

**Tyrone Town Council
Meeting Minutes
August 19, 2021
7:00 P.M.**

Present:

Mayor, Eric Dial

Mayor Pro Tem, Gloria Furr

Council Member, Linda Howard

Council Member, Melissa Hill

Council Member, Billy Campbell

Town Manager, Brandon Perkins

Town Planner, Phillip Trocquet

Town Attorney, Dennis Davenport

Town Clerk, Dee Baker

Finance Manager, Sandy Beach

Town Engineer / Public Works Director, Scott Langford

Court Clerk, April Spradlin

Mayor Dial called the meeting to order with limited seating and broadcasted on YouTube Live at 7:00 pm, this was followed by the invocation and the pledge of allegiance. The public was invited to watch.

Approval of Agenda

Council Member Campbell made a motion to approve the agenda.

Council Member Howard seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

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.*

Approval of minutes, July 15, 2021.

Consideration to approve an agreement from Pyrotechnico for the Founders Day Firework's show.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Consideration to hire Public Works Maintenance Technician I candidate Roderick Jones.

Consideration to hire Public Works Maintenance Technician I candidate Cody Kelley.

Consideration of an updated agreement with Atlanta Gas Light to change the gas meter for the new generator at Town Hall.

Council Member Furr made a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Council Member Campbell seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

Public Hearing:

1. Consideration of a petition from applicant Yuet-Yuen Cushing on behalf of owner Yuet Wah Chan for the rezoning of a 5.11-acre tract with parcel number 0729-006. The requested rezoning is from AR to R-12. ***Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner***

Mr. Trocquet informed Council that applicant Yuet-Yuen Cushing had applied for the rezoning of parcel 0792 006 off of Greenwood Lane. The petition was from AR to R-12. The property existed on the border of Tyrone and Peachtree City to the south. The property was served by an easement that ran south through four Peachtree City parcels onto Greenwood Lane in the Kedron Hills subdivision. He shared that the intent of the rezoning was to achieve more zoning flexibility with the land. He added that it should be noted that Peachtree City ordinances permit a maximum of two homes to be served by one easement. Since this was a Peachtree City easement, any subsequent division of the land would be contingent upon Peachtree City allowing access to the new properties, or a second driveway. Mr. Trocquet stated that Peachtree City did submit comments regarding the driveway, referencing Article 2, Section 201-(t) of their Land Development Ordinances. He added that although the rezoning was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Tyrone zoning classifications if approved, the property would need to conform with Tyrone subdivision regulations and development ordinances.

Mr. Trocquet stated that the surrounding zoning to the property was AR, R-12, and EI. He added that the petition to R-12 was consistent with the Future Development Map and Comprehensive Plan in general. The property currently was located within the Estate Residential character area which permitted R-12 zoning. The property was also located adjacent to other R-12 zoned properties. He added that specific site conditions, zoning considerations, and property history should be taken into account for the determination.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Mr. Trocquet shared that regarding the compatibility with the zoning ordinance and impact assessment, the proposed zoning would permit 1-acre single-family development consistent with surrounding properties. He added that the proposed rezoning would not adversely affect adjacent properties. R-12 was listed as a denser zoning district, which was 1-unit per acre, as opposed to AR's 1-unit per three acres, the intensity that was allowed in AR, could be more intense than R-12. He stated that the property did have reasonable economic use as it was currently zoned. Given that the property had limited access, its current configuration as a single 5-acre estate residential tract was still suitable for the area. Mr. Trocquet stated that the proposed rezoning could potentially allow the split of the lot if access were given. The impact on existing infrastructure would be on Peachtree City, not Tyrone in such a circumstance. He added that in practice, access easements should only serve a minimal number of lots for service delivery purposes. It was not recommended that the lot be divided further given its distance from a public road. He ended by stating that Planning Commission and Staff recommended approval of the rezoning petition.

A discussion began regarding the location of the easement. Mr. Trocquet shared that the easement went through the applicant's parcel and south through several properties to Greenwood Lane. He understood the easement to only be access for two lots. Council Member Campbell asked if there was direct access to the property. Mr. Trocquet shared that the easement traverses through the southeast portion of the property owner to the south of the applicant. Council Member Campbell asked how the applicant would access the easement. Mr. Trocquet shared that the only way would be a hike through the woods, under the current conditions. He added that there was no pre-existing path.

A citizen from the audience attempted to engage in conversation regarding a plat. Mayor Dial requested he wait until the public hearing portion. Council Member Howard inquired if there were legal terms that stated that you had to have access to your property. Mr. Trocquet shared that in terms of road frontage, the lot was land-locked. There is a state precedent regarding municipalities blocking access. He believed it impossible to deny access. Mr. Davenport reiterated that the property was indeed land-locked, however, there was a way for access through an existing easement. The homeowner was required to abide by any restrictions placed on the easement because the property does not front a public road. He added that due to the fact the applicant cannot access the property, this may have an impact on the development. The zoning category does not matter if the access is not available. Council Member Campbell asked if we knew the applicant's plans for the property. Mr. Trocquet shared that the stated intent was to have the flexibility to split the lot. He added that staff did relay the perceived difficulty to pursue this to the applicant.

Mayor Dial opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in support of the rezoning. No one spoke.

Mayor Dial opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in opposition to the rezoning.

Mr. Andrew Gonczi who lives on Crabapple Lane spoke. He provided a copy of a plat to Mr. Trocquet of his property. He shared that he lives to the east of the property in question. He bought the property 49 ½ years ago and has lived there ever since. His property excluding the easement was 4.9 acres. He added that there was one house on the property and he intended to keep one house. He stated that the parcel was divided into seven sections ranging from five to seven acres. He understood that the lots could not be subdivided, and they had to have one house per parcel, this expired in 1991. The stipulation, he understood was active from 1972 to 1991, and it was no longer active. At the time, he believed that the owners had a reasonable idea of what was to take place with the seven lots. He added that today, it would be inconsistent with the intent of the properties, and that was the reason he would oppose the rezoning. He shared that his lot was originally zoned AR and now it was zoned R-12, he did not understand how it was rezoned. He added that his property was originally within unincorporated Fayette County and Tyrone annexed it without his knowledge.

Mayor Dial asked for Mr. Trocquet's opinion regarding the document provided. Mr. Trocquet shared that the information provided was consistent with what staff had. He added that the easement straddled the property line with 15 feet on the west and east sides. Mr. Gonczi stated that years ago, the item came before Council and he asked if he could use the easement as well as his neighbor, the answer was yes, he would have that right.

Council Member Hill asked Mr. Trocquet if he knew when and why the property was zoned R-12? He stated that there was limited information regarding the actual zoning of the property. Council Member Campbell inquired about Mr. Gonczi's access to the easement. He added that according to what he had heard and read, Mr. Gonczi would not be able to access the easement. Mr. Trocquet agreed and added that he may walk the easement with the property owner's permission, but not with a vehicle, not to gain another access.

Mr. William Bach a resident on Loring Lane, in Peachtree City spoke next. He was concerned with the safety of more people utilizing his easement. It would be detrimental to his children, the children in the neighborhood, the safety of the Peachtree City residents, and the citizens of Kedron Hills. The rezoning would create more traffic for an already heavily traveled road.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

He added that one more home would create more cars and delivery trucks, it is a hassle and would be dangerous. He shared that the road currently was one car wide. People drive on his grass to pass each other. This does not seem like the right thing to do. He added that having Tyrone fight with Peachtree City for something that was not allowed in Peachtree City was not good. He shared that he was against the possibility to build in that area.

Mr. Nathan D. Saville spoke next in opposition to the item. He lives on Greenwood Lane in Peachtree City. He added that his property was immediately south of the lot in question. He shared that one of the displayed survey plats was commissioned by him. He stated that he shared the easement with the property and was very familiar with the lay of the land, and was happy to answer any questions Council may have. He then shared his primary concern. He purchased the land four years ago with the understanding there was an AR lot to the north, west, and east. He and his wife selected it for the country feel, privacy, and seclusion. His lot was zoned ER. He added that they felt that there was much less potential for developing the surrounding parcels. The lot that was recently split into five lots was also zoned ER and traversed his easement. Mr. Saville stated that within the last two to three years the lots have been subdivided into five lots with the construction of five homes. He stated that equipment and delivery vehicles were constantly going to the wrong address. In the unlikely event that the lot in question was allowed to be developed further than the original use was intended, it would cause an excessive burden on the entire area. It would change the easement, the dynamic and what the residents had become accustomed too and why they purchased in the first place. This would change the character of the entire area, and not for the better. He added that the two households per one driveway was a preventative measure, however, we are dealing with five parcels to our southeast. This should not be an issue, but it is.

Mayor Dial asked Mr. Saville if he had any conflict with the prior gentleman sharing an easement. Mr. Saville stated that there were no conflicts and he had spoken with the property owner regarding the access to his property and the shared driveway. He added that his driveway ended on the southeast corner of his property. They would have to park their car and walk through the woods approximately 200 yards. Mayor Dial shared that it would be an issue of a Tyrone resident coming through a Peachtree City property. Mr. Saville stated that the driveway would have to be extended for access. Mayor Dial reiterated that it would be his impression that the issue would be a Tyrone citizen coming through a Peachtree City property, not the opposite. Mr. Saville shared that he did not mind what the boundaries where it was the burden of the load of traffic and changing the country feel. He added that the owner had a right to build there and he would welcome that. If permission was given for five lots, that would change the character.

Council Member Campbell asked Mr. Trocquet what the intentions were of the property owner.

Mr. Trocquet stated that the expressed intention of the land use was to subdivide the property. Council Member Campbell asked currently, what could the property owner potentially do with their lot? Mr. Trocquet stated that an R-12 lot with road frontage, it could potentially be subdivided into five 1-acre lots. He added that being that the property shared an easement currently with another property, that could be a hindrance. Just by rezoning the property, that would not indicate the use of an easement. He shared that as Mr. Davenport stated they would need to abide by the zoning rules and ordinances. Council Member Campbell asked if the easement that would be used as a drive was 30 feet wide? Mr. Trocquet stated that yes, more than likely, and it would be fifteen feet on each side. Council Member Campbell asked how many lots were being built on? Mr. Saville stated that currently one lot was under construction and the northern lot had been cleared. The third lot south's house was recently preserved. The two furthest south had already been developed. Council Member Campbell shared that he understood Mr. Saville's frustration with the traffic issue that was already there, two more homes would just add to the issue.

Council Member Howard asked how the issue slipped through Peachtree City's zoning when there should have only been two homes not five? Mr. Saville shared that he assumed it was overlooked why they discussed the five-acre lot. He added that his wife had attended the meetings. The developer of the area had hired an attorney to represent his interests. Mr. Saville understood that the northern lot would share a drive with his property, meeting the requirements of two lots sharing a drive. The lot that was before Council tonight was not in question at the time it was not on their radar. He reiterated that currently, that was the case, he and the owner of the property to the north shared a drive. Council Member Howard inquired about the other three lots, what access would they use? Mr. Saville stated that they were technically supposed to utilize a drive on the eastern side. He added that gravel was added for a construction entrance but that everyone was still utilizing his driveway. He wants to welcome any new neighbors, however, by maintaining the current path, there could be a potential conflict.

Council Member Campbell asked Mr. Saville if he thought the Peachtree City citizens would attend a meeting to tell Mayor and Council that they did not want additional homes that would create more traffic? Mr. Saville shared that Peachtree City citizens attended the meeting two years ago, many objected and it was approved anyway. Mayor Dial clarified his early comment and shared that he was not implying that Mr. Saville had issues with Tyrone citizens. He added that there was a track record of Kedron Hills not being big fans of Tyrone. The mood was light and Mr. Saville shared that his house was built before Kedron Hills and he could be happy to be an ambassador. Mr. Mayor shared that Mr. Saville could raise the Tyrone flag.

Council Member Campbell made a motion to approve 0729 006 rezoning from AR to R-12.
Motion dies for lack of a second.

Council Member Hill made a motion to deny the rezoning request.

Council Member Furr seconded the motion. Motion was approved 3-1.

2. Consideration of a petition from applicant Douglas Pollard for the rezoning of a 6.41-acre tract with parcel number 0738-053 at property address 163 Palmetto Road. The requested rezoning is from AR to R-12. ***Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner***

Mr. Trocquet informed Council that Douglas Pollard had submitted a petition to rezone 163 Palmetto Road from AR (Agricultural Residential) to R-12 (Residential Single-Family 1,200 sq.ft. min.). The expressed intent was to rezone the property in tandem with the adjoining property to the north, 129 Palmetto Road, for re-platting the two properties with greater flexibility on lot size and configuration. He added that R-12 required a 30 ft. rear yard setback, the current accessory structures on the lot would be considered illegal by development standards. The accessory structures would need to be moved or removed for the property to conform to R-12 development standards. Mr. Pollard pursued the option of purchasing property to the north to no avail. Mr. Trocquet shared that if the rezoning was approved, Mr. Pollard would be required to adhere to several conditions.

Mr. Trocquet shared that the Future Development Map and the Comp Plan indicated that the property was located in a Commercial Corridor Character Area with commercial zoning surrounding most of the property. The LCI study also reflected that public input suggested that the area develops as mixed use or walkable residential which would most appropriately be the Town Center, In-Town Residential character areas. If approved, it would require a Comp Plan amendment.

Mr. Trocquet shared the compatibility with the zoning ordinance and impact assessment. He stated that surrounding uses were commercial which was normally not compatible with single-family development. The current lot configuration insulated the property from surrounding commercial properties and the use of the property would not change from what existed currently. Mr. Trocquet added that the current configuration of the accessory structures encroached on the setbacks required by R-12 intended to create separation from adjoining properties. If approved without the condition to move or remove the structures, it could adversely affect the adjacent property to the north. If conditionally approved, R-12 zoning was a low-intensity residential zoning classification that would not typically adversely affect adjoining C-1 properties which had higher intensity uses.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Mr. Trocquet stated that AR zoning was the lowest intensity zoning in the Town. Palmetto Road in that area was a light-commercial corridor for the Town with land values reflected accordingly. AR had the least development potential in those circumstances, thereby limiting its economic use as currently zoned, moving from a 3-acre lot minimum to a 1-acre lot minimum. He added that it was staff's opinion that Palmetto Road had been designed as a commercial corridor for the Town in that area. Single-family residential would assume a lower intensity and would impact infrastructure than what was typically planned. He added that it was staff opinion that the petition did not meet the criteria set forth by the Comprehensive Plan in keeping with the Future Development Map, however, the current LCI study suggested a change in the Future Development Map for that area, which was subject to interpretation. The petition did meet the impact assessment criteria outlined in the Town's zoning ordinance and would not create use that would adversely affect adjoining properties with the structures being within the setbacks. He added that the proposed zoning would not change the current use of the property which was single-family residential. He stated that the Planning Commission discussed the accessory structures creating an illegal use on the property if it were to be zoned R-12. He added that Commissioner Schouw recommended approval with condition that the accessory structures be removed within 120 calendar days, Commission Bouquet seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Mr. Trocquet informed Council that staff was in favor of the recommendation and added the conditions that no land-use applications nor building/construction applications be applied for, including a plat, and site plan, until the structures have been removed. If at the end of the 120 days the structures were not removed, the property would be subject to appear before Council and reverted to its original AR zoning.

Council Member Hill asked Mr. Trocquet, who was on the other side of the property, and how would it adversely affect the property owner? Mr. Trocquet stated that the property was owned by a commercial developer and the accessory structures were encroaching on the buffer, which was a detriment to the other property. Council Member Hill asked if the property owner was aware. Mr. Trocquet stated, yes, they were aware. Council Member Hill also asked how much of the buildings were within the setbacks. Mr. Trocquet stated that the first building was a small wooden barn that was completely within the 30 ft. setback, for R-12. The larger concrete building was $\frac{3}{4}$ within the setback. Currently, the AR setback was 50 ft. meaning that both buildings were completely in the setback. Council Member Campbell confirmed that with the current AR zoning, both buildings were illegal. Mr. Trocquet assumed that the buildings may be grandfathered in with a previous configuration. Mayor Dial asked when the structures were erected. From the audience (inaudible), the applicant shared that they were erected in 1963. Mayor Dial inquired if the buildings were within the setbacks in 1963? Mr. Trocquet shared that he believed that there were not as many zoning regulations back then and could not attest if they were or were not within the setbacks.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Mr. Davenport informed Council that the classification was a non-conforming structure, which allowed them to exist in the current state. When a zoning classification is changed or the property is reconfigured, then the new regulations apply. Council Member Hill asked the applicant if the buildings could be moved. Mayor Dial shared that Mr. Pollard could answer questions from the podium once the public hearing began.

Mayor Dial opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in favor of the rezoning.

Mr. Doug Pollard who lives at 129 Palmetto Road spoke. He shared that the official survey plat was updated and approved in 2013 and that the Town did approve the structures that were built in 1963, and the property was initially within unincorporated Fayette County. He added that he did not wish to tear down the concrete structure but could remove the wooden structure. He shared that one structure was 11 ft. from the property line and the other was 13.9 ft on the back of the property. The wooden structure was 2.4 ft. from the line. Mr. Pollard stated that the owner of the adjoining property wished for him to come to Council to have the buildings grandfathered in. The developer also stated that if developed, he would add a buffer. Mr. Trocquet displayed the property under R-12 zoning and indicated how far the buildings would be within the setbacks. Mr. Pollard stated that when his mother passed in December, he intended to place her house on a 1-acre lot and sell it. He had no intention of further development on his side of the property.

Mayor Dial shared that the zoning that was administered in 2013 was proper. Council Member Furr assumed that Mr. Pollard had already spent a great deal of money attempting to straighten everything out. Mr. Pollard agreed with the statement.

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

Council Member Hill made a motion to approve the rezoning of the property located at 163 Palmetto Road from AR to R-12.

Council Member Howard seconded the motion.

Mr. Davenport reminded Council of the several conditions that were recommended in the report, if approved. He asked if the conditions were part of the motion. Council Member Hill shared that she did not want Mr. Pollard to be made to tear down his buildings. Mr. Davenport advised that if approved, the buildings would change from non-conforming to illegal structures. Mr. Trocquet elaborated that the intended purpose was to combine the lots which would not be allowed if the property was rezoned. The lots would no longer be able to be reconfigured with the structures within the setbacks.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

He reiterated that if Council approved without the aforementioned conditions, the Planning Commission and staff would not be able to approve a revised final plat with the structures located within the setbacks. Council Member Hill asked if the property owner with adjoining property could lend any means to make it work? Mr. Davenport gave an example explaining non-conforming and grandfathered structures. If someone builds a structure without any regulations in place at the time, over time regulations change, that structure then becomes non-conforming to no fault of their own. This structure would be grandfathered in. If Council took the next step to rezone, the Town would be violating its ordinance and creating an illegal structure. That puts the owner in a difficult position because you as a body created the illegal structure. The issue would be elevated if approved with the conditions the buildings be removed or moved. Mr. Davenport suggested another solution to consider, the homeowner could ask for a variance from the zoning code as a condition, with a time frame. He added to keep in mind, Council was the same body that sits for rezonings and variances. To knowingly create an illegal structure sets a very bad precedent. Mr. Trocquet began a discussion regarding the issuance of a variance as it pertained to specific zoning of the property. Any change to the current state of the property would make the structures illegal. Mr. Davenport stated that the structures on the property were an issue no matter what change would take place. If more property could be added to the north end of the property, the issue would be solved. He added that in the property's current state, the structures were not an issue, as long as no change took place.

Council Member Furr asked if Council voted for a variance as a condition with a time frame, could the homeowner then split the lots? Mr. Davenport reiterated what Mr. Trocquet stated, once a variance was issued on a specific piece of property, it existed with that property in that current configuration. If the property owner wished to change the configuration of the property, he still had the same issue and would require an additional variance. Grandfathered structures were intended to go away over time. When actions were taken that ignored them, it caused further problems, it set a precedent. Mr. Davenport shared that his staff, along with Mr. Trocquet had spoken at length regarding options, none have worked out. He added that if Council chose to vote in that particular way, it would not solve the issue but cause more problems.

Council Member Hill asked if the item could be tabled, giving Mr. Pollard more time to speak with the other property owner. Mr. Davenport reflected that he believed that Mr. Pollard tried but was unsuccessful. The other property owner would have to subdivide a portion of his commercially zoned property and have that section rezoned to AR, then to R-12, this would be a lengthy process.

Council Members withdrew their motions. Mr. Pollard shared that he had approached the property owner, the board of directors did not want to get involved with a civil matter.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Council Member Furr asked Mr. Pollard his opinion regarding the variance. Mr. Pollard stated that he did attempt to apply for a variance but it was kicked back. Mr. Trocquet explained that there was a petition to rezone from AR to R-12, and there was also a petition for a variance of R-12. The application for a variance could not be accepted because the property had not been rezoned to R-12. Mr. Davenport explained that Mr. Pollard could not ask for a variance for an R-12 property when his property was zoned AR. He did not need a variance for his AR property, because the structures were grandfathered. He added that the suggested 90-day variance as a condition to the rezoning was an option, this was only a first step. If Mr. Pollard received his rezoning and variance, he now had a variance as the property was currently configured. His next step would be to reconfigure the property, which would also be contingent on applying for and receiving another variance this would take another thirty to sixty days.

Council Member Campbell confirmed with Mr. Pollard that the portion of the lot with the home and the two buildings was the portion that he wanted to make into a 1-acre lot and sell. Mr. Pollard agreed. Mr. Pollard then questioned the grandfathered status. Mr. Davenport explained that if the lot was split and that portion remained the same with no changes, and the new owner made no changes, the lot and the two buildings would remain grandfathered as long as no change would take place, no rezoning, and no variance. A new owner would have the same issues, they could not reconfigure the property in any way or the structures would be illegal and they would lose the grandfathered status.

Council Member Campbell asked if the applicant could subdivide the property under the current condition. Mr. Davenport reiterated that any change to the property would cause the two structures to become illegal. Council Member Furr shared that she believed the applicant to have two possible options, tear down the structures or ask for a variance, rezone the property, then ask for another variance. Mr. Trocquet added that plat approval would be conditioned upon any variance approvals. Mr. Davenport added the caveat that at any time Mr. Pollard was told no in the process, everything would end.

Council Member Howard asked for a display of the lot indicating the 1-acre lot. Council Member Furr then asked for Mr. Pollard's opinion. Mr. Pollard shared his frustrations with the time frame and why the buildings could not remain grandfathered with any future changes to the lot. Mayor Dial asked, what process was best for the applicant, was it better to approve with the condition or to table and bring it back at a later date? Mr. Davenport stated that the ideal option would be to add property, and that was not going to happen. He added that the other option would be to approve with the condition the applicant return within a certain time frame. Now he has to reconfigure the properties.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Mr. Davenport added that once he seeks to reconfigure, that would be conditioned upon receiving a variance based upon the new configuration. Then he would have to go through the variance process a second time. The entire process may take 120-180 days. Then he would have his solution. Mr. Trocquet stated that it was not guaranteed that the request would meet the standards in the ordinance for the variance. Mr. Davenport stated that it was the only solution other than tearing down the structures. The variance would run with the land if that portion was sold.

Council Member Campbell made a motion to approve the rezoning with the condition Mr. Pollard receives a variance within 120 days.

Council Member Howard seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

Mr. Pollard shared that when he first came to the Town to apply for a variance, he was told that he did not qualify. Mr. Davenport stated that currently, the property was grandfathered in and did not require a variance. By changing the zoning, it would require a variance. Mr. Trocquet explained that in his position, he would not be able to administer a variance without Council's approval and a public hearing.

3. Consideration of a petition from applicant Douglas Pollard for the rezoning of a 3.15-acre tract with parcel number 0738-161 at property address 129 Palmetto Road. The requested rezoning is from AR to R-12. ***Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner***

Mr. Trocquet stated that Mr. Pollard owned the adjacent lot and wished to rezone the property. He added that staff recommended approval with no conditions.

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

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

Council Member Furr made a motion to rezone the 3.15-acre tract located at 129 Palmetto Road from AR to R-12.

Council Member Howard seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

4. Consideration of a petition from applicant Teresa Shell for the rezoning of a 2-acre tract with parcel number 0736 -021 at property address 458 Senoia Road. The requested rezoning is from R-12 to C-1. ***Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner***

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Mr. Trocquet shared that applicant Teresa Shell wished to rezone the property with the intent to accommodate a Montessori school/daycare at the property. He added that it would be a daycare, not a school. He added that the current configuration of structures on the property would accommodate C-1 development regulations and setback requirements without creating nonconformities. The barn on the north end of the property and the house on the south end both lie outside of the setback and buffer requirements for adjoining residential for C-1. He shared that the future land use designation for the area was Production & Employment which accommodated the C-1, C-2, M-1, and M-2 zoning districts. The industrial park to the northwest was M-2 zoning, south was C-1, and further south was industrial zoning.

Council Member Campbell reaffirmed that the barn and house sat outside of the setbacks and inquired if that was acceptable. Mr. Trocquet confirmed that it was acceptable for C-1 zoning and R-12 zoning. Mr. Trocquet shared that due to traffic concerns, he took the liberty of pulling Institute of Traffic Engineers (I.T.E.) numbers for trips per hour, based on the square footage of the property. Peak hours normally reflect eight to eleven trips per hour. Higher standards anticipate thirteen to fifteen cars per hour. He added that it would be staff's opinion that the number of cars would not have a detrimental impact.

Council Member Furr asked how many students would be attending. Mr. Trocquet stated that the applicant indicated 20-24 with two to three classrooms.

Mayor Dial opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in favor of the item.

The property owner, Teresa Shell spoke. She shared that she wanted to rezone to C-1 because it was the lowest intensity zoning category for commercial, and also followed the Town's Comprehensive Plan. She added that she grew up in a small town and realized that Council would hear from people with family ties to the property and understood. The property had not been in the family for a while and the previous owner offered to sell it back, and they declined. She shared that her sister wanted to move to the area and she had two children. They began looking for daycare facilities. Most had waitlists or did not return their calls. Ms. Shell then decided to purchase the adorable property and wanted to maintain the house and the barn. The property had been an eyesore for a while, she and her family prayed and decided to bring the property back to life. She added that she had no intent on starting a daycare with 200 children, she wished to maintain the current footprint. She understood the concern of additional traffic and added that she planned on combining the two driveways and staggering drop-offs and pick-ups. Teachers would escort children to the cars, parents would not need to park. She shared that Council may hear the request to keep the property residential, but the property was narrow, on a minor arterial road with a train track behind it.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

It would be a tough sell for a realtor. If the property were to remain residential, we would have to tear down the house and barn due to the square footage to create an in-home daycare. She added that she would then be required to build a bigger home which would ruin the essence of the area. The property as is would be the perfect balance with commercial to the south and residential across the street. She asked Council to allow her to rezone to C-1 to clean up the property and to make it as good as it once was.

Matt Griffin who lives on Berry Hill Lane stated that he had lived in Tyrone for nine years and had worked there for seventeen. He had recently become aware of the social media firestorm regarding the property that morning. He visited the property and was glad that someone wanted to purchase it and maintain it. He shared that he was in support of the rezoning and hearing that there would not be a major traffic impact solidified his decision. He ended by stating that people should be able to do what they want with their own property.

Roberto Trejo, a Fayetteville resident spoke next. He shared that he had a one-year-old and it was difficult to find someone to care for children in the area. There were waiting lists and having more options would be great. He added that his mom was a teacher for thirty years and having a Montessori school would be great for the community. This would help develop skills for his daughter that would help when she attended school.

Melissa Turner, a Sharpsburg resident spoke next. She shared that in addition to those who have spoken in favor, Ms. Shell also had twenty letters in support of the rezoning and for the type of business. She chose one from a neighbor, Steve McWilliams. She read the letter, “as a neighbor and property owner directly across from 458 Senoia Road, I would like to submit my support for the rezoning of this property for a Montessori school. I believe that such a school would be an asset for Tyrone. Since this property has been an eyesore now for several years, this is a good opportunity to approve it for worthwhile use. Respectfully, Steve McWilliams”.

Mayor Dial then opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in opposition to the rezoning.

Ms. Darlene Scott who lives on Senoia Road spoke. She shared that she lived across the street from the property, and added that it had been said to pick your battles wisely. She added that this was a small battle in a future war over property in Tyrone. Anything south of the railroad tracks at Dogwood Trail was a “hurry up and wait for the Tyrone Zoning Committee”. Residents were at their disposal regarding demographics. They know our names and ages, and income. Zoning members could sit back and wait for the right resident to make the wrong move, especially on the east side of Senoia Road.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

She added that the zoning members say that the east side should remain residential, it was in the laws and written on the maps. We all know that “hope” and “keep it residential” does not always pan out. We all know that changes could happen in the matter of a vote. She shared that she had letters and notes from residents along Senoia Road on the east side, including Maple Shade that was against the rezoning and any future rezoning along Senoia Road.

Mr. Lloyd Walding who lives on Senoia Road spoke in opposition. He shared that he had lived two doors down from Ms. Scott for twenty years. He added that most of his neighbors had lived there for generations. He stated that it was not about, it’s their property they can do what they want. It was about the commercial property across the street from residential. Since McDuff Parkway was opened, there has been more traffic, we have had a tough time already, the business would cause more traffic. Another fifteen cars would be too many. He stated that Riverdale used to be a lot like Tyrone, adding more commercial property, Tyrone would become another Riverdale. We moved to Tyrone because it was a small town.

Mr. Gary Farr who lives on Senoia Road spoke next. He referenced Mr. McWilliams and stated that he did not live there, it was an Air B&B. He shared that his concern was traffic and he conducted his own two-day traffic study with equipment he had access to. In two days, 16,000 cars traveled down Senoia Road, with 77% above the speed limit, 13% was over 55 mph, 80% were speeding heading south with a top speed of 86 mph. He added that heading north, 75% were speeding with a top speed of 83 mph. He shared that dump trucks that came from the industrial park would not hit their brakes, they would have to push to get up the hill. He stated that from his house, across the street beyond the railroad tracks, 40 ft. pine trees blocked all commercial acting as a natural buffer. He believed the lot south of Ms. Shell’s was zoned C-2 (commercial), a grass field. He shared his concern with a school being placed there with the railroad tracks behind and Senoia Road in front, there was danger on both sides. He added that he was an accident investigator and he studied traffic. The numbers reflected were outrageous. Between 6 am and 7 pm, there were 6,030 cars with 2,600 over the speed limit. Mr. Farr submitted his study for the record.

Mr. Roberts who lives on Senoia Road spoke in opposition. He shared that he was in opposition to the rezoning of his grandparent’s old house. He added that he had lived across the railroad tracks behind the property and he and his brother owned several acres. He believed that the industry had gotten close enough to everyone. He stated that the train tracks were very close to 458 Senoia Road and were very dangerous and tempting for children. He had lived in Tyrone for forty-six years and had “touched the train” many times. He added that traffic was very heavy on Senoia Road and that he owned a dump truck and understood having to push to get up the hill. After topping the hill, it would be very difficult to stop quickly.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

He shared that his grandmother has had vehicles wreck on and around their property. Mr. Roberts shared that there was work already being conducted on the property for commercial before any residents being able to approach a committee. He felt that when she bought the property, it was commercial, it is confusing. Who was the permit made out to, her or the business? He was curious about having a caregiving business on a residential property if it was not rezoned. He shared his concern regarding the different types of industrial vehicles going in and out of the industrial park.

Mindy Walding who lives on Senoia Road spoke. She shared that they bought property among family and that it was wonderful living that close. She stated that the traffic was already bad on Senoia Road and one of her concerns was that her sixteen-year-old son had begun driving and the standing traffic at the school. She added that children did not exit cars in a timely manner, nor did they leave the school promptly. This would cause standing traffic which would add to the standing traffic caused by the train and heavy trucks, this would create accidents. Accidents happen in front of their home often. She questioned how the rezoning would affect their property value being across from a commercial location? She asked, what was next, was the Town going to keep adding commercial, where did it stop? Ms. Walding attributed the lack of daycare to COVID, a lot of facilities were currently closed. We may have a problem now, however, the issue may not exist six months to a year from now. She stated that if the property was rezoned, the Town created a property that could later be used as a bar, restaurant, gas station, and a multitude of other uses. The owner says said wanted a Montessori school now, what if she sold or changed her mind? Was Tyrone willing to take a chance on a business that we may not want in the future?

Heather Farr who lives on Senoia Road spoke next. She noted that the rezoning was not consistent with the character of the surrounding properties. While there were some limited commercial zonings and uses in the area, the majority were separated by the railroad tracks and natural barriers. She added that one border of the property was recently rezoned commercial, which was inconsistent to the other properties and remained an open field. The remaining borders met with either residential or agricultural residential properties. She stated that the change in zoning would not be by-right, and the Comprehensive Plan did not mandate the change to commercial, it was a proposal. Ms. Farr shared that there were case studies that the presumption that the governing body's decision that the property was residential now, did not deem that decision was valid. To overcome the decision, the landowner needed to show clear and convincing evidence that the zoning classification was a detriment to them. If the owner failed to show detriment insubstantial relationship to the public welfare, the landowner's challenge to the zoning ordinance fails. She added that the landowner would need to indicate economic loss, which Ms. Shell had not made in the presentation. Without showing any detriment at all, the application should not be further considered. Indicating detriment would require more than just showing that the property would be more valuable if rezoned or it would be difficult to rezone.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Evidence that it would be difficult to develop the property under its existing zoning or that the owner would suffer an economic loss unless the property was rezoned was not sufficient to support the legal decision to rezone the property. She then read from the Town's website, the purpose of C-1 downtown commercial is intended to protect and promote suitable areas for business and commercial uses that benefit the proximity to each other. She added that it was not so much zoning it to daycare, by rezoning it to commercial, added 118 commercial uses, such as an electric transformer station.

Barbara Frost who lives on Linch Road in Senoia spoke. She stated that she grew up in the home in question and that she would cross the railroad tracks to get to her grandfather's pond to go fishing. She shared that children were drawn to the train and it was dangerous. She agreed that there was a traffic issue and added that Tyrone Police could make a lot of revenue in that area regarding speeders. She added that her main concern was the welfare of the children. She stated that she had acreage on the north side, across the tracks, that her children may build on in the near future. When her parents passed it was a difficult decision to sell the property. Her parents served their country for twenty-one years. They wanted to build in Tyrone and have a big yard. This was more than her family could maintain. They screened potential buyers to find the right fit to also maintain their garden. She added that they found a family from Chia and when they moved in, we thought they would be there forever. However, he bought the property as an investment to have rezoned to commercial. He offered to sell back the property for more than double. The current owner paid less than that.

Florian Meier who lives on Millbrook Village Drive spoke next. He shared that he enjoyed riding bikes with his daughters but the traffic was making it more difficult to continue riding. He added that his concern was not the additional eleven cars from the daycare, but what if the school failed, there could be a gas station or a McDonald's in its place. He added that just before the meeting, there was a crash at the corner of Dogwood Trail and Hwy 74. There were already too many cars, this would not be a good idea to rezone to commercial.

Scott Slaton who lives on Senoia Road spoke in opposition. He shared that his main issue was the dishonesty on social media. When the owner of the property was asked how many children were going to attend, she said thirteen. He added that Mr. Trocquet was gracious enough to share a different number, that he believed to be correct. He added that he also believed that the business would be successful and would need to triple in size. The building would then turn into a concrete structure that no one would want to look at. It would also add 26-60 more vehicles. The Town had grown exponentially, this was where he was raised and grew up and added that Tyrone was getting too big for its britches.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Ms. Shell was given the opportunity for rebuttal. She shared that regarding the twenty-plus children, the number thirteen was referencing the number of families with a total of twenty-seven children, which was correct. She added that the number of cars totaled fifteen. She added that staggering the cars, would make the numbers fewer. Ms. Shell stated that she did not want a big block building. The way the ordinance was written she could tear everything down and build a bigger home and keep 30% as a daycare. She came to Council so she could keep the structures as they were, it was very charming. She added that it was similar as to how she grew up. If COVID finally opened everything up, she would have a bigger demand, she already had a waitlist. Regarding high speeds, if a family moved in as residential, that would be terrible because there was no fence. She added that she would place a charming white picket fence in the front and rear of the property to protect the children. She would also be keeping the residential setbacks which would be an excess of state standards. Ms. Shell stated that she had been a traffic engineer for ten years and that she had completed her due diligence. Traffic would not be adversely affected. She added, frankly should I have not rezoned it and raised the whole thing, build a house and paint it pink because there was no HOA? She added that she felt that she was doing the right thing, she wished to keep the charm. There were blackberry and blueberry bushes and fig trees, she asked, could you imagine the sweet children making fig jam? She added that it was the perfect property and she wanted to keep it that way. She owned another company that was doing well, last year was their best year, there would be no reason she would fail, she was trying to do the right thing.

Council Member Campbell asked if she were to keep the property residential, what would be the ratio? She stated that the Town's requirement was up to 30% of the square footage was allowed for an in-home business. The house would utilize 910 square feet, she added that she would like to have fewer children and more space. She spoke of opening up the barn so they could utilize that space as well. Council Member Campbell asked Mr. Trocquet if she was able to utilize the barn? Mr. Trocquet stated that with a home occupation, the principal property would be the house. Rules were associated with home occupations including only 30% of the principal property be used for a business. He added that there were additional regulations for home daycares. Council Member Campbell confirmed that she could not utilize the barn under residential. Ms. Shell stated that if it were residential, she would have to destroy the house and barn to build a bigger house, and she did not wish to do that. She added that she had contacted a contractor after the Planning Commission meeting, and she was informed that it would take up to seventeen months of construction. This would cause more traffic and noise as a hindrance to the area, she did not wish to do that to her neighbors.

Council Member Furr asked if Ms. Shell had intended on living in the house. Ms. Shell stated that initially, she would use the barn as property and place her sister in the house.

However, due to the time frame, her sister may not be able to move for a couple of months. They have decided to utilize the house as the primary classroom. She shared that within the C-1 zoning use, there was a listing for an in-home caregiver.

Council Member Hill asked if Ms. Shell if she was under contract as residential. Ms. Shell stated that she had already purchased the property, under commercial. She attempted to purchase under residential. The home loan agent would not meet with her, the agent shared that the property was listed as future commercial property and would not meet with her. She bought the property with the plan to utilize the barn and place her sister in the home. Based on the property's value as potential commercial, she could not be screened for a home loan. Council Member Hill shared that the real estate agent listed the property incorrectly. Mr. Perkins stated that the Future Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plans were only guides.

Mayor Dial asked Mr. Trocquet for some of the uses for the property as commercial. Mr. Trocquet stated that C-1 (downtown) was a lighter commercial and the zoning ordinance listed a litany of uses, whether they were permitted uses or uses with conditions attached. He added that it was approximately 118 uses. The cap was automotive with conditions, more than likely existing behind another permitted use that was non-automotive. The lower spectrum was offices, a restaurant permitting septic usage and site plan approval, or daycare facilities. He added that there were also physical dimensions to consider.

Council Member Campbell inquired about the small triangle property to the south of Ms. Shell's property. Mr. Trocquet stated that the property was approximately 1-acre and zoned C-1. Council Member Furr asked if it could be built on. Mr. Trocquet stated that it was a non-conforming lot. She then inquired about the property above Ms. Shell's. Mr. Trocquet stated that it was zoned R-12 and was also approximately 1-acre. Council Member Furr inquired about another strip of property near Dogwood Trail. Mr. Trocquet stated that a report was not available for the property on the Fayette County Tax map, however, according to the configuration, he believed the property to be close to 1-acre also.

Mr. Jamie Roberts returned to the podium. He explained that a portion of the aforementioned land was "dead man land". He added that it was a portion of a cul-de-sac within the industrial park that was part of a building moratorium due to no second entrance within the industrial park. He added that another portion was his and his brother's land, he had lived in Tyrone and did not plan on leaving the home that he built. He added that a 100ft. berm separated his property from the industrial park. He shared that his land was listed as future development and asked for to be removed from the suggested Town plan.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Council Member Furr shared that it was her opinion that there was always a beginning and end. She added that Ms. Shell's property was the ending of commercial zoning. From Ms. Shell's property heading north should be residential. She stated that there were eleven homes near to Ms. Shell's property and she did not wish for the neighbors to look across the street to see commercial property. She believed the property to be inappropriate for a school. Council Member Furr stated that the reason for the public hearing was to rezone the property from R-12 to C-1. She mentioned of the scenario of when homeowners died, that now was the chance to act. She did not agree with the scenario. She believed that commercial zoning should end at the vacant lot adjacent to the property which was zoned C-1. She did not wish for the homeowners across the street to worry about what would happen tomorrow.

Council Member Hill stated that she was torn because she saw both sides, however, when Ms. Shell purchased the property, it was residential, and when she closed it was residential. Council Member Hill added that Council had received many letters and emails regarding the rezoning and $\frac{3}{4}$ were not in favor.

Council Member Furr made a motion to deny the rezoning.
Council Member Hill seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

5. Consideration of a petition from applicant Zachary Eyster for the rezoning of an 8.2-acre tract with parcel number 0742-033 at property address 240 Briarwood Road. The requested rezoning is from AR to R-12. ***Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner***

Mr. Trocquet shared that the applicant's intent to rezone the property was to subdivide the lot into two parcels. He added that the property was an 8.2-acre lot with a large portion of a flood plain. Being that the property was currently zoned AR, somewhat inhibited the split due to the flood plain and setbacks. There was also state water running through the flood plain which would also place 100 ft. setbacks/stream buffer on the property. He stated that R-12 zoning would allow greater flexibility on both lot size and development standards to carve out a secondary lot on the land. Rezoning to R-12 would not create a nonconforming situation on the lot and would comply with all R-12 development standards. Mr. Trocquet stated that staff recommended approval and believed that the property would not harm the zoning ordinance and was in line with the Comp Plan and Future Development Map.

Mayor Dial opened the public hearing for anyone that wished to speak in favor.

Zach Eyster stated that the purpose for the split was to build a space for his in-laws to live in a home larger than 700 sq. ft. According to the AR zoning, we would need to rezone.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

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

Council Member Campbell made a motion to approve the rezoning of the 8.2-acre tract located at 240 Briarwood Road.

Council Member Howard seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

Referring to the property on Senoia Road mentioned earlier in the meeting Mayor Dial asked Mr. Trocquet to explain the process of carving out a piece of property and changing it from commercial to residential on the Future Land Use Map. Mr. Trocquet stated that it would take a Comprehensive Plan amendment before Council in the form of a public hearing with no signage posting required. He added that the Comp Plan was due for a readoption next year. He added that it would be a good time to reassess the Future Land Use Map boundaries as well. Mayor Dial asked Council if they would like to wait, or for the change to occur sooner. Council Member Furr stated that she could wait, Council Member Howard wished to move forward, and added that who knows what the next few years would bring. Mr. Trocquet shared that typically, the process would require a public input session. Being that it was only an amendment, it would not trigger the threshold of requiring public input, other than the public hearing. Usually, any amendments to the Comprehensive Plan or the Future Land Use Map would require approval from the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA). He stated that he would contact them. Mayor Dial spoke for the Council and stated that they did not recall looking at the area and indicating that it should be zoned commercial. Mr. Trocquet stated that it was slated commercial since 2007. Mr. Perkins stated that he was on the panel in 2007 and that the changes were based on public input, this was what the citizens asked for. Council Member Furr stated that when citizens place stickers on a certain area, it was usually never within their neighborhoods. Mayor Dial asked Mr. Trocquet to begin the process for the change. Council agreed.

New Business:

6. Consideration to adopt the 2021-2021 Millage Rate. *Brandon Perkins, Town Manager*

Ms. Beach informed everyone that three public hearings had been advertised and held and that staff recommended setting the 2021 millage rate at 2.889 for the fourteenth year in a row. Home values had been assessed higher as a whole with a 6.78 % increase of \$93,444. This would assist with the cost to run the Town.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Council Member Campbell made a motion to set the millage rate at 2.889 for 2021.
Council Member Hill seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

7. Consideration to award the 2021 Roadside Tree Pruning contract to LTRC Tree Specialists for \$24,641. **Scott Langford, Town Engineer/Public Works Director**

Mr. Langford shared that during the 2021 retreat and budget session, staff came to Council requesting funding for tree removal and pruning within the rights-of-way. He added that the first phase would begin on Castlewood, Dogwood, and Senoia Roads along the cart path and under the overpass. The second phase would include assuring ownership of certain properties. He shared that staff recommended approval contingent upon legal approval of the agreement, to the low bidder, LTRC Tree Specialists for \$24,641, which was well within their budget. Council Member Campbell inquired about the scope of the work. Mr. Langford stated that along Dogwood Trail near Dogwood Church, in the vicinity of the new pipe, there was a small strip of trees along the power lines and ditch line. By trimming back, it would lend better access. He added that they would also prune along the entrance to the Southfork subdivision. Another section would be the Palmetto, Senoia, and Tyrone Road intersection and beyond. Also, toward the bridge and down Tyrone Road toward the future cart path. Council Member Campbell also mentioned the area down Senoia Road, after crossing Dogwood Trail near Maple Shade. Mr. Langford stated that the Maple Shade section was a section that required knowledge of property ownership before commencement.

Council Member Campbell made a motion to award the 2021 Roadside Tree Pruning contract to LTRC Tree Specialists for \$24,641 upon approval of Legal Counsel's review of the contract documents.

Council Member Hill seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

8. Consideration for a Budget Amendment to the 2020/2021 Fiscal Year. **Sandy Beach, Finance/HR Manager**

Ms. Beach stated that the auditors would arrive the following day and would begin the annual audit for our previous fiscal year. The first amendment would be for Council's approval to move \$5,000 from last year's Founders Day budget to the Museum fund. The second would be for CARES Act funding totaling \$392,921.74. A portion had been used; the remainder would be placed in contingency funding for future years. The list was shared with Council. She stated that the third adjustment would be within the Federal Seizures fund for \$10,000. The fund had its own bank account and more money was spent than anticipated. The final adjustment would take place within the Planning/Zoning fund and would be taken from Public Works.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

The additional funds were coming from Public Works due to the dam project that never occurred and would be added to Planning/Zoning due to an increase in Town inspections for new construction. Ms. Beach added that funds would be moved within the General Fund to remain in compliance.

Council Member Furr made a motion to approve the 2020/2021 Budget Amendment as presented. Council Member Howard seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

Staff Comments

Mr. Langford thanked Ms. Baker from the audience for squeezing in the new employees on the agenda, and it was nice to have Devon Boullion on board in the Environmental Specialist position. He gave a shout-out to Ms. Beach for working hard and putting in late hours especially regarding Human Resources and making new employees her priority.

Mr. Perkins stated that rezonings always had the potential of being contentious and a lot of work went into preparing for one. People make assumptions and accusations were made in public and in person, which did affect our staff. He stated that when a property applied for a rezoning and our staff did their job, unfortunately, staff sometimes bore the brunt of public backlash. Mr. Perkins thanked Mr. Trocquet for handling himself professionally throughout the process. He added that he had heard some of Mr. Trocquet's phone calls and stated that he could not ask for better from him. He recognized and thanked him for his patience and for handling the weight of everything well.

Mr. Perkins shared that he had just received word from Paris Construction that the new Town Hall facility was awarded the 2021 Construction Management Association of America Project Achievement Award for public buildings for new construction for less than \$10 Million.

Ms. Spradlin shared that the Tyrone Court's federal drug audit was submitted and approved. This meant that they were handling their funds according to federal law.

Council Comments

Council Member Howard shared that she would like Council to revisit changing the speed limit on Senoia Road. Mr. Perkins stated that a traffic study was slated and that he was not sure if it included that section, however, the traffic trailers could be placed along Senoia Road. He added that any decision made should come from the science and study performed.

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm

Mr. Perkins shared that with any traffic study, there would always be a handful that was way over the limit, however, the average was usually within the speed limit. He stated that staff could begin researching.

Executive Session

Council Member Howard made a motion to move into Executive Session to approve the Executive Session minutes from July 15, 2021 meeting and one item for Real Estate acquisition.

Council Member Campbell seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

Council Member Campbell made a motion to reconvene.

Council Member Howard seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

Council Member Furr made a motion to approve the Executive Session minutes from the July 15, 2021 meeting.

Council Member Howard seconded the motion. Motion was approved 4-0.

Adjournment

Council Member Campbell made a motion to adjourn. Motion was approved 4-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:56 pm.

By: _____
Eric Dial, Mayor

Attest: _____
Dee Baker, Town Clerk

Council Meeting – Social Distancing/YouTube Live
August 19, 2021 7:00 pm