

**HALL COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
RECOMMENDATION REPORT**

Applicant Jason Dye

Request Rezone from Residential-II (R-II, [17.80](#)) to Planned Residential Development (PRD, [17.180.060](#))

Proposed Use 44-unit townhome development

Size 5.51± acres

Zoning Current Residential-II (R-II, [17.80](#)) | Proposed Planned Residential Development (PRD, [17.180.060](#))

Location **2455 Floyd Road** | Tax Parcel 15022 000037

Commission District Four

Planning Commission Date February 19, 2024

Staff Recommendation **Denial**, as the development exceeds the one dwelling unit per acre recommended for the Rural Residential future land use classification in the [Comprehensive Plan](#).

Planning Commission Recommendation.....**Approval, with conditions**
Vote: 3-2 (Pilcher & Sosebee opposed)

Planning Commission Conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the site plan submitted on February 9, 2024, and as described in the project narrative submitted on October 19, 2023, and addendum dated February 9, 2024, modified as necessary for compliance with conditions herein and development standards enforced at the time of site plan approval.
2. The development shall be limited to 44 units.
3. All residences and services within the development shall connect to the public sidewalk along Floyd Road by internal sidewalks no less than five (5) feet in width.
4. The minimum heated floor area (HFA) of each townhome unit shall be 993 square feet and each duplex unit shall be 870 square feet.

5. Final review and approval of building elevations is subject to the Planning and Zoning Administrator, or their designee.
6. The development shall be served by public sewer, with the obtainment of all required easements and other construction costs such as a lift station and force main to be the responsibility of the developer.
7. All parking areas shall be accessed via internal drives and roads only. No parking shall be accessed directly from Floyd Road.
8. All signs shall comply with the underlying sign code requirements listed in 17.270 sign standards. All signage must be permitted.
9. All amenities depicted in the site plan submitted on February 9, 2024, are to be constructed within the development. The children's playground and covered shelter shall be constructed within the proposed playground area before 50% of the certificates of occupancy are issued for the entire development.
10. All conditions of zoning shall be made part of any plats created for the subdivision.
11. No variances to Planned Residential Development (17.180.060) standards are granted other than those approved herein.
12. The project shall be built in a single phase.

Staff Recommended Conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the site plan submitted on October 19, 2023, and as described in the project narrative submitted on October 19, 2023, modified as necessary for compliance with conditions herein and development standards enforced at the time of site plan approval.
2. The development shall be limited to 44 units.
3. All residences and services within the development shall connect to the public sidewalk along Floyd Road by internal sidewalks no less than five (5) feet in width.
4. The minimum heated floor area (HFA) of each residential unit shall be 1,350 square feet.
5. Final review and approval of building elevations is subject to the Director of Community Development and Infrastructure, or their designee.
6. The development shall be served by public sewer, with the obtainment of all required easements and other construction costs such as a lift station and force main to be the responsibility of the developer.

7. All parking areas shall be accessed via internal drives and roads only. No parking shall be accessed directly from Floyd Road.
 8. All signs shall comply with the underlying sign code requirements listed in 17.270 sign standards. All signage must be permitted.
 9. All amenities depicted in the site plan submitted on 10/19/2023 are to be constructed within the development. The children's playground and covered shelter shall be constructed within the proposed playground area before 50% of the certificates of occupancy are issued for the entire development.
 10. All conditions of zoning shall be made part of any plats created for the subdivision.
 11. No variances or development exceptions are granted as part of this request that are not explicitly granted by board approval. The development shall be compliant with the Official Code of Hall County.
-

The following should be considered as exceptions to the Official Code of Hall County, and shall warrant further determination by the Board should it choose to approve the submitted narrative and site plan:

- [17.180.060.B.4.a.](#) Lot Area
 - For a one-story multi-family residence and/or townhouse with the minimum three attached single-family units, the minimum lot area standard of 35,000 square feet will apply.
 - For each additional unit in a one-story multi-family residence and/or townhouse over three units, the minimum additional lot area standard of 5,000 square feet will apply.
 - The applicant has proposed 44 townhomes which would require a total of 360,000 square feet. The applicant has proposed this development on a total of 240,015 square feet.
- [17.180.060.B.2.c.](#) Setbacks
 - Minimum front yard setback from the property line of 25 feet.
 - The applicant has proposed a 20 foot front yard setback, which deviates from the standard.
 - Minimum side yard setback from the property line of 10 feet.
 - The applicant has proposed a 40 foot side yard setback, which meets the standard.
 - Minimum rear yard setback from the property line of 20 feet.
 - The applicant has proposed a 40 foot rear yard setback, which meets the standard.
- [17.180.060.B.5](#) Buffers.
 - A minimum 50 foot planted buffer shall be established along the perimeter of all property boundaries adjacent to residential and/or non-residential zoning districts to ensure that the planned residential development is appropriately screened. The planted buffers shall conform to the requirements as described in section 17.260.020 titled vegetation buffers and vision clearance. In conditions where required stream buffers exist along a perimeter property

boundary, the planning director may grant exemptions from the 50 foot planted buffer if a stream buffer meets or exceeds the 50 foot planted buffer width.

- The applicant has proposed a planted buffer of 40 feet, made up of existing and supplemental vegetation, which deviates from the standard.
 - The applicant has proposed the installation of a privacy fence to supplement the planted buffer.
- [17.180.060.B.9.a](#) Building materials.
 - All facades of all residences, including single-family, two-family, and/or multi-family, and any non-residential buildings shall be finished with brick, stone, stucco, wood siding, wood shakes, or fiber cement type siding. The front facades shall incorporate changes in building material, texture, and/or color. Vinyl siding on all residential and non-residential buildings shall be prohibited.
 - The sample elevations of the townhome styles that were provided in the application indicate that the townhomes will not incorporate changes in building material, texture, and/or color, which deviates from the standard.

January 16, 2024 Public Forum:

There were no comments in support or opposition.

February 19, 2024 Public Forum:

Jonathan Rucker, 6422 Flat Rock Drive, Flowery Branch, spoke in opposition. Concerns were affordable housing, displacement, housing shortage, and lack of monetary gain.

Angela Middleton, 2836 Gaines Mill Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. Concerns were debt, assistance in relocation, inflated rent, and stipend.

Willie Lipscomb, 3673 Maple Valley Drive, Buford, spoke in opposition. Concerns were trailer relocations, notices, and communication.

Garnet Bailey, 3610 Gaines Mill Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. Concerns were relocation fees, forcing people out, old trailers, and homelessness.

Rickey Holland, 560 Queen City Parkway, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. Concerns were being forced out, raising rent, accountability, relocation, and homelessness.

December 18, 2023 Public Forum:

Rickey Holland, 2455 Floyd Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. Mr. Holland stated that he had lived in the community for many years and found it to be a good place to live, free of crime. He stated that he owns his home and rents the lot. He was not approached by the developer regarding the project.

Felicia Howard, 2423 Floyd Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. She lives adjacent to the subject property. She is concerned about an increase in taxes. The area is safe and enjoyable.

Shannon Howard, 2423 Floyd Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. She stated that there is a creek at the back of the property that leads into a pond, not a cesspool. There are multiple subdivisions being developed around their property. She would like for the homes to be priced accordingly to the community.

Summary Analysis

The applicant is requesting to rezone 5.51± acres of property zoned Residential-II (R-II, [17.80](#)) to Planned Residential Development (PRD, [17.180.060](#)) for the purpose of constructing a 44-unit townhome development with a gross density of 7.99± units per acre.

The project narrative states that the proposed residences will range from 1,350 square feet to 1,550 square feet. The development would consist of twenty-four (24) three-bedroom units and twenty (20) two-bedroom units. As part of the application materials, the applicant has provided two renderings to illustrate the style of homes proposed for the development. The townhomes will feature board and batten cementitious panels, cementitious siding, architectural asphalt shingle roofing, and metal accents on select awnings. It should be noted that Section [17.180.060\(B\)\(9\)](#) of the PRD code requires that all homes have accents of brick or stone on the front of the homes, at a minimum; the proposed renderings do not meet this requirement. The applicant has not identified this as a variance request from the PRD standards; however, a variance must be granted or the homes must comply with [17.180.060\(B\)\(9\)](#) at the time of permitting. Each unit will feature a front porch and a rear patio. The townhomes will not include garages.

The submitted site plan shows three separate access points to serve the development. The main access point stems from Floyd Road, which will serve the residences and the common parking area. The other two access points are located via a 30-foot gravel easement; one is a gated emergency-only entrance and the other serves as a utility access point for the bio-retention pond, community dumpster, and lift station. The applicant has not indicated any intention to pave the gravel drive. The Hall County Fire Marshal has provided comments that modifications may be needed to buildings 400, 600, and 700 in order to obtain an approved route for a fire apparatus in order to meet fire code.

The submitted site plan includes an interconnected parking area to serve the development with ninety-six parking spaces designated for residences and an additional three short term parking spaces reserved for the development’s cluster mailbox unit (CBU). The development will include five foot wide concrete sidewalks that will connect the existing sidewalk along Floyd Road to the residences, the community dumpster, the cluster mailbox unit (CBU), and the playground area.

The narrative and site plan indicate that a monument-style sign will be constructed at the main entrance at Floyd Road. Per county sign regulations, residential sign area is determined by the number of lots within a development. Based on the application materials, the development will be limited to a monument sign that has a sign area no greater than 20 square feet. No signage renderings have been included in the submitted plans.

The development standards for the project are described in the table below and are compared with the PRD requirements, ([17.180.060](#)):

Standard	PRD Requirement (17.180.060)	Proposed Development
----------	--	----------------------

Site Area	5 acre minimum	5.51± acres
Number of Units	See min. Density and Lot Area	44 attached townhouse units
Density	5.32 units per acre	7.99 units per acre*
Min. Lot Area (Townhomes) *35,000 sqft per 3 attached + 5,000 sqft for each additional unit	360,000 sq. ft.	240,015 sq. ft.
Max. Building Height	–	Two stories
Min. Open Space	30%	30.77%
Exterior Buffer	50 feet	40 feet*
Front Setback (Internal)	25 feet	20 feet*
Side Setback	5 feet	40 feet
Rear Setback (Internal)	20 feet	40 feet
Parking	2 spaces for each dwelling unit (17.250.020)	2.18 spaces per each dwelling unit
Min. Heated Floor Space	–	1,350 square feet (2-bedroom) 1,550 square feet (3-bedroom)
Garage – % of front façade	50% of the width of the townhome unit	No garages
Minimum Sidewalk Width	5 feet	5 feet
Cluster Mailbox Unit (CBU)	CBU with 3 short-term parking spaces	CBU with 3 short-term parking spaces
Note: Items marked with an asterisk (*) do not conform to 17.180.060 .		

Proposed amenities for the development include a playground area and an adjacent shelter. No details or renderings have been provided for either amenity. The playground area and shelter will be located near the northwestern corner of the development, adjacent to the stormwater management pond and cluster mailbox unit (CBU).

Per the submitted narrative, water and sanitary sewer will be provided by the City of Gainesville. The availability of these services was confirmed in a letter dated November 7, 2023 with the contingency of the property obtaining an annexation requirement waiver. The development received approval for the waiver of the annexation requirement for connection to Gainesville City’s sanitary sewer system from Mayor W. Samuel Couvillon on November 7, 2023. Additionally, the Hall County Engineering Department has provided comments regarding the need for a stormwater management report to be conducted.

Several variances have been identified as part of this request; therefore, any deficiencies identified as part of the plan will be required to comply with the requirements of the PRD unless granted by the board in the conditions of approval.

The property is currently developed with a mobile home park that consists of twenty-two mobile home connections, two single-family residences, and a wastewater treatment pond. The property features a 30-foot gravel access easement along the eastern property line that connects to an adjacent property to the north.

Based on the future land-use plan, staff finds the requested zoning designation *not consistent* with the Hall County [Comprehensive Plan](#) future land use designation of “Rural Residential”. This land use category is characterized by low-density single-family residences and agricultural uses. The intent of this character area is to preserve the established residential/rural character and create a transition between rural areas and residential areas. Future development will continue to be detached, single-family homes at low densities. The subject parcel also falls within the Neighborhood Revitalization Area Morningside Heights. This area has been identified as a traditionally underserved community and the Neighborhood Revitalization aims to implement several actions for the betterment and preservation of this neighborhood. The Rural Residential designation envisions a maximum density of 1 dwelling unit per 1-1.5 acres, lower than the maximum density requirement within a Planned Residential Development (PRD, [17.180.060](#)) of 5.32 dwelling units per acre as regulated by minimum lot area. The development has proposed a density of 7.99 units per acre.

Zoning Analysis

When considering a zoning amendment to the zoning maps, the following items must be considered:

1. Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property; **The zoning proposal may be suitable given the context of the surrounding area, though the proposed development is denser than the surrounding development with an overall density of 7.99± units per acre. The surrounding area consists primarily of low- and medium-density residential uses. However, the adjacent parcel to the north and east is a Planned Unit Development district, currently being developed with single-family and multi-family residences.**
2. Whether the zoning proposal will adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property; **No, it is not anticipated that the proposed residential use will adversely affect adjacent properties.**
3. Whether the property to be affected by the zoning proposal has reasonable economic use as currently zoned. **The property appears to have reasonable economic use as currently zoned, Residential-II (R-II, [17.80](#)), and is developed with manufactured homes and two single-family residences.**
4. Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, or utilities; **No, it is not anticipated that the proposed zoning use will result in an excessive or burdensome use of local infrastructure. The proposal includes the installation of pedestrian-friendly infrastructure and the City of Gainesville sewer will serve the development.**

5. Whether the zoning proposal is in conformity with the policy and intent of the land use plan; **The proposed use is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the "Rural Residential" land use designation. Density is envisioned to be a maximum of one dwelling unit per 1-1.5 acres. The proposed development has an overall density of 7.99± units per acre. The subject parcel is also within the Morningside Heights Neighborhood revitalization area, in which the goal is to align development with the current, low-density pattern.**
6. The extent to which property values are diminished by the existing zoning restrictions; **Staff is unable to determine the extent to which property values are diminished by the existing zoning restrictions.**
7. The extent to which the destruction of the subject property's value under the existing zoning promotes the health, safety, morals or general welfare of the public; **Staff is unable to comment on the impact of property values without a full market analysis. Multiple factors impact property value including construction types, proposed uses, and maintenance. Often it is difficult to determine the effect of a development on adjacent properties until the development is completed.**
8. The relative gain to the public as compared to the hardship imposed upon the individual property owner; **Staff has not identified a hardship imposed on the property owner as the property is currently zoned.**
9. The length of time the property has been vacant as zoned considered in the context of land development in the area in the vicinity of the property; **The property is currently developed with a manufactured home development.**
10. Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use or development of the property which give supporting grounds for either approval or disapproval of the zoning proposal; **Staff is not aware of any changing conditions that affect the use and development of the property.**
11. Whether the change would create an isolated district unrelated to the surrounding districts; **The proposed zoning is a Planned Residential Development (PRD, [17.180.080](#)). Per the Official Code of Hall County, Planned Development Districts ([17.180](#)) are to be utilized as a "floating zone" which shall mean that areas will not be pre-designated as planned development districts but rather each such designation shall result from a specific and separate application for amendment. The proposed density is higher than that found on surrounding properties.**
12. Whether the present zoning district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions in the area; **There is no evidence that the present zoning district boundaries are illogically drawn.**
13. Whether the change requested is out of scale with the needs of the county as a whole or the immediate neighborhood; **The proposed density is higher than that found on immediately surrounding properties, but in general the use does not appear to be out of scale with the needs of the County as a whole, as there is a need for additional and varied housing.**
14. Whether it is impossible to find adequate sites for the proposed use in districts permitting such use and already appropriately zoned; **There are other properties within the County that support a high-density single-family residential uses based on the Future Land Use Map, though the development as proposed cannot be developed in any of the existing residential or multi-family districts.**
15. Whether the need for rezoning could be handled instead by a variance request to the [Planning Commission]; **The request could not be handled alternatively as a variance.**

16. Whether there would be an ecological or pollution impact resulting from major modifications to the land if the request is granted; **Any land disturbance activities on the property shall be required to go through the land development permitting process and as a result are subject to local, state, and federal regulations. As a result, there should not be an ecological or pollution impact resulting from any modification to the land if the request is granted.**
17. Whether there is reasonable evidence based upon existing and anticipated land use that would indicate a mistake was made in the original zoning of the property; **There is no indication that a mistake was made in the original zoning.**

A Planned Residential Development (PRD, [17.180.080](#)) allows for more flexibility in the design and development of the property. This provides for a mixture of housing types and encourages maximum use of natural features through proper site planning measures. The development should conform to the existing character and development pattern of the surrounding area.

17.380.050. - Submission requirements for a rezoning request

- A. Any person or persons requesting a change in the official zoning map or use subject to approval of the county commission shall file an application with a plat or map of the property attached thereto, together with payment of such fees set forth in [chapter 17.30](#) to cover administrative and advertising costs, in the planning department office. Such person or persons or their authorized agent shall appear in person at the public hearing held to consider the district change. **The proposal meets the requirement. The applicant has paid the appropriate fees and understands that someone must be present at both the Hall County Planning Commission meeting and the voting meeting of the Hall County Board of Commissioners.**
- B. All applications for a change of zoning classification or use subject to approval of the county commission shall include:
1. A narrative statement identifying the existing and proposed use of the property and addressing each of the criteria set forth in section 17.380.060.C of this section [chapter]. **Proposal provides a narrative outlining the intent of the development, however, the applicant has not prepared a response to each of the criteria listed in [17.380.060.C](#).**
 2. A site plan drawn to scale designating the area covered by the application and identifying existing and proposed buildings and uses, adjacent existing land uses, zoning on contiguous parcels, including those across an abutting public right-of-way, and any other significant site improvements proposed to accommodate the proposed use or buffer adjacent uses, etc., or a plat of the subject property where no specific land use is proposed. In cases where only a plat or map is provided and no land use is proposed, the planning commission and county commission shall evaluate the application based on the most intense possible land use permitted in the proposed district. **The proposal does meet the requirement. The applicant has provided a site plan and included much of the necessary information to properly assess the development. However, information about adjacent parcels is limited.**
- C. For any application for a slow rate land treatment system (see [chapter 17.20](#)), the following additional requirements apply. **The proposed development will utilize public sewer and water; as such, this is not applicable.**
- D. For any application proposing the development of 100 or more residential dwelling units, a traffic impact study shall be submitted prior to consideration of the application by the planning

commission. At the applicant's expense, the traffic impact study shall be prepared by a professional engineer in accordance with requirements established by the Hall County Engineering Department. The engineering department shall review the traffic impact study and forward any comments to the Hall County Planning Commission. **The proposed development contains less than 100 residential dwelling units, and as such is exempt from this requirement.**

Development Support and Constraints

Hall County Environmental Health

In an email dated November 15, 2023, Emily McGahee stated “All components of the existing wastewater disposal system must be properly decommissioned per Regulations. Please contact the Environmental Protection Division of the Department of Natural Resources for requirements. The entire development must be developed on public or EPD permitted sewer/septic system. No onsite sewage management systems to be permitted by Environmental Health.”

Hall County Fire Marshal

In an email dated November 16, 2023, John Hornick, NPQ Fire Inspector 1, Plans Review Lieutenant stated the following:

503.1.1 Buildings and facilities. International Fire Code 2018 Edition

Approved fire apparatus access roads shall be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction. The fire apparatus access road shall comply with the requirements of this section and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility.

Access to buildings 400, 600 and 700 do not appear to meet the above code requirement. Building length may have to be modified to meet fire code.

Hall County Public Works and Utilities

In a memorandum from Public Works and Utilities dated November 20, 2023, Bill Nash, Director, stated the following:

Engineering:

This site may require a stormwater management report should the site plan indicate the proposed development meets stormwater thresholds for impervious surfaces and/or disturbed acreage.

Traffic:

No comment

Utilities:

City of Gainesville Sewer District.

Georgia Department of Transportation

In an email dated November 16, 2023, Veronica Chavers, D1TO Civil Engineer 3, stated “No GDOT coordination required.”

➤ Excerpts from the minutes of the **December 18, 2023** meeting

Applicant's Presentation:

Katie Greenway, Principal Planner, presented a summary of the request.

Justin Crighton, 355 Oneta Street, Athens, presented the request. The current use of the property is a mobile home park, and construct 44 townhomes. The development has approval from City of Gainesville Water Resources for public water and sewer.

Public Forum:

Rickey Holland, 2455 Floyd Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. Mr. Holland stated that he had lived in the community for many years and found it to be a good place to live, free of crime. He stated that he owns his home and rents the lot. He was not approached by the developer regarding the project.

Felicia Howard, 2423 Floyd Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. She lives adjacent to the subject property. She is concerned about an increase in taxes. The area is safe and enjoyable.

Shannon Howard, 2423 Floyd Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. She stated that there is a creek at the back of the property that leads into a pond, not a cesspool. There are multiple subdivisions being developed around their property. She would like for the homes to be priced accordingly to the community.

Planning Commission Comments:

Mr. Braswell asked if the townhomes would be rentals, and Mr. Hunt asked about the expected rent. Mr. Crighton answered that they would, and rent would be \$1,800 to \$2,000. Mr. Crighton also stated that the owner of the mobile home park, **Stephanie Robinson, 3065 Holcomb Bridge Road, Suite A2, Greenleaf** acknowledged that the project budget does allow for the property owner to relocate the mobile homes to another park. Mr. Sosebee asked where the other parks are located that the homes may be moved to. Mr. Varner stated that he could not support the application due to the lack of transparency and consideration of the community. Ms. Pilcher stated that there may be mobile homes that could not be moved due to age or condition. Mr. Sosebee suggested discussing the relocation of homes with the residents and the options available to them. Mr. Varner suggested that the request be tabled to allow time to meet with the community. Mr. Braswell recommended consideration of the road and emergency access.

Motion: *A motion was made to table to January 16, 2024 by Mr. Varner and seconded by Mr. Hunt. Vote: 5-0*

➤ Excerpts from the minutes of the **February 19, 2024** meeting

Applicant's Presentation:

Katie Greenway, Principal Planner, presented a summary of the request.

Stephanie Robinson, 3081 Holcomb Bridge, Norcross, presented the request.

Josh Friedensohn, 3081 Holcomb Bridge, Norcross, presented the request.

Justin Creighton, 355 First Street, Athens, presented the request. The applicant stated that the town hall meeting helped adjust the application. The applicant stated that the homes on the property are near the end of their life cycle. The applicant stated that the reduced footprints will provide more attainable housing by reducing rental costs. The applicant stated that there would be a 40 foot planted buffer with a 6 foot privacy fence around the perimeter with increased parking.

Public Forum:

Jonathan Rucker, 6422 Flat Rock Drive, Flowery Branch, spoke in opposition. Concerns were affordable housing, displacement, housing shortage, and lack of monetary gain.

Angela Middleton, 2836 Gaines Mill Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. Concerns were debt, assistance in relocation, inflated rent, and stipend.

Willie Lipscomb, 3673 Maple Valley Drive, Buford, spoke in opposition. Concerns were trailer relocations, notices, and communication.

Garnet Bailey, 3610 Gaines Mill Road, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. Concerns were relocation fees, forcing people out, old trailers, and homelessness.

Rickey Holland, 560 Queen City Parkway, Gainesville, spoke in opposition. Concerns were being forced out, raising rent, accountability, relocation, and homelessness.

Planning Commission Comments:

Mr. Braswell questioned why the residents were given a form weeks after the town hall meeting with a short turnaround. Mr. Creighton stated that he wasn't sure about the dates that the notices were distributed but they gave the residents several options. Mr. Braswell questioned the current lease terms. Ms. Robinson stated that there were currently no month-to-month leases, but all of them expire throughout 2024 with an option to start month-to-month leases. Ms. Robinson stated that notices were first sent out to residents February 1st with a deadline of February 12th. Mr. Braswell questioned the rental rate with the size of the units decreasing. Mr. Creighton stated that it was previously planned to be \$1,000 to \$1,200. Ms. Robinson stated that if the residents choose to move the mobile homes to a sister property, it will be done at the expense of Greenleaf with set up included. The residents will only have to pay a transfer fee for utilities. Mr. Hunt questioned which homes can be moved. Ms. Garmon stated it depended on an inspection. Mr. Sosebee questioned if the applicants have experienced this situation before. Ms. Robinson stated this was the first time. Mr. Friedensohn stated that Greenleaf has been a part of affordable housing in the county. Mr. Varner stated that the cost of living in the development wouldn't allow people to stay in the community. Mr. Friedensohn stated that the property is reaching the end of its life cycle and it needs to remain usable. Mr. Braswell stated that developing in an area that already has existing tenants needs to keep in mind the human element. Mr. Varner stated the importance of the rental rates for the homes.

Motion: A motion to table to March 4, 2024 was made by Mr. Varner and seconded by Mr. Sosebee. Vote: 5-0

- Excerpts from the minutes of the **March 4, 2024** meeting

Applicant's Presentation

Katie Greenway, Principal Planner, presented a summary of the request. Ms. Greenway reminded Mr. Braswell that public comment for this application was closed at the February 19, 2024 meeting.

Justin Crighton, 355 Oneta Street, Athens, presented the request. The applicant stated that the revised site plan will be cost effective and blends with the character of the area. The applicant stated that once the development is complete, Greenleaf is offering to rent units to the current tenants for \$1,200 a month.

Public Forum:

There were no comments in support or opposition.

Planning Commission Comments:

Mr. Braswell questioned the construction phase of the development. The applicant stated that it would be developed in one phase.

Motion: A motion to approve, with conditions was made by Mr. Varner and seconded by Mr. Hunt. Vote: 3-2

Braswell – aye

Hunt – aye

Varner – aye

Pilcher – nay

Sosebee – nay

Conditions:

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the site plan submitted on February 9, 2024, and as described in the project narrative submitted on October 19, 2023, and addendum dated February 9, 2024, modified as necessary for compliance with conditions herein and development standards enforced at the time of site plan approval.
2. The development shall be limited to 44 units.
3. All residences and services within the development shall connect to the public sidewalk along Floyd Road by internal sidewalks no less than five (5) feet in width.
4. The minimum heated floor area (HFA) of each townhome unit shall be 993 square feet and each duplex unit shall be 870 square feet.
5. Final review and approval of building elevations is subject to the Planning and Zoning Administrator, or their designee.
6. The development shall be served by public sewer, with the obtainment of all required easements and other construction costs such as a lift station and force main to be the responsibility of the developer.

7. All parking areas shall be accessed via internal drives and roads only. No parking shall be accessed directly from Floyd Road.
8. All signs shall comply with the underlying sign code requirements listed in 17.270 sign standards. All signage must be permitted.
9. All amenities depicted in the site plan submitted on February 9, 2024, are to be constructed within the development. The children's playground and covered shelter shall be constructed within the proposed playground area before 50% of the certificates of occupancy are issued for the entire development.
10. All conditions of zoning shall be made part of any plats created for the subdivision.
11. No variances to Planned Residential Development (17.180.060) standards are granted other than those approved herein.
12. The project shall be built in a single phase.