



**Forest Acres Planning Commission
Minutes
September 7, 2021
City Council Chambers
6:00 PM**

I. Call to order

- 1. Determination of a Quorum**
- 2. Statement of Notification**

In the absence of Chairman Jack Cantey, Vice Chairman Ellis Creel called the meeting to order at 6:00PM and noted that there was a quorum. Ms. Beronica Whisnant, Mr. Ralph Bailey, Mr. Ellis Creel, Mr. Lyle Lee, Mr. Stephen Powell, and Ms. Carrie Walker were present. Mr. Jack Cantey was absent.

Mr. Creel and Mr. Shaun Greenwood, City Administrator, noted that proper public notice had been given for this meeting.

II. New Business

1. *Rezoning Request – A request to rezone the property at 1615 Valley Road (TMS 14006-02-04 and NX 1615 Valley Road (14005-02-05) from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R-2 (Group Housing).*

Mr. Creel introduced this request. Mr. Greenwood noted that the applicant for this was not present, so the Commission deferred this item to later in the meeting.

2. *Map Amendment – A request to annex and rezone properties the following addresses/TMS:
5719 Pinebranch Road, TMS 14016-02-04
5656 Pinebranch Road, TMS 14016-06-15
4537 Fernwood Road, TMS 14015-07-09
~~5643 Pinebranch Road, TMS 14016-07-09~~
5659 Pinebranch Road, TMS 14016-07-05
and to establish R-1 (Single Family Residential) zoning.*

Mr. Creel introduced these requests. Mr. Greenwood noted that, after reviewing the County GIS mapping, 5643 Pinebranch Rd. was determined by City staff and the City Attorney to be non-contiguous to City boundaries. There is a very small distance between the property and the closest parcel in the City. There may be a future opportunity for contiguity through annexation of other parcels in the area.

Mr. Greenwood noted that these parcels were part of a pilot annexation initiative in which he went door-to-door and that these were the property owners that agreed to be annexed into the City. These are all 100%-petition annexation requests.

Mr. Powell made a motion to recommend annexation and establishment of R-1 zoning for the four parcels in the request. Ms. Whisnant seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission returned to item #1 under New Business. The applicant was still not present. Mr. Greenwood went over the basics of the request. The lot had, in December 2020, been the subject of a request to rezone to R-3 to allow group housing. It went through Planning Commission, but as it reached City Council, the applicant agreed to hold his application while the City looked into other ways to achieve more density on residential lots without it having to be R-3. The City then implemented changes to its ordinance in this regard.

The current request is to rezone to R-2. This would go through Planning Commission and go to Council for Public Hearing and two readings. This would allow for duplex housing but not apartments (as would have been the case with R-3). Mr. Greenwood noted that by ordinance, there would have to be a second request to Planning Commission and Council for group housing specifically. Mr. Greenwood noted that group housing on the subject property would allow for an estimated 11 units.

Mr. Greenwood notes that we haven't seen actual plans for the property under the current developer. They were just interested in the rezoning tonight. Mr. Greenwood noted that the Planning Commission can still take action tonight or they can defer.

Mr. Bailey noted his continued concerns with limitations on Valley Rd., particularly road width. Mr. Greenwood noted that the private interior road in the development would have to meet county standards. Further, Valley Rd. is a DOT road not likely in compliance with current standards but DOT will not likely change it, and the developer wouldn't have control over that issue. The DOT would, however, likely take the condition of Valley Rd. in consideration when looking at curb-cuts.

Ms. Whisnant asked about Walden Ct. Mr. Greenwood noted that it's R-3, with group housing. The R-3 Walden Ct. zoning allows the current applicant for the subject property to request R-2. Ms. Whisnant asked how many units Walden Ct. has; a resident on Zoom answered that there are 18 units.

Ms. Whisnant requested to hear comments from the public.

- Mr. Dennis Williams, 105 Walden Ct., expressed his concern about moving forward without the developer present with plans. He requested hearing this at a later meeting with the developer present. Ms. Whisnant noted that with rezoning to R-2, the developer wouldn't have to stick to any specific plan. Mr. Greenwood concurred, but noted with group housing designation, they would have to stick to the specific plan proposed.
- Ms. Holly Fetner, 3410 Hanson Ave., asked if the units would be rental or for sale. Mr. Greenwood noted that they would be for sale but that the City has no control over whether a particular property is used as a rental. Ms. Fetner asked about price point and Mr. Greenwood noted that the last he heard the target was in the \$300Ks.
- Ms. Rebecca Creel, 1721 Dalloz., asked for the maximum number of units that could be on the property. Mr. Greenwood noted that strict R-2 would allow for

subdivision into lots with four buildings, each with 2 units (i.e., four duplexes).
With group housing, they could get an estimated 11 single units.

Ms. Whisnant noted her concern with increased traffic. Mr. Baily asked about the developer; Mr. Greenwood noted that a new developer is looking at the property and took over the application from the previous developer changing the request to R-2, rather than R-3.

Ms. Whisnant made a motion to deny the rezoning the request. Mr. Bailey seconded. The motion failed 2-4, with Mr. Creel, Ms. Walker, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Powell voting no.

Ms. Walker made a motion to table this until the next meeting. Mr. Lee seconded. The motion passed 4-2, with Mr. Bailey and Ms. Whisnant voting no.

A resident, Linda Kemp 114 Walden Ct., wanted to know how this might affect Quinine Park. Mr. Greenwood noted that the City owns the park and that the development shouldn't encroach in any way on the City's property, but it would change the wooded nature of the lot next to the park. They would be required to have landscaping. Mr. Lee asked about parking for Quinine Hill Park; Mr. Greenwood noted that there is curbside parking and that we haven't generally had problems with parking at that park.

Mr. Creel noted that there's no Old Business.

III. Adjournment –

Mr. Bailey made a motion to adjourn; Ms. Whisnant seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 6:31p.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andy Smith, Asst. City Administrator/Finance Director
(Administrative support of Planning Commission)