

**MINUTES**  
**GREATER LOWNDES PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
 LOWNDES COUNTY SOUTH HEALTH DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
 325 WEST SAVANNAH AVENUE  
 Monday, July 31, 2017  
 5:30 P.M.

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff
Franklin Bailey, Chairman	Chip Wildes	Matt Martin, City Planning & Zoning Admin.
Lou McClendon	W. Keith Sandlin	Carmella Braswell, Recording Secre.
Brad Folsom	Johnny Ball, III	Jason Davenport, County Planner
Vicki Rountree	Tommy Willis	
Celine Gladwin	~Dasher Rep~	
Jody Hall		

**VISITORS PRESENT:**

(See Sign-In Sheet)

**AGENDA ITEM #1:**

**CALL TO ORDER, INVOCATION, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairman Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. Chairman Bailey welcomed everyone to the GLPC meeting. Chairman Bailey explained that the Planning Commission serves as an advisory body to the local member governments regarding land use requests. Chairman Bailey explained that the Planning Commission is a recommending body only, and the final determination of the requests presented will be made by the applicable local governments. Chairman Bailey explained the meeting procedures and stated that handouts were available for review by the public for the conducting of the public hearing, to include the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Powers that will be used as part of their determination for the cases on the agenda. Chairman Bailey announced the dates of the public hearing for the local member governments as listed on the agenda.

Chairman Bailey asked Commissioner McClendon to lead the Invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**AGENDA ITEM #2:**

**Approval of the Meeting Minutes: June 26, 2017**

Chairman Bailey called for questions, corrections, and approval of the June 26, 2017, GLPC meeting minutes.

There being none, Chairman Bailey called for a motion.

Commissioner Hall made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Folsom seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Bailey called the motion and it was carried unanimously. (Vote 5-0)

## **CITY OF HAHIRA**

### **AGENDA ITEM #3:**

#### **Case HA-2017-02, Wilby Coleman**

**Nature of Request:** Mr. Martin stated this is a request by Wilby Coleman to rezone 3 tracts of land totaling 8.91 acres from Single-Family Residential (R-10) to either Highway Commercial (C-H) or conditional Single-Family Residential (R-10)(c). The subject property is located at the NE quadrant of Exit 29. Tract "A" (7.62 acres) is being proposed for rezoning to C-H; Tract "B" (0.04 acres) is being proposed for rezoning to C-H; and, Tract "C" (1.25 acres) is being proposed to remain R-10 w/conditions. The "new" Union Road right-of-way is depicted as purple lines on the map, for which the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) has already acquired the land for their proposed improvements. The applicant owns the property on both sides of the proposed right-of-way and is proposing commercial zoning along the new right-of-way. The purpose of the 50' strip along W. Stanfill is to separate their future commercial development from the Stanfill Road corridor and the houses that are located along the present road. The applicant is planning to market the property for speculative commercial development. All of the subject property is located within a Community Activity Center (CAC) character area on the Future Development Map of the Comprehensive Plan. The current R-10 zoning is considered non-compliant with this CAC character designation. The subject property is currently undeveloped and mostly wooded. All tracts (A, B, and C) are shown on the survey within the staff report. Staff is recommending approval after finding the request consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Power, and is recommending approval of C-H for Tracts "A" and "B"; and approval of R-10 for Tract "C" with the following four (4) conditions: 1) No motorized vehicular access to West Stanfill Street, except for golf cart paths as approved by the City Engineer; 2) This area shall otherwise remain undisturbed in a primarily natural vegetated state. At the time of development of the adjacent C-H zoning area, there shall be a minimum equivalency of at least 50 evergreen shrubs and 10 evergreen trees per 100 linear feet within this R-10 area. Existing vegetation may be counted toward these minimums, but additional evergreen plantings may be required at the time of development; 3) there shall be no non-governmental signage in this area; 4) Future stormwater management areas may encroach no more than 10' into the southern portion of this 50' strip.

Chairman Bailey asked if there were any questions to staff from the Planning Commission.

There being none, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone was present wishing to speak in favor of the request.

Mr. Wilby Coleman, 1203 Hickory Drive, stated he is not making this request in his own name but in the family limited partnership that is set up in the laws of Georgia – with he being the principal partner and the limited partners being his children that make up 99% of the partnership. The rezoning request is being made after GDOT’s threat to pursue this project has finally happened. The relocating of Union Road has affected their property in 2 ways – 1) the closing of Union Road North with its connection with Highway 122, and, 2) on the south side, they are constructing a cul-de-sac which restricts traffic to access Highway 122. The redesign took 9.4 acres of their commercial property and its usefulness on the south side and totally on the north side. The rezoning request to C-H and R-10 is an attempt to seek to recoup some of what was lost. They are considering the residential properties on the north side of W. Stanfill Street and will provide planted buffer and evergreen shrubberies and trees.

Chairman Bailey asked if there were any questions for the speaker.

There being none, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone else was present wishing to speak in favor of the request.

There being none, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone was present wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Ms. Paulette Barnes, 1026 W. Stanfill Street, stated her property lies near the corner of W. Stanfill Street and some apartments. The proposed Union Road will lie directly in front of her home. She believes that once the subject property is rezoned to C-H, any type of business will be able to locate on the property. Is there a more restrictive zoning given this is in a residential area? She is not interested in viewing the back of a commercial business i.e. minute market, hotel, or a McDonald’s and does not want commercial property or businesses that will devalue her property. The apartments have already lowered the value of her property.

Commissioner Gladwin and Commissioner Rountree stated to the speaker that the applicant is proposing a vegetative buffer to protect the residential homes across the street.

There being no questions for the speaker, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone else was present wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Mr. Donald Isaacson, 1038 W. Stanfill Street, stated they had bought their home about 13 years ago, and not aware that the interchange improvements were coming. They are concerned about how the new road will affect the value of their property and what restrictions does the C-H zoning place on the property. They are also concerned if buffers will be required and what will be the speed limit. Other concerns are for traffic congestion.

Mr. Martin stated C-H zoning allows a full range of commercial services i.e. hotel, motels, restaurants, etc.

There being no questions for the speaker, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone else was present wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

There being none, Chairman Bailey closed the public participation portion of the request and entertained further discussion from the Planning Commission.

There being none, Chairman Bailey called for a motion.

Commissioner Hall made a motion to recommend approval of C-H zoning for Tracts "A" and "B", and to recommend approval of R-10 with conditions for Tract "C" as presented by staff. Commissioner Folsom seconded the motion.

Chairman Bailey called for questions and discussion on the motion. There being none, Chairman Bailey called the motion and it was carried. (Vote 5-0)

#### **Agenda Item #4**

##### **VA-2017-10**

##### **Tombrooks LLC, 318 Eager Road**

**Nature of Request:** Mr. Martin stated agenda items #4 and #5 will be presented separately as each request involves different properties. Mr. Martin stated this is a rezoning request for 1.57 acres from Single-Family Residential (R-15) to Single-Family Residential (R-10). The subject property is located at 318 Eager Road. This is the same applicant that rezoned property several years ago for 316 Eager Road to R-10. The subject property is planned to be added to the R-10 property to the east. The subject property currently has 2 duplexes that were constructed in the 1970s – the uses are nonconforming. Several properties along the north side of Eager Road were annexed into the city limits several years ago. The applicant is proposing a different master plan than was presented a few years ago. The subject property is located in an Established Residential (ER) Character Area on the Future Development Map of the Comprehensive Plan, which allows the possibility of R-10 zoning. The existing land use pattern along Eager Road is dominated by R-15 zoning and single-family residential subdivisions of various shapes and sizes. Along the south side of Eager Road there is both R-15 and R-10 zoning. Staff finds the request consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Power (SFEZP), and is recommending approval of the zoning change.

Chairman Bailey asked if there were any questions to staff from the Planning Commission.

There being none, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone was present wishing to speak in favor of the request.

Mr. Tom Call, 1108 Gornto Road, stated he has been in the real estate business for a long while and his firm has a reputation of constructing good residential infill developments where there is a need. The proposed development will be similar to Huntington Ridge, Thornbrook, and Georgetown that will support residents who like to downsize and/or young professionals. There

is a market for young professionals. This development will be managed by a homeowners association. The proposed development will be good for Valdosta. He has met with a neighbor about their concerns and plan to address the concerns as they design the development.

Chairman Bailey asked if there were any questions from the Planning Commission to the presenter. There being none, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone else was present wishing to speak in favor of the request.

There being none, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone was present wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Mr. Anthony Rowe, 317 Crestview Drive, stated he has a petition that was signed by 75 people in 2 days. The proposed development takes up 100% of his backyard. He is primarily concerned with the potential water runoff as it appears that the subject property will be raised. Water flows naturally from Betty Jo Drive towards Eager Road. The future widening of Eager Road will bring more traffic. He is also concerned about the proposed development's impact on property values.

There being no questions for the speaker, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone else was present wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Ms. Ann Anderson, 400 Eager Road, stated there appears to be an island of R-10 zoning in the area of R-15 zoning on the map. There are about 100 residential lots in the Fawnwood Subdivision that is across the street, for which 70% are not owner-occupied. There is a propensity for traffic accidents and safety issues if the development is approved. There is a problem and concern with water runoff. There was a recent traffic count that yielded 30,000 cars a day on Eager Road – this is an already congested area. The requested R-10 zoning is too high of a residential density and will bring riffraff and the lack of pride for homeownership. This area needs no more R-10 development.

There being no questions for the speaker, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone else was present wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Mr. Jim Harrell, 320 Eager Road, stated he also owns 322 Eager Road. He is concerned with keeping similar properties in the same area. Their neighborhood has pushed to keep the R-15 zoning in a previous rezoning request. There appears to be no interest in preserving the neighborhoods, and the interest lies in how much revenue you can get from taxable property. The developer can build within the R-15 zoning district. His properties now hold water and his driveway was damaged to help address the water flow issues. He is in favor of keeping the R-15 zoning and does not support more dense housing in the area.

There being no questions for the speaker, Chairman Bailey closed the public participation on the rezoning request.

Chairman Bailey called for further questions and discussion to staff.

Commissioner Gladwin asked if the subject property is allowed to be redeveloped with 4 lots with the current R-15 zoning; and, theoretically will the proposed R-10 zoning yield 6 lots given the required road frontage.

Mr. Martin stated yes, if a street is constructed to provide adequate frontage; the concern is not so much with land area, but with road frontage. The current zoning may yield 3 lots as indicated in the staff report.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Bailey called for a motion.

Commissioner Folsom made a motion to find the request consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Power and recommended approval of R-10 zoning as presented; Commissioner Hall seconded the motion.

Chairman Bailey called for discussion on the motion. There being none, the motion was called and carried by the majority. (Vote 4-1 [Commissioner Gladwin voted against the motion])

## **Agenda Item #5**

### **VA-2017-11**

#### **Tombrooks LLC, 316 & 318 Eager Road**

**Nature of Request:** Mr. Martin stated this request is for a Planned Development for 2 properties to redevelop them in R-10 zoning. The proposed development will consist of 17 dwelling units that will be either attached or detached. The subject property includes 316 Eager Road that was approved 4 years ago as a masterplan development. The applicant is the same and the previously approved Planned Development has expired. The proposed development has a different design. The subject properties are located in an Established Residential (ER) Character Area on the Future Development Map in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed master plan depicts 18 parcels of land but 17 homes with only 13 rooftops – one of these parcels is a designated common area and open space. The proposed development will have a private road system. The single-family attached homes are connected, similar to a townhouse style with 1 roof system and a property line that separates the dwelling units. The masterplan will include a 10' buffer with perimeter fencing. Each home will be approximately 1500 square feet with garages. Access and driveways onto Eager Road is a major concern. The applicant seeks to redevelop these 2 parcels that are large enough for several dwelling units but are hard to develop conventionally because of their lack of existing road frontage. These properties are therefore an ideal candidate for planned development consideration. This development proposes nonconventional development to conserve space, as well as offer flexible design with clustered housing. Staff is of the opinion that the redesign is much better than the previous masterplan and is recommending for its approval subject to 14 conditions:

- (1) Approval shall be granted for an all-residential Planned Development in accordance with the submitted conceptual master plan. The development shall consist of both single-family "detached" and single-family "attached" dwellings, but with a total of no more than 17 dwelling units and no more than 13 residential

structures. Single-family attached dwellings shall be in two-unit buildings only. All dwellings shall be on their own parcel of land that includes both building and land area (not isolated building pads). All other allowable uses in R-10 zoning shall be excluded, except for home occupations that generate no traffic.

- (2) All dwelling units shall be limited to one-story, and contain a minimum heated floor area of 1,500 square feet. At least two different basic floor plans shall be utilized in a mixed pattern with variable architectural details along the streetscape. There shall be no more than two buildings having an identical front façade design. Exterior design features shall be a vernacular Craftsman style as represented by the submitted sample drawings. The use of vinyl siding shall be prohibited. All yards shall be irrigated and professionally landscaped by the time of home completion.
- (3) All buildings shall observe a minimum building setback of at least 10' from all external property lines of the development, and 6' from all interior property lines and pavement edges for the shared access roadways.
- (4) The development shall connect to City water and sewer services, with a looped water system design that connects to existing mains in both Eager Road and Simpson Place, as approved by the City Engineer. The unused portions of the existing 20' utility easement along the eastern boundary of the development shall be abandoned and vacated before approval of the development's final plat.
- (5) The development shall include restrictive Covenants and a Property Owners Association that is responsible for the proper maintenance of all common areas, shared roadway, stormwater facilities, entrance features, and internal landscaping etc...
- (6) The shared access driveway shall be a named, privately owned and maintained roadway in the form of a shared access and public utility easement across each lot. Pavement shall be asphalt with a width of at least 24' near the entrance with Eager Road and at least 20' elsewhere. Sidewalks shall be omitted and curb and gutter shall be deemed optional. The roadway shall otherwise be constructed to City standards as approved by the City Engineer. The northernmost cul-de-sac shall instead be designed and constructed as a Y-shaped emergency vehicle turnaround as approved by the City Fire Marshal. Maintenance of the roadways shall be with the Property Owners Association and/or the collective property owners in perpetuity.
- (7) The internal roadway shall include decorative streetlights and grouped mailboxes. There shall be no on-street parking allowed, except for temporary loading/unloading for the residents.
- (8) In lieu of individual garbage cans, the development shall include a shared dumpster facility that is located in the center of the development adjacent to the larger roundabout. The dumpster area shall be gated and fully screened from view with opaque fencing or wall. Access design for the dumpster shall be approved by Public Works Director.
- (9) The perimeter of the development shall include a solid opaque wooden privacy fence and a planted buffer area. Except for the southernmost 30' near Eager Road, the fence shall be at least 8' high and the fence shall be finished on both sides. The perimeter buffer area shall include a minimum of 5 small and 1 canopy tree (all evergreens) per 100 linear feet, as approved by the City Arborist. Buffer area landscaping shall be integrated into the design of other landscaping for each development, without necessary separation between the buffer area and adjacent buildings.
- (10) The development's frontage along Eager Road shall include only the shared private roadway and no other entrance drive, piping of the existing ditch in Eager Road, as well as a decorative landscaped entrance berm/fencing with trees as approved by the City Arborist. There shall be no more than one entrance sign for the development, which shall be a non-illuminated monument sign not to exceed 6' in height nor 32 square feet in size.
- (11) Development of the project shall commence within 2 years and be completed within 5 years. Otherwise, Planned Development approval shall automatically expire.

Chairman Bailey asked if there were any questions to staff from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Gladwin asked if applicant considered a master planned development using R-15 zoning.

Mr. Martin stated there will not be much difference in the numbers - between 14 and 17 units, with 17 being the maximum for R-10 zoning.

Commissioner Gladwin asked if consideration had been given for guest parking; and, how was the 10' external setback determined.

Mr. Martin stated guest parking has not been addressed although parking spaces need to be provided; additionally, the 10' external setback is a deviation from the regulations.

Commissioner McClendon asked if the fire department approved the proposed egress/ingress.

Mr. Martin stated there has been much discussion between the fire department, engineering department, and the utility department concerning that issue; the fire department has approved the concept with the exception that the northernmost cul-de-sac be changed to a Y-shaped turnaround.

Commissioner Folsom asked staff to address the number of planting requirements as compared to their previous recommendation; and, to address his concerns with the recommended condition concerning the dumpster being the focal point; and lastly, there are concerns with there being no condominium restrictions for the attached single-family homes.

Mr. Martin stated the planting requirements was intended to remain the same; however, the Planning Commission can make recommendations that will be carried forward. Regarding the dumpster, a shared facility was a recommendation by the public works director given the proposed road system; from a building code perspective, there will be fire-rated separation between the units so each unit may be individually owned.

Commissioner Rountree asked if the proposed detention facility addresses the resident's existing concern for water runoff.

Mr. Martin stated that this site has not been engineered; any water runoff will have to be routed and tie into the city's system.

Commissioner Rountree asked if guest parking can be addressed as a condition for a common parking area.

Mr. Martin stated yes.

There being no further questions, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone was present wishing to speak in favor of the request.

Mr. Tom Call, 1108 Gornto Road, stated in response to some of the concerns, they are bound to the city's requirements for water runoff. Their plans are to route the water into the detention facility that will eventually flow into the city's drainage system. They intend on having some pervious parking surfaces. The water and the parking are under control in their opinion. The traffic count, as they checked that day, is 10,000 cars a day as Eager Road is classified as a

collector road. This will be a good neighborhood with a good floor plan that will make it marketable, as he intends to live there as well. They will have to address the condominium issue. There was not adequate time to address the conditions concerning the dumpster location and the Y-turnaround and would like those conditions removed as they had received the updates late Friday afternoon. They meet the city's code with regards to the length of the cul-de-sac. They do not think the idea for a centralized location for a dumpster is good. They would like the second half of condition #6 be removed and condition #8 in its entirety.

Commissioner Rountree asked if roll offs were the choice, will the garbage trucks be able to go in and turnaround.

Mr. Call stated the garbage trucks will not be able to turnaround as it is too narrow to turn around fully.

Commissioner Folsom asked if any restrictions will be placed on units used as rentals? Fence? Community area plans?

Mr. Call stated they have not. They are proposing an eight (8') feet fence and to move unit #13 as far away from the neighbor's lot (Mr. Rowe). As far as the community area, thoughts of green space garden or pool have been considered – they are not sure at this time.

There being no further questions for the speaker, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone else was present wishing to speak in favor of the request.

There being none, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone was present wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Mr. Anthony Rowe, 317 Crestview Drive, stated he was told that the development would be a retirement villa/living facility. He is concerned with the successors of the dwelling units not having a vested interest in the community. When will Eager Road be widened? Other concerns is the noise generated by the trash trucks every morning.

Commissioner Folsom asked the speaker if the masterplan did not go through, what was his plan to increase his property's value.

Mr. Rowe stated he does not care to do anything to increase his property's value. His plan is to never leave, but to protect his property.

There being no questions for the speaker, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone else was present wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Ms. Ann Anderson, 400 Eager Road, stated the property's accessibility will be limited due to the width of the road, limited access for fire trucks – this will not be safe. If this is proposed to be for

a community of older people, the centralized dumpster location will be restrictive to those residents. Why maximize the density rather than make streets wider and safer for the residents?

Ms. Sandy Burkette, 409 Georgetown Circle, stated if there can be a restriction in place to require each buyer to live in the house - this will protect the neighborhood.

Chairman Bailey closed the public participation and entertained discussion from the Planning Commission.

There being none, Chairman Bailey called for a motion.

Commissioner Folsom made a motion to recommend approval of Planned Development with conditions #1-#7, #9-#11, and to strike the second to the last sentence in condition #6. Commissioner Hall seconded the motion.

There being no questions or discussion, Chairman Bailey called the motion and it was carried (Vote 5-0)

## **Agenda Item #6**

### **VA-2017-12**

#### **Jon Nijem, 410 & 412 Baytree Road**

**Nature of Request:** Mr. Martin stated this is another pair of requests – same applicant and same location for both requests. The subject property consists of 1.12 acres and is currently zoned Multi-Family Residential (R-6M) w/conditions, and is proposed to be rezoned to Multi-Family Residential (R-6M). The applicant is proposing to purchase 2 properties and separate them out from the 8 properties that were rezoned to R-M in 2014. The subject property is located in a Neighborhood Activity Center (NAC) Character Area on the Future Development Map of the Comprehensive Plan. The subject property is also located in the Baytree-University Corridor Overlay District. Previous conditions triggered this rezoning request. This request is to remove the condition in order to separate these 2 parcels out. The site plan has changed somewhat from the work session. The applicant amended the request to 24 dwelling units consisting of all 1-bedroom units (24 bedrooms). The applicant has also increased the green space which makes the project less dense with less impervious area. Staff is supportive of the rezoning request and the planned development request and finds both requests consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Power, the Planned Development Review Criteria, and recommends approval of the Planned Development request with 7 conditions:

- 1) Approval shall be granted for a multi-family residential development in general accordance with the submitted layout plan, including the minimum building setback distances as shown. Both parcel shall be combined together as one parcel;
- 2) There shall be no more than 24 dwelling units total, and all of these shall be 1-bedroom units in accordance with R-M zoning standards;
- 3) Building height shall not exceed 2 stories;
- 4) There shall be connecting interior sidewalks and one driveway access from Baytree Road;

- 5) The perimeter of the property shall include bugger yard landscaping as required next to the neighboring R-10 zoned properties, as well as required trees and shrubs in the Baytree street yard and through the rest of the development as required by the City's LDR. There shall be a minimum 4' high decorative fence along Baytree Road and along the side property lines for a distance of 25' from Baytree Road. The remainder of the side and rear property lines shall include a minimum 6' tall solid opaque fence or wall;
- 6) All other applicable development standards and requirements shall be followed;
- 7) Construction of the development shall commence within 3 years. Otherwise, Planned Development approval shall automatically expire.

Chairman Bailey asked if there were any questions to staff from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hall stated it appears that only 1 building encroaches into the setback and the remainder of the development exceeds the R-M standards.

Mr. Martin stated yes.

Commissioner Folsom stated it appears that the site depicts an 8' solid wood fence versus the proposed condition; secondly, there is also concern with students crossing a 4-lane road due to an increase in the number of apartments close to the university – does the city have any plans to construct a crosswalk or something similar to address this.

Mr. Martin stated he is not as concerned with the fence, unlike the previous request. Because of similar adjacent zoning, there is no requirement for a vegetative buffer, with the exception of the western lot line where a buffer will be required. The applicant is also proposing a greater setback distance along the western border. Because of the visibility and aesthetics, staff is recommending only portions of the front and sides are fenced with a decorative material. Regarding the crosswalk, the Planning Commission can add a condition that a sign be constructed to direct students/residents to a nearby crosswalk. Staff is concerned with mandating this requirement on some developers and not others.

There being no further questions to staff, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone was present wishing to speak in favor of the Rezoning and Planned Development requests.

Mr. Jon Nijem, 8428 Coffee Road, Hahira, Georgia, stated his rezoning request is definitely nothing like previous rezoning request when this property was a part of the big apartment complex off of Pinetree Road a few years ago. He has met with staff several times to produce a better project and to try and keep everyone happy. It is not my intent to maximize the density. Our rules for our residents are very strict. The existing houses are a wreck. A 4' decorative fence will help and will improve the looks of the development.

There being no questions for the speaker, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone else is present wishing to speak in favor of the request.

There being none, Chairman Bailey asked if anyone is present wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

There being none, Chairman Bailey closed the public participation portion of the request and entertained further questions and discussion from the Planning Commission.

There being none, Chairman Bailey called for a motion.

Commissioner Folsom made a motion to recommend approval on the “rezoning” request. Commissioner Gladwin seconded the motion.

Chairman Bailey called for questions and discussion on the motion. There being none, Chairman Bailey called the motion and it was carried. (5-0)

**Agenda Item #7**

**VA-2017-13**

**Jon Nijem, 410 & 412 Baytree Road**

Chairman Bailey called for a motion on Agenda Item #7, the “planned development” request on the same property.

Commissioner Folsom made a motion to recommend approval on the “planned development” with the conditions as outlined in the staff report. Commissioner Rountree seconded the motion.

Chairman Bailey called for questions and discussion on the motion. There being none, Chairman Bailey called the motion and it was carried. (5-0)

**Other Business**

There being no other business, Chairman Bailey thanked the Planning Commission and adjourned the meeting. (7:47 p.m.)

---

**Franklin S. Bailey, Chairman**  
**Greater Lowndes Planning Commission**

---

**Date**