

**SPALDING COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**May 25, 2004**

The Spalding County Planning Commission held its regular monthly meeting on May 26, 2004 at 7:00 P.M. in Room 108 of the Spalding County Courthouse Annex. Members present were: Karen Mathiak, Chairman, presiding, Ray Browning, Ronald Green, Delores Phillips, and John Youmans.

Also present were Charles Taylor, Community Development Director, Newton Galloway, Attorney, Bruce Ballard, Griffin-Spalding County School System, and Yvonne Langford to record the minutes.

Ms. Mathiak called the meeting to order, introduced the members of the Planning Commission, and invited those present wanting to address the Board regarding any matter to sign in on the appropriate form. Ms. Mathiak read the rules for the conduct of business for the meeting.

**AGENDA**

Mr. Browning made a motion to amend the agenda to consider S/D 04-02 prior to the zoning requests. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Youmans with Mr. Browning, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak, Ms. Phillips and Ms. Mathiak voting for the motion.

**MINUTES**

Ms. Phillips made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 27, 2004 meeting. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Green with Mr. Browning, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak, Ms. Phillips, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

**#S/D 04-02:** Stan's Corner – Stan Lindsey, Owners – 10.737 acres off Amelia Road and Locust Grove Road located in Land Lots 84 and 85 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Land District – 5 lots.

Mr. Taylor said the staff had reviewed the plat, and the recommendation is for approval conditioned on all the county departments signing off on the plat. There are a couple of minor things that need to be corrected.

**MOTION**

Mr. Browning made a motion to approve S/D 04-02 conditioned on approval from all county departments.

**Application #04-11Z:** Big Pines Farm, LLLP, Owner – Robert S. Hockett, Agent – Smoak Road (262.25 acres, more or less, located in Land Lots 198, 218, 219 and 220 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Land District) – requesting a rezoning from R-1, Single Family Residential Low Density, to PDD, Planned Development District.

**Application #04-11AZ:** – Robert S. Hockett, Owner and Agent – Smoak Road (5 acres, more or less, located in Land Lot 230 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Land District) – requesting a rezoning form R-1, Single Family Residential Low Density, to PDD, Planned Development District.

**Application #04-11BZ:** – Elizabeth C. H. Dupree, Owner – Robert S. Hockett, Agent – Smoak Road (1 acre located in Land Lot 219 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Land District) – requesting a rezoning form R-1, Single Family Residential Low Density, to PDD, Planned Development District

**Application #04-11CZ:** – Robert S. Hockett, and Carrie Frances Hockett, Owners – Robert S. Hockett, Agent - Smoak Road (17.09 acres, more or less, located in Land Lots 198 and 219 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Land District) – requesting a rezoning form R-1, Single Family Residential Low Density, to PDD, Planned Development District.

Ms. Mathiak said that Application's #04-11Z, #04-11AZ, #04-11BZ and #04-11CZ together but voted separately.

Mr. Taylor said the staff recommends denial for the following reasons:

1. The Future Land Use Map indicates that this property should be developed as agricultural/forestry land, which allows for residential uses on larger tracts.
2. The current zoning does not diminish the value of the property as it allows for subdivision development.
3. The condition of Smoak Road to the north of the development (following typical commuting patterns would indicate that this would be the primary direction of the traffic generated by this subdivision) does not support the number of lots proposed. Traffic generated by 525 lots (4,766 per day) and a school would overburden the dirt road.
4. There are several deficiencies in the master plan and the site plan that have been submitted with the application. These deficiencies in the master plan and the site plan that have been submitted with the application make it difficult to consider this site plan as a viable design for a development.
5. There are several environmental issues, specifically the creeks that cross this property, that are not fully protected by this design. The increased buffers required within the Towaliga River Watershed Protection area are shown within the lots. While this is a common practice for developments with one and two acre lots, the smaller lots (6,000-12,000 square feet) proposed within this development do not provide adequate area to both develop the property and ensure the buffers are protected.
6. The predominant development pattern within the general area is for minimum one-acre lots with a density of approximately 0.67 units per acre. This is seen in subdivisions known as Seven Forks and Longview Estates.

7. Spring Lake is the only property zoned PDD in this general area and it provides multiple accesses through roads that are already considered collector roads and can accommodate traffic generated by large subdivision.

Andy Welch – 22000 Keys Ferry Court – McDonough, Georgia

Mr. Welch said this request is for zoning from R-1 to PDD. There are approximately 280 acres off of Smoak Road. They have been through the pre-concept review process. They additionally held a preliminary conference with the Planning Commission last month. They took suggestions from the Board and modified the plan. They addressed many of the issues raised. Mr. Hockett is the property owner and the agent for the other property owners involved.

Robert Hockett – 497 Smoak Road

Mr. Hockett made a Power-Point presentation giving an overview of the project. Mr. Hockett said they are donating 12 acres of land for a new elementary school on this property. They will have three road access points, three lakes, swim and tennis facilities, 3.7 miles of walking trails, 40% green space, and 10 miles of sidewalks (sidewalks on both sides of the road). They will be proposing to amend their application to increase the square footage to 1,750 SF houses. This will require 60' lots rather than the 50' lots. This will increase the price of the houses from \$130,000 to between \$140,000 and \$380,000. The houses will all be Hardi-plank and brick, no vinyl. They will have restrictive covenants. His house is on the property and he will be living there. They have plans for a sewage treatment plant. There are several options and at the present time they have not confirmed which one they will be using. They prefer to use the underground drip system. They will have to get approval from EPD for whichever one they use. He requested approval for this application.

Beth Jones – 2120 East McIntosh Road

The Hockett's have decided to sell their land, and it is their right. At first they were not happy about it, but she has seen the plans. It is going to be developed one way or another, and they have seen the plan and decided they liked the family-friendly atmosphere this community might have. They would like that plan as opposed to a trailer park that would "run down" the property value. It will help the property value of the people in the area and it will bring a lot of revenue for Spalding County. For that reason, they have decided to vote in favor.

Terry Jones – 2120 East McIntosh Road

He feels the same.

Vernell Lanier - 476 Smoak Road

Ms. Lanier said she would live across from the proposed site of the school. The traffic and confusion that would be created is going to make living there rough. There will be a development, but she does not want the small lots. This is a quarter of an acre per house and that is too small.

James Lanier - 476 Smoak Road  
He is opposed.

Darryl Rapp – 70 Edgewater Drive

He is a new resident and loves it. They built their house last year based on the idea that it is serene. They are a mile “as the crow flies” from this site. He is a builder in Atlanta. They build on small lots where you can touch your neighbor, and this is what is planned for this site. It may increase the property value a little, but it will certainly decrease the living value. The traffic will increase incredibly. Please vote against this development.

John McCorkle – 2051 East McIntosh

He shares a common property line of approximately 2,000 feet with Mr. Hockett. He is opposed to this rezoning and could recite a litany of reasons why. Do you want to keep Spalding basically rural, quality of life, and retain the present zoning with the quality of life that is attached to that or do you want to create disorder by rezoning this property? This is overwhelming. They are talking about their own sewerage plant, their own school. They are not opposed to growth but they want orderly not disorderly growth. Look at Henry and Clayton counties. He would like to think that Spalding is different. He urged and asked for a no vote.

Maria Johnson – 600 Hamil Road

Her understanding is that this property is currently zoned R-1 which is one house per two acres. This particular area is zoned for agriculture in the future land use plan. A number of people here have participated in the future land use plan for 2020. There was a lot of community input as far as what they want the county to look like and where they want the development to be. Earlier, it was indicated that it is close to medium density property. If we take that attitude and say even though it is planned to be agriculture but nearby it is medium and we start bringing in and changing the nearby property from agricultural to medium or high density, then it will completely destroy what the community has tried to do as far as what we want this county to look like in 2020. Mr. Browning talked in one of the planning meetings about how we could control and manage growth to set higher standards so that we do not get this very high-density development. She does not see putting 525 units on 170 acres, which includes roads and other types of space that would be needed to accommodate those units. That is not raising the standards, it is lowering the standards. She requested the Board consider this. There are a lot of people that do not want to see this density in this area. She has 43 acres and most of the people have a lot of acreage and they like it that way. She asked for denial.

Ed Johnson – 600 Hamil Road

There are already signs that the county is growing too fast. In the April 15, 2004 Griffin Daily News, there is an article that says we do not have enough money to open the Moreland Road Elementary School. That has been deferred for one year. Hopefully there will be enough money to open it then. Another article in the same paper talked about trailers that are already being used at three of the schools, which indicate the population is growing faster than the schools are. In the April 17, 2004 Griffin Daily

News, there was an article on Spalding County being one of the Georgia counties with excessive smog level that is going to required stricter air pollution controls in the future. 525 houses on 225 acres will not help improve the air quality. The citizens that worked on the 2020 plan listed as their top priority keeping the rural characteristics of the county. Another high priority of the planning group was to manage growth going forward. They had specific population targets for 2020 as well as the number of housing units that would take the county to that target. The number of houses to be built between now and 2020 is 8,200. Once you take out the houses that have been approved for Minerva's Spring Lake and Heron Bay, you are left with approximately 325 houses per year that can be built in this county and still stay within the population and growth guidelines for 2020. If this one development is approved, you have used up almost two years on the planned growth. He requested denial of the application.

Angie Boylan – 3456 Teamon Road

She has purchased property three years ago at 3456 Teamon Road. They specifically purchased in Spalding County after looking in Henry County for three years. They were unable to find a low-density area in Henry County. She wants to live in the type community that she would like. One of the reasons she can do that is because of zoning. She chose Spalding County because she was told that what was happening in Henry County was not going to happen in Spalding County. She requested denial.

Terri Smith – 511 Smoak Road

Against

Mr. and Mrs. Mendias – Edgewater Court

They are opposed

Mr. Martin – 132 Smoak Road

Opposed

Keith and Carrie Lovett – 2227 East McIntosh Road

Opposed

Mike Little – 591 Smoak Road

Opposed

Barbara Dougherty 106 Cabin Creek Circle

Opposed – did not wish to speak

Eddie Scott – 92 Pamela Circle

Opposed

Laura Blauser – 207 Smoak Road

Opposed – Did not wish to speak

Mr. and Mrs. Emerson – 187 Smoak Road  
Opposed – Did not wish to speak.

Brenda Cobb

Currently resides in Henry County and has become very discouraged with Henry County's congestion so they recently purchased 5 acres at 322 Smoak Road.

Ms. Cobb read a prepared statement, which is attached to and becomes a part of these minutes.

Tilman Blakely – 599 Smoak Road

Mr. Blakely presented a map that he wanted entered into the record. The map was of Smoak Road identifying the residences and acreages. This plan is going to affect many lives. There are 23 houses on Smoak Road with most of them ranging from three to 10 acres with some at one acre and some up to 50 acres. If you consider the Girl Scout Camp area, there are another 21 homes there. You have an area larger than the Hockett's that has 44 houses. This is rural. In the planning sessions, this is what was discussed for preservation. There is no way you can put 525 houses on a road that is two miles long and do anything but destroy a neighborhood. There is no way that a neighborhood should be ruined like this. It is not called for on the present or future land use plan. The largest lot that the Hockett plan has is 28/100's of an acre. It is an ill-conceived idea, and he urged denial. He, also, urged the Hockett Family to go back and reconsider the R-1 zoning. That will give something that is more compatible with the area there now. This will ruin the neighborhood. He gave post cards and petitions representing 347 names in opposition to this. He requested they be added to the record. He is not requesting that the property not be developed. He requested that the zoning not be changed,

Sylvia Avery – 1861 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Opposed

James E. Avery – 1861 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Opposes the rezoning

Grace Dougherty – North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Opposed

John Scott – 1906 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Ext.

His property adjoins the Hockett's on the south side. They have lived here for 20 years. He is retired military. They wanted to live outside. They are concerned about the fact that this property has steep hills and it will affect the flood plain. Where is the drainage going? There will be a great storm water issue. He is, additionally, concerned because he has a nice creek on his property and if you put houses next to the creek 25 feet is not going to stop anything. He is afraid that it will be clear-cut. He is concerned about his quality of life. He wants to keep the rural atmosphere. If they want to develop this property R-1, there is no problem.

Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Holloway – 396 Smoak Road  
Did not care to speak but they are both against.

Mr. and Mrs. Mauro Cisneros – 3000 Teamon Road  
Opposed

Dewayne Hamrick – 376 Smoak Road  
Did not wish to speak but he and his wife both opposed.

Kerry Sampler – 785 Smoak Road  
He is one of the two houses on the dirt portion of the road. The dust with the present traffic is about the “kill them”. They do not need any more traffic. They are on a well and they do not have county water. He is going to be drinking Minerva sewerage now and he does not need anyone else’s. He is opposed to this.

Elto Rosso – 50 Smoak Road  
He is director of operations for the Roosevelt Railroad, and they plan to run passenger trains through this area in less than two weeks. They are trying to keep a natural setting for the railroad. They have a railroad crossing on Smoak Road that is adequate for the present level of traffic. They are concerned with the added traffic. The crossing will have to be improved and he wants to know who is responsible for improving the crossing.

Kennedy King – 1635 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Ext.  
Opposed

Louis Goverro – 2222 Honeybee Creek  
He is for this project. He feels that it is a wonderful idea. He has heard a lot of arguments and they seem selfish. It is all about me, me, me, me. He has heard patriotism and freedom and wonderful things but what is the American dream? To have a house and a family. It is hard to have a house and a family. It is expensive. Most people cannot have a large house with a lot of land. They would rather have less land with a nicer house and get the American dream. He does not understand keeping this R-1. How can you develop a house with that much land and still keep it economical? You cannot afford the amenities. It would be an unorganized mess. We are going to grow. We need to improve our street; we need to improve our schools; it has to happen. He would rather see it happen in a condensed smaller area like this well planned out, well thought out. We are not going to be drinking sewer water and stuff like that if it is done right. They cannot do it unless they do it right. If it is done right and it looks nice, he has no problem with it.

Dave Emerson – 187 Smoak Road  
Opposed

Randy Dougherty – 100 Cabin Creek Circle  
He is opposed. Everything he wanted to say has been said.

Tamara Pursley – 248 Hamil Road  
Opposed

Diane McGahee – 55 Smoak Road  
She has lived here since 1972. It has always been rural. This is a quiet neighborhood with good schools. Why would anyone want to build all these houses on a two/three mile road? This is serious. This is her life they are changing. She does not like it. This is a quiet neighborhood, and they want it to stay that way.

Tim McGahee – 550 Smoak Road  
This is life changing. The people around are going to have to live with this. The road has too many curves and it is half dirt. They say they are putting a sewerage system in. It doesn't matter how good the system, sooner or later it is going to break and go straight into the creek. That is a beautiful creek and he does not want that creek to be polluted. The more that comes up the more it is going to be polluted. He wants the zoning to stay as it is so they can have the least amount possible in the neighborhood.

Angela McDaniel – 30 Smoak Road  
He has lived here since 1981 and is highly opposed to this type density.

Bobbie Bonner – 2035 East McIntosh Road  
The main thing that needs to be addressed is traffic. Anyone that lives on East McIntosh can tell you there is not a weekend that goes by that there is not at least one wreck. That much more traffic is going to mean less quality of life. She is opposed.

Dianne Brooks – 2225 East McIntosh Road  
Opposed

Willie J. Etheridge – 147 Wood Hollow Road  
A lot of people have said what he was going to say but he wants to mention some small things. In 1990, there were only two house on the road. He and his wife made a walking trail and would walk the trail and see one or two cars. Now there are 15 houses on Wood Hollow Road and they almost have to walk in the ditch because of the traffic. They are afraid to walk because of the traffic on East McIntosh and County Line Roads. You can hardly get to work for getting behind school buses. There used to be a thing called a bus stop where the children would meet at a certain place to catch the bus but now things are so bad they cannot allow their children to walk any distance and the school bus stops at almost every house. If you get behind a bus in the morning, it is really bad. It is going to be more congested. He is also concerned about the wildlife.

Ann Benefield – 110 Cabin Creek Circle  
Opposed

Adriene Lowry – 119 Cabin Creek Circle  
Opposed

J. R. Lowry – 119 Cabin Creek Circle  
Opposed

Thomas Tyler – 990 Smoak Road

He feels the same way as most that have spoken. He is opposed. He and his wife waited a long time to buy the home he has purchased. They were happy to get it. They purchased it because of the R-1 zoning. There is lots of wildlife and wooded areas. They had been living in Jonesboro until the congestion drove them to Henry County and the same thing happened. They do not oppose growth but 500 + houses are too much.

Henry Bryan – 1999 East McIntosh Road

In 1985, he was looking for work and a job opened up in Griffin. They looked at several places and chose this because it was rural like he grew up in. He loves the rural area. He has a problem because the land will be developed with all these houses and then the people will have all these issues regarding things that have been there for 20, 30, 40, 50 years. They want you to get rid of your cattle because of the odor. If you want high density, go to Henry or Clayton Counties. We need a tax base but we need jobs to support this development. He likes his quality of life. This is going to mess up Smoak Road. Who is going to widen and pave Smoak Road? It is going to increase traffic on East McIntosh Road and Highway 155. He requested a no vote.

Bart Lundy – 385 Smoak Road

He opposes this. The development will surround his house.

Robert Warr – 360 Smoak Road

Did not wish to speak but opposes this application

Susan Blakely – 599 Smoak Road

They built in 1978, and there were 8 houses there. There are 23 houses. When Mr. Hockett visited to explain the subdivision he said he was going to move north and his mother was going to move to Lamar County and he suggested that they do that also. They like Spalding County. This is their home.

Barbara Adcox – 2640 Teamon Road

She is in the bad curve on the corner of Smoak and Teamon Roads where there are a lot of accidents. It is so dangerous that the school bus will not stop there. The children are picked up and dropped off at the church. They have lived there for 26 years and she does not like the congestion. She is opposed.

Glen Adcox – 2640 Teamon Road

Opposed

W. S. Jones – 233 Smoak Road

Someone mentioned that they were being selfish as homeowners. Isn't that what this "boils down to" when you think about it? Mr. Hockett can make a couple of more million dollars here as opposed to keeping it R-1. He, his wife and daughter like it here.

He drives 62 miles to work at a Dekalb County Fire Station. If it was 100 miles, he would still drive to 233 Smoak Road. He loves it there. He loves to sit on his deck and watch the sun go down. He has only been there for two years. He wants to raise his children there. It is zoned R-1 and lets keep it R-1.

Michael Hull – 2140 East McIntosh Road

He moved here selfishly 11 ½ years ago, because it was zoned R-1. He does not want to live with sidewalks and tennis courts. They want to continue to live in Spalding County and enjoy themselves.

Noel Whitney – 1522 Cabin Creek Trail

Opposed

Anita Thurmond – 2230 East McIntosh Road

The traffic on East McIntosh Road is horrible. She cannot imagine adding 525 houses. She is basically opposed.

Carla Rapp – 70 Edgewater Drive

Opposed

Queen Williams – 1101 Spring Creek Circle

Opposed

Vegas McCain – 1805 Cindy Lane

He is for this development. Spalding is growing. The motto is “Great and Growing”. It is going to happen anyway. The 2020 plan probably won’t last until 2008. All plans are plans until they meet the enemy and then it “goes down the drain”. Spalding County is basically a suburb of Atlanta. It is happening. Two years ago no one could imagine the traffic the Super Wal-Mart would generate. Coming and going out of Spalding County is a nightmare. It is almost as bad as I-285. He drives to and from Kennesaw everyday. People are moving here from Atlanta, Clayton, Henry Counties. It is coming. If we give this the recreational facilities, it will end up being the nicest subdivision in Spalding County. He does not know any subdivision that has sidewalks on both sides of the road, or walking trails. The school site is being donated. We all know we are going to have to buy another school site. People are still going to have homes on their 30 acres or their 10 acres. It does not change that. They may not be able to ride their horses down the road. His area has grown up all around him. Get something nice because it will pass the next board and it may be trailer parks.

Martin Paulin – 75 Edgewater Drive

He purchased his property with two acres a year and a half ago. These are not homes that people will buy, raise a family, retire, die and will on to someone in the family. These are truly rental houses. He is not against growth in Spalding County. He likes the diverse atmosphere and friendliness. When they were ready to purchase, they considered going further south because of the “run-off growth” from Henry and Clayton Counties.

He is vehemently opposed to this type development. He is in the country and wants to remain in the country.

Barbara Morales – 2079 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street

She has lived here for six years. They have eight acres. She has heard, “Why not build sidewalks so the children can play?” Why not have open land so they can have freedom and understand nature. She grew up in the city and she is now seeing what she missed. She wishes her children were younger so they could experience what she and her husband are experiencing now.

Ricardo Morales – 2019 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street

He is opposed.

Letters opposing were entered as follows:

Cathy and Ernie Marshall from Texas opposing because it would be devastating to the homeowners in the area. She is also opposed because of what it would do to the schools in the area.

Helen Grayson – 287 Jordan Hill Road

Opposing because it does not meet the land use plans. It will be a detriment to the existing community and a strain on the infrastructure. It will also impact the schools, and bring more traffic. She wants to preserve the rural character.

Josephine Scott – 1906 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Extension

Grace Dougherty – 1374 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Extension

Opposed due to environmental concerns. This is a watershed that should have minimal development.

Tilman Blakely – 599 Smoak Road

Opposing

The following are letters supporting the subdivision:

Mary Ann Whitehurst –

Likes the development.

Mike Whitehurst

Likes the development.

Howard McClain – 1805 Cindy Lane

Supports the development. It brings needed housing, schools, recreation and keeps green space.

Louis Governs

It is a quality development. Donates land for a school.

Debbie Dutton – 161 West Ellis Road  
The county needs quality growth

Mr. Welch and Mr. Hockett returned to address the concerns.

Mr. Welch presented a petition signed by people that are in favor of this development. There are some things in the Staff Report that are incorrect. The Staff Report refers to the minimum lot size as being 11,250 SF allowed in the ordinance. The ordinance allows in PDD with the special exception 11,000 SF. The Staff recommendation is for denial and gives a series of issues as reasons for the denial. They state that there are several deficiencies in the master plan. The master plan is entirely compliant with the requirements of the PDD. The deficiencies that are referred to have all be resolved except whether the street crossings meet with the Spalding County standards. There is an issue regarding buffer requirements. That can be easily remedied and they intend to do that. They will have the lots line up so they do not have the stream buffers in the lots. There are 12 to 16 lots where that occurs. There is concern regarding the 25-foot buffer protection to adjacent property owners. If this is rezoned, there are ways to protect that 25-foot buffer through protective covenants. It will give the surrounding property owners the authority to enforce the covenants. They raised the issue of variances and special exceptions. They have identified those problems and have changed the square footage of the houses and the width of the lots to resolve those issues. It states that the minimum house size would have to be 1,750 SF and they have made that change. There will be two car garages. The Staff Report also deals with environmental issues and they are required to have a 100' stream buffer. The master plan provides for and stipulates that. Where that 100' buffer line overlaps a property or lot line it will be corrected. They take issue with the statement in the report that predominate development patterns in the general area are for one-acre lots. Spring Lake will have over 2,000 homes and the density will be 2.31. This is a colossal development that is occurring 500 feet from this subdivision.

Mr. Hockett said they have had a good relationship with the staff and they do a good job. Under the predominant development, if you do not include this project, 93% of all of the pending schools that are listed in their project go to the Jordan Hill Elementary School area are in a PDD. 97% of Kelsey Middle School are in a PDD. This includes Heron Bay. 80% of the proposed houses that have been approved are in a PDD.

Mr. Welch said access to Smoak Road is an issue. Spring Lake Development has been approved and one entrance there will serve 700 homes. This development has three entrances and exits serving 525 homes.

He feels they have addressed the concerns and exceeded the minimum standards that have been set. They have tried to raise the bar and develop a plan and a project that will preserve a significant amount of open space and integrate that open space into the development so that it is not all clustered into one area. Over 1/3 of the houses there will have access to open space.

Mr. Hockett said there was a question that was posed for them to review the development design to go to one-acre lots. This project is designed for middle-income people moving the home prices to \$145,000 to \$380,000 price range. The projects that have been approved recently with PDD zoning that are more dense than one acre have \$1,000,000 homes. He does not know many people that can afford a \$1,000,000 home. Minerva does a high quality product and they have tried to mimic their project. They had an opportunity to sell their property under the present zoning but turned it down because they are not going to build the way they want it built.

Mr. Welch said the sewer has been an issue. They are interested in preserving the environment. They will postpone the construction until that sewer plant is on line, operational and has met all the requirements.

Mr. Hockett said his house if not for sale and there is no for sale sign on it.

Mr. Browning said there has been productive, intense discussion. When you participate in planning, you cannot ignore the value of the planning. This plan, as currently proposed, does not fit the current land use plan. It may not fit the new plan either. This is a great development as far as the elements that are included. He finds no fault with the development but it does not fit the land use plan. If we don't stick to the land use plan, you will have disorganization and rampant growth. It will not help economically, socially, the roads, or the schools.

Dolores Phillips said the Hockett's have presented a good quality subdivision. With the amount of rural area in the R-1 zoning, she feels the subdivision will be more fitting in the R-1 zoning.

Mr. Green thanked Mr. Hockett for putting a great development together but looking are the area it is suited for R-1. The dirt road also concerns him and he does not feel good about the project.

Mr. Youmans said he echoes some of the same thoughts Mr. Browning had. A lot of effort was put in on Saturdays to try to plan. It is disheartening to have the plan attached and that it is doomed to failure. The only way we are doomed to failure is if we don't have a plan and follow it. Mr. Hockett brought an excellent plan. He visited the area and if you have three access points on a dirt road it is still a dirt road. It does not lend itself well for the long term. He is also concerned about the long-term implications of a private sewer system. He is not certain that a sewer treatment plant will be approved.

Mr. Ballard said through the school system and the time he has been attending these meetings he has reviewed most of the plans that have been brought to the City and County since 1996. He agrees that Mr. Hockett should be commended for this design. It meets or surpasses most everything that has been seen. There are issues still. They are still concerned about the growth. He commends Mr. Hockett for being proactive and considering the donation of a school site on this property. They need developers to come into the county and take a pro-active approach to these issues. The land use plan was set

up for the development for the future of the county. The school system tries to use that plan for their planning for the development of the school system.

**MOTION**

Mr. Youmans made a motion to deny Application #04-11Z. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Green with Mr. Browning, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak, Ms. Phillips, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

**MOTION**

Mr. Youmans made a motion to deny Application #04-11AZ. The motion passed on a second by Ms. Phillips with Mr. Browning, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak, Ms. Phillips, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

**MOTION**

Mr. Youmans made a motion to deny Application #04-11BZ. The motion passed on a second by Ms. Phillips with Mr. Browning, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak, Ms. Phillips, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

**MOTION**

Mr. Youmans made a motion to deny Application #04-11CZ. The motion passed on a second by Mr. Green with Mr. Browning, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak, Ms. Phillips, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

**Rename Street** – Farrar Court to Farrar Lane located in the Fair Oaks Subdivision.

Mr. Taylor said one of the family members does not like the Court and wants it changed to Lane.

**MOTION**

Mr. Browning made a motion to approve the name change from Farrar Court to Farrar Lane in the Fair Oaks subdivision. The motion passed with Mr. Browning, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak, Ms. Phillips, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

**MOTION**

The meeting was adjourned on a motion by Mr. Browning and a second by Mr. Green with Mr. Browning, Mr. Green, Ms. Mathiak, Ms. Phillips, and Mr. Youmans voting for the motion.

---

Karen Mathiak – Chairman

---

Yvonne M. Langford - Recorder