

**SUMMARY
MEETING REPORT
ROME-FLOYD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
November 3, 2016**

PRESENT:

Frank Brown
Charles Jackson
Carol Greissing
Logan Boss

Tom Bennett
Rickey Beeman
Terry Jones
Ronnie Kilgo

Evie McNiece

Scotty Hancock

ABSENT:

Anthony McClain, Bill Temple

STAFF:

Sue Hiller, Planning Director
Frank Beacham, City Attorney
Patrick Eidson, Assistant City Manager

David Thompson, Associate Planner
Gary Burkhalter, Assistant County Manager

PUBLIC:

DeAnn Richardson Bridget Janes Harry Janes Charles Chastain Jared Dusthimer
Clyde Coates Rickey Coates Mark Munns Doug Sharp Charles Ford Denise Brown
Alison Vidwlf Raymond Howard, MD Gail Ballew James Oakes Floyd Ozment
Lynn Ozment Al Abernathy Chandra Fallin Angie McWhorter Libby Monteith
David Monteith Jeff Terhune Rarri Terhune Brenda Cinder Wanda Jacobs Alan Fuller
Renee Fuller Kelli Bryant Keith Atkinson Alma Payne Katie Dusthimer Donald Nixon
Kathy Dusthimer Dori Murdock Maria Beard Ronnie Beard Rebecca Spate
Benjamin Spate Barry Murdock W.T. Wooten Gary Beard Doyce Davis Lloyd Whaley
Luis Gonzalez Kelli Gonzalez Audra Davis Joyce Davis Priscilla Watkins Fay Wigley
Tommy Wigley Tim Nichols W.A. Mundy John Morris Theresa Murray Karen Nichols
Ramona Schwengel Quintor Schwengel Becky Adams Mandel Brown Lisa Smith
Andi Beyer

CALL TO ORDER:

Frank Brown - Chair, called the November 3, 2016 meeting of the Rome-Floyd County Planning Commission to order at 2:45 PM. It was determined by roll call that a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Jones made a motion to revise the agenda and move the Floyd County Rezonings & Special Use Permits requests, specifically File #114-2016SUP, to be reviewed first. Boss seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Boss made a motion to approve the revised agenda. Beeman seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Bennett made a motion to correct and amend the minutes. Greissinger seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

SUBDIVISIONS:

City:

1. None

County:

1. None

FLOYD COUNTY REZONINGS & SPECIAL USE PERMITS

1. **File #114-2016SUP** Requests Special Use Permit for recreational vehicle park on property on Alabama Highway at Barker Road identified on Floyd County Tax Map G13X as parcel 239 (C-C Community Commercial). Staff showed slides and recommended that approval of the application, if granted, be conditioned on the site plan submitted on October 10th, 2016. Bill Gore, applicant, spoke in favor of the request. Mr. Gore has intended to build a recreational vehicle park for many years but needed a location to build on. Mr. Gore chose the location due to its acreage, road frontage and proximity to downtown Rome. The proposed recreational vehicle park would be a high-end park with a recreational vehicle service center, according to Mr. Gore. Mr. Gore offered to have approval of the application be conditioned on proposed text amendments to the ULDC regarding recreational vehicle parks. Lisa Smith, Tourism Director, spoke in favor of the request, citing a need for a recreational vehicle park in Floyd County. Ms. Smith pointed to increased revenue from tourism, growing interest in recreational vehicle use, and the popularity of local events attracting recreational vehicle owners as reasons to support the application. Andi Beyer, event organizer, spoke in favor of the request. Ms. Beyer said that the lack of sufficient camping and recreational vehicle sites in Floyd County prevented events from taking place in the county. Rickey Coates and Clyde Coates, property owners at 140 Barker Road, spoke in opposition. Mr. Coates opposed the request because Mr. Gore wants to use part of Mr. Coates's driveway for the proposed use; the driveway would be tied into the driveway of Mr. Gore's recreational vehicle accessory store. Mr. Coates tried to purchase Mr. Gore's property from the previous owners but was denied. Regarding what Ms. Beier said earlier, Mr. Coates had purchased a home and allowed recreational vehicle owners to stay on the property for free through the duration of a local event. Mr. Coates said he cannot sell his property at the price he is asking for because of the proposed use. Mr. Coates said that there are other places in Floyd County for recreational vehicles. Angie McWhorter, property owner at 129 Barker Road, spoke in opposition. Ms. McWhorter opposed the request because of concerns of reduced property values if the proposed use is built; the potential for negative impacts caused by park users on the neighborhood; safety concerns over ease of access for motorists and

nearby property owners traveling Barker Road; potential negative impacts of immature vegetation inside the landscape buffers; concerns over rules and regulations that the applicant would have flexibility over; and concerns with the proposed text amendments regarding recreational vehicle parks. Kelli Gonzalez, property owner at 8 Intervale Drive and 83 Barker Road, spoke in opposition. Mrs. Gonzalez opposes the request because of safety concerns with the width of Barker Road and the ability of recreational vehicle drivers to navigate on Barker. Mrs. Gonzalez submitted photos of Barker Road to the planning commission. Jones made a motion to accept the photos into the record. Boss seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Mrs. Gonzalez said that there is already parking on-site for events, questioning whether the recreational vehicle park is meant for event goers; instead, Mr. Gore would target transient workers that may or may not have criminal histories with the neighborhood being unaware until it is too late. Mrs. Gonzalez pointed to a recreational vehicle park in Ringgold, Georgia, with park users causing an increase in crime and the park owners to sell. Mrs. Gonzalez said Mr. Gore would not be able to discriminate against potential customers. Mark Munns, property owner at 205 Barker Road, spoke in opposition. Mr. Munns opposed the request because of safety concerns with recreational vehicle drivers and other motorists on Barker Road and questioned how the proposed use would address sewage issues. Dr. Raymond Howard, property owner at 214 Barker Road, spoke in opposition to the request because of safety concerns over the width of Barker Road. Bennett made a motion to extend the speaking time for both sides by ten minutes. Boss seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Jared Dusthimer, property owner at 438 Barker Road, spoke in opposition. Mr. Dusthimer opposed the request because of safety concerns on Barker Road; concerns over park users that cannot be discriminated against; concerns over the long term impact of the proposed use on the neighborhood; and concerns over the lack of regulation of recreational vehicle parks. Mandel Brown, property owner at 137 Barker Road, spoke in opposition. Mr. Brown opposed the request because of safety concerns over Barker Road and the potential for negative impacts caused by park users. Tim Nichols, property owner at 14 Albion Drive, spoke in opposition. Mr. Nichols opposed the request because of noise, garbage, safety concerns, and the potential for negative impacts caused by park users. Jeff Terhune, property owner at 18 Beacon Drive, spoke in opposition. Mr. Terhune opposed the request because of safety concerns and pointed to 911 calls related to existing recreational vehicle parks in Floyd County. Mr. Terhune questioned whether the recreational vehicle park would be used by the high-end recreational vehicle owners Mr. Gore envisions. Mr. Terhune also expressed concern over property values of the neighborhood if the proposed use is approved. Alan Fuller, property owner at 183 Barker Road, spoke in opposition. Mr. Fuller opposed the request because of concerns over property values and the ability of recreational vehicle drivers to navigate to the subject property. Fay Wigley, property owner at 586 Barker Road, spoke in opposition. Mr. Gore spoke in rebuttal. The proposed recreational vehicle park would have a staging area so vehicles wouldn't stop in the road; the existing mature vegetation along Barker Road would be preserved for the landscaped buffer; the service center will be built on the subject property with or without approval of the special use permit for the recreational vehicle park; there would be no traffic or issues while traveling on Barker Road; normally, there are not enough fully equipped camping sites for recreational vehicles at events and the proposed use would provide them; Mr. Gore would set the guidelines on renting sites (recreational vehicles built within the last ten years and any older models on a case-by-case basis) and reserve the right to deny service;

Mr. Gore and his family intend to live on the second floor of the proposed facility shown on the site plan; property values of adjacent and nearby properties would not decrease if the proposed use is approved; Mr. Gore would clean up the subject property that has been used as an illegal trash dump; Mr. Gore would close the recreational vehicle park at 10 PM; property values of the subject property would increase with approval; and Mr. Gore has invested time and money to try and improve the subject property. Jones asked Mr. Gore if the dumping station would connect into the county sewer line. Mr. Gore said it would. Jones asked Mr. Gore if he has explored an option with the county. Mr. Gore has had staff from the building inspection department investigate the subject property. The site plan had to be redesigned because of a state bluewater stream on the subject property. Mr. Gore was consulted by building inspection staff on issues regarding wastewater. Staff made a correction that only the City runs a sewer system and asked Mr. Gore to check with the City water and sewer department. Greissinger asked if the entrance would be from Alabama Highway. Mr. Gore said no, it would be from Barker Road and will have plenty of room for entry. Greissinger asked Mr. Gore if he will have a time limit for park users. Mr. Gore answered it would be 60 days, assuming proposed text amendments regarding recreational vehicle parks are adopted. Mr. Gore said he would be fine with any rules that are adopted. Jones noted that the subject property is partially within a flood hazard and asked Mr. Gore how he plans to address that. Mr. Gore answered that the facilities building and the service center will not be in the floodplain and that the only portion of the proposed park in the floodplain will have concrete pads to be used weather-permitting. Jones asked Mr. Gore what kind of cost analysis he has done. Mr. Gore answered that, with no income coming in from the service center, he can maintain the recreational vehicle park at 27% occupancy. Bennett asked Mr. Gore if there was any merit to the argument about the potential for increased 911 calls. Mr. Gore said he would not dispute the examples given, however Mr. Gore said he has never seen any police presence at any of the sites he has managed. Mr. Gore allowed that he has heard of police calls at other recreational vehicle parks, but these troubles would not occur at his park; Mr. Gore reiterated that he has the ability to deny service to park users, and he would not damage his and his park's reputation by allowing any trouble at his facilities. Mr. Gore said he would make sure he would handle any potential problem immediately. Bennett asked where the staging area would be located. Mr. Gore pointed to his submitted site plan it would be located inside the entry drive to the east of the facilities area. Bennett asked if Mr. Gore's home is shown on the submitted site plan. Mr. Gore said it is, but it is not labeled as such. It would be the second floor of the facilities building with the first floor having 6 full service private shower rooms, laundry room, women's restroom, men's restroom and park office. Bennett asked Mr. Gore if he had looked at a location off of Highway 20. Mr. Gore said he had but the proximity to the railroad and floodplain made it an inappropriate site. Staff made a note that there are ways of accommodating a residence at the subject property. Bennett expressed concern whether there was enough space for recreational vehicles going to and inside the park and for the staging area. Mr. Gore offered to make any changes to the site plan or additional conditions to his application. Bennett asked Mr. Gore about the hours of operation. Mr. Gore said there would be a quiet period starting from 10 PM and that there would be procedures in place to address park users coming in during afterhours. Mr. Kilgo expressed concern about the proposed service center. Mr. Gore gave dimensions for the service center which would have 4 service bays and a retail store at the northwest corner of the building; the service center is intended for small

service, accessory parts and cleaning with a quick turnaround for customers. Boss asked staff what uses would be allowed on the subject property other than the proposed uses that would give neighbors concern. Staff replied that the C-C Community Commercial zoning district allows for a wide array of service and retail uses, e.g. motels. Boss asked staff why the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) shows the subject property as suburban residential. Staff replied that although the property is located along a major corridor, it does back up against a rural area. The other commercial properties adjacent to the subject property are not being used for commercial purposes and are undeveloped. The nearest non-residential property of any size is the contractor yard. Beeman asked whether Barker Road is a two-lane road. Mr. Gore said yes, it is. Beeman asked Mr. Gore if he intends to put his home off of Barker Road. Mr. Gore answered that his home would be within the park with no separate entryway. Beeman asked where the entrance to the service center would be at. Mr. Gore answered that the service center will use the same entrance as the recreational vehicle park and go down a road that is 27 feet wide directly to the service center. Mr. Gore said that motorists will not go down Barker Road for the service center. The only indication on the submitted site plan that there is an entry to the service center off of Barker Road is dangerous, according to Mr. Gore; what would be there at the maximum use would be graveled and used as a construction entrance only and then landscaped over. Beeman asked if Mr. Gore had driven over Barker Road before planning to construct the proposed uses. Mr. Gore answered he had several times. Beeman asked Mr. Gore if he had notice a curve along Barker Road. Mr. Gore said he has and estimated the curve is located about a quarter mile past the entrance on the submitted site plan. Beeman expressed concern about the recreational vehicle park at the subject property and the safety of the neighborhood. Mr. Gore said that the only length of Barker Road for the recreational vehicle park that will be traveled will be from Alabama Highway only. **Beeman made a motion to recommend denial. Boss seconded the motion. Boss, Brown, Beeman, Greissinger, Jackson, Jones, Kilgo, and Bennett voted for the motion (8-0).**

2. **File #111-2016Z** Requests rezoning from C-C Community Commercial to SR Suburban Residential for existing single-family dwelling on property on Old School Road at Old Dalton Road identified on Floyd County Tax Map J12X as parcel 065. Staff showed slides and recommended approval of the application. Lloyd Atkinson, the applicant's brother, spoke in favor of the request. No one spoke in opposition. **Jones made a motion to recommend approval. Boss seconded the motion. Boss, Brown, Beeman, Greissinger, Jackson, Jones, Kilgo, and Bennett voted for the motion (8-0).**

CITY OF ROME REZONINGS & SPECIAL USE PERMITS

1. **File #112-2016Z** Requests rezoning from H-T-R High Density Traditional Residential to M-R Multi-Family Residential for existing triplex on property on East 15th Street identified on Floyd County Tax Map J14N as parcel 386. Staff showed slides and recommend denial of the application. No one spoke in favor of the request. No one spoke in opposition. Jones asked staff what triggered the applicant's request. Staff answered they were told by the applicant the request was made for financing purposes, but no specifics were given. Bennett asked staff if financing would be an issue with a legal non-conforming structure. Staff replied that it could be because a legal non-conforming structure could not be placed back on a property if

it were to be removed or destroyed; in those cases, it can be difficult to obtain insurance. Bennett expressed concern with the applicant's ability to borrow money for the purposes of improving the property if the request was denied. Bennett asked if the request could be postponed to next month's meeting. Staff replied that the planning commission can make a motion to postpone if that is their choice. **Bennett made a motion to postpone. Beeman seconded the motion. Boss, Beeman, Brown, Greissinger, Jackson, Jones, and Bennett voted for the motion (8-0).**

2. **File #113-2016Z** Requests rezoning from H-T-R High Density Traditional Residential to C-C Community Commercial for marketing purposes of property on West Butler Street identified on Floyd County Tax Map H13W as parcel 092. Staff showed slides and recommended approval of the application. John Ivester, the applicant, spoke in favor of the request. No one spoke in opposition. **Bennett made to motion to recommend approval. Boss seconded the motion. Boss, Brown, Beeman, Greissinger, Jackson, Jones, Kilgo, and Bennett voted for the motion (8-0).**

ANNEXATIONS:

1. **File #03-2016A** Requests annexation into the City of Rome with no change in zoning of property off of Locust Street at Elmwood Street identified on Floyd County Tax Map J12Z as parcels 132 and 133. O-I Office Institutional. Staff showed slides and recommended that annexation be with no change in zoning. No one spoke in favor or in opposition. **Jones made a motion to recommend that annexation be with no change in zoning. Kilgo seconded the motion. Brown, Boss, Beeman, Greissinger, Jackson, Jones, Kilgo, and Bennett voted for the motion (8-0).**
2. **File #04-2016A** Requests annexation into the City of Rome with no change in zoning of property on US Highway 411 at Hobson Way identified on Floyd County Tax Map K15X as parcel 276. C-C Community Commercial. Staff showed slides and recommended that annexation be with no change in zoning. No one spoke in favor or in opposition. **Boss made a motion to recommend that annexation be with no change in zoning. Greissinger seconded the motion. Brown, Boss, Beeman, Greissinger, Jackson, Jones, Kilgo, and Bennett voted for the motion (8-0).**

TEXT AMENDMENTS:

1. Revise or delete Article 3; Article 4; Article 6; and Article 8 of the ULDC regarding residential cluster development. No one spoke in favor or in opposition. **Jones made a motion to recommend approval of the amendment of Article 8. Boss seconded the motion. Brown, Boss, Beeman, Greissinger, Jackson, Jones, Kilgo, and Bennte vote for the motion (8-0).** *Please see attached.*
2. Revise or delete Article 4 and Article 6 of the ULDC regarding Recreational Vehicle Parks.

DEPARTMENTAL UPDATES:

1. None

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Nominating committee report

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Historic Preservation Commission Application Fees

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to bring before this body, the November 3, 2016 meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned by Frank Brown, Chair, at 4:55 p.m.

X

Frank Brown
Chairman

DRAFT

TINY HOMES/MODULAR HOMES

ARTICLE 8 DEFINITIONS

Proposed (to be added):

Industrialized Building: See under “Modular Home”.

Modular Home: A factory fabricated, transportable structure, consisting of a single section or multiple sections called modules, to be constructed on top of a permanent foundation at the site for residential use. This structure is constructed in compliance with the standards adopted by the State Commissioner of Community Affairs in accordance with the Georgia Industrialized Buildings Act. A label bearing the Commissioner’s insignia will be affixed to the structure certifying the design and construction of the structure complies with the requirements of the Commissioner’s rules.

Residential Cluster Development: A cluster of attached and detached single-family dwelling units developed on a single lot.

Tiny Home: A custom-built, transportable structure designed to provide living quarters that may be constructed for one of the following uses:

- (1) **Modular Home:** This structure when it bears a label certifying it is constructed in compliance with the Georgia Industrialized Buildings Act and meets standards in this Code is allowed wherever site-built single-family dwellings are permitted if:
 - The structure is placed on continuous footings and foundations; and
 - Exterior walls of modular buildings are supported by continuous solid or fully grouted masonry or concrete footings and foundations; and
 - The towing tongue and wheels are removed from the structure.
- (2) **Manufactured Home:** This structure when it bears a label certifying that it is constructed in compliance with the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act, U.S. Public Law 93-383 and meets standards in this Code is allowed wherever manufactured housing units are permitted.
- (3) **Recreational Vehicle:** This structure is used or designed for temporary portable housing or occupancy while on vacation or other recreational trip and provided with sleeping accommodations.