the house.

Mr. Trocquet moved to section (f) street and sidewalk area requirements. He shared that any developer should reference the master plan with the highest degree possible regarding street types. They should have adequate buffers for sidewalks/paths, utilized the grid plan, and discourage cul-de-sacs. Council Member Campbell stated that the 90-degree parking should be eliminated on Senoia Road as well.

Mr. Trocquet moved to section (g) downtown commercial development regulations. He stated that the minimum building lot area could be 7,000 s.f., and the maximum building footprint size would be 15,000 s.f. The footprint was a recommendation from the consultants for the downtown master plan to limit the size of buildings and was changed from 30,000 s.f. He added that currently, no building measured that size downtown. This could cause issues regarding site flexibility; however, the intent was to have smaller- looking buildings downtown. He added that the overall square footage of the new Town Hall was over 15,000 s.f. Council Member Hill agreed and added that over 15,000 s.f. would not be conducive to a walkable village-style downtown.

Council Member Campbell agreed and inquired about Mr. Townsel's building (Red Door). He asked for the size of the building. Mr. Trocquet stated that his building was approximately 13,000 s.f. He added that 15,000 s.f. was recommended but 20,000 s.f. could accomplish the same goal with more flexibility. He added that currently, there were no other buildings downtown that exceeded 15,000 s.f. Council Member Campbell asked if Mr. Townsel would be required to build closer to the street, according to the TCMU. Mr. Trocquet stated that his property was currently zoned C-1, if the overlay district would be changed, Mr. Townsel would not be required to apply. He would just inherit the new setback requirements.

Mayor Dial began a discussion regarding assisted living facilities downtown and their large building footprint. Mr. Trocquet agreed that it would limit their square footage. He added that a larger medical building would also want to be closer to the 30,000 s.f. range, both facilities could build outside of downtown. Council Member Hill stated that facilities could build upward.

Mr. Trocquet stated that most of the lot sizes downtown prevented larger buildings. Council Member Hill stated that a builder could buy several lots and build a larger building. Mr. Trocquet stated that it was a possibility however, it would still need to meet all other standards and be suitable for downtown.

Mr. Trocquet stated that the builder could build a larger building then add suites. Council Member Hill stated that she was comfortable with the 15,000 s.f. requirement. Mayor Dial shared that the downtown corridor also reached closer to Hwy 74. He asked, how many separate businesses could go into a 15,000 s.f. strip. Mr. Trocquet gave the example of CVS and Dollar Tree. Those buildings were approximately 15,000 s.f. Mayor Dial shared that the dilemma was, did the Town keep the smaller 15,000 s.f. or limit other businesses. Council Member Howard agreed that it was a difficult decision.

Mayor Dial asked again, how many smaller businesses could fit within a 15,000 s.f. plan. Mr. Trocquet stated that approximately three businesses may fit. Council Member Hill inquired about the Goodwill square footage. Mr. Trocquet stated that it was approximately 26,000 s.f. Mr. Perkins shared that the new Town Hall was 18,000 s.f. which would make a lot of linear s.f.

Council Member Furr inquired about what ordinance would be followed regarding property on Hwy 74. Mr. Davenport indicated that it would only be property along the west side and they would fall under each overlay. Typically, along Hwy 74 the standards were geared more toward architecture and setbacks. The building size would not be similar to those of downtown. Council Member Furr inquired that also included Palmetto and Arrowood Roads. Mr. Trocquet confirmed, yes. Mr. Perkins stated that there was a least one interest party that wished to build an assisted living facility within that downtown area. If the square footage was restricted, they would not be able to build. Those types of developments were low impact and should be considered. Council Member's Hill and Furr suggested changing the downtown maximum square footage to 15,000 s.f. Mr. Davenport added that 15,000 s.f. was the number suggested by the consultants.

Mr. Trocquet continued regarding downtown commercial requirements. He shared that the suggested setbacks for the front yard were a 15 ft. maximum, the side was 5ft. and the rear was 30 ft. This would encourage buildings to be closer to the street and to be pedestrian-friendly. The maximum building height was set at 40 ft., not to exceed 3 stories which were consistent with the C-1 zoning. He ended the presentation with examples of residential and commercial buildings within the downtown area and street typologies with on-street parking and sidewalks/multi-use paths. He shared that a lot of consideration went into the changes, he asked for Council's input.

Mayor Dial asked Mr. Trocquet if any portion of the document gave him any trepidation. Mr. Trocquet shared that some of the language needed to be hammered out and that legal counsel needed to look over the document, but overall, he felt comfortable. He mentioned the discussion regarding building size and an assisted living facility. He also shared that the 15,000 s.f. recommendation fit for a village-style feel. He added that there was no right or wrong way, it was all about the overall goal of downtown and there was nothing in the document that would prevent that.

Council Member Furr asked for clarification regarding section (2) under façade requirements. It stated that "There shall be no more than two building materials used (not including trim/accent materials)." Mr. Trocquet stated that the document originally stated, no more than two. Planning Commission wished to remove the provision. They suggested that the architectural rendering be presented with more than two primary materials.

Council Member Furr asked for clarification regarding how many building materials could be used on the outside of a building. Mr. Trocquet stated that no more than two did not include the trim. Council Member Furr asked if glass would be considered a primary material such as the O'Reilly's building. Mr. Trocquet stated that glass would be considered a primary material. Council Member Campbell asked what the Planning Commission recommended. Mr. Trocquet stated that they recommended removing the provision, allowing the builder to choose as many as they wanted. Council Member Furr stated that there should be a limit but more than two. Council Member Hill reminded everyone that it did not include accents.

Mr. Davenport asked how were primary materials decided? Mr. Trocquet stated that it was the largest material used for the façade. Mr. Davenport clarified that there was only one primary material used in any building. He suggested adding language for the builders to better define “primary”. Mayor Dial stated that if glass was considered a primary material, it should be listed.

Council Member Howard inquired about the Planning Commission specifying building height at 40ft at street level. Mr. Trocquet clarified that if the building were built on a hill, it would allow for a basement and would not count in the overall building height. Mayor Dial clarified that it could not go over 40 ft.

Mayor Dial thanked Mr. Trocquet for his time. Mr. Trocquet stated that he would be returning to Council with more comments soon.

XI. PUBLIC COMMENTS: *The second public comment period is for any issue. Comments are limited to three (3) minutes. Please state your name & address. Comments that require a response may not be answered during this time. The Council or staff may respond at a later date.*

XII. STAFF COMMENTS

XIII. COUNCIL COMMENTS

XIV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

XV. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made.

Motion made by Council Member Furr, Seconded by Council Member Campbell.

Voting Yea: Council Member Howard, Council Member Hill.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm.

Eric Dial, Mayor

Dee Baker, Town Clerk