



Coweta County Board of Commissioners

22 East Broad Street
Newnan, GA 30263
www.coweta.ga.us

Public Hearing/Regular Meeting Session

Minutes

Shannon Zerangue
Fran Collins
770.254.2601

December 16, 2025

6:00 PM

**Commission Chambers
37 Perry Street
Newnan, GA 30263**

Coweta County Board of Commissioners

Roll Call/Call to Order

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Bill McKenzie	District 2 - Chairman	Present
John Reidelbach	District 4 - Vice Chairman	Present
Jeff Fisher	District 1	Present
Bob Blackburn	District 3	Present
Alphonso Smith	District 5	Present
Michael Fouts	County Administrator	Present
Kelly Mickle	Assistant County Administrator	Present
Sandy Wisenbaker	Assistant County Administrator	Present
Tod Handley	Public Works Administrator	Present
Nathan Lee	County Attorney	Present
Fran Collins	Deputy County Clerk	Present

The Honorable Board of Commissioners of Coweta County, Georgia met in Public Hearing/Regular Meeting Session on Tuesday, December 16, 2025.

Meeting Called to Order

Chairman McKenzie called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman McKenzie led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Invocation

Invocation was given by Commissioner Smith.

Notification of Location of Rules

Chairman McKenzie explained that the rules governing the meeting could be found on the County's website as well as on the table located in the lobby outside the meeting room.

Announcements and Comments from the Commissioners

Chairman McKenzie called for any announcements and/or comments from the Board.

Chairman McKenzie wished all in attendance a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. He reminded everyone that this is the season of giving and asked everyone to dig deep into their heart to see if they can be of help to a neighbor in need.

Regular Session

Awards and Presentations

1. Presentation from the Coweta County 4-H Club

County Extension Coordinator Stephanie Butcher expressed appreciation to the Board for their continued support and funding for the 4-H program. She introduced 4-H member Rosie Rich from Brooks Elementary School, who presented a synopsis of her project regarding ocean pollution.

County Extension Coordinator Butcher and Miss Rich presented the Board with a box of goodies as a token of their appreciation.

Chairman McKenzie expressed appreciation to Ms. Butcher for all she does for the Extension Office and 4-H program.

Approval of Minutes

2. Request Approval of the Minutes from the Public Hearing/Regular Meeting Session Held on December 4, 2025

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to approve the minutes from the Public Hearing/Regular Meeting Session held on December 4, 2025.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Bob Blackburn

SECONDER: John Reidelbach

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Supplemental and Non-Agenda Items

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to approve the addition of two (2) Non-Agenda items for discussion.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: John Reidelbach

SECONDER: Bob Blackburn

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Public Hearing (The Chairman will call for any comments regarding the following items after each item is presented)

3. **Public Hearing Regarding Petition # REZ 25-09 Filed by Robert Matteri, Kathryn Lannin, and Carole Matteri Requesting to Rezone Property Located at 296 Fischer Spur Road, Hudgens Road, and Palmetto Tyrone Road, Newnan - District 4**

Zoning Associate Nicole Blackwell explained that prior to tonight's meeting, staff received a request from applicant representative Steven Jones to withdraw Petition # REZ 25-09 filled by Robert Matteri, Kathryn Lannin, and Carole Matteri requesting to rezone property located at 296 Fischer Spur Road, Hudgens Road, and Palmetto Tyrone Road, Newnan [Parcel # 130-6082-001 (partial)] from *RC (Rural Conservation)* to *RC w/LDGS Point Exemption (Rural Conservation with Land Development Guidance System Point Exemption)*. Mr. Jones has also requested that the Board waive the 6-month waiting period as required in the *Code of Ordinances* prior to reapplication.

Commissioner Reidelbach noted that if the Board chooses to allow withdrawal of the application, the applicant would have to pay fees associated with filing a new application because of the amount of work staff has already performed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smith, Mr. Steven Jones, applicant representative, explained that the applicant requests to withdraw the rezoning application because of a recommended condition associated with the improvement and realignment of Hudgens Road. The applicant wishes more time to discuss and work on that condition with staff.

In response to questions from Commissioner Smith, Administrator Fouts explained that the *Code of Ordinances* does not allow an applicant to withdraw on the day of the Public Hearing. However, such action can be requested by an applicant. If not approved, the Public Hearing will have to continue tonight. He also explained that it is staff's preference

that the applicant be allowed to withdraw as opposed to continuing the Public Hearing for thirty (30) days because it may not be adequate time to resolve the issue. Currently, the *Code of Ordinances* allows for an applicant to withdraw a rezoning petition a minimum of seven (7) days prior to a Public Hearing. However, from time to time, the Board has allowed an applicant to withdraw within that time frame, depending upon the circumstances.

Motion to: Approve Withdrawal by Applicant

The Board voted to approve withdrawal of Petition # REZ 25-09 filed by Robert Matteri, Kathryn Lannin, and Carole Matteri requesting to rezone property located at 296 Fischer Spur Road, Hudgens Road, and Palmetto Tyrone Road, Newnan [Parcel # 130-6082-001 (partial)] from *RC (Rural Conservation)* to *RC w/LDGS Point Exemption (Rural Conservation with Land Development Guidance System Point Exemption)* as requested by the applicant prior to the meeting and to waive the 6-month waiting period to reapply.

RESULT: Passed (4-1)

MOVER: John Reidelbach

SECONDER: Bob Blackburn

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn

NAYES: Al Smith

4. **Public Hearing Regarding a Proposed Amendment to Chapter 58 - Signs of the Coweta County Code of Ordinances**

Zoning Manager Lisa Eschman explained that *Chapter 58 - Signs, Section 58.6 - General Provisions. item (h) Movement and Animation* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances* currently reads “(h) Movement or animation. No sign or part of a sign shall rotate, oscillate, or otherwise move or change in appearance more than one time in a 24-hour period, except letters or numbers that are not greater than 12 inches in height and do not have a display area greater than two square feet which may change no more than one time every 15 seconds.” and that staff is proposing an amendment to delete item (h) in its entirety. She further explained that staff has recently received numerous requests from businesses and churches for greater flexibility to update their signage to in-motion messaging to advertise or communicate upcoming events beyond what is currently permitted by the ordinance. The proposed amendment is intended to address these requests while maintaining compliance with all other provisions of the *Sign Ordinance*. In closing, she requested that the Board consider deleting item (h) *Movement and Animation* of the *Coweta County Sign Ordinances* in its entirety.

Chairman McKenzie called for comments in support of or in opposition to the proposed amendment. There were none.

Chairman McKezie called for any additional comments from staff. There were none.

Motion to: Close the Public Hearing

The Board voted to close the Public Hearing regarding a proposed amendment to *Chapter 58 - Signs, Section 58.6 - General Provisions*. item (h) *Movement and Animation* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances*.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Bob Blackburn

SECONDER: Jeff Fisher

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute an amendment to *Chapter 58. Signs, Section 58.6 - General Provisions* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances* to delete item (h) *Movement and Animation* in its entirety.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Jeff Fisher

SECONDER: Bob Blackburn

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

5. Continuation of a Public Hearing Regarding Proposed Amendments to Appendix A. Zoning and Development of the Coweta County Code of Ordinances Associated with Data Centers

Chairman McKenzie announced that the issue tonight is not associated with the rezoning for "Project Sail". Tonight's Public Hearing is regarding proposed amendments to *Appendix A. Zoning and Development* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances* associated with data centers.

Community Development Director Ben Sewell explained that on May 7, 2025, the Board enacted a moratorium on new applications for data center projects that was set to expire on November 3, 2025. Following that action, staff researched and drafted a few versions of a proposed zoning ordinance amendment, which the Board considered at various Public Hearings throughout the year. In addition to the typical Public Hearings required for ordinance amendments, the Board held Work Sessions on July 22, 2025, October 16, 2025, and held a special Public Hearing at the County Fairgrounds on September 11, 2025. As the process continued, it required that the Board extend the original moratorium to December 4, 2025, and then again to December 17, 2025 (tomorrow). At the November 18th Public Hearing, staff requested direction from the Board regarding any changes they desired to the proposed ordinance. The areas of concern that the Board identified were development standards (maximum height), infrastructure (roads), buffering, screening, utilities verification, and decommissioning. In an effort to gain a consensus, the Board charged staff to obtain individual feedback from the Board regarding the areas of concern.

To achieve this in a documentable way, staff generated a survey for the Board to complete regarding their individual thoughts on each of the areas of concern. Staff then utilized the Board's responses to generate the revisions being presented tonight.

Mr. Sewell further explained that after reviewing the survey results, staff understood that the consensus of the Board was to leave the building structure height limitation to sixty (60) feet while allowing an additional ten (10) feet for parapet walls and rooftop equipment, not to exceed seventy (70) feet total. Regarding infrastructure, staff understood that the consensus of the Board was to remove the road classification requirement and revert to the existing zoning standards listed in *Article 18 - LM Light Industrial District* and *Article 19 - M Industrial District*, which permit industrial development off arterial and major collector streets or within industrial parks having access to such streets. Regarding buffering, staff understood that the majority of the Board did not wish to further adjust the 300-foot buffer requirement. Regarding screening of equipment, staff understood that it was the Board's desire to strengthen the language to state that all mechanical equipment, emergency generators, substations, and appurtenances shall be screened from view from any public right-of-way or adjoining property zoned for or used for residential purposes and that the screening shall be a minimum of 8-feet high consisting of fence, wall, and/or vegetative berm providing a minimum opacity of 95%. He noted that formerly, this section only applied to equipment between the buildings and the road, but now it applies to all visible equipment. Regarding utility verification, staff understood that the Board desired to simplify the ordinance language while at the same time verifying that essential utilities, including power and water and sewer, would be available at the site. Staff proposed new language to specify that as part of the rezoning petition or at the time of the land disturbance permit (if already zoned), the applicant shall provide a letter of intent to serve the proposed project from the applicable utility provider(s), confirming that preliminary coordination has occurred and that service to the proposed project is feasible subject to final engineering. Regarding decommissioning, he explained that with the understanding that many data center sites will likely be selected within industrial parks where repurposing will likely supersede decommissioning, the majority of the Board desired to handle decommissioning by enacting zoning conditions specific to the site selected rather than addressing it within the ordinance. Regarding enforcement provisions of noise limitations, staff understood the Board's desire to include language that acknowledges that staff may first issue written notice of noise violations. Such written notice is not a necessary condition precedent to enforcement of the ordinance and that should noise infractions be a continuing nuisance, legal remedies will ultimately be sought against operators. In closing, he explained that the latest draft (November 26th) was published on the County's website on Tuesday, December 2nd for public review.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Sewell explained that when another developer that was utilizing solar panels violated the ordinance regarding visibility from the highway, staff made the developer comply with the ordinance.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smith, Mr. Sewell explained that the County's Code Enforcement Officers are the County's first line of defense for zoning ordinance-related matters. The current code enforcement policy is complaint-driven or as directed by the Board of Commissioners. If the Board wishes staff to take a different approach regarding data centers, they can do so.

Chairman McKenzie called for comments in support of the proposed amendments to the *Coweta County Zoning and Development Ordinance* associated with data centers.

The following individuals spoke in support of the proposed *Data Center Ordinance* and data centers. They commended the Commissioners for the time taken to consider public input and for developing a well-thought-out draft ordinance that they believe is fair to all parties. Speakers stated that the ordinance adequately addresses concerns related to noise, safety, privacy, and on-site power generation timelines. They emphasized the need for a balanced tax base that includes residential, commercial, and industrial revenue, noting that the cost of providing public services often exceeds the tax revenue generated by residential development. They highlighted that Coweta County and the State of Georgia are experiencing rapid growth and that future population growth alone will not generate sufficient tax revenue to fund needed services, particularly education. They asserted that data centers are in the best interest of all citizens, that a majority of residents support both data centers and the ordinance, and urged the Commissioners not to delay decisions on the ordinance or related projects. Several speakers noted that the modern economy, democracy, and way of life rely on data and artificial intelligence, which they believe should remain under the control of American companies, making domestic infrastructure development essential. They described data centers as a generational opportunity to create substantial tax revenue that could help future generations of Coweta County residents afford to remain in the community. It was stated that one or two data centers could generate tax revenue comparable to the County's current budget while creating minimal population growth.

Additional comments characterized data centers as large warehouse-style facilities with land-use impacts comparable to or less than distribution centers. Speakers referenced the State's role in addressing power rates through the Public Service Commission and noted Georgia Power's estimates that residential rates will decrease. They further stated that the proposed ordinance prohibits open-loop cooling systems and that building size limits, noise standards, and significantly expanded buffer requirements address many citizen concerns. Any remaining issues, they suggested, could be addressed on a case-by-case basis depending on site conditions. Speakers cautioned against over-regulation and emphasized that managed growth is necessary to generate revenue, jobs, and overall welfare for the citizens of Coweta County.

- Mr. Dennis McEntire, Brookside Drive, Newnan

- Mr. Jason Peace, District 3
- Mr. Steven Jones, Atlanta
- Mr. Isaac Melson, Powell Place, Newnan
- Ms. Maggie McMahon, Heard County
- Mr. Alejandro Golumba, Fair Oaks Court, Newnan
- Mr. Ron Bockrath, Boone Road, Newnan

During their respective allotted time, Ms. McMahon and Mr. Bockrath spoke in support of the proposed ordinance. However, they expressed opposition to the ordinance and to data centers. They requested stricter requirements for rural lands proposed for rezoning for data centers and raised concerns about potential environmental impacts, including groundwater, air quality, and personal health. They stated that additional research is needed, requested an extension of the moratorium, asserted that the current draft ordinance does not adequately protect residents, and contended that the noise restrictions are insufficient. They also noted that information available on Facebook should have been considered by the Commissioners.

Chairman McKenzie called for comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the *Coweta County Zoning and Development Ordinance* associated with data centers.

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the proposed *Data Center Ordinance* and data center development, citing concerns including the weakening of ordinance restrictions, erosion of public trust, and the lack of a transparent and credible tax revenue analysis. Speakers emphasized that their opposition is not anti-business, but rather pro-process, pro-transparency, and pro-citizen. They called for the restoration of previously removed protections and urged long-term responsibility in decision-making. Multiple speakers noted that recent revisions to the ordinance represent a step backward, particularly regarding building height limits, placement along arterial roads, buffer requirements, and enforcement of noise violations. They raised concerns about undefined environmental impacts, the absence of provisions for electrical grid expansion or upgrades, and the lack of decommissioning plans. Several urged the Board to delay approval, noting that recent changes appear tailored specifically to accommodate "Project Sail". They argued that each data center proposal should be evaluated on its individual merits and that a broad ordinance is unnecessary. Concerns were also raised about "Project Sail's" proposed location on a recharge zone and its inconsistency with Coweta County's 20-year Comprehensive Plan, which prioritizes preserving community character, livability, sustainable infrastructure, resource stewardship, community-driven planning, environmental resilience, and green space protection. Speakers asserted that the ordinance conflicts with these foundational pillars, prioritizes corporate efficiency over community well-being, and favors development at the expense of long-term quality of life. The decision was framed as one that will shape the future of the county and affect the people who live here. Speakers described data centers as extractive developments that

consume local energy, water, and land resources for the benefit of distant corporations. They warned that promised economic benefits are misleading, citing minimal permanent job creation, profits flowing out of the community, and what some characterized as “digital colonization.” Additional concerns included increased noise from cooling systems, heavy truck traffic, and declining quality of life. Financial concerns focused on limited tax revenue during the construction phase, with meaningful returns not projected until 2036. Speakers referenced growing statewide opposition to data centers, worries about long-term obsolescence, escalating energy demands driven by AI workloads, and uncertainty about future viability. Speakers emphasized that the Board serves as the gatekeeper of local development and should prioritize residents over developers. They called for transparency regarding long-term tax benefits and short-term exemptions, renewable energy commitments, strict enforcement of zoning standards, water usage limits, and noise controls. They also urged the negotiation of community benefit agreements that ensure job creation, infrastructure improvements, and equitable revenue sharing. Lastly, speakers stated that citizens do not want data centers and warned that approving the ordinance would abandon the will of the people. They urged accountability, careful consideration of long-term consequences, protection of land and quality of life, and encouraged decision-makers to discern the truth and do what is right for the community.

- Mr. Rob Cole, District 5
- Mr. Jimmy Newman, District 2
- Mr. Tim Ryan, District 3
- Ms. Misty Caballero, District 3
- Mr. C.J. Caballero, District 3
- Mr. Spencer Lewis, Newnan
- Mr. Alan Brady, Barrington Overlook, Newnan

Chairman McKenzie called for any additional comments from staff. There were none.

Administrator Fouts explained that the twenty (20) minutes (per side) outlined in the rules governing Commission meetings had expired and there were nine (9) additional individuals that were signed up to speak in opposition.

Following a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Board that equal time had been provided (support and opposition) as outlined in the rules governing the meeting, and they chose not to extend the time for additional speakers.

Motion to: Close the Public Hearing

The Board voted to close the Public Hearing regarding proposed amendments to the *Coweta County Zoning and Development Ordinance* associated with data centers.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Bob Blackburn

SECONDER: John Reidelbach

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Commissioner Reidelbach explained that the Board has spent nearly a year developing a *Data Center Ordinance*. Throughout this process, the Board and staff have held multiple Public Hearings and Work Sessions and have conducted extensive research. Approval of the *Data Center Ordinance* would not make it final; applicants would still be required to appear before the Board, and project-specific conditions could be imposed. Additionally, ordinances can be revised over time to improve both the process and the benefits to the community.

Chairman McKenzie explained that this version of the draft ordinance incorporates the changes requested by the Board, and that the decision on the ordinance will be determined by a majority vote.

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute amendments to *Appendix A. Zoning and Development of the Coweta County Code of Ordinances* associated with data centers.

RESULT: Passed (4-1)

MOVER: Alphonso Smith

SECONDER: Jeff Fisher

AYES: John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

NAYES: Bill McKenzie

Regular Session

Public Comments Regarding Items On the Agenda - This is also time for anyone that wishes to address the Board regarding cases heard at the Public Hearing conducted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Chairman McKenzie called for comments regarding any items on the agenda.

- Mr. Scott Seccuro, owner of Lot 1 Bears Bend Subdivision, explained that he is the applicant for Petition # VAR 25-23 (agenda item # 6) requesting a front yard setback variance for Lot 1 located in the Bears Bend Subdivision. He displayed photographs of several homes located in the Bears Bend Subdivision and explained that many of the grandfathered lots shown are located within the required 300-foot setback. He explained that he has a hardship because of the topography of his lot and that the placement of his home would sit below the crest of a hill. If a variance is not granted, he will have to bring in approximately 700 truck loads of

dirt to locate the home behind the required setback.

- Ms. Susan Bowen, Bear Creek Road, Moreland, explained that she lives on Bear Creek Road and represents other residents that live there. She further explained that the variance requested by Mr. Seccuro (agenda item # 6) is the second time that an owner of this Lot has approached the Board for a setback variance. When the developer designed the lots in the subdivision, they failed to consider the topography and buildability of this Lot. The issue is not a hardship but that of a developer that failed to do their due diligence and is not being held accountable.
- Mr. Phil Town, Bear Creek Road, Moreland, explained that he and Ms. Bowen represent numerous families that live on Bear Creek Road and requested that the Board deny the variance requested by Mr. Seccuro (agenda item # 6).

Recommendations from Community Development and/or the Board of Zoning Appeals

6. Recommend Denial of Petition # VAR 25-23 Filed by Scott and Kimberly Seccuro Requesting a Front Yard Setback Variance for Property Located off Bear Creek Road, Lot 1 in the Bears Bend Subdivision, Moreland - District 2

Zoning Manager Eschman presented Petition # VAR 25-23 filed by Scott and Kimberly Seccuro requesting a front yard setback variance for Lot 1 located in the Bears Bend Subdivision, Moreland (Parcel # 128-1070-001) along with a recommendation of denial from the Board of Zoning Appeals. She explained that the property consists of 7.29± acres and is zoned *RC (Rural Conservation)* under *EL-A (Estate Lot Averaging)* district. The intent of the *EL-A (Estate Lot Averaging)* zoning district is to allow for single-family residential developments to have a conventional lot layout that allows for varying lot sizes and substantial front setback requirements in order to preserve the rural aesthetic along the county roadways. A key feature of the *EL-A (Estate Lot Averaging)* development requires a 300-foot minimum front setback along the right-of-way. This substantial setback is designed to preserve the rural character and maintain visual aesthetics along the roadway. The applicants purchased the property in March 2025 and have intentions of constructing a single-family residence. According to the submitted site plan, the proposed home would be located approximately 200 feet from Bear Creek Road. Therefore, the applicants are requesting a 100-foot front yard setback reduction (from 300-feet to 200-feet) along Bear Creek Road. She further explained that previous Petition # VAR 23-31 filed by Todd Freeman Builders and Edwin and Edith Byers (previous property owners) requesting 150-foot front setback reductions (from 300-feet to 150-feet) for Lot 1 and Lot 8 was denied by the Board on January 23, 2024.

In response to questions from Commissioner Reidelbach, Community Development Director Sewell explained that staff does not have a way to notify a prospective buyer of a

previous denial of a variance. However, setbacks are clearly noted on the plat, any prospective buyer can see that, and plats are on record with the Clerk of Superior Court.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smith, Mr. Sewell explained that the topography of lots is not shown on the final plat.

Administrator Fouts also explained that the final plat that is recorded contains a signature from the developer signifying that they understand the ordinances at the time of recording. The developer took a large piece of land and subdivided it to meet requirements of the ordinances at the time.

In response to questions and comments from Commissioner Smith, Chairman McKenzie explained that in 2024, the Board denied a previous variance request for Lot 1 and Lot 8. However, the new owner of Lot 8 was able to construct their residence and meet the required front setback (300-feet).

Ms. Eschman pointed out on an overhead view of the plat the Lots the developer planned and included in Bears Bend Subdivision, including Lot 1 and Lot 8.

Administrator Fouts pointed out that the applicant referenced other properties that do not require a 300-foot setback and those properties were developed under *RC (Rural Conservation)* zoning not *RC (Rural Conservation)* under *EL-A (Estate Lot Averaging)*, which is a different zoning altogether and has different setbacks. Those homes are not in the same subdivision, but are on the same road. He also explained that this zoning classification was developed very specifically for the rural portions of the county, and the developer received density credits for developing in this style. In addition, there was strict adherence to guidelines such as the setbacks, and those had to be a 300-foot setback from the main road. The setback from the actual easement is different, which is why some of the other homes sit closer to the easement but not the main road into the development, which is an important distinction.

Commissioner Smith expressed his belief that this request sounds like a situation that needs some type of remedy or grace. It would not harm or have any effect on his neighbors where his house is located on his seven acres. The applicant simply does not want to build his house on the other side of a hill.

In response to questions from Commissioner Fisher, Administrator Fouts explained that Lots 1 and 8 were not split from each other. They are and have been individual Lots. The original variance application in 2023 included Lots 1 and 8. After that, the developer/builder constructed a home on Lot 8 in compliance with the required 300-foot setback. He also explained that the subdivision has a Homeowners Association (HOA).

Commissioner Fisher pointed out that the applicant should have discovered the required

setback during purchase of the property, and that under the HOA, the people who have already bought and built in the subdivision have a reasonable expectation of what else is to be built.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smith, Chairman McKenzie explained that, in his opinion, the community is affected because everyone else had to follow the ordinance. He does not consider the applicant as having a definite hardship to change and allow him to build his house 100 feet in front of his neighbors.

Ms. Susan Bowen, Bear Creek Road, Moreland explained that reducing the setback would set a precedent and that the owner of Lot 8 had to comply with the ordinance. In addition, on the other side of the road leading into the Bear Creek Subdivision there is a large tract that could be developed and have road frontage. If this variance is granted, they too will be asking the Board for front setback variances. It could also affect the values of the properties located along Bear Creek Road.

Commissioner Fisher asked if the subject property would be unbuildable if the variance is not granted. He also questioned granting a 50-foot setback reduction rather than 100 feet.

Commissioner Reidelbach explained that the other Lots in the subdivision have had to comply with the County's ordinances, and granting the setback reduction would set a precedent for other undeveloped lots in the neighborhood and the surrounding area.

In response to a question from Chairman McKenzie, Commissioner Smith expressed his belief that the applicant does have a hardship because he cannot construct a home at the apex of the hill on the Lot.

Chairman McKenzie pointed out that the only thing that has changed with the subject property since 2023 is the owner.

Mr. Scott Seccuro, applicant, explained that in 2023, Todd Freeman (developer) asked for a 150-foot front yard setback variance, which was the maximum that he could ask for at the time. Now, he (Mr. Seccuro) has reduced that to 100 feet in an effort to protect the community and try to reach a compromise on where his home can be built.

Mr. Phil Town, Bear Creek Road, Moreland explained that when the subdivision was first developed, Todd Freeman put it together with the anticipation that the Board would allow the variance. In other words, they had an architect come in and design this specifically so that the owners of Lots 1 and Lot 8 would ask the Board for a variance and the Board would grant the variance to those two lots because they couldn't get it going through the normal zoning process. So, by granting a front setback reduction, the Board will open that same kind of thinking up to every developer along Bear Creek Road. The residents of Bear Creek Road are requesting that the Board follow the County's ordinances, and not to grant

a variance because they think it is the right thing to do because it's an obscure case. This obscure case is going to be used as a precedent for every developer along Bear Creek Road.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Community Development Director Sewell explained that the developer was aware of the required setbacks. The subject property is a buildable lot, even if the topography may not be optimal to some people, but a house can be situated on this lot.

Administrator Fouts explained that Public Works Director Handley pointed out that the topography on Lot 8 may be worse than the topography on the subject property.

Attorney Lee explained that the ordinance requires a demonstration of hardship. An example of which would be that they could not build on the property, but they can.

Chairman McKenzie called for any further discussion. There was none.

Motion to: Deny

The Board voted to deny a 100-foot front yard setback reduction (from 300-feet to 200-feet) for Lot 1 located in Bears Bend Subdivision, Moreland (Parcel # 128-1070-001) as requested in Petition # VAR 25-23 filed by Scott and Kimberly Seccuro.

RESULT: Passed (4-1)

MOVER: Bill McKenzie

SECONDER: Bob Blackburn

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn

NAYES: Alphonso Smith

7. Request Direction from the Board Regarding Condition # 7 Associated with Previous Petition # REZ 24-10 Filed by Chris Cott for Property Located at 4237 East Highway 34, Sharpsburg - District 1

Zoning Associate Blackwell explained that at the Commission meeting held on December 17, 2024, the Board voted to rezone 4.43± acres located at 4237 East Highway 34, Sharpsburg (Parcel # 133-6101-003) from *RC (Rural Conservation)* to *C-3 (Commercial Retail)* as requested in Petition # REZ 24-10 filed by Chris Cott, subject to twelve (12) conditions. Condition # 7 requires that a Land Disturbance Permit (LDP) be obtained within a 12-month period and as of today, a land disturbance has not been issued. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a six-month extension. Civil engineering plans were previously submitted to the County for formal review and County staff provided red line comments. The extension will allow time to complete revisions, resubmission of plans, and to obtain a land disturbance permit. At this time, staff is seeking direction from the Board regarding the request for an extension.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Assistant Community Development Director Teresa Crow, explained that revisions were sent to the applicant, the applicant completed the first round of reviews which resulted in forty (40) comments from County staff, so they were not eligible for the express pass. The applicant will have another 21-business day review period for the second submittal. If the quality control is better, the applicant should receive a fast pass for the third submittal. However, the process will take several more months.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Kip Oldham, applicant representative, explained that the process is taking a little longer than expected, and they will be ready to resubmit plans after the 21-business day review cycle.

Motion to: Set a Public Hearing

The Board voted to set a Public Hearing on December 15, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. regarding possible rezoning of 4.43± acres located at 4237 East Highway 34, Sharpsburg (Parcel # 133-6101-003) from *C-3 (Commercial Retail)* back to *RC (Rural Conservation)* associated with Condition # 7 of previous Petition # REZ 24-10 filed by Chris Cott, thereby granting the applicant a 12-month extension to obtain a Land Disturbance Permit (LDP).

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Jeff Fisher

SECONDER: John Reidelbach

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Unfinished Business

8. Request Appointments to Various Boards/Authorities

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to appoint Reverend Jeremy Bryant to serve as an At-Large representative to the Board of Directors of the Department of Family and Children's Services to fill the unexpired term of Reverend Steve Cothran which expires June 30, 2027.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Alphonso Smith

SECONDER: John Reidelbach

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

New Business

Bids and Contracts

9. **Request Approval/Execution of an Easement Agreement with Georgia Power Associated with Expansion of the Electrical Distribution Network at Leroy Johnson Park - District 1**

Public Works Director Handley explained that the expansion at Leroy Johnson Park to add baseball fields, tennis courts, pickleball courts, and associated buildings such a restroom and pavilion requires an expansion of the electrical distribution network at the park. In order to expand the electrical network to the newly developed areas of the park, Georgia Power requires an easement for the installation and maintenance of their lines.

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute an Easement Agreement with Georgia Power associated with expansion of the electrical distribution network at Leroy Johnson Park.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Jeff Fisher

SECONDER: John Reidelbach

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

10. **Bid Award Associated with Turn Lane Construction and Sight Distance Improvement on Tommy Lee Cook Road (RB23.4) - District 3**

Public Works Administrator Handley explained that bids were solicited for a construction project to improve the sight distance (including the addition of left turn lanes) on Tommy Lee Cook Road at its intersection with Cedar Ridge Road. A portion of the work is in conjunction with a development agreement with the developer of Serenbe and Chattahoochee Hills. He noted that a large portion of the project cost, \$588,597, will be reimbursed by the developer. Bids were received from seven (7) contractors, with Southeastern Site Development, Inc. submitting the lowest and best bid in the amount of \$753,758.50.

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute a contract with Southeastern Site Development, Inc. to construct a left turn and perform sight distance improvements at Tommy Lee Cook Road and Cedar Ridge Road at a total cost of \$753,758.50 (RB23.4).

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Bob Blackburn

SECONDER: Jeff Fisher

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

11. **Request Approval/Execution of an Agreement with True Natural Gas for Calendar Year 2026**

Assistant Administrator Mickle explained that staff is requesting that the Board execute an agreement with True Nature Gas to provide natural gas service for calendar year 2026 at a rate of 0.479 per therm for a period of twelve (12) months.

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute an agreement with True Natural Gas to provide natural gas service for Calendar Year 2026 at a rate of 0.479 per therm for a period of twelve (12) months.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: John Reidelbach

SECONDER: Bob Blackburn

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Additional Action Items

12. Request Approval/Execution of a Resolution to Set Qualifying Fees for Various Elected Offices

Assistant Administrator Mickle presented qualifying fees for the calendar year 2026 elections, explaining that the fees have been calculated based upon state law.

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute a resolution to set the following qualifying fees for calendar year 2026:

- County Commissioner: \$360
- Board of Education: \$342
- State Court Judge: \$4,814

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Bob Blackburn

SECONDER: Bill McKenzie

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Supplemental and Non-Agenda Items

13. Request Approval to Temporarily Close a Portion of Martin Mill Road for the Purpose of Replacing a Cross Drain Pipe - District 2

Public Works Administrator Handley explained that staff discovered a failing cross drain pipe located between addresses 363 and 393 Martin Mill Road that needs to be replaced. Staff will need to temporarily close the roadway between these addresses for a period of two (2) days, weather permitting, and will place message boards for the traveling public prior to closure.

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to temporarily close Martin Mill Road between addresses 363 and 393 for a period of two (2) days, weather permitting, for the purpose of replacing a failing cross drain pipe.

RESULT: (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Bill McKenzie

SECONDER: Bob Blackburn

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

14. Request Approval to Waive Fees at the Landfill as Requested by the Daughters of the American Revolution

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to waive fees at the C&D Landfill on Saturday, January 3, 2026, for the purpose of disposing wreaths utilized by the Daughters of the American Revolution during the Wreaths Across America ceremony at Oak Hill Cemetery.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Bob Blackburn

SECONDER: Jeff Fisher

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Public Comments Regarding Items Not on the Agenda – This section is for any public comments regarding items NOT on the agenda. In accordance with the rules governing the meeting, up to 10 speakers will be afforded 3 minutes to speak and will be respectfully heard by the Board without public display or approval/disapproval from the audience. The Board does not engage with speakers during their comments. The Board will listen to any questions or comments and take them into consideration but will ask the County Administrator or staff to correct any inconsistencies or false statements after the speaker has been heard without debate.

Chairman McKenzie called for comments regarding any items not on the agenda. He explained that in accordance with the rules governing the meeting, up to ten (10) speakers will be afforded three (3) minutes to speak and will be respectfully heard by the Board without public display or approval/disapproval from the audience. The Board does not

engage with speakers during their comments. The Board will listen to any questions or comments and take them into consideration but will ask the County Administrator or staff to correct any inconsistencies or false statements after the speaker has been heard without debate.

The following citizens addressed the Board regarding their opposition to "Project Sail" citing misleading information from County Administrator Fouts, taxation without representation, failure to help the citizens of Coweta County, the embarrassment of having some of the Commissioners representing them, and a future lawsuit against the Board and the County should "Project Sail" be approved.

- Mr. Ron Bockrath, Boone Road, Newnan
- Ms. Cathy Smith, Creekview Drive, Newnan

Executive Session - In accordance with O.C.G.A. § 50-14-2

Motion to: Enter into Executive Session

The Board voted to enter into Executive Session for the purposes of discussing personnel, real estate, and litigation issues.

Members in attendance included Chairman McKenzie, Commissioner Blackburn, Commissioner Reidelbach, Commissioner Smith, and Commissioner Fisher. Staff members in attendance included Administrator Fouts, Assistant Administrator Mickle, Assistant Administrator Wisenbaker, Public Works Administrator Handley, Attorney Lee, and Deputy County Clerk Collins.

Community and Human Resources Director Patricia Palmer was also in attendance.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: John Reidelbach

SECONDER: Bob Blackburn

AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Regular Session

**** Commissioner Fisher exited Executive Session prior to discussion of a litigation matter, citing a potential conflict of interest and did not return to Regular Session. ****

Motion to: Return to Regular Session

The Board discussed personnel, real estate, and litigation issues during Executive Session and voted to return to Regular Session.

RESULT: Passed (4 to 0)

MOVER: John Reidelbach
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith
ABSENT: Jeff Fisher

Affidavit

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute an Affidavit and Resolution for Executive Session.

RESULT: Passed (4 to 0)
MOVER: John Reidelbach
SECONDER: Bill McKenzie
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith
ABSENT: Jeff Fisher

Adjournment

Motion to: Adjourn

The Board voted to adjourn the meeting.

RESULT: Passed (4 to 0)
MOVER: John Reidelbach
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith
ABSENT: Jeff Fisher