

---

# Planning and Zoning Commission

23 EAST MAIN STREET, FORSYTH, GA. 31029 478.994.7747

WWW.CITYOFFORSYTH.NET

---

## September 16, 2025, Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes

**Voting Board Members Present:** Steve Coleman, Kathy Rowland, James Freeman, Hal Clarke, and Martin Pennington.

**Voting Board Members Not Present:** Michael Brewster and Noah Harbuck

**Staff Present:** Dean Nelson, Rachel Floyd, Will Campbell, and Brian Causey.

- I. **Call to Order:** Steve Coleman called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Agenda:** Mr. Freeman motioned for the agenda to be approved. Mrs. Rowland seconded this motion. The agenda was approved unanimously. (5-0)
- III. **Planning and Zoning:**

### **Discussion of proposed amendment of Article 12 to add a new zoning classification to be known as the Multi-Use District to the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Forsyth.**

Community Development Director Dean Nelson provided a review of what was discussed in the August 25 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting regarding the proposal of Article 12. Mr. Nelson also stated that a development agreement is not possible because the City of Forsyth does not collect impact fees. Mr. Nelson also informed the Commission that on September 2 in a City Council work session concerning the same proposal, city staff was asked to request the Middle Georgia Regional Commission review the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Nelson stated that upon review, Mr. Greg Boike and Mr. Alex Smith of MGRC recommend the proposed zoning classification be called a PUD-M for Multi-Use and added as a subsection of the current PUD article, and the current PUD classification be amended to PUD-R for Residential. A PUD-C (commercial) and PUD-I (industrial) could also be added in the future. It was also recommended to remove the acreage limitation listed in the proposed article in addition to adding two objectives, (1) to establish application

requirements more rigorous than that of zoning applications and conditional use permits, and (2) to ensure that different building forms are interrelated and architecturally harmonious. The proposed article 12 table of uses could also be removed since uses within a PUD would be conditional by nature and proposed by the applicant and subject to the approval of the city. MGRC also recommended the procedural steps from the current PUD section be used for permit approval.

Mr. Nelson also provided two example Multi-Use PUD categories, one from Warner Robins and one from Macon-Bibb.

Mr. Coleman asked what was discussed in the City Council work session. Mr. Nelson stated that Mr. Hanna gave a presentation similar to the one he provided in the previous Planning and Zoning meeting, then Councilmembers asked questions and the City Attorney questioned if the zoning could be construed as spot zoning before the council asked if a third party could review the proposed article, leading to Mr. Goolsby's suggestion that staff reach out to MGRC to review the article.

Mr. Clarke asked for clarification on impact fees. Mr. Causey replied that the city has not adopted the Development Impact Fee Act (DIFA), which allows local governments to charge impact fees for the burden development would have on infrastructure. If City Council were to adopt DIFA, the city could enter into development agreements.

Mr. Clarke asked what would offer the city more protection. Mr. Nelson opined that charging impact fees and entering into development agreements would protect the city more.

Mr. Clarke, Mr. Coleman, and Mrs. Rowland discussed if impact fees would make housing less affordable. Mr. Pennington stated that the current cost per square foot for a standard home is a minimum of \$130 excluding property.

Mr. Clarke discussed traffic and the need for a bypass.

Mr. Nelson explained that with the PUD rezoning, the applicant would need to show consistency with the comprehensive plan, appropriateness for land use, buildings will have to have harmonious architecture, and the uses will have to meet certain percentages dictated by the city.

Mrs. Rowland asked about the PUD on Juliette Road being rezoned without a time limit and then sold before development. Mr. Coleman stated that when the property was purchased the PUD zoning was inherited. Mr. Nelson made the board aware of Andrea Goolsby's appeal of the annexation and rezoning of the parcel.

Mr. Clarke inquired about removing the acreage requirement. Mr. Causey stated that MGRC's recommendation stemmed from the desire to avoid creating a zoning classification for one person, or only a select number of people.

Mr. Coleman stated that there is often an acreage limitation on PUD zoning. Mr. Nelson stated that there is not currently an acreage minimum on the city's PUD district.

The board discussed the current PUD's use requirements.

Mr. Causey stated that rezoning is usually done by parcel.

Mr. Pennington asked about the parcel count for the H & H property. Mr. Nelson stated that it is 16 or more different parcels.

Mr. Clarke and Mr. Coleman discussed the current agricultural zoning of the property.

Mr. Coleman stated that he thinks the PUD classification is a good idea, and that he wants to ensure the city has control and input when the 1,630 acres is developed.

Mr. Causey stated that every district the city has would be viable in the proposed Multi-Use classification.

Mr. Coleman stated that with PUD-M, everything would be conditional.

Mr. Pennington asked why MGRC recommended table 12.1 and 12.2 be removed. Mr. Nelson explained that all uses would be conditional in a PUD, and instead something like 8.4 would be used to give percentages.

Mr. Nelson stated that Mixed-Use would not be parcel based after the entirety of the property is zoned that way, but a PUD-M would remain parcel based.

Mr. Coleman stated that he believes the request for the Multi-Use zoning category is for marketing purposes when Mr. Hanna begins to find developers for the property. He stated residential will probably be closer to Forsyth, commercial on Johnsonville Rd., and Industrial in the middle.

Mrs. Rowland asked about criteria for creating a PUD-M. Mr. Nelson stated that a section similar to 8.4 would need to be created, and if the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Board was to deny the Article as proposed, they could also recommend that the current PUD category be amended to PUD-R and then the Regional Commission be contacted to assist in the creation of a PUD-M category.

Mr. Causey clarified that the creation of an entirely new district for a landowner would set a precedent. Mr. Nelson and Mr. Clarke agreed.

Mr. Causey and Mr. Nelson discussed if the requester would withdraw their request if the Planning and Zoning Commission offered the recommendation to deny the request and create a new PUD district instead. Mr. Nelson stated he believed the requester would still complete the process and have the public hearing before City Council.

Mr. Causey explained the deadline and process for the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation, stating that a decision must be made in the September 22 meeting and the report provided to City Council two or three days after the meeting.

Mr. Coleman stated that he prefers the PUD-M classification.

Mrs. Rowland stated that if they recommend denying the request and creating a PUD-M instead, the board does not have a draft to show the requester or the council.

Mr. Nelson, Mr. Causey, and Mr. Clarke recommended reviewing PUD-M zoning districts of other cities. Mr. Nelson stated that if the council accepts the recommendation to create a PUD-M, and a draft could be provided at a later date.

The Board discussed some examples of PUD zoning districts.

Mr. Nelson discussed spot zoning.

Mr. Clarke stated that the city needs to distance itself from what was requested to avoid setting a precedent.

Mrs. Rowland asked if City Council could still approve the proposal if the Planning and Zoning Board did not recommend it. Mr. Coleman said yes. Mr. Causey stated that the council may accept, reject, or edit the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Nelson described how he writes his reports regarding the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mrs. Rowland stated that she will not be able to attend the Planning and Zoning meeting on September 22.

Mr. Causey stated that the City Council will be able to review Planning and Zoning's recommendations before the City Council meeting.

Mr. Coleman asked that all board members review the materials and research before the Planning and Zoning meeting on September 22.

Mr. Causey discussed the PUD districts in Tifton.

#### **IV. Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:29 p.m.