

Town of Tyrone
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
January 27th, 2022
7:00 PM

Present:

Chairman, David Nebergall
Vice-Chairman, Dia Hunter
Commission Member, Jeff Duncan
Commission Member, Carl Schouw
Commission Member, Scott Bousquet

Town Attorney, Patrick Stough
Town Planner, Phillip Trocquet

Call to Order:

Chairman Nebergall called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. The meeting was also available via YouTube Live.

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Bousquet made a motion to approve the agenda.
Commissioner Schouw seconded the motion. Motion was approved 5-0.

Approval of Minutes:

Commissioner Schouw made a motion to approve the minutes from January 13th, 2022.
Commissioner Bousquet seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Chairman Nebergall noted that there were no public hearings for this meeting.

New Business:

2. Workshop item to discuss potential changes to Section 113-134 Town Center Architectural Design Considerations. **Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner**

Mr. Trocquet said that the Town had been focusing on the downtown area for the past several years and that the area had been the focus of planning studies. The Downtown Masterplan, Livable Centers Initiative (LCI), and Envision Tyrone were a few of the studies conducted on the area. He said that the LCI highlighted great items and a large section of the LCI recommended ordinance changes in the area. A 2018 Atlanta Regional Commission study recommended some downtown ordinance changes as well. Mr. Trocquet stated he wanted to revise the overlay district to give owners more flexibility downtown. He said that there were a couple of big elements that

incorporated some of the items identified in those studies, and that he incorporated resident and staff input as well.

He said that section 113-134 is called Town Center Architectural Design Considerations. He continued that it would essentially be an overlay district, which is a district that would have superseding conditions and regulations over those already applying to a zoning district. He then put the map up on the screen to show a rough boundary of the area. He noted that section A of the proposed ordinance change had the purpose and intent of the area and merely talked about the reason for the overlay district.

He noted that the section name was in the works to be changed to Town Center District Overlay. The boundary followed two different character areas in the future development map, both the intown residential and the town center district. He said that intown residential was primarily residential and consisted of the supporting neighborhoods. The town center was primarily the commercial district directly off of Senoia Road. The eastern boundary would be HWY 74, with the western boundary being a land lot line of Briarwood Road and then it shifted to another land lot line going up north to Spencer Lane and the town boundary. The south was bounded by East Crestwood and Old Sherman Ave. He said that some of the properties in the area were residential and some are commercial and that the district regulations address both.

Chairman Nebergall asked about the boundary to the north of the town and why that was not included. Mr. Trocquet said that there was not a specific reason why they couldn't be included. He said that those character areas will most likely change with the adoption of the comprehensive plan.

Chairman Nebergall said that if it would be simpler if the boundary lines went straight down instead of shifting. Mr. Trocquet stated districts were typically bound by fixed points, like roads or streams, and that particular area was bounded by Tyrone Road and Senoia Road, but that if it needed to be changed at a later date, it could be.

Commissioner Bousquet asked if the line coming down Senoia Road was a defined boundary. Mr. Trocquet noted that the area was really encompassing the properties to the west of Senoia Road. Commissioner Bousquet asked if there was something in the works for a cart path for that area. Mr. Trocquet stated that with any street in the area, the right-of-way multi-use path would be included when discussing development.

Mr., Trocquet said that there were four areas of focus, streets, building and architecture requirements, site requirements, and lastly, parking. He started with architecture. He said that the intent was to help spur and catalyze growth and development in a way that was not too controlling. He said that other districts have gotten very specific on their architecture requirements, including craftsman columns, but the proposed changes laid out before them were much more foundational.

He said the proposed changes focused on the architectural style, but were flexible, as long as certain requirements were met. He listed out the materials the buildings could be made of, such as brick, brick veneer, natural wood, or cement wood siding. He said that section f was supposed to

be a supplemental ordinance, but it could also replace all of those exterior materials if that's something that they wanted.

He continued reading section f stating that all materials used should be natural in appearance with strong preference given to brick. He said this section was a way to make the section a little more relaxed, but still focused with a particular intent. Builders using this section would require a bit more of a review, but it would also give people more flexibility. Commissioner Duncan asked if section "f" could replace section "a, b, c, and d." Mr. Trocquet stated that it could. He said it gives property owners a little more flexibility and also allows the ordinance to be more "future proof" since new building materials and façade requirements come out all of the time. This section was there is an option for builders and owners, but any proposed building or façade would still have to go through an architectural review.

Vice Chairman Hunter asked if there was any plan to implement some type of maintenance requirement. Commissioner Bousquet asked if that would fall under code enforcement. Mr. Trocquet stated that the buildings would have to decay pretty heavily for it to fall under code enforcement. He added that it could be something that was added to the overlay requirement.

Vice Chairman Hunter added that he did not want to put an unfair burden on property owners. He voiced concern over the accountability aspect of maintaining the properties. Mr. Trocquet noted that brick was frequently listed as the preferred building material because it was considered low maintenance over time. He said that the new Town Hall was supposed to help set the standard for the downtown area. He said that wood could also be removed as an allowable material. The only reason it was currently listed was because of the older homes in the area, and homeowners tend to replace their siding with like-for-like material.

Mr., Trocquet stated that they had had inquiries about buildings with more modern materials, such as buildings made out of shipping containers. He said that he had been telling them that as long as the container met building code, then there would be no other reason they couldn't construct it other than the architectural requirements. All commissioners noted that they liked section f over the others.

Mr. Trocquet stated that section two was a leftover requirement, which said that no building shall be made out of more than two materials. He said he took out the part that allowed for other materials on accessory buildings, as he thought that accessory structures should match the material of the main building. Vice Chairman Hunter said he did not agree with that. Commissioner Duncan agreed with the Vice Chairman.

Vice Chairman asked if there was an architectural review committee. Mr. Trocquet noted that there was not one, and the only developments that would have to get approval in regard to architectural design currently would be those along HWY 74, which have to have a certificate of appropriateness. He said that a committee could be created, but that would involve a lot more regulations. Commissioner Bousquet stated that he liked the idea of the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) having input on the issue. Mr. Trocquet stated that he could put in similar language to what was already in the ordinance for HWY 74 and have either Planning Commission

or Town Council approve it. He continued that he did not think it overburdened the planning commission to add it to their load.

Mr. Trocquet then moved to the colors section. No commissioners had comments on this section.

He then moved to the entrance section. He said that section a said that the sidewalk needed to connect to the covered part of the building. He noted that section b required buildings to have some type of covered main entry. Chairman Nebergall added that these requirements added to the atmosphere and made it feel more like a downtown area.

Mr. Trocquet then moved on to item five, windows. He stated that windows should be used at regular intervals for architectural relief. Commissioner Schouw asked if that left it open for builders to make the windows look any way they wanted. Mr. Trocquet said that sections b and d would address that concern. Commissioner Bousquet noted that if the regulations were too stringent, then there would not be any variety in the downtown area.

Mr. Trocquet then moved down to section d, building and site requirements. Number one talked about massing. He said it was a standard requirement, but it did limit the builders' choices. Vice Chairman Hunter pointed out examples of why that section was not always appropriate and he thought it did not leave room for flexibility. He asked if they could make it more flexible and leave room for exceptions.

Mr. Trocquet then moved on to the roof section. Mr. Trocquet said they added a line stating that rooming membrane systems are permitted for flat roof only. He noted that there was also a section for pitted roof walls. He added that they replaced the line "material that has the same visual appearance" with "similar material that is in harmony with surrounding buildings" and that dark roofing materials were preferred. Commissioner Schouw asked about green roofs. Mr. Trocquet said that there was nothing written regarding those.

He said that they tried to avoid using language as "have a preference for" in these ordinances. He noted that something could be put in addressing specific types of roofing. Commissioner Duncan asked if solar panels on roofs were addressed. Mr. Trocquet said that those would most likely be considered rooftop equipment, which should be shielded from view. Vice Chairman Hunter said he thought those would not be roofing equipment, but rather considered a roofing material. Mr. Trocquet then moved to section e, which stated that rooftop-mounted equipment should be physically screened from the road and/or sidewalk. He said this clarified that it would be considered rooftop-mounted equipment.

Mr. Trocquet then moved back to sections b and c. He said that b previously stipulated that all single-story buildings needed to have a pitched roof. He said he took that part out and put in a provision that stated that there could be a flat roof on a single-story building, but it did have to have a parapet wall.

Commissioner Duncan asked if there was a standard height requirement for the parapet wall. Mr. Trocquet said that it would need to wrap around the corner and that if any rooftop equipment were being screened, the wall should be at a height that is as high or higher than the rooftop equipment.

Vice Chairman Hunter asked if there could be a two-story building with a parapet wall and it still be under the height requirements. Mr. Trocquet said that the overlay conditions would allow buildings to be up to 40 feet in height but not to exceed 3 stories. This gave enough architectural flexibility for builders to do what they need. He said that occasionally buildings with lobbies will want 15-foot ceilings and still want two floors above that. It was meant to be a flexibility item in regard to architecture.

Vice Chairman Hunter asked about possibility of a builder adding a basement and whether that would count as a story or not. Mr. Trocquet said it would depend on how the word “story” was defined, but he did not think something like that would be approved.

Commissioner Bousquet asked about the factory finished sheet metal in part two. Mr. Trocquet said that the ordinance said that dark materials were preferred, leaving room for a tin roof type of look. He said it would be more so for architectural roofing accents than guidelines for an entire roof. Chairman Nebergall pointed out the phrase that says it must be in harmony with the surrounding buildings and that he thought it would be enough of a factor to not approve unliked materials.

Mr. Trocquet then moved on loading docks and dumpsters. He said the part where they needed to be screened from any open space or sidewalk area with a dumpster pad enclosure was left in. He asked if the commissioners thought that a dumpster pad enclosure needed to be a requirement. Mr. Trocquet said he thought a dumpster pad enclosure should only be required if it was visible from the road. Commissioner Bousquet said that he would not want to see that type of thing at all. Chairman Nebergall pointed out that ordinance was concerning the downtown area of the Town, and they needed to put their best foot forward. Vice Chairman Hunter asked about shared dumpster space. He said his relative shared a dumpster with five other surrounding businesses. Mr. Trocquet said that might be something that would be allowed, especially since the town already allowed shared parking.

Mr. Trocquet then moved on to the requirements for exterior storage. He mentioned that a lot of towns have completely banned exterior storage, but that this was not the route that he had taken. He had put in provisions for exterior storage. He pointed out that most of the businesses that the area would attract would not utilize exterior storage anyways, due to the nature of the businesses. Vice Chairman Hunter said he thought that was fine, but had questions about exterior storages for the properties located close to the park. Mr. Trocquet said that it would still be required to be screen from view. Vice Chairman Hunter then asked about the buildings that face the park. Mr. Trocquet suggested that the language from the loading dock section stating that it should be screened from any public open space for sidewalk area also be applied to this section.

Mr. Trocquet read the next part stating that exterior storage should not apply to seasonal displays or advertisement of goods during business hours. He explained that this was meant to help businesses who needed items placed outside temporarily to assist their business. He noted that he would further define the terms.

Commissioner Bousquet asked about items blocking sidewalks or in the right-of-way. Mr. Trocquet confirmed that that would be covered in other areas of code enforcement and other parts of the ordinance.

Mr. Trocquet moved to section e and f, parking and street requirements. He pulled up street typologies on the screen. He explained that this section talked about street design, sidewalk placement, tree placement, etc.

Commissioner Duncan asked about the section in 1C about 90-degree parking. He did not think that 90-degree parking should be allowed on Senoia Road. Chairman Nebergall pointed out that this would also include residential areas as well. Mr. Trocquet suggested that he add a phrase restricting 90-degree parking to only residential areas. Vice Chairman Hunter asked if the speed limit would be tied to the type of parking allowed. Chairman Nebergall voiced safety concerns with 90-degree parking in the commercial area.

Mr. Trocquet then moved on to other types of parking. He said that the ordinance required for one golf cart/bike space per every twenty automobile spaces at a minimum. Commissioner Bousquet asked if all of the road typologies shown on the screen were acceptable. Mr. Trocquet said that they were, but that which type used would depend on the site plan of the building. He said that there would be a standard model that would be encouraged and commonly used.

Vice Chairman Hunter asked if when the density of the town increased, was there any thought to multi-level parking in the heart of the Town. Mr. Trocquet said it would be a Town decision. He added that one of the things they were looking to do as a town was to remove the burden of a property owner putting parking on their own site, because especially in the downtown area, the parking requirements could take up a sizeable portion of a lot. He would like to switch it to putting parking on public property, like a parking bank. There, a property owner would pay a fee for the parking spaces they would normally have, and then the Town would take that money and build parking on public property nearby.

Vice Chairman Hunter was concerned about the influx of traffic as more homes were built in the area. Commissioner Bousquet inquired about the maximum number of spots that could be currently put on public property. Mr. Trocquet said that Integrated Traffic engineers (ITE) has a number ascribed to parking. He said that they would use those numbers and the geometry of the roads to figure out the max amount of parking that was feasible. He said that they could potentially put up to 200 parking spots on Town owned property. He explained that with the parking bank, it would allow more parking while also not counting on taxpayer dollars to fund it.

Mr. Trocquet then moved to section 3 on detached and attached garages. He said that some towns required all garage entries to be in the back of the building. He said that with the proposed ordinance, the garage door would have to have a decorative door, and it could not be the main architectural feature. Detached garages should also match and complement the style of the main structure. He pointed out the problems that front loaded lots tended to present when it came to cars stacking up. He said that they could more clearly define in the ordinance that garages should not face the street. Vice Chairman Hunter asked about “granny suites” or “mother-in-law suites.” Mr.

Trocquet said they that are allowed, but they could not be leased out for gain and could be no larger than 700 square feet.

Mr. Trocquet said that there was a provision stating that properties next to a park must provide a multi-use patio connection garden or other adequate design element. He then moved on to street and sidewalk area requirements. He said that streets were highly discouraged from having cul-de-sacs in the downtown area and that there should be high connectivity between roads. This would also allow for traffic dispersion and increased walkability for pedestrians. He said that would be the number one way to allow for a lesser traffic impact. He said that currently because the streets were not as interconnected, the traffic load the intersections could handle was much lower. He said this idea was reinforced in other areas of the ordinance as well.

Mr. Trocquet then moved to the revised C-1 downtown commercial development standards. He explained that as it currently stood, there was an 80-foot setback required on those properties. He said this ordinance would apply to those located within the Town Center District. He noted that C-1 commercial had expanded beyond the downtown area, but he only wanted to change the ordinance for those within the downtown area. The proposed change would include a lot size minimum of 7,000 square feet instead of 1 acre, with the maximum building size being 15,000 square feet. Front yard setbacks would be changed to a maximum of 15 feet from the property line. Side setbacks would be 5 and rear setbacks would be 30, with parking required to be in the rear of the buildings. He said that current buildings would be grandfathered in, but that with any building improvements, they would be encouraged to become compliant.

Commissioner Bousquet asked Mr. Trocquet to clarify the front setback requirement. Mr. Trocquet reexplained the proposed change, and then added that it would give property owners flexibility. Commissioner Schouw was concerned with the variability of buildings being different lengths from the road/sidewalk. Mr. Trocquet said he could put in something saying that the setback should almost match or exactly match their neighbor's setback line. Vice Chairman Hunter disagreed and brought up other examples where differing setbacks in the same area worked.

Vice Chairman Hunter asked about nonconforming buildings in the area. Mr. Trocquet said that there was not anything in the zoning ordinance about bringing those properties into compliance, but that other cities did have them, and that could be added.

Vice Chairman Hunter mentioned the façade of the existing structures. He thought there should be a grant or funding from the town to help those business owners meeting the new standards.

Mr. Trocquet asked if porches, verandas, decks, patios, courtyards should be included as part of the building for setback purposes. He added that unless it was over about 20 feet, most people would not notice the difference.

Staff Comments

Commissioner Bousquet asked if there were any updates on the rebuilding of the Red Door building. Mr. Trocquet said that the owner of the building was wanting to rebuild quickly.

Vice Chairman Hunter added that he heard that the Papa John's in town is part of a pilot program to deliver pizzas via drone. Mr. Trocquet noted that the town could not regulate heavier than the FAA. Commissioner Bousquet asked if we could regulate the launch of drones from town property. Mr. Trocquet noted that that was a possibility.

Commission Comments

No commissioner comments.

Adjournment

Vice Chairman Hunter. Meeting ended at 8:44PM.

Chairman David Nebergall

Phillip Trocquet, Town Planner