

**GAINESVILLE PLANNING AND APPEALS BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
NOVEMBER 11, 2014**

CALL TO ORDER Vice-Chair @ 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Vice-Chair Jane Fleming and Board Members Dexter Stanley, Connie Rucker, John Snyder and Eddie Martin, Sr.

Members Absent: Chairman Doyle Johnson and Board Member George Hokayem

Staff Present: Community Development Director Rusty Ligon, Planning Manager Matt Tate and Recording Secretary Judy Foster

Others Present: Council Members Bob Hamrick, Myrtle Figueras and George Wangemann

MINUTES OF OCTOBER 14, 2014

There was a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion made by Board Member Stanley
Motion seconded by Board Member Martin
Vote – 5 favor, 2 absent (Johnson, Hokayem)

NEW BUSINESS

A. Variance Request

- 1) Request from **First Baptist Church of Gainesville** to vary the lighting and size requirements to allow for an electronic message board sign insert on an existing monument sign on a 24.64± acres property located on the southwest side of the intersection of Green Street and Holly Drive, having road frontage on Bradford Street and Simmons Street (a/k/a **751 Green Street** NW), having a zoning classification of Residential-I (R-I) and Residential and Office (R-O).

Ward Number: Two
Tax Parcel Number(s): 01-041-001-036
Request: Electronic message board sign

Staff Presentation: Planning Manager Matt Tate gave the following staff presentation:

The subject property is 24.64± acres in size and is zoned R-I and R-O within the Gateway Corridor Overlay Zone. The property is located adjacent to the Green Street Local Historic District and is partially located within the National Register for Historic Places. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow an Electronic Message Board (EMB) sign within the R-I zoning district and to vary the size of the EMB sign from 20 square feet to 30 square feet in size. Specifically, the proposed EMB display would replace the existing 30 square foot manual display area located on the existing monument sign. Everything else with the existing sign will remain unchanged. In September of 2004, the property was approved to vary sign structure, sign face, sign height and sign lighting to allow the existing sign. As a condition of the approval, the monument sign was required to be setback 30-feet from the right-of-way and no electronic message board (EMB) sign or external ground spot lighting be allowed.

The applicant states that an EMB sign is needed in order to display the numerous church and community events held at the church and that the 30 square foot EMB sign is necessary for better visibility due to the existing trees located along Green Street and the fact that the existing sign is setback 30-feet from the right-of-way.

A similar request was granted by the Planning and Appeals Board in June of 2008, for the Gainesville First United Methodist Church located at 2780 Thompson Bridge Road, to allow an EMB sign within the Residential-I-A (R-I-A) zoning district. The EMB sign is 19.5 square feet in size and is approximately 60-feet from the road. Civic Center sign is 15-square feet in size and is approximately 15-feet from the road.

The Planning Division staff is recommending conditional approval of this variance request based on the location of the existing sign and vegetation with the following condition:

The subject property shall be limited to one electronic message board sign. The electronic message board sign may be two sided not to exceed 20 square feet per side with amber colored lighting.

Applicant's Presentation: Jim Harrison, 2122 Brittany Court, stated that he was the Property Chair for the First Baptist Church of Gainesville and was also the presenter of the original sign application in 2004 which was first tabled, then the proposal was adjusted to be more comparable to other church signs. He stated the church has been happy with the sign, but times have changed and their campus has grown to include a new banquet hall and preschool, and there are a lot more activities going on behind the church than is visible. He stated that the church doesn't have the personnel to change out the sign as often as needed since it is time consuming because of all the available activities. He mentioned some different clubs and non-profits that use their facilities at no charge. Mr. Harrison stated that the church is not asking for a larger sign, but simply to replace the white portion of the sign with an electronic message board (EMB) sign insert which would require approximately 28 square feet. He stated that he would not say that it could not be done, but if they have to go with a smaller EMB sign as required by the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC), it would not be as aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Harrison stated that there is some debate as to why the sign is 30-feet off the road, which is irrelevant at this point, but asked why the church would want it 30-feet off the road unless the City required it. He stated that an EMB may not get the message out any better than the current sign, but it can be changed more often. He felt the Board should grant the variance as requested because the church is providing fundamentally good work to the community as compared to a Publix or other business along Thompson Bridge Road. In conclusion, he stated that there was no other campus that was 24 acres in size and they serve thousands of people.

Planning and Appeals Board Comments: Board Member Snyder asked Mr. Harrison if the church agreed with the first variance in 2004 that they would not come back and request another variance. Mr. Harrison stated that they agreed to the terms of the variance that was acceptable at the time; however, he did not think it meant they could never request an EMB sign. Mr. Harrison stated that they are only asking for what other property owners have been allowed to do in the same area.

Board Member Snyder stated that requesting a 30 square feet EMB sign is way over the maximum allowed by the ULDC. Mr. Harrison stated that when the Board of Deacons

met to discuss this issue, his thought was regarding amber lighting, but never thought they would be asked to reduce the EMB sign size. Mr. Harrison stated that he didn't understand why what was agreed to seven years ago is not acceptable today.

Board Member Snyder asked if the EMB sign size is limited to 20 square feet, would it prevent installation of the sign. Mr. Harrison stated possibly, but didn't know how the sign could be adjusted to make it aesthetically pleasing, noting if they planned to change the entire sign, it would be easier. He stated that he would not say that it couldn't be done or that the church would not do it, but he has seen a couple of representations of what could be done to reduce the insert size and it is not as aesthetically pleasing as he would like.

Board Member Martin asked for confirmation that the purpose for the EMB sign is simply to save time. Mr. Harrison stated yes, they have had so many organizations ask to use their facilities and announce it on the sign that it is difficult to change daily.

Board Member Stanley asked if the size of the monument sign itself would remain the same. Mr. Harrison stated yes, they are not asking for a larger monument sign but to replace the white area of the sign with an EMB sign.

Board Member Martin asked Staff if this request is approved, will it set a precedent for others along Green Street. Planning Manager Matt Tate stated that each request must be considered on a case by case basis and felt they have been consistent with keeping the EMB sign sizes to 20 square feet or less. Mr. Tate gave two comparisons: The new Civic Center sign which is closer to the road than this proposal, is only 15 square feet; and the First United Methodist Church sign is 60-feet from the road and their sign is less than 20 square feet.

Mr. Harrison stated that they did not ask for an EMB sign until the Civic Center installed one almost directly across the road from them, noting Memorial Park, Lakewood Baptist Church and the First United Methodist Church also have EMB signs. He stated that the ULDC requires the use of amber lights only; however, Brenau and the Weaver Law Firm have been allowed to use yellow and green lights; Westminster Church uses red lights; and Lakewood Baptist Church uses red, yellow and green lights on their respective signs. Mr. Harrison stated that precedence was set as the Board has given variances in the past and felt his request was no different, and that the sign should be grandfathered in since they are not changing the size of the monument sign.

FAVOR: **Kent Murphey**, 4562 Blooming Way, Flowery Branch, stated that there was a concern about setting a precedent allowing EMB signs along the rest of Green Street. Mr. Murphey commented that the Civic Center sign is no farther away from the historic district than the church, noting that neither the Civic Center nor the church is located within the Green Street Local Historic District.

OPPOSED: None

Planning Manager Matt Tate stated that if another business along Green Street proposed an EMB sign, it would have to go before this Board as well as the Historic Preservation Commission which gives another layer of protection for the historic district.

Mr. Tate stated that the Westminster Church EMB sign was installed before the current ULDC was adopted, which prompted the need for color consistency with EMB signs. He

stated that the EMB signs are capable of displaying multiple colors by the flip of a switch and some businesses have tried to use other colors on occasion until it is discovered and they are warned to keep it on the amber color. Mr. Tate also commented that EMB signs within unincorporated Hall County use multi-color EMB signs.

Vice-Chair Fleming asked if the Board chose to grant the variance with 20 square feet, would it be consistent with other EMB signs. Planning Manager Matt Tate clarified that the variance request is to allow for a EMB sign within a residential district instead of a commercial district and also to allow for a larger EMB sign than the ULDC allows. He stated that 20 square feet is the maximum size for an EMB sign and all of them within the City meet that requirement.

There was a motion to approve the sign variance request for an electronic message board sign insert on an existing monument sign located at 751 Green Street with one condition as follows:

Condition

The subject property shall be limited to one electronic message board sign. The electronic message board sign may be two sided not to exceed 20 square feet per side with amber colored lighting.

Motion made by Board Member Snyder

Motion seconded by Board Member Rucker

Vote – 3 favor (Snyder, Rucker, Fleming), 2 opposed (Stanley, Martin), 2 absent (Johnson, Hokayem)

Upon inquiry by Jim Harrison, Board Member Snyder clarified the motion. Mr. Harrison asked about the process to appeal the decision. Planning Manager Matt Tate stated that it would have to go through the court system.

B. Rezoning Request

- 1) Request from **David P. Johnson** to rezone a 1.458± acres tract located on the southwest side of the intersection of Virginia Circle and Thompson Bridge Road (a/k/a **1537 and 1551 Thompson Bridge Road NW; 135 Virginia Circle NW**) from Residential-I (R-I) to Neighborhood Business (N-B), with a special use.

Ward Number: Two

Tax Parcel Number(s): 01-088-002-004, 005 and 006

Request: Restaurant with drive-thru and retail building

Staff Presentation: Planning Manager Matt Tate gave the following staff presentation:

The subject property consists of three parcels totaling 1.458 acres in size, is zoned R-I and is located within the Gateway Corridor Overlay Zone. The three lots consist of a vacant lot and two single-family homes. The applicant proposes to rezone the subject property from Residential-I (R-I) to Neighborhood Business (N-B), with a special use in order to construct a 7,362 square foot retail building and a 1,800 square foot restaurant building with a drive-thru. The special use portion of the request is to allow for a drive-thru restaurant. The occupants of the proposed retail and restaurant use have not been disclosed at this time. The applicant proposes to locate the drive-thru window and speaker device on the northern side of the building along Virginia Circle facing towards Roper Park. Access is proposed from a two-way driveway off of Thompson Bridge Road

and Virginia Circle. GDOT states that a driveway permit will be needed for the development. Gainesville Parks and Recreation reported that between September of 2013 and September of 2014, the adjacent Roper Park (field, pavilion and tennis courts) held 612.5 hours of scheduled events with an estimated attendance of 35,096 people. Much of the attendance was generated by baseball, football and cheerleading practices. This total does not include unscheduled activities.

The Gainesville 2030 Future Development Map for the City of Gainesville places the subject property both within the *Mixed-Use General* land use category and the *Low-Medium Density Residential* land use category. Specifically, the front two parcels touching Thompson Bridge road are within the *Mixed-Use General* land use category which includes areas containing or planned for a mixture of land uses including office, neighborhood retail, and residential. The rear parcel fronting Virginia Circle is located within the *Low-Medium Density Residential* land use category which includes areas containing or planned for single-family detached or semi-detached housing at densities ranging from two to four dwelling units per acre. According to the Character Area Map of the 2030 Gainesville Comprehensive Plan, all of the subject property is located within the *Traditional Neighborhoods* Character Area specifically within the *Northern Neighborhoods subarea*. The vision for this area anticipates minimal change guarding against incompatible infill development and the threat of encroaching urban sprawl. Commercial encroachment should be minimized and should respect and mirror the small scale of the surrounding neighborhoods, while preserving the purity of the landscape and quality of housing. The area is not a primary destination for business; however neighborhood serving business development is encouraged. Land uses allowed in the *Northern Neighborhoods subarea* include low-density/medium-density residential, and mixed-use / commercial.

The Planning staff believes the request as presented is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as the rear lot is shown to remain as residential or for light office uses. Therefore, Staff recommends denial of this rezoning and special use request based on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the adjacent/nearby single-family residential uses.

If the request was considered for approval by the Planning and Appeals Board, staff would recommend the following conditions:

1. The subject property shall be limited to the proposed retail and restaurant with drive-thru uses and all other uses permitted within the Neighborhood Business (N-B) zoning district excluding a convenience store, coin laundry or tattoo parlor.
2. The exterior architecture of the proposed building shall be generally consistent with the elevation rendering submitted with the application to be constructed with a minimum of 50% of brick, stone or rock materials on the exterior walls.
3. The subject property shall contain a minimum 25-foot wide perimeter buffer area along the westerly property line adjacent to the single-family residential property. The buffer shall consist of an 8-foot tall black vinyl coated fence and the combination of existing and new vegetation in order to provide for a solid buffer. The new vegetation shall consist of a mixture of Cryptomeria trees, Leyland Cypress trees and other similar evergreen vegetation at a minimum height of six feet (6') upon installation. The final number, type and location of trees shall be subject to the approval of the Community Development Department Director.

4. Sound emitted from any outdoor speaker devices shall be regulated in a manner to have no impact on the adjacent residential properties.
5. All access point design along Thompson Bridge Road and Virginia Circle must be reviewed and approved by the Gainesville Public Works Director in conjunction with the Georgia Department of Transportation. Any required traffic improvements associated with the proposed development shall be at the full expense of the developer/property owner.
6. The proposed monument sign located along Virginia Circle adjacent to the single-family property shall not exceed five (5) feet in height and twenty (20) square feet in size.

Applicant's Presentation: Steve Gilliam, 301 Green Street, stated that he was representing the applicant and David Kelly with Multi-State Properties, LLC. Mr. Gilliam presented a report to the Board which included various location maps, photos, concept plan, elevation renderings, aerials of surrounding properties showing the distance from driveways to Thompson Bridge Road, future development map, dimensional requirements for non-residential zoning districts (Table 9-6-2 from the ULDC), and a list of comments. Mr. Gilliam stated that commercial zoning classifications surround the subject properties with the exception of Roper Park and those lots to the rear of the properties. The front two parcels are identified as mixed-use in the Comprehensive Plan, with the third rear parcel identified as residential which raised concerns with Staff. Mr. Gilliam gave an overview of the photos that were presented, specifically noting that there are three driveways along Virginia Circle which access the subject parcels. He reviewed the concept plan which consists of a 1,800 sq. ft. restaurant with 22 parking spaces and a 7,362 sq. ft. retail anchor with 38 parking spaces. There is also a 25-foot landscape buffer between the proposed development and the residential area, noting there was also additional property that could be utilized for storm water retention or additional landscape buffer if needed. He stated that the proposed driveway access on Virginia Circle is 180-feet from Thompson Bridge Road which is comparable to the BB&T rear driveway which is 185-feet from Thompson Bridge Road, noting BB&T's second access on Virginia Circle is 53-feet from Thompson Bridge Road. Mr. Gilliam stated that there are other developments located south and east from the subject parcels which he felt have established precedent regarding commercial businesses locating adjacent to residential areas such as the SunTrust Bank, Pizza Hut restaurant with drive-thru, Coleman & Chambers Law Offices and Wells Fargo Bank. He stated that this area is no different from what the applicant has proposed. Mr. Gilliam stated that the Future Development Map shows mixed use along the Highway 60 corridor. He stated that the setback requirements limit the development of the property and can be detrimental. Mr. Gilliam stated that if only the front two lots are developed, there would only be a 25-foot landscape buffer and the driveway access would be off of Virginia Circle only. The applicant is asking to incorporate the back parcel and move the driveway access down Virginia Circle to be in line with BB&T, which could also accommodate a greater buffer area and would be less intrusive for the neighborhood. Mr. Gilliam stated that if the rear parcel cannot be combined with the other lots, it will cause a negative effect on the two front lots by diminishing their value and use greatly. Mr. Gilliam gave some examples from an Engineer of different options for development of the front two lots only and noted that they are not feasible. He stated that the applicant had the parcels appraised and the proposal is the highest and best use for the property. In conclusion, Mr. Gilliam stated that the proposal meets the requirements for Neighborhood Business (N-B), and

would provide greater employment, greater tax base, easier traffic flow, and is a much better plan for the development of the property. He confirmed that the applicant is agreeable with the proposed conditions if approved.

FAVOR: None

OPPOSED: **Brenda Coursey**, 493 Mountain View Drive, stated that the subject property does have an access on Thompson Bridge Road where a house was demolished. She felt that the proposed development would encroach more into the neighborhood than BB&T and that it would be detrimental to Residential-I (R-I) zoning and Roper Park. She agreed that Roper Park is a highly utilized park which has no parking lot, so people park on both sides of the street and there are even multiple school buses parked there at times. She stated that there is only enough room for one car to come and go at times. Mrs. Coursey stated that whatever comes to the corner of Virginia Circle and Thompson Bridge Road should not have access on Virginia Circle because of safety and traffic issues. She stated that Gainesville has a wonderful park system and we should do anything we can to protect the integrity of the parks and R-I neighborhoods.

Emilie Cook, 144 Virginia Circle, stated that she lives directly behind the BB&T Bank. She felt that the bank and the proposed development are not comparable since BB&T is closed on Saturdays and Sundays and closes at 6pm on other days of the week, assuming those hours will not be the same as a drive-thru restaurant. She stated that other than lighting issues, there is very little else that can be compared between the two businesses except they both have a drive-thru, noting that the bank has very few ATM customers late at night. Ms. Cook stated that there is a theoretical line in the sand between commercial and residential properties and asked how that line can be erased so easily. She felt that there are better uses for the subject property and a restaurant was an inappropriate use for the neighborhood. She stated that she can't imagine sitting on her front porch and seeing lights from a restaurant drive-thru in her view so she hoped the Board would deny the request.

John Fuller, 210 Oakland Drive, stated that he was a longtime resident of the neighborhood and because of the parking issues at Roper Park the residents often have trouble getting to and from their residences. He stated that while he conceived that Thompson Bridge Road would be commercial, he doesn't conceive commercial development coming further into the neighborhood and is also opposed to any driveway access on Virginia Circle. Mr. Fuller asked the Board to consider the neighborhood when making their decision. In conclusion, he stated that like a 401k, sometimes you have diminished value because you make a bad investment, but you have to figure a way out of it.

Tamra Greeson Schardi, 286 Oakland Drive, stated that she lives half a block from Roper Park and agreed with her neighbors that people park on both sides of the road, and added that there was a lot of pedestrian traffic, so she would hate to see more vehicular traffic from a drive-thru.

Planning and Appeals Board Comments: Board Member Snyder asked about the possibility of an entrance on Thompson Bridge Road. Planning Manager Matt Tate stated that the developer would have to apply for a permit with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) for an entrance on Thompson Bridge Road because of a

change in use. He stated that the concept plan shows an entrance, but GDOT would control the access points.

Board Member Snyder stated that a 25-foot landscape buffer between the development and the residential area is not much and felt the whole strip behind the driveway could be landscaped. Planning Manager Matt Tate stated that the ULDC requires a minimum of 25-feet when Neighborhood Business is adjacent to residential zoned properties.

Board Member Martin asked if the property was rezoned, could a recommendation be made that there be no access on Virginia Circle. Planning Manager Matt Tate stated that a condition prohibiting access on Virginia Circle could be added; however, he did not know how the concept plan would work in that case or how the applicant would feel about it.

Planning Manager Matt Tate stated that the most difficult zoning issues are when parcels front a major highway and backs up to residential. He stated that the 2012 Comprehensive Plan gave focus to this. He stated that transitional uses such as light office uses are best between commercial and residential zonings. He stated that developments that were approved years ago may not be approved today with the current regulations.

There was a motion to recommend denial of the rezoning request as presented.

Motion made by Board Member Martin
Motion seconded by Board Member Stanley
Vote – 5 favor, 2 absent (Johnson, Hokayem)

C. Zoning Amendment Request

- 1) Request from **Over the Hill Holdings, LLC** to amend the existing Planned Unit Development (P-U-D) zoning on a 10.34± acres tract located west of Thompson Bridge Road, north of Minor Drive (a/k/a **2601 Thompson Bridge Road NW**).
Ward Number: One
Tax Parcel Number(s): 01-100-001-002A
Request: Assisted living facility

Staff Presentation: Planning Manager Matt Tate gave the following staff presentation:

The applicant is proposing to amend an existing 10.34± acres property currently zoned Planned Unit Development (P-U-D) for an assisted living facility. In 2009, the property was approved for 90, 3-story residential condominium units that were never constructed. The subject property is currently vacant of structures and has public access through a private drive easement belonging to the adjacent Rubicon office property. The surrounding area consists of properties zoned R-II and G-B and contains vacant land, the Rubicon office building, Social Security office, insurance office and a dance studio. The zoning development includes a 200 bed assisted living facility and 20 attached independent living homes. Specifically, the development is to include a one-story, 80,000 to 90,000 square foot building that will contain 100-units and will be licensed for 200 residents. However, it is estimated there will be 130-140 residents when full. The minimum size of the bedrooms will be 400 square feet. Amenities for the development are to include large common areas, outdoor gathering areas, movie theatre, public dining room, private dining room, chapel, hair salon, and activity rooms. Phase 2 of the

development is to include 20 independent living homes consisting of 4-5 separate buildings each containing 4-5 units. The independent units are estimated to be 1,000 to 1,500 square feet in size with attached garages. These residents will also have use of the 14-slip community boat dock permitted by the Corps of Engineers. Access is to remain from a common easement along the Rubicon office building property to Thompson Bridge Road.

Gainesville Public Utilities commented that there is sufficient water and sewer to serve the development; however, depending on the fire flow demands for the proposed assisted-living development, a water main extension from the existing 8-inch main on Thompson Bridge Road may be required at the expense of the owner/developer.

The Gainesville Future Development Map places the subject property within the *Mixed-Use General* land use category which includes areas containing or planned for a mixture of land uses including office, neighborhood retail, and residential. The types of non-residential uses that are desirable in this area would include restaurants, specialty retail, and low-intensity office.

According to the Character Area Map of the 2030 Gainesville Comprehensive Plan the property is located within the *Lake District* Character Area which states that infill development is not a priority, although redevelopment of older apartments, retail and office space is important. Land uses allowed within this district are low-density residential, mixed-use, commercial, public / institutional, transportation / communications / utilities, and parks / recreation / conservation.

Therefore, based on the Comprehensive Plan and the surrounding residential and non-residential land uses, the Planning Division is recommending conditional approval of this zoning amendment request with the following conditions:

1. The proposed use shall meet the development standards as stated within the applicant's narrative and shown on the applicant's building architectural renderings.
2. Any improved access design identified shall be approved by the Gainesville Public Works Director and the Georgia Department of Transportation and shall be at the full expense of the owner/developer.
3. Proposed signage for the development shall not exceed the Project Entrance Sign requirements as described within Section 9-18-7-9 of the Gainesville Unified Land Development Code.
4. An updated as-built boundary survey/plat of the subject property, indicating all improvements, shall be recorded prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy for the proposed use.

Board Member Snyder asked what advantage the applicant has with a Planned Unit Development (P-U-D) zoning as opposed to rezoning the property. Planning Manager Matt Tate stated that P-U-D zoning is beneficial in that the developer can set their own design standards, noting that P-U-D zoning can consist of mixed use, commercial, and various types of residential. He stated that the property could be rezoned to Office and Institutional, with a special use for this type of development. Vice-Chair Fleming stated that this request is like the one that was approved on Enota which was also a P-U-D.

Applicant's Presentation: **Brian Sticker**, 14 Honeysuckle Trail in Dawsonville, stated that he and Mike Pascoe are 50% partners in the entity with an option to purchase the subject property. Mr. Sticker stated that they also will manage the assisted living facility, noting they wish to do the same type styling and architecture as their facility in Canton. He stated that keeping the P-U-D zoning was of no real benefit to them, but they felt it would be a less invasive change. He stated that he understands that several projects have been approved for this property in the past which never came to fruition. However, their due diligence is almost complete and the purchase of the property is contingent on obtaining approval of the rezoning request. The process should come to fruition by December 20th and they plan to start construction within three months if the request is granted. He stated that the main building would be 80,000 - 90,000 square feet, with the core of the building being two-story to enjoy the lake views and the wings of the facility being one-story. He stated that the draw to Lake Lanier is that it will provide great outdoor facilities of peace and tranquility for the residents. Mr. Sticker stated that the proposal is unorthodox since he doesn't know of any other similar developments on Lake Lanier and that is probably because the cost of the project will be twice the normal amount since it is on the lake.

Vice-Chair Fleming asked if the facility would be assisted living only. Mr. Pascoe stated that it would be for memory care and assisted living, but no skilled nursing.

Mr. Sticker stated that the property is already permitted for a dock and they would like to keep that for some of the independent living residents who might enjoy it, noting they would have to make a safe way to get down to the dock.

Board Member Martin asked if any of the independent living homes would be sold. Mr. Sticker stated no, they would pay a monthly rental fee.

Mr. Sticker added that they can provide some services for the residents in the larger facility as well which would be a cost savings for people with issues who may need help with things in order to keep them independent as long as possible.

FAVOR: None

OPPOSED: None

Planning and Appeals Board Comments: None

There was a motion to recommend conditional approval of the request to amend the existing Planned Unit Development (P-U-D) located at 2601 Thompson Bridge Road, as presented with the following conditions:

Conditions

- 1. The proposed use shall meet the development standards as stated within the applicant's narrative and shown on the applicant's building architectural renderings.**
- 2. Any improved access design identified shall be approved by the Gainesville Public Works Director and the Georgia Department of Transportation and shall be at the full expense of the owner/developer.**

3. **Proposed signage for the development shall not exceed the Project Entrance Sign requirements as described within Section 9-18-7-9 of the Gainesville Unified Land Development Code.**
4. **An updated as-built boundary survey/plat of the subject property, indicating all improvements, shall be recorded prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy for the proposed use.**

Motion made by Board Member Stanley
Motion seconded by Board Member Snyder
Vote – 5 favor, 2 absent (Johnson, Hokayem)

ADJOURNMENT

There was a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:45 PM.

Motion made by Board Member Snyder
Motion seconded by Board Member Rucker
Vote – 5 favor, 2 absent (Johnson, Hokayem)

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Fleming, Vice-Chair

Judy Foster, Recording Secretary