



Planning and Zoning Commission  
Meeting Minutes

City Hall: 56 Malone Street,  
Fairburn, GA 30213  
Tuesday, July 6, 2024  
7:00 p.m.

Jason Jones, Vice Chair  
Michelle James  
Lina Parker  
Elizabeth Echols  
Tony Smith

Planning Director: Denise Brookins  
Planner: Chancellor Felton  
City Attorney: Valerie Ross

- 
- A. Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Vice Chairman Jones.
- B. Determination of a Quorum:** A quorum was determined, and the meeting proceeded.
- C. Pledge of Allegiance**
- D. Approval of the Meeting Agenda:**
1. Commissioner James made a motion to approve the agenda. Commissioner Echols seconded.  
**THE MOTION CARRIED.**
- E. Approval of the Meeting Minutes:**
1. Commissioner Echols made a motion to approve the June 4, 2024, minutes. Commissioner Smith seconded.  
**THE MOTION CARRIED.**
- F. Public Comments:** None.
- G. Old Business:** None.
- H. New Business:**
1. **Future Land Use Amendment Text Amendment Discussion**  
Request to discuss the text amendment.
    - a. Vice Chairman Jones introduced the case. Denise Brookins presented the case on behalf of Staff. Vice Chairman Jones opened the floor for the Commission to ask Staff questions.
    - b. Vice Chairman Jones wanted to clarify that this Future Land Use Amendment Text Amendment was to ensure that there was a formal process for a future land use amendment.
    - c. Ms. Brookins said yes. As it stands the City does not have a future land use amendment process, which could lead to the City missing out on good development opportunities.
    - d. Commissioner James inquired about the Comprehensive Plan Update. Ms. Brookins noted that the agenda item being discussed is for a singular text amendment to the Zoning Code. The Comprehensive Plan Update is different from that.
    - e. Vice Chairman Jones closed the floor to ask Staff questions.

## 2. **Poplar Commons Rezoning**

Applicant: Freedom Land Holdings LLC

Address: 0 Milo Fisher Street [Parcel ID: 09F100900520167], Parcel ID: 09F100900520332, Parcel ID: 09F100900520340, and Parcel ID: 09F100900520357

Request to review the rezoning.

- a. Vice Chairman Jones introduced the case. Denise Brookins presented the case on behalf of Staff. Staff made a recommendation for approval with conditions. Vice Chairman Jones opened the floor for the Commission to ask Staff questions.
- b. Commissioner Smith asked how far the development is away from Landmark. Ms. Brookins said that the development is really close.
- c. Vice Chairman Jones inquired why Staff was partially in support of the request. Ms. Brookins answered that due to one of the parcels having a Rural Residential Future Land Use Designation, Staff could not support the full request. The development has a higher density than what the future land use designation will allow.
- d. Commissioner James asked what the density is for Rural Residential. Ms. Brookins said about one home per acre.
- e. Vice Chairman Jones asked if a runoff study had been done. Ms. Brookins said that a runoff study is done after approval and any findings that would need mitigation from said study will be the responsibility of the applicant.
- f. Vice Chairman Jones asked if access is only off of Milo Fisher and not East Campbellton Road. Ms. Brookins said yes.
- g. Commissioner James inquired about the square footage of an average home in the development. Ms. Brookins said that the minimum square foot in the proposed zoning district R-CT is 1,200 square feet.
- h. Commissioner Parker asked what the price point is for the homes. Ms. Brookins said that pricing is not a consideration during this review process and the applicant may be able to answer.
- i. Vice Chairman Jones closed the floor to ask Staff questions and opened the floor to ask the applicant questions and address the Commission.
- j. The applicant presented to the Commission.
- k. Commissioner Smith asked how far the development is away from Landmark. The applicant said that the development is across the street from Landmark.
- l. Commissioner Smith asked if there was a town hall meeting with Landmark leadership. The applicant said that they have been involved since inception. Commissioner Smith if they are okay with the development. The applicant said that they have heard no objections.
- m. Commissioner James inquired about guest parking. The applicant said that there are two-car garages, driveways, and overflow guest parking spaces with one parking space per two households.
- n. Commissioner James asked what the price point is for the homes. The applicant said upper \$300,000s and lower \$400,000s.
- o. Commissioner Echols asked if these homes would be specifically for Landmark parents and personnel. The applicant said no.

- p. Commissioner Smith asked how big the homes would be. The applicant said more than 2,400 square feet.
- q. Commissioner Parker stated that a traffic study should be required.
- r. Commissioner James asked if there would be a homeowners' association. The applicant said yes.
- s. Vice Chairman Jones closed the floor to ask the applicant questions and opened the floor to public comments.
- t. Mr. Brooks made a public comment about the traffic and density increasing.
- u. Mr. Alderman made a public comment about the traffic, density, and property taxes increasing.
- v. Ms. Scharko made a public comment about the septic system being challenged and traffic increasing.
- w. Mr. Pallend made a public comment that he does not think that this type of development is appropriate for the neighborhood.
- x. Mr. Ballard made a public comment that the development changes the character of the neighborhood and that the developer is not fully transparent and reliable.
- y. Mr. Scharko made a public comment about the existing infrastructure issues that will be exacerbated by this type of development.
- z. The applicant stated that they tried their best to address concerns. They dropped their density and incorporated the water features on the site. A traffic study will be done if required.
- aa. Mr. Brooks made a public comment to always consider the environmental impacts of proposed developments.
- bb. Ms. Mayfield made a public comment that Landmark has personnel and parents that would move into these homes and have a hard time looking for homes near the school. She stated that crime is not an issue and the original use of the Landmark-owned parcel was to be institutional – not rural.
- cc. Vice Chairman Jones closed the floor to public comments.
- dd. Commissioner James noted that this decision is very complex and is a difficult one to make. She notes that there is a delicate balance between considering senior residents on fixed incomes who can't afford property tax increases with building more homes that will woo more commercial and service providers to the City that will enhance the quality of life of residents.

Commissioner James made a motion to **APPROVE**. Commissioner Echols seconded.

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

3. **Poplar Commons Concurrent Variance**

Applicant: Freedom Land Holdings LLC

Address: 0 Milo Fisher Street [Parcel ID: 09F100900520167], Parcel ID: 09F100900520332, Parcel ID: 09F100900520340, and Parcel ID: 09F100900520357

Request to review the concurrent variance.

Commissioner James motioned to **APPROVE**. Commissioner Echols seconded.

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**I. Adjournment:**

1. Commissioner Smith motioned to adjourn the public meeting at 8:21 pm. Commissioner Echols seconded.

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**