

REZ-2026-02 Bullard Property, 7270 Old Valdosta Rd., 1ac, E-A to R-1, Well & Septic

County Planner, J.D. Dillard, presented the item. Mr. Dillard stated this rezoning request represents a change in zoning on the subject property from E-A (Estate Agricultural) to R-1 (Low Density Residential) zoning, in order to bring the lot and its allowable uses into conformity. The subject property possesses road frontage on Old Valdosta Road, a county-maintained local road and is within the Rural Service Area and Agricultural Forestry Character Area. Mr. Dillard stated the applicants have hired a surveyor to properly locate the parcel boundaries around the existing house, and the TRC recommended approval for R-1 zoning to be able to apply the ULDC to its current uses and future land uses. The Planning Commission also recommended approval of the request for R-1. No one spoke for or against this request. Vice Chairman Orenstein made a motion to approve this request, seconded by Commissioner Evans. All voted in favor, no one opposed. Motion carried.

REZ-2026-03 Villanueva Property, 6201 Union Rd., 6ac, E-A to C-G, Well & Septic

County Planner, J.D. Dillard, presented the item. Mr. Dillard stated this case represents a change in zoning on a 6.0 acre property from Estate-Agricultural (E-A) zoning to General Commercial (C-G) zoning. The main motivation for the request is to allow for a proposed office and storage facility on the subject property for an existing business. Mr. Dillard further stated the subject property is largely open, with a large pond centrally located on the property, over top of a natural gas pipeline and a County Sewer Forcemain. The subject property possesses road frontage on Union Road, a County Maintained Major Collector, with typical traffic flow capacity between 3,000 and 6,000 traffic count on Union Road per day, and ~460' of visibility from I-75 with a typical traffic flow in excess of 57,600 per day. Mr. Dillard stated TRC staff recommended approval of the request for C-G zoning with the following conditions: 1.) A minimum 10' buffer shall be required along the eastern edge of the property along Union Rd. Breaks in the buffer to allow for ingress/egress along Union Rd are allowed. The construction of the buffer is allowed to be done concurrent with development of the property. All other buffer standards shall be governed by the Landscaping, Buffers, and Tree Protection Sections of the ULDC (4.07.00) e.g. types and amount of landscaping, the ability to utilize existing vegetation, maintenance, etc. and 2.) No clubs, lodges, meeting or event facilities, alcohol package stores, or gasoline stations (with or without a convenience store) are allowed on the subject property. Mr. Dillard stated the Planning Commission recommended the addition to condition one, that states the existing fence along the western property line abutting I-75, shall be consistent with the color, materials, and design of buildings in the surrounding area. The condition was modified and recommended for approval 8-0, as well as condition two, that states, no clubs, lodges, meeting or event facilities, alcohol package stores, or gasoline stations (with or without a convenience store) are allowed on the subject property. No one spoke for or against this request. Vice Chairman Orenstein asked if the 10 foot buffer only pertains to the Union Road side. Mr. Dillard responded correct, that is staff's recommendation. Mr. Dillard went on to say that Commercial Zoning next to Residential or Agricultural Zoning has natural buffers built in, so this is in addition. Lowndes County does not typically buffer common roadways, but given Franks Creek Storage and Union Springs both have landscape buffers along Union Road, staff believes it is appropriate to require a 10 foot buffer along Union road as well. Vice Chairman Orenstein asked if the applicant installed any of the fencing on the property. Mr. Dillard stated he believed the front portion of the fencing was installed by the applicant. Vice Chairman Orenstein asked if there is a corridor overlay on I-75. Mr. Dillard responded no. Commissioner Marshall asked Chairman Slaughter to elaborate on his concern about the color of the fencing and how it might possibly be addressed in the motion. Chairman Slaughter stated he would say that the issue with the colors of the fencing should be stricken. Vice Chairman Orenstein stated he understands and appreciates the concerns of the Planning Commission and he also agrees that we do not need to get into design standards or one parcel at a time. Vice Chairman Orenstein stated these things should be