



Board of Zoning Appeals

www.coweta.ga.us

Public Hearing

Minutes

Lisa Eschman
770.254.2635

January 29, 2026

6:00 PM

Commission Chambers - 37
Perry Street, Newnan

Board of Zoning Appeals

Roll Call/Call to Order

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Lisa Mitchum	District 1 - Chairperson	Present
Billy Cranford	District 4 - Vice-Chairperson	Present
Mike Yeager	District 2	Present
Russell Berry	District 3	Present
Dee Crouch	District 5	Present
Ben Sewell	Community Development Director	Present
Lisa Eschman	Zoning Manager	Present
Nicole Blackwell	Zoning Coordinator	Present
Rebekah Graham	Community Development Clerk	Present

The Coweta County Board of Zoning Appeals conducted a Public Hearing on Thursday, January 29, 2026.

Chairperson Mitchum called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Chairperson Mitchum explained that the rules governing the meeting could be located on the County's website and on the table in the lobby outside the meeting room.

Chairperson Mitchum explained that the Board of Zoning Appeals serves as a recommending board to the Coweta County Board of Commissioners. She informed everyone that the Board of Commissioners will consider all of tonight's cases for a final decision on Tuesday, February 17, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

Beginning of Year Business

1. Beginning of the Year Appointments for Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

Motion to: Elect a Chairperson

The Board voted to elect Lisa Mitchum to serve as Chairperson of the Board of Zoning Appeals for calendar year 2026.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Billy Cranford

SECONDER: Russell Berry

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

Motion to: Elect a Vice-Chairperson

The Board voted to elect Billy Cranford to serve as Vice-Chairperson of the Board of Zoning Appeals for calendar year 2026.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Mike Yeager

SECONDER: Dee Crouch

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

2. Adoption of the Rules Governing the Coweta County Board of Zoning Appeals Meetings

Motion to: Adopt

The Board voted to adopt the current rules governing the Board of Zoning Appeals meetings (previously adopted on February 1, 2025).

Coweta County Board of Zoning Appeals Rules and Procedures

The following rules are designed to promote a fair and open process for the Board of Zoning Appeals Public Hearings.

Section 1 - GENERAL

1.1 The location of the Rules Governing the Public Hearings will be announced at the beginning of each meeting.

1.2 The Board of Zoning Appeals will follow *Robert's Rules of Order*.

Section 2 – OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

2.1 MEETINGS

2.1.1 Public Hearings of the Coweta County Board of Zoning Appeals are scheduled, recurring meetings of the Board of Zoning Appeals to review all variances and conditional use applications.

Section 3 – QUORUM

Any three (3) board members of the district Board of Zoning Appeals shall constitute a quorum for any meeting of the Coweta County Board of Zoning Appeals.

3.1 Adjournment Upon Absence of Quorum at Commencement of Meeting – If a quorum is not present thirty (30) minutes following the scheduled hour of convening, the Chair or Vice-chair may adjourn the meeting.

3.2 Adjournment Upon Loss of Quorum During Meeting – If during the meeting there ceases to be a quorum, all business must stop, except that the Board, may:

- a. Adjourn and return at the next regular meeting; or
- b. Recess to determine if a quorum will be present within a short period of time.

Section 4 – MINUTES

4.1 Contents of Minutes – All recommendations of the Board of Zoning Appeals, shall be accurately recorded by the Clerk (or his/her designee) in the minutes, which shall include:

- a. All motions, or stipulations;
- b. The name of the maker of all motions;
- c. Disposition of all motions, whether:
 - 1. Adopted;
 - 2. Defeated;
 - 3. Referred to committee or to staff for further information or recommendation;or
- 4. Deferred/Tabled until a date and time certain
- d. How each Board Member voted; and
- e. Comments as deemed necessary
- f. Public comments

4.2 Adoption and Correction of Minutes Attestation – The minutes of each Board of Zoning Appeals meeting shall be approved/adopted by the Board at the next subsequent Regular Board of Zoning Appeals meeting.

Section 5 – AGENDA

A. An agenda for the Public Hearings of the Coweta County Board of Zoning Appeals will be prepared by the Community Development Staff and will be available to the Board of Zoning Appeals no later than close of business on the Friday preceding the meeting.

B. The agenda for all meetings shall be made available to the public no later than twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting.

Section 6 – VOTING

All votes shall be taken by electronic vote, show of hand, or verbal pronouncement. Formal voting on Board matters will ordinarily occur during a Public Hearing.

6.1 Effect of Approval/Denial – An affirmative majority vote shall be required to adopt a motion unless otherwise noted in this document. If a motion to recommend approval of an item is defeated by the vote, the vote does not constitute an affirmative recommendation of denial of the item. Instead, a motion to recommend denial should immediately follow to bring closure to the item. Likewise, if a motion to recommend denial is defeated by the vote, the vote does not constitute an affirmative recommendation of approval of the item. Instead, a motion to recommend approval should immediately follow to bring closure to the item.

6.2 Tie Vote – A tie vote on a motion shall keep the motion as pending before the Board and the motion shall be rescheduled for another time.

Section 7 – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Coweta County Board of Zoning Appeals welcomes citizens and visitors to Board meetings and is willing to hear any person or persons desiring to appear before the Board during the time set aside for public comments that concern the services, policies, or affairs of Coweta County in accordance with the following rules.

Any member of the public engaging in disruptive behavior that interferes with the Board of Zoning Appeal's ability to conduct business, including but not limited to applause, cheers, jeers, interruption of other speakers, etc., may, after warning, be subject to removal from the meeting.

7.1 Public Comments – Each person wishing to provide public comment in writing shall deliver such public comment to the Community Development Department no later than noon on the day of the meeting. A written public comment must contain the name, address, and contact information (email address and/or phone number) for the person submitting it. Any written public comment received after the noon deadline will not be included in the agenda packet and there is no guarantee that such comments will be considered.

7.2 Manner of Addressing the Board of Zoning Appeals – All persons shall address the Board of Zoning Appeals in the following manner:

- a. State his/her name and address;
- b. The speaker shall be required to state:
 - i. Whether he/she is speaking for himself/herself or for another;

- ii. If he/she represents an organization or represents a policy established by an organization or governing body and whether he/she is being compensated by the person(s) for whom he/she speaks;
 - iii. Whether he/she or any member of his/her immediate family has a personal interest in the pending matter.
- c. The following content is prohibited:
 - i. Campaigning for public office;
 - ii. Promoting private business;
 - iii. Using profanity, vulgar language or gestures, fighting words, or slander which is disruptive to the meeting;
 - iv. Comments directed to an individual which are not related to the official duties (such as performance, conduct, or qualifications) of an official or staff member of Coweta County.

7.3 Directing of Comments — All remarks shall be directed to the Board of Zoning Appeals Members as a body and addressed through the Chair, not toward the public or staff. Remarks shall not be made to a particular Board Member.

7.4 Questions by Board of Zoning Appeals — Questions from the Board of Zoning Appeals may be asked for clarification. However, no person shall be allowed to enter any discussion, either directly or through a member of the Board of Zoning Appeals, without permission of the Chair.

7.5 Public Hearings — Persons wishing to address the Board of Zoning Appeals during Public Hearings will be heard. Prior to speaking, each speaker shall sign up to do so prior to the start of the meeting. Each speaker will be called to address the Board on a first-come basis. No prior reservations shall be taken for these spots.

- a. In addition to the presentation by Community Development, an applicant or his/her representative shall be allotted a total of ten (10) minutes for their presentation, including time for rebuttal. Speakers other than the applicant or his/her representative shall sign up to speak separately, will be allotted a maximum of three (3) minutes, and will be called to address the Board based upon the order in which they signed up to speak prior to the start of the meeting. The time allotted for these speakers will not count toward the applicants' ten (10) minutes.
- b. Each speaker will be allotted a maximum of three (3) minutes. Proponents and opponents of a particular item shall be afforded a maximum of twenty (20) minutes (per side).
- c. Said time limit per person may be lengthened or shortened for a given speaker, or for seven (7) all speakers on a given matter, or for all speakers in a given meeting, by a majority vote of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

8.0 ADOPTION/AMENDMENTS

Following adoption of the rules governing the Board of Zoning Appeals meetings, the rules may be amended by a majority vote of the Board of Zoning Appeals following a duly advertised Public Hearing. Provided that notice has been given of the amendment(s) at the meeting prior to the vote on the amendment(s).

SO ADOPTED IN LAWFULLY ASSEMBLED, OPEN SESSION AFTER PUBLIC NOTICE AS PROVIDED BY GEORGIA LAW, THIS 29th DAY OF JANUARY 2026, TO BECOME EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 1, 2026.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Dee Crouch

SECONDER: Mike Yeager

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

3. **Request Approval to Set Meeting Dates and Times for Calendar Year 2026 and the Beginning of 2027**

Motion to: Set Meeting Dates and Times

The Board voted to set the following meeting dates and times for calendar year 2026 and the beginning of 2027:

- February 26, 2026 (Fourth Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- March 26, 2026 (Fourth Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- April 23, 2026 (Fourth Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- May 21, 2026 (Third Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- June 25, 2026 (Fourth Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- July 23, 2026 (Fourth Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- August 27, 2026 (Fourth Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- September 24, 2026 (Fourth Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- October 22, 2026 (Fourth Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- November 19, 2026 (Third Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- December 17, 2026 (Third Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.
- January 28, 2027 (Fourth Thursday) at 6:00 p.m.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Mike Yeager

SECONDER: Dee Crouch

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

Approval of Minutes

4. **Request Approval of the Minutes from the Public Hearing Held on December 18, 2025**

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to approve the minutes from the Public Hearing held on Thursday, December 18, 2025.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Russell Berry

SECONDER: Billy Cranford

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

Petitions

5. **Public Hearing Regarding Petition # VAR 25-30 Filed by Sam Bowers Requesting a Barn Setback Variance for Property Located on Sid Hunter Road, Senoia - District 1**

Zoning Coordinator Blackwell presented Petition # VAR-30 filed by Sam Bowers requesting a barn setback variance for property located on Sid Hunter Road, Senoia (Parcel # 127-1074-001A). She explained that the subject property consists of 32.8± acres, zoned *RC (Rural Conservation)*. She further explained that the applicant is requesting a variance to allow for placement of a barn measuring 60-feet by 52-feet. As proposed, the barn will sit 25-feet from the property line and although the applicant owns the adjacent property closest to the proposed barn, a variance is required pursuant to *Article 7, Section 72, Item 4(a)* of the *Coweta County Zoning and Development Ordinance* which requires the barn to be located at least 100-feet from all property lines and 200-feet from any existing off-site residential dwelling. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a barn setback reduction of 75-feet (from 100-feet to 25-feet) from the property line adjoining his home site property. In closing, she reviewed the factors considered by staff during the application process.

Ms. Blackwell highlighted the following factors for consideration in reviewing the variance request:

1. Barns are common within the *RC (Rural Conservation)* zoning district and support non-commercial agricultural uses consistent with the rural character of the area.
2. The adjacent home site is under common ownership; the barn setback will only impact the applicant's property.

Ms. Blackwell explained that should the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend approval of the request, the Community Development Department submits the following condition for consideration:

1. The barn shall be located a minimum of 25-feet from the property line adjoining the applicant's adjacent home site, as shown on the site plan submitted with the variance application.

Chairperson Mitchum asked if there were any questions from the Board for staff. There were none.

Chairperson Mitchum asked if the applicant was present.

Mr. Sam Bowers, applicant, explained that the proposed variance request is to avoid placing the new barn in the middle of his field. He would like to build the new barn near an existing barn.

Chairperson Mitchum called for any comments in support of or in opposition to the proposed variance request. There were none.

Motion to: Close the Public Hearing

The Board voted to close the Public Hearing regarding Petition # VAR 25-30 filed by Sam Bowers requesting a barn setback variance for property located on Sid Hunter Road, Senoia (Parcel # 127-1074-001A).

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Dee Crouch

SECONDER: Russell Berry

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

Motion to: Recommend Approval

The Board voted to recommend that the Board of Commissioners grant a 75-foot barn setback reduction (from 100-feet to 25-feet) for property located on Sid Hunter Road, Senoia (Parcel # 127-1074-001A) as requested in Petition # VAR 25-30 filed by Sam Bowers, subject to the following condition:

1. The barn shall be located a minimum of 25-feet from the property line adjoining the applicant's adjacent home site, as shown on the site plan submitted with the variance application.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Mike Yeager

SECONDER: Dee Crouch

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

6. Public Hearing Regarding Petition # VAR 25-22 Filed by Yamaha Motor Manufacturing Company dba DHL Supply Chain (USA) Requesting an Exterior Architectural Standards Variance for Property Located at the Northeast Intersection of Interstate Way and Hwy 34 E, Newnan - District 3

Zoning Manager Lisa Eschman presented Petition # VAR 25-22 filed by Yamaha Motor Manufacturing Company [doing business as DHL Supply Chain (USA)] requesting an exterior architectural standards variance for property located at the northeast intersection of Interstate Way and Hwy 34 East, Newnan [Parcel # 097-5078-001 (partial)]. She explained that the subject property consists of 51.352± acres, zoned *M (Industrial)*, with a portion of the property lying within the Highway 34 East *Quality Development Corridor District (QDCD)*. She further explained that the subject property has been zoned *M (Industrial)* since the adoption of the *Coweta County Zoning and Development Ordinance* in 1969. DHL Supply Chain (USA) proposes to construct a 784,700 square-foot building, approximately 60 feet in height, to be used as a parts distribution facility serving Yamaha's nearby manufacturing operations. The proposed warehouse square footage triggered a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review (# 4423). She also noted that the *Quality Development Corridor District (QDCD)* requires enhanced architectural standards. Specifically, each exterior elevation must consist of a minimum of 80% Category A materials (brick, stone, glass) and no more than 20% Category B materials (stucco, exterior insulation finish system [EIFS], fiber cement board). According to the applicant, the required exterior architectural standards are costly, inefficient, and not typically used for warehouse construction. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a variance to reduce the Category A materials and allow the following alternative exterior materials:

North Building Elevation:

- 97.7% - Painted Tilt Wall Panels - (Requesting Allowance)
- 2.3% - Glazing - (Reduction of 78% from required Category A material)

South Building Elevation:

- 78.5% - Painted Tilt Wall Panels - (Requesting Allowance)
- 7.7% - Aluminum Composite Panels (ACM) - (Requesting Allowance)
- 13.8% - Glazing - (Reduction of 67% from Category A material)

East Building Elevation:

- 88.5% - Painted Tilt Wall Panels - (Requesting Allowance)
- 1.3% - Aluminum Composite Material (ACM) – (Requesting Allowance)
- 7.5% - Metal Roll-up Doors – (Painted to match adjacent wall color)

- 2.7% - Glazing - (Reduction of 78% from required Category A material)

West Building Elevation:

- 88.4% - Painted Tilt Wall Panels - (Requesting Allowance)
- 1.3% - Aluminum Composite Material (ACM) – (Requesting Allowance)
- 8.0% - Metal Roll-up Doors - (Painted to match adjacent wall color)
- 2.6% - Glazing - (Reduction of 78% from required Category A material)

Ms. Eschman further explained the proposed plans to mitigate the visual impacts associated with reduced Category A materials and the use of alternative exterior materials. The applicant is proposing to plant approximately 800 trees to screen the building from public view along Interstate Way and SR 34, incorporating enhanced architectural elements along the building facade facing Highway 34, and installing a curvilinear driveway entrance from Highway 34 to reduce the visual presence of the site and loading areas.

She highlighted the following factors for consideration in reviewing the variance request:

1. The building's large size (784,700 square feet) and requested 60-foot height may limit effective visual screening at the Interstate Way/SR 34 intersection within the Hwy 34 East *Quality Development Corridor District (QDCD)* and could set a precedent for future development.
2. The Board should consider whether the request to reduce the required exterior architectural standards and/or allow alternative exterior materials is justified by hardship as the ordinance requires.

In closing, Ms. Eschman explained that should the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend that the Board of Commissioners approve the variance request, the Community Development Department submits the following six (6) conditions for consideration:

1. The developer shall permit the proposed right-in-right-out access point through the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), with the placement of the access point at the point recommended and approved by GDOT.
2. The developer shall construct dedicated left turn lanes on the approaches of Interstate Way and Lakeside Way to SR 34, modify the traffic signal to accommodate the addition of the left turn lanes and add Flashing Yellow Arrow operations for the left turn movements. All transportation improvements within the rights-of-way (ROW) of the Georgia Department of Transportation and Coweta County must be permitted and approved by the respective agency. The addition of the left turn lane on the Interstate Way approach to SR 34 will

require the dedication of additional ROW from the development tract and may require relocation of utilities along the side streets. The transportation improvements shall be completed prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the project.

3. The applicant shall comply with all conditions set forth in Attachments A, B, and C of DRI # 4423, Notice of Decision.
4. The building shall be consistent with and not materially deviate from the architectural plans and renderings submitted with the application in materials, percentages and colors.
5. The applicant shall install a curvilinear drive entrance from Hwy 34, as depicted on the site plan submitted with the variance application.
6. As depicted on the landscape plan submitted with the variance application, the applicant shall install a minimum of 800 trees to screen the building from view. All trees along Hwy 34 and Interstate Way shall meet the required buffer plantings under *Article 25 of the Coweta County Zoning and Development Ordinance*.

In response to a question from Vice-Chairperson Cranford regarding the setback off Highway 34 East, Ms. Eschman confirmed the setback requirements to be 135 feet from the centerline outside the right-of-way.

In response to a question from Chairperson Mitchum regarding the proposed entrance locations along Interstate Way and Highway 34 East, Community Development Director Ben Sewell explained that the proposed variance request relates to the exterior building materials. He further explained that any direct access off Highway 34 East will require approval from the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT). However, based on the traffic study, the proposed curvilinear design of the drive off Highway 34 East will not accommodate typical tractor-trailer traffic.

In response to a question from Vice-Chairperson Cranford regarding the proposed blue, gray, and white colors of the building's front elevation, Ms. Eschman stated that DHL's typical colors are indeed yellow and red.

Chairperson Mitchum asked if the applicant was present.

Applicant Steve Hess from DHL Supply Chain located in Dublin, Ohio, addressed the Board. He stated that he has been working with staff for the better part of the year and the staff has been cooperative, concise and informative. He then requested clarification regarding condition # 3.

Zoning Manager Eschman explained that condition # 3 is related to the DRI (Development of Regional Impact) Notice of Decision (# 4423).

Mr. Hess explained that the east and north-facing walls are shielded by woods. The primary focus has been the south and west-facing walls. His team has done their best to screen these walls with extensive landscaping. Otherwise, they have no issue with the conditions presented. He then asked if the Board had any questions for his team.

In response to a question from Board Member Yeager regarding the access drive to the north, Mr. Hess confirmed that access will be the truck entrance and exit. Interstate Way and Highway 34 East are for car entrance and exit only.

Chairperson Mitchum called for any comments in support of or in opposition to the proposed variance request. There were none.

In response to questions from Board member Crouch and Chairperson Mitchum regarding the proposed landscaping to be utilized for screening purposes and the existing mature trees, Community Development Director Sewell explained that it is hard to predict how the screening will look when planted since the topography of the site will change significantly, so the final grade, size and position of the trees up and down the slope is what will potentially screen the building. He further explained that it is important to note that the building is very large compared to the surrounding commercial buildings. He added that the applicant has done the best they can by proposing to plant a significant number of trees, but it's difficult to predict if the proposed trees can screen a building 60 feet in height. The building will be most visible along Highway 34 East coming from Fayetteville into Newnan.

In response to a question from Vice-Chairperson Cranford regarding whether there is a minimum-finished floor elevation, Mr. Bob McCann with Haines Gipson & Associates, a member of the applicant's civil engineering team, stated that the proposed elevation is 718 feet. The entrance along Highway 34 East has an elevation of 705 feet, and the building will sit approximately 10–15 feet higher than the entrance. He further explained that the reason they are proposing a curvilinear drive is to also help screen the building from the roadway.

Motion to: Close the Public Hearing

The Board voted to close the Public Hearing regarding Petition # VAR 25-22 filed by Yamaha Motor Manufacturing Company [dba DHL Supply Chain (USA)] requesting an exterior architectural standards variance for property located at the northeast intersection of Interstate Way and Hwy 34 East, Newnan [Parcel # 097-5078-001 (partial)].

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Billy Cranford

SECONDER: Dee Crouch

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

Chairperson Mitchum stated that as the ordinance is written, there is no hardship. There have been other corporations that have been constructed in the *QDCD* and have maintained the *QDCD* requirements. Therefore, she feels that approving this variance request will set a huge precedent.

In response to questions from Vice-Chairman Cranford, Zoning Manager Eschman explained that the *QDCD* is 1,000 feet from the right-of-way line of Highway 34 East and indicated on a map where half of the building is located within the *QDCD*.

Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that he agrees with Chairperson Mitchum regarding the importance of the *QDCD* overlay district, and that approving this request would set a precedent. However, he is a fan of trying to give businesses some relief if possible while still protecting the County from any future liability.

In response to a question from Board member Yeager, Community Development Director Sewell explained that the Orchard Hills development on Highway 16 East may not be physically located within that *QDCD*, but that development had a zoning condition that required them to meet *QDCD* standards, and then they sought relief from those requirements.

Community Development Director Sewell explained that the *QDCD* districts are protective architectural and landscaping districts along a lot of the major corridors in the county. Since adoption of the *QDCD* districts, there have been times, via a condition of zoning, that the Board of Commissioners would require *QDCD* standards on properties that were not physically in a *QDCD* corridor. He further explained that the Highway 34 corridor was the first and preeminent *QDCD* corridor.

Community Development Director Sewell also noted that the largest warehouse located off Campus Drive and Highway 16 East is not located within a *QDCD* corridor. The corridor ends just where the former Orchard Hills clubhouse used to be at the old golf course.

Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that because of the precedent that would be set by approving this request and because of the need to protect the County from any liability, he believes that any portion of the building within the *QDCD* should be required to meet the Category A materials. However, he expressed that the Board could give the applicant some relief on the portion of the building that is not physically located within the *QDCD*. He further stated that he is confident that the applicant's design team could marry *QDCD* standards and non-*QDCD* standards into an aesthetically pleasing building.

Community Development Director Sewell explained that there are other buildings in the county that straddle a *QDCD* corridor, so the portion outside a *QDCD* corridor does not have to meet those standards.

Board member Berry expressed his agreement that the *QDCD* is important and that what the applicant is proposing is different from the existing old architecture such as aluminum and tin previously used on warehouses.

Vice-Chairman Cranford explained that the Board of Zoning Appeals is tasked with protecting the County and, based upon the current ordinance, the applicant does not have a hardship that warrants a variance. However, the Board can recommend that the Board of Commissioners provide relief on the portion of the building that is located outside the *QDCD*.

In response to Board member Crouch, Vice-Chairman Cranford explained that he believes the applicant's design team can figure out how to successfully address the wrap-around challenge for the building's facade.

In response to a question from Board member Berry, Vice-Chairman Cranford explained that he would recommend that the applicant must meet *QDCD* standards on the portion of the building that is located within the *QDCD* and then transition to other building materials on the portion(s) of the building not located within the *QDCD*.

In response to a question from Chairperson Mitchum, Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that if the applicant has to meet the *QDCD* standards on the portion of the building within the *QDCD*, then there may not be a need for as many plantings to buffer/screen the building based upon the ordinance.

In response to a question from Chairperson Mitchum, Community Development Director Sewell explained that the *QDCD* ordinance does not require buffering from the road. A landscape strip containing ornamental overstory and understory trees typical of a commercial development is required.

Chairperson Mitchum and Vice-Chairman Cranford explained that if the applicant meets the *QDCD* standards on the portion of the building located within the *QDCD* it would mitigate the need to plant 800 trees.

Chairperson Mitchum and Vice-Chairman Cranford briefly reviewed the six (6) conditions proffered by Community Development and proposed removing the following conditions:
4. The building shall be consistent with and not materially deviate from the architectural plans and renderings submitted with the application in materials, percentages and colors.

6. As depicted on the landscape plan submitted with the variance application, the applicant shall install a minimum of 800 trees to screen the building from view. All trees along Hwy 34 and Interstate Way shall meet the required buffer plantings under *Article 25* of the Coweta County *Zoning and Development Ordinance*.

In response to a question from Vice-Chairman Cranford, Mr. Scott Shelton from Piper O'Brien Architects, explained that it is very difficult to tie two different types of construction together. The proposed building is approximately 52 feet to the top of the parapet and placing brick that high is not very common, even with some high-rise buildings. Using brick on a building that is 52–60 feet in height is very economically challenging. When designing the building, his team was under the impression that by providing the 800 trees as screening it would be a mitigation measure to prevent passersby from necessarily seeing the building.

In response to Chairperson Mitchum, Mr. Shelton stated that it is very difficult to completely obscure the building from view, but there will be a lot of mature trees that will remain along Highway 34. In addition, behind that, a 20-foot of landscape strip of new plantings, which includes part of the 800 trees along Highway 34, will be installed and then wrap along Interstate Way. So, by planting the 800 trees, at an enormous cost to the applicant, that is how the design team is trying to mitigate the *QDCD* requirements of Class A materials for the building.

Chairperson Mitchum re-emphasized that granting the applicant's request would set a precedent for future applicants/cases.

In response to a question from Vice-Chairperson Cranford regarding the proposed facade of the building, Mr. Shelton explained that there is more glazing on the building than is typically seen on large warehouses. With a building of this size and scale, it's more common to see fewer design elements than presented in the renderings for the proposed building. He further explained that at the beginning of the design process, he wondered if the *QDCD* standards were meant for a different type of industrial park, such as one that contained one to two-story buildings with 10 to 30 different tenants. This building will serve a single tenant.

In response to a question from Vice-Chairman Cranford, Ms. Eschman explained that Class A Materials include brick, stone, and glass.

Mr. Shelton explained that tilt wall construction does offer some options when it comes to using form liners to give the building the appearance that another material was used. Using brick on a building of this scale would look out of place. The proposed design is more than what would normally be designed for a building of this scale.

Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that the rendering of the building is a nice design. However, the Board of Zoning Appeals is tasked with determining if a hardship exists in accordance with the ordinance and there does not appear to be a hardship in this case. He has been trying to offer options that would provide the applicant with some relief while still complying with the *QDCD* standards.

Mr. Shelton proposed the use of a form liner to give the appearance of brick and questioned whether that would be acceptable. He reiterated that the challenge is the scale of the building and that the use of brick on a building of this size will not look as nice as the one that is being preferred by the applicant.

Community Development Director Sewell explained that the Board of Commissioners has previously denied the use of Quik-Brik which is a concrete block material that is made to look like brick. However, staff has never assessed the use of a brick form liner.

In response to a question from Mr. Shelton, Community Development Director Sewell explained that should the variance be denied, and the proposed building meet the *QDCD* requirements, there would be no requirement for the additional trees.

Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that the Board of Zoning Appeals must determine if there is a hardship that would warrant a recommendation of approval or determine if the applicant can proffer a potential compromise that could be presented to the Board of Commissioners for consideration. It does not appear that there is a solution that can be determined tonight.

Mr. Hess, applicant, explained that there are a number of reasons why brick is not used on these types of buildings, including design perspectives, maintenance perspectives, and drainage perspectives.

In response to a question from Mr. Hess, Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that economic feasibility is not considered to be a hardship.

Vice-Chairman Cranford reiterated that he was hoping to be able to work through the issue, but it does not appear that a solution/compromise will be reached tonight.

In response to a question from Chairperson Mitchum, Ms. Eschman explained that the Lou Sobh Kia dealership that is located within the *QDCD* was granted a variance to utilize aluminum composite material (ACM) along with brick.

In response to a question from Mr. Hess, Vice-Chairperson Cranford confirmed that the current Yamaha manufacturing plant predates adoption of the *QDCD* overlay district.

Community Development Director Sewell explained that the front of the Yamaha plant is physically located within the *QDCD*, but it greatly predates the establishment of the *QDCD*. This *QDCD* corridor was adopted in 2003 and Yamaha has been in existence since the late 1980s.

Board member Yeager agreed that the proposed building design is very nice and agreed

that brick, stone, or glass (Class A materials) would be needed mostly on the south elevation.

In response to a question from Board member Crouch about the applicant's options, Chairperson Mitchum stated that the Board of Zoning Appeals could vote to deny the variance request and the Board of Commissioners, having the final decision, could decide differently.

Community Development Director further explained that the applicant would not have to withdraw the application. They could present an alternative to the Board of Commissioners for consideration. If they withdraw the application, they would be required to resubmit a new application and proceed through the variance process again. He also explained that staff will present the Board of Zoning Appeals' recommendation at the Commission meeting.

Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that between this meeting and the final decision by the Board of Commissioners, the applicant will have an opportunity to devise an alternate plan to present to the Board of Commissioners for consideration.

Community Development Director Sewell explained that staff will be presenting the Board of Zoning Appeals' decision to the Board of Commissioners. The Public Hearing regarding this applicant is being conducted tonight by the Board of Zoning Appeals. Therefore, at the beginning of the Commission meeting, the applicant will have three (3) minutes to address the Board regarding items that are on that agenda (in accordance with the rules governing Commission meetings).

Mr. Shelton explained that if the County is only looking for the aesthetic of brick, then a form liner will provide that.

In response to a question from Mr. Shelton, Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that relief has been given in the past regarding the use of aluminum composite material (ACM).

In response to a comment from Mr. Shelton that they plan to utilize ACM on the proposed building, Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that the ACM is unrelated to the requirement that Class A materials be used. The Kia dealership was granted an allowance to use ACM along with brick.

Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that he does not see how a solution could be reached tonight and suggested that the applicant consider figuring out how to marry ACM with brick (on the portion of the building that is within the *QDCD*).

Mr. Shelton reiterated that the use of brick on the proposed building is not feasible. Form liners are a great option and from a distance, you cannot tell that form liners are not

actually brick. He is trying to determine whether the intent of the *QDCD* is to have the aesthetic look of brick or whether actual brick is required.

Vice-Chairperson Cranford explained that the Board of Zoning Appeals did not author the *QDCD* ordinance and cannot speak to its intent.

Motion to: Recommend Denial

The Board voted to recommend that the Board of Commissioners deny Petition # VAR 25-22 filed by Yamaha Motor Manufacturing Company [dba DHL Supply Chain (USA)] requesting an exterior architectural standards variance for property located at the northeast intersection of Interstate Way and Hwy 34 East, Newnan [Parcel # 097-5078-001 (partial)].

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Billy Cranford

SECONDER: Lisa Mitchum

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

Additional Business

Zoning Manger Eschman explained that the next Board of Zoning Appeals meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 26, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

Adjournment

Motion to: Adjourn

The Board voted to adjourn the meeting.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)

MOVER: Russell Berry

SECONDER: Dee Crouch

AYES: Dee Crouch, Lisa Mitchum, Russell Berry, Billy Cranford, Mike Yeager

Read, approved, and adopted this 26th day of March 2026

Chairperson

ATTEST: _____
BOZA Clerk

