

**TYRONE TOWN COUNCIL
MEETING
MINUTES
November 03, 2022 at 7:00 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:

Tracy Young, Fayette County Development Authority Representative

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 to approve the agenda was made.

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

Voting Yea: Council Member Howard, Council Member Hill.

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.*

1. Approval of the October 20, 2022 minutes.
2. Approval of the Pyrotechnico agreement and addendum for the rescheduled fireworks show from October 1, 2022, to November 27, 2022.
3. Approval of the State Certification three-year contract between the Georgia Association of Chiefs of Police (GACP) and the Town of Tyrone.

A motion was made to approve the consent agenda.

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

Voting Yea: Council Member Hill, Council Member Furr.

VII. PRESENTATIONS

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

4. Petition to consider a rezoning of parcel 072604009 at 1400 Senoia Road from O-I (Office-Institutional) to C-2 (Highway Commercial). **Phillip Trocquet, Community Development**

Mr. Trocquet stated that applicant Randy Wright submitted a petition on behalf of the owner, 74 South, LLC. for a rezoning petition for three recently combined parcels at property address 1400 Senoia Road. The applicant per the request of the Planning Commission combined the properties which at the time were non-conforming. Planning Commission approved the rezoning with the condition the properties be combined.

The applicant's expressed intent was to match the zoning adjacent to the properties under consideration, which they also own. The proposed development was for a highway commercial flex office/warehouse business park consisting of three 30,000 s.f. structures.

He stated that the petition was consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and Future Development strategy. The property fell within the Commercial Corridor Character area which permitted C-2 zoning and encouraged high architectural and landscaping standards. Commercial areas should be screened from the right-of-way and pedestrian connectivity should be accommodated throughout the site and in accordance with future path plans. The property lies within the SR-74 Quality Growth Overlay district which required higher architectural and landscaping provisions for any portion of the site fronting or visible from SR-74.

Mr. Trocquet shared that the proposed development plan suggested appropriate uses for SR-74 and the Community Gateway Character area and surrounding properties if appropriately screened, buffered, and constructed to the architectural guidelines listed in the ordinance. He added that the proposed zoning was consistent with the zoning of surrounding properties; it was staff's determination that the zoning would not adversely affect adjacent properties. He stated that it was staff's determination that Office Institutional did have reasonable economic use.

He shared that given the traffic capacity of Senoia Road, it was staff's opinion that if adequate vehicular circulation was provided on-site, it would not be excessively burdensome on road infrastructure. The business park at the end of Senoia Road was designed for a buildout of all properties; the development of the parcels at C-2 zoning would be consistent with that buildout.

The proposed development did not suggest a sewer usage that would be burdensome on the Town's existing sewer or water capacity.

Stormwater facilities were already provided for the business park. Hydrological information confirming that preexisting facilities could handle the capacity of the development would be required.

Mr. Trocquet shared that the Planning Commission discussed the impact of office traffic versus highway commercial traffic. Office uses usually generated more traffic than highway commercial, however, it would depend on the use. He gave examples of fast food or retail establishments generating more traffic. Warehouse types of businesses would generate less traffic than office traffic. He added that offices would generate more due to employees coming and going at the same time during morning and evening hours.

He added that the Planning Commission also discussed future traffic with more development, in the area of Senoia Road and Carriage Oaks Drive. They recommended requesting traffic studies for developments in the future for the long term. He stated that staff approved of the rezoning.

Mayor Dial opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in favor of the rezoning. Mr. Randy Wright shared that he, Blake Barnett, and Jason Walls were available for any questions. Mr. Wright and Mr. Barnett were the owners of the property and represented their business, 74 South, LLC. Mr. Walls was their Primary Engineer from Integrated Science and Engineering.

Mayor Dial opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in opposition to the item. No one spoke.

Council Member Campbell inquired about the planned multiuse path that would connect Senoia Road cart traffic to Sandy Creek Highschool. Mr. Trocquet shared that the projected path would travel along Senoia Road to Powers Way, bypassing their property. Which side of the street was undecided at this point, however, there was an expanded right-of-way in that area. The path would connect to a path that would lead to the Sandy Creek parking lot. Council Member Campbell asked how the path would cross the railroad tracks. Mr. Trocquet stated that the section was a spur and was owned by the Hobgood family and not CSX.

A motion was made to rezone parcel 072604009 located at 1400 Senoia Road from O-I (Office-Institutional) to C-2 (Highway Commercial).

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

IX. OLD BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

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

Mr. Perkins shared that he and Mr. Trocquet met with all Fayette County city representatives and the Fayette County Chamber of Commerce for its SPLOST meeting. Each city presented their SPLOST project lists. He added that the Fayette County Chamber voted unanimously to support the SPLOST overall. He shared that the Chamber also supported the E-SPLOST last year.

Mr. Perkins reminded everyone that the Shamrock Park Christmas Tree Farm order was due by 11:00 am tomorrow morning for anyone that wished to display a Christmas Tree around Shamrock Lake.

Mr. Perkins also reminded everyone that the annual Veterans Day Program would be on Friday, November 11th at 11:00 am and that the Museum would have special hours that day from 11:30 am to 1:30 pm.

Mr. Perkins addressed online comments made that week regarding the building permit process. If folks were to read some of the commentaries, one would be led to believe that it would be difficult to obtain a permit in Tyrone. He added that the reality was that the process was very streamlined. The Town was held to minimum state standards. He stated that as of this January, 205 permits were issued, of which were, new commercial, residential, pool, and fences. No permits were denied and the average turnaround time was 15-21 days. Many times, permits came through and comments were sent back requiring additional information. That was a normal part of the process.

He shared that with no disrespect to government if he had a project at his home, he would have his general contractor pull the permit. The process could be very technical. Additional comments normally lengthened the review time. Mr. Perkins stated that regarding the permit that was discussed on social media, the Town did not receive a completed application until October 14th and it was turned around in 4 days. He added that the turnaround time was incredible considering Town staff was not the only department reviewing the information, outside agencies were also included in the process. He stated that he was told that the technical architectural portion was not completed and that staff still required one piece of information before the permit would be issued. The permit was in need of approval from the Fire Marshal. Staff was ready, however, still waiting on the required information to issue the permit.

Mr. Perkins shared that since January, staff has had two full commercial applications come through.

The first one did not require resubmission of the construction plans, however, the site plan and landscape plans required resubmission. The turnaround review average was 10 days on that project.

The second commercial project required three resubmissions to address additional comments which took an average of 7-9 days. He reiterated that it was a natural process depending on the complexity of the build. A similar commercial alteration permit took 15 days to complete with one request for information. Another alteration took 12 days with two requests for information and it included a Stop Work Order. He stated that two commercial permits took only 1 day to issue, one permit having one comment to issue. Mr. Perkins stated that the last commercial alteration permit only took 1 day to issue which included comments that needed addressing.

Mr. Perkins stated that he wanted to go on record to those that read the minutes or watch the meetings online, the Town was not in the business of denying permits. We would like nothing more than to issue the permit that was in question but there was a required process that must be followed. The Town did not get in the way nor slow down the process. The Town did not prevent the applicant from receiving their permit. It was unfortunate that it happened as it did. There were ways that could have shortened the process but it was not on the Town's end.

Council Member Campbell asked how many Christmas trees were purchased. Mr. Perkins stated that 20 trees were purchased but only 9 were currently ordered. Council Member Howard stated that she added a post on the Tyrone Connections Facebook page as a reminder.

Mayor Dial stated that he wished to go back to the former topic. He declared that clearly, it was not the Town that delayed the permit since it was received on October 14th. There were issues with the general contractor and the architect. Mr. Trocquet shared that he did not want to cast blame but there were two processes that needed to be completed, the site plan and the new construction review. He clarified that the new construction plans were received on October 18th. The site plan process proceeded with the construction review. He added that typically, the site plan was footballed by the engineer and or the general contractor. The Town's role was not to cast blame, staff was only pointing out that there were normally several entities involved in the permitting process.

Council Member Campbell clarified that the Chamber of Commerce unanimously voted to support the SPLOST and the vote would be in March. Mr. Perkins shared that the process would begin with the cities being asked to consider the referendum for a vote. Once the referendum was passed it would go back to the County. The County would officially make a call for the cities to place the referendum on the agenda for a vote. The County would then officially vote to call for the SPLOST, if the call passed, then the referendum would be placed on the March ballot for the citizens to vote on.

XIII. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Council Member Furr inquired about the status of the burned homes in Town. Mr. Perkins stated that there was no time limit and that staff was working with the owners.

Mr. Trocquet clarified that if the fire department and the insurance company had completed their investigations, staff then work with the owner to try and remove the building, especially if it was structurally unsound. The homeowner would need to comply with Town ordinances. He added that if the home was an attractive nuisance, meaning that it was open and could attract children, it would be easier to officially condemn.

He stated that the process usually took a long time. The owners would need to be located and then contacted. Mr. Trocquet stated that two homes in particular, the owners had been contacted regarding the burned buildings.

XIV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

XV. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to adjourn.

Motion made by Council Member Campbell.

Voting Yea: Council Member Howard, Council Member Hill, Council Member Furr.

The meeting adjourned at 7:31 pm.

By: _____
Eric Dial, Mayor

Attest: _____
Dee Baker, Town Clerk