Coweta County Board of Commissioners

Public Hearing/Regular Meeting Session

Minutes

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

Shannon Zerangue
County Clerk
770.254.2601

May 19, 2026 **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
Alphonso Smith	District 5 - Vice Chairman	Present
Jeff Fisher	District 1	Present
Bob Blackburn	District 3	Present
John Reidelbach	District 4	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
Shannon Zerangue	County Clerk	Present
Autumn Payne	Deputy County Clerk	Present

The Honorable Board of Commissioners of Coweta County, Georgia met in Public Hearing/Regular Meeting Session on Tuesday, May 19, 2026.

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. There were none.

Regular Session

Awards and Presentations

1. **Request Approval of the Fiscal Year 2025 Final Budget Amendments**

Finance Director Hans Wilson explained that the County's Fiscal year 2025 revenue and expenditures have been closed and audited and that the proposed final budget amendments to the General Fund, Fire Fund, American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) fund, Sheriff's Program Fund, DATE Fund, E-911 Fund, Library System Fund, Solid Waste Authority Fund, EMS Fund, Transit Fund and Opioid Settlement Funds are recommended for approval.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Wilson explained that this information is available to the public on the County's website.

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to approve the Fiscal Year 2025 final budget amendments for the General Fund, Fire Fund, American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) fund, Sheriff's Program Fund, DATE Fund, the E-911 Fund, Library System Fund, Solid Waste Authority Fund, EMS Fund, Transit Fund and Opioid Settlement Funds as presented by staff.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bob Blackburn
SECONDER: Jeff Fisher
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

2. **Presentation of the 2025 Audited Financial Statements by Nichols, Cauley & Associates**

Mr. Greg Chapman, Audit Partner with the CPA firm of Nichols, Cauley & Associates, presented the Fiscal Year 2025 audit results and the 2025 Coweta County Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR). He expressed appreciation for the opportunity to be of service to the County, the Board of Commissioners, and the citizens of Coweta County. He explained that the objective of the audit is to provide reasonable assurance that the basic financial statements, which are the responsibility of the County's management, are free from material misstatement. The audit is performed in accordance with the Generally Accepted Auditing Standards in the United States of America (GAAS) and Government Auditing Standards (GAS). The results of the FY 2025 audit show that assurance based on the financial statements. His firm is also in the process of completing a report on a single audit which the County is required to go through as a recipient of federal funding. The American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) program has received the most funding in the last few years and is being audited. They are anticipating an unmodified or "clean" opinion for the major federal program tested in accordance with Title 2 U.S. CFR Section 200 (Uniform Guidance). He noted that the County's Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) goes above and beyond the minimum requirements of generally accepted accounting principles, and Coweta County has received its sixteenth (16th) consecutive GFOA certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting, with only thirty-six (36) other counties in Georgia receiving this award for 2024.

He highlighted the General Fund Revenues and explained that total revenues were just over $115 million and expenditures, including transfers out, were just over $117 million, which resulted in a net decrease in fund balance of $1.1 million. The year began with a net position of $26.6 million and ended with a net position of $25.4 million. He explained that property taxes make up about 40.4% of revenues, Local Option Sales Tax (LOST) about 22% and title ad valorem tax (TAVT) about 10% and insurance premum taxes about 3%. Breaking down general fund expenditures, he explained that the majority of the budget, or 43.3%, goes to public safety, which is in line with what other counties spend. Judicial (courts) expenditures make up 11.5%, and 18.6 % for general government (Administration, Finance, IT, Elections, Assessor, Tax Commissioner, etc.). The County currently has approximately eighty-six (86) days of fund balance. The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) recommends at least sixty days. He explained that the importance of maintaining a strong fund balance included periods of economic uncertainty, cash flow operations without short-term borrowing, significant emergencies (2021 tornado), unanticipated expenditures, and better interest rates on debt issuance. In closing, he pointed out there are required communications, including a letter his firm provided to the Board that summarizes some disclosures they have to make to those charged with governance, a "clean" opinion with no audit findings. His firm received full cooperation from management staff, and they could not have performed the audit without the assistance of Finance Director Hans Wilson, Assistant Finance Director Amy Henson, Accounting Manager Shannon Ashmore, and various other departments, including the Sheriff's Office, Tax Commissioner, courts, etc. All of them worked to gather information needed to compete the audit and finalize financial statements. There were no significant issues discussed with management that they are required to report, no uncorrected misstatements, and any adjustments that were proposed during the audit process were accepted by management and reflected in the financial report. And lastly, Nichols, Cauley

& Associates are independent of the County in accordance with GAS.

During Mr. Chapman's presentation, Administrator Fouts fielded a question from Commissioner Smith explaining that the "Health and Welfare" portion of the overall budget is less than 1%. It only includes a small appropriation (approximately $68,000) to the Department of Health, a state agency. He further explained that they are funded by the State and fees for service, so the County's share is just a small mandatory contribution.

Chairman McKenzie expressed appreciation to Mr. Chapman for providing service to the County, and to Finance Director Wilson and the Finance Department team for their hard work and dedication and for achieving 16-years of recognized excellence.

Approval of Minutes

3. **Request Approval of the Minutes from the Public Hearing/Regular Meeting Session Held on May 5, 2026**

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to approve the minutes from the Public Hearing/Regular Meeting Session held on May 5, 2026.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bob Blackburn
SECONDER: Alphonso Smith
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Consent Agenda

4. **Confirm Execution of a Proclamation Designating April as "Safe Digging Month" in Coweta County**

Motion to: Confirm

The Board voted to confirm execution of a proclamation designating April as "Safe Digging Month" in Coweta County.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bob Blackburn
SECONDER: Alphonso Smith
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

5. **Confirm Execution of a Proclamation Designating "Men's Health Week" in Coweta**

County

Motion to: Confirm

The Board voted to confirm execution of a proclamation designating "Men's Health Week" in Coweta County.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bob Blackburn
SECONDER: Jeff Fisher
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

6. **Confirm Execution of a Proclamation Recognizing the 70th Anniversary of The Lawrence Welk Show**

Motion to: Confirm

The Board voted to confirm execution of a proclamation recognizing the 70th anniversary of the Lawrence Welk Show.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Jeff Fisher
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Supplemental and Non-Agenda Items

There were no Supplemental or Non-Agenda items to be added for discussion.

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

7. **Public Hearing Regarding Petition # REZ 26-02 Filed by Robert Matteri, Carole Matteri, and Kathryn Lannin Requesting to Rezone Property Located at 296 Fischer Spur Road, Hudgens Road, and Palmetto Tyrone Road, Newnan - District 4**

Zoning Coordinator Nicole Blackwell presented Petition # REZ 26-02 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 #130-6082-002) from RC (*Rural Conservation*) to *RC with LDGS Point Exception* (*Rural Conservation with Land Develpoment Guidance System Point Exception*). She explained that the subject property consists of 51.21± acres, contains an existing barn measuring approximately forty-two (42) feet by thirty-nine (39) feet, and is bordered by Fischer Spur Road to the west, Palmetto Tyrone Road to the north-east, and Hudgens Road to the east and south-east. She further explained that the LDGS was first adopted by the Board on March 3, 2020, and was established to direct subdivision developments to allowable locations within the *RC* (*Rural Conversation*) district. Subdivision density is guided by the LDGS, which assigns the property a numerical score based on the infrastructure and location. Higher scores indicate areas more suitable for higher residential densities. She noted that the subject property has an LDGS score of five (5) points, which, according to the LDGS, requires a minimum lot size of five (5) acres, limiting the number of lots to ten (10). The proposed request would allow the development of a single-family residential subdivision consisting of twenty-three (23) lots, each with a minimum lot size of two (2) acres. She reviewed the types of subdivision that are allowed by right in the *RC* district and explained that the applicants seek to develop this area at a density equivalent to that of an LDGS score of six (6), thereby allowing *EL-2* (*Estate Lot Two-Acre Minimum*) subdivision standards within the *RC* district. She reviewed the zoning of surrounding properties and explained that the properties to the south-east and south-west have an LDGS score of six (6) or greater, while properties to the east, north and west have scores below six (6). She also noted that several nearby subdivisions were created prior to the adoption of the LDGS, including the following:

- Virginia Quail Plantation, which is located to the south-east and was created in 1993 and included four (4) lots, each less than 1 acre.
- Jackson's Creek, located to the south-west and created in 2016 and includes twenty-seven (27) lots ranging from 1 to 1.65 acres, with open space.
- Logan Acres, located to the west and was built in 2007 and includes three (3) lots ranging from 4 to 7.25 acres.
- Clearview Estates, located to the north-west and was built in 2015 and includes twenty-five (25) one-acre lots with open space.

In closing, Ms. Blackwell reviewed the factors considered by staff during the application process and presented seven (7) conditions for consideration by the Board should they choose to approve the rezoning request.

Mr. Steven Jones, applicant representative, reiterated that the proposed development is a single-family residential subdivision consisting of twenty-three (23) lots, each with a minimum lot size of two (2) acres. He expressed that his client would agree to realign Hudgens Road at the applicant's expense, if the request is approved. In Phase 1, the plan is to build ten (10) lots to the north and sell them before pursuing the road improvements on the south side. He expressed his appreciation to staff for assisting with the timeframe so that the applicant could build the northern lots in order to fund the road improvement and southern lots. He proffered additional verbiage to condition # 3 to read as follows: "If the developer elects to construct the realignment of Hudgens Road and its intersection with Palmetto Tyrone Road, the construction plans for such realignment shall be included in, and completed as part of the work associated with the land disturbance permit for Phase 2."

Chairman McKenzie called for any comments in support of the proposed rezoning request.

Mr. Robert Matteri, the applicant, explained that his father purchased this property in the 1960s and his father's vision for this property was to develop it and provide a benefit for the county. He believed the zoning would increase the number of residents who could appreciate the farm land and stated this could be a way of reliving his father's dream and use this property for citizens to live in that part of the county.

Chairman McKenzie called for any comments in opposition to the proposed rezoning request.

Mr. Tim Carter, Elizabeth Lane, Newnan, addressed the Board regarding Petition # REZ 26-02. He explained that he resides across the street in the Jackson's Creek Subdivision, is the president of the HOA in his community, and wishes the subject property to remain zoned as *RC* (*Rural Conservation*). He is concerned about increased road traffic with the added neighborhood. He also expressed concerns for those who enjoy walking and running, etc. on the shaded portion of Fischer Spur Road. He requested that there be a stipulation added for the rezoning that a sidewalk be added on Fischer Spur Road. He believes this would be safer for those who wish to use it and add value to the new homes that will be constructed.

Mr. Kris Bremer, Hudgens Road, Newnan, addressed the Board regarding Petition # REZ 26-02. He explained that he enjoys that the area is not crowded, and that if he wished to live in the neighborhood, he would have ten years ago when he moved to his current residence. He explained that when the LDGS became effective in 2020, the subject property's point rating allowed ten (10) homes on five (5) acre lots rather than the proposed twenty-three (23) homes on two (2) acre lots. In closing, he expressed that if the rezoning is approved, he believes the Commissioners would be reversing the policy they previously adopted.

In rebuttal, Mr. Jones explained that many of the other adjacent and surrounding neighborhoods have homes on less than two (2) acres. The applicants are proposing two (2) acre lots, which is double the size of the ones on Hudgens Road. He expressed respect for the request for the sidewalk; however, the property owners are already funding a new realignment of a County road and the request for a sidewalk should not be imposed as a condition for the benefit of residents outside the proposed subdivision. He expressed that the applicants are already going to accrue in excess of six figures, and requiring a sidewalk would be taking valuable dollars away from the applicants. He further expressed that the property owners had already agreed to the realignment of the road and that it is a significant transportation improvement. He believes that a sidewalk should not be a condition of the rezoning, and that staff did not include a sidewalk in their considerations.

In response to questions from Commissioner Reidelbach, Public Works Administrator Tod Handley explained that the road realignment would cost approximately $325,000. He further stated that the construction cost for one mile of sidewalk is approximately $750,000, and that the proposed development would incorporate 1/2 mile of sidewalk. In addition, he explained that any sidewalk would be required to be constructed on private property, not in the County's right-of-way, and the County would not be responsible for maintaining it.

Motion to: Close the Public Hearing

The Board voted to close the Public Hearing regarding # REZ 26-02 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 #130-6082-002) from *RC* (*Rural Conservation*) to *RC with LDGS Point Exception* (*Rural Conservation with Land Development Guidance System Point Exception*).

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bob Blackburn
SECONDER: John Reidelbach
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to rezone 51.21± acres located at 296 Fischer Spur Road, Hudgens Road, and Palmetto Tyrone Road, Newnan (Parcel # 130-6082-002) from *RC* (Rural *Conservation*) to *RC with LDGS Point Exception* (*Rural Conservation with Land Development Guidance System Point Exception*), subject to the following seven (7) conditions:

1. The development shall contain no more than twenty-three (23) lots, each with a minimum lot size of two (2) acres and lot configurations and sizes to be approved by Coweta County.
2. Prior to the issuance of the land disturbance permit for Phase 2, as shown on the Conceptual Site Plan for Fischer Spur Road, prepared by Moore Bass Consulting, Inc., dated 03-11-2026 (the "Concept Plan"), the developer shall design and provide to the County construction plans for the realignment of Hudgens Road at its approach to Palmetto Tyrone Road and required utility relocation, to be approved by Coweta County Public Works.
3. Prior to the issuance of the land disturbance permit for Phase 2, as shown on the Concept Plan, the developer shall elect to either (a) construct the realignment of Hudgens Road and its intersection with Palmetto Tyrone Road or (b) shall reimburse the County for the cost of such project if the construction is performed by the County or contracted by the County including necessary utility relocations. If the developer elects to construct the realignment of Hudgens Road and its intersection with Palmetto Tyrone Road, the construction plans for such

realignment shall be included in and completed as part of the work associated with the land disturbance permit for Phase 2.

4. The developer shall dedicate the necessary right-of-way for the realignment of Hudgens Road (a) before the issuance of a Land Disturbance Permit for Phase 2 as shown on the Concept Plan if the County is to build the realignment project or (b) with the final plat for Phase 2 as shown on the Concept Plan if the realignment will be built by the developer.
5. At the time of the final plat for each Phase as shown on the Concept Plan, the developer shall dedicate the necessary amount of right-of-way along Hudgens Road and Fischer Spur, as applicable, to provide a minimum of forty (40) feet of right-of-way from the centerline of the roads.
6. The permit applicant shall be responsible for stormwater management meeting the requirements of *Chapter 30* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances* for each subbasin and each shall be studied at the points where each subbasin leaves the proposed development's property. Additionally, it is required that Runoff Reduction practices be implemented upgradient from the detention/retention ponding to help avoid maintenance concerns and provide a treatment train approach as intended by the ordinance unless an infeasibility determination can be supported by staff.
7. The applicant shall obtain a land disturbance permit within an eighteen (18) month period beginning the next business day following approval by the Board. If the applicant fails to do so, the Board may initiate rezoning of the property.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER:John Reidelbach
SECONDER: Jeff Fisher
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

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.

Administrator Fouts explained that agenda items # 9 and # 10 are variance requests related to the same parcel. In accordance with the rules governing the meeting, speakers are allotted three (3) minutes to address the Board, and he asked whether the Board would like speakers to utilize their three minutes to address both items.

It was the consensus of the Board to allow each speaker wishing to address the Board regarding agenda items # 9 and # 10 a total of three (3) minutes to do so.

Mr. Lyle Millard, Bruce Jackson Road, Newnan, addressed the Board regarding Petitions # VAR 26-02 and # VAR 26-03 (agenda items # 9 and # 10) filed by Virginia Singh. He discussed how Coweta County has grown since 1970 and provided background on prior ownership of the property before it was acquired by the Singh family. He expressed opposition to the proposed convenience store and stated that many surrounding residents did not want the development.

Mr. Randall Duncan, Bruce Jackson Road, Newnan, addressed the Board regarding Petitions # VAR 26-02 and # VAR 26-03 (agenda items # 9 and # 10) filed by Virginia Singh. He stated that he and his family supported the recommendation of denial by the Board of Zoning Appeals. He expressed concern that the lot was too small for the proposed development and stated that variances should be considered as a last resort. He emphasized that zoning regulations exist for a reason and should not be altered for developer convenience. He further stated that there was no hardship associated with the property, noting that the land is level, free of standing water or streams, and conforms naturally to the angle of the surrounding roads. In closing, he expressed his belief that the applicant is requesting excessive buffer reductions.

Mr. Manny Singh, applicant representative/co-applicant, addressed the Board regarding Petitions # VAR 26-02 and # VAR 26-03 (agenda item # 9 and # 10) filed by Virginia Singh. He and his wife, the applicant, are requesting approval of the variances for the property. He stated that the property has been zoned commercial since 1969 and that they intended to develop it in a safe, responsible, and compatible manner while respecting the surrounding community. He referenced *Article 28* of the *Coweta County Zoning and Development Ordinance* and stated that variances may be approved where unique property conditions create unnecessary hardship. He explained that the requested canopy setback reduction is necessary to support safe traffic flow, emergency vehicle access and turning radius, proper spacing between fuel pumps and structures, and compliance with fire and operational safety standards. He also stated that he and his wife support the GDOT traffic study and staff recommendations, including the addition of a turn lane and other improvements.

Mr. John Myers, attorney of Mr. Singh and his wife, addressed the Board regarding Petitions # VAR 26-02 and # VAR 26-03 (agenda item # 9 and # 10) filed by Virginia Singh. He stated that he feels that the family should be recognized for donating 3.7± acres to the County for the purpose of a future fire station. He also noted that a nearby property along the corridor (referencing the BP and Little Giant area) had previously received similar variance approvals to those being requested.
In closing, Attorney Myers thanked the Board for its consideration and requested approval of the requested variances.

Mr. John Miller addressed the Board regarding Petitions # VAR 26-02 and # VAR 26-03 (agenda item # 9 and # 10) filed by Virginia Singh. He stated that he was the engineer who prepared the original site layout. He explained that the requested buffer reductions were driven by the placement of the driveway on Bruce Jackson Road, which was designed to maximize distance from the Highway 34 intersection in order to improve traffic safety and allow vehicles to decelerate when entering the site. In addition, he stated that he had discussed turn lane options with GDOT representatives. In closing, he noted that a Level 3 soil study had already been completed for the property.

Mr. Sean Reinhardt, Sandy Springs, Georgia, addressed the Board regarding the request for approval of tax-exempt bonds for the Monarch at the Creek Senior Living Community (agenda item # 18). He stated that the senior living community is currently under construction and in the process of obtaining the necessary permits. He explained that the request before the Board was to approve the City of Newnan's Housing Authority's participation, so the project could operate within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated county (versus being located within the jurisdiction of the City of Newnan). He stated that the project would provide significant benefits to the community and represents an estimated $70 million investment in the county. He also expressed a desire to work with the County and the Housing Authority of Newnan rather than solely through the State of Georgia process. He noted that there would be no liability to the County or the Housing Authority associated with the project.

Mr. David Williams introduced himself as the bond attorney representing the Housing Authority of Newnan regarding the request for approval of tax-exempt bonds for the Monarch at the Creek Senior Living Community (agenda item # 18). He stated that he was present to answer any legal questions regarding the tax-exempt bond issuance. He also explained that the Housing Authority may issue bonds as a financing mechanism for senior housing and noted that the project would remain subject to property tax obligations as applicable.

Mr. Jess Barron, Alpine Drive, Newnan, addressed the Board regarding the request for approval of tax-exempt bonds for the Monarch at the Creek Senior Living Community (agenda item # 18). He stated that he serves as Chairman of the Housing Authority and explained that he and his team are requesting the Board's approval for the Housing Authority to act as the conduit issuer for the bonds to the developer. He noted that the property is located outside the city limits, which limits the ability of the City of Newnan Housing Authority to fully assist with the project. He explained that the Housing Authority's mission is to serve the community and referenced Ashlyn Ridge as an example of a prior development they have supported.

Dr. Sarah Powell, Northside Drive, Newnan, addressed the Board regarding Petition # VAR 26-01 (agenda item # 8) filed by Blue Frog Engineering, LLC on behalf of TSP, LLC. She stated that she is a co-owner of Sweetwater Veterinary Hospital and explained that the existing property setbacks create a hardship by limiting the amount of usable land needed to accommodate the clinic's rapidly growing operations and caseload. She also noted that after evaluating other sites, the subject property best meets their needs, particularly because of its proximity to the interstate. She noted that the clinic intends to provide services for exotic animals, with the nearest comparable provider located a significant distance away. She also expressed concerns about their staffing limitations at their Palmetto location, stating that space constraints have affected their ability to hire new graduates and limit the number of students and veterinary technicians they can accommodate. She explained that the project has been under review for approximately six months and that the applicant has incurred approximately $55,000 in costs related to traffic studies and soil testing to determine feasibility. In closing, she stated that she feels that the time and expense involved in pursuing the variance demonstrate the hardship associated with the property setbacks.

Mr. Kai Burke addressed the Board regarding Petition # VAR 26-01 (agenda # 8) filed by Blue Frog Engineering, LLC on behalf of TSP, LLC. He explained that the property is subject to significant setbacks along three (3) road frontages, which limits the developable building envelope to approximately 5,700 square feet, or about 7.6% of the total parcel area. He referenced *Article 28, Section 284* of the *Coweta County Zoning and Development Ordinance* and stated his belief that the request meets the applicable criteria for variance approval. He explained that approval of the setback variances would reduce the development hardship associated with the property. In conclusion, he stated that he has identified sixteen (16) other properties with similar variances that had previously been approved.

Administrator Fouts announced that, in accordance with the rules governing the meeting, the number of speakers allowed (10) to comment on items that are on the agenda has been reached, but there were other individuals that signed up to address the Board (note: the Board did not amend the rules to allow any additional speakers).

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

8. **Recommend Denial of Petition # VAR 26-01 Filed by Blue Frog Engineering, LLC on Behalf of TSP, LLC Requesting a Front Yard Setback Variance for Property Located at the Northwest Corner of Highway 29 and Pine Road, Newnan - District 2**

Zoning Coordinator Nicole Blackwell presented Petition # VAR 26-01 filed by Blue Frog Engineering on behalf of TSP, LLC requesting a front yard setback variance for property located at the north-west corner of Highway 29 South and Pine Road, Newnan (Parcel # 076-2072-020) along with a recommendation of denial from the Boardd of Zoning

Appeals. She explained that the applicant is proposing construction of a 5,500 square foot, two-story veterinary clinic. Because of the subject property's frontage on both Pine Road and Highway 29 South, the site is subject to three (3) front setback requirements. She noted that the subject property does meet the required setback on the western portion along Pine Road. However, the applicant is requesting a 30-foot reduction from the required 135-feet along the eastern property line adjacent to Highway 29 South, and a 40-foot reduction from the required 100-feet along Pine Road. She further explained that at the Public Hearing held by the Board of Zoning Appeals, one person spoke in support of the variance request and no one spoke in opposition.

Commissioner Reidelbach referenced the Board of Zoning Appeals minutes, noting that BOZA member Billy Cranford had indicated that the proposed development could fit within the established setback and buffer requirements. He questioned the basis for a hardship claim associated with the variance request, stating that if the development can comply with the existing requirements, the site plan could potentially be redesigned to fit within the required setbacks.

In response to questions from Commissioner Reidelbach, Chairman McKenzie, and Commissioner Fisher, Public Works Administrator Handley explained that the setback on Highway 29 is important for potential future road widening. Regarding the setback on Pine Road, he noted that the Southwest Connector project currently begins on Millard Farmer Road and the next phase of that project would go over the railroad and tie into Pine Road. He further explained that currently, the road does not need to be widened, but it could at some point in the future.

Mr. Sewell explained that, theoretically, the building could be shifted farther north and west on the site and still fit within the required setbacks.

Mr. Kai Burke, the applicant's representative, stated that currently the building envelope is approximately four (4) feet narrower than the proposed building design, which would interfere with the internal layout of the veterinary clinic. The clinic requires specific dimensions for exam rooms, hallways, laboratories, and related operational spaces. He acknowledged that a smaller building could potentially be constructed on the site, but the additional space is needed to accommodate the clinic's intended operations, as previously indicated by Dr. Powell. He also explained that the standard for granting a variance is not simply whether development is physically possible, but whether the property is subject to an undue burden or hardship. He expressed his belief that the reduced developable area imposed on the subject property, compared with surrounding properties, constitutes an undue hardship.

Commissioner Reidelbach emphasized that, if the Southwest Connector proceeds as discussed by staff, granting the variance could potentially create an undue hardship for the County if additional right-of-way must later be acquired from the property owner for roadway improvements.

Mr. Burke noted that the Public Works department indicated in the staff report that it does not anticipate the need for additional right-of-way along Pine Road for future roadway improvements.

Commissioner Reidelbach commented that County staff cannot speak for the future intentions of the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT).

In response to questions from Chairman McKenzie and Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Burke explained that the proposed clinic is a two-story building consisting of approximately 5,500 square feet total, with roughly 4,000 square feet at ground level and the remaining square footage on a second story. Based upon site constraints, approximately 3,500 square feet could be accommodated within a rectangular footprint to meet setback requirements, with additional square footage potentially on the upper level (estimated at approximately 1,000 to 2,000 square feet).

In response to a question from Commissioner Fisher regarding placing a condition that the developer must dedicate right-of-way to the County in the future if it is needed, Attorney Lee explained that widening of Highway 29 would be a GDOT project, not a County project. It might be possible to place such a condition on the variance, but he is unsure whether that would resolve the issue.

Mr. Handley explained that the existing roadway includes two (2) eastbound through lanes, one eastbound right-turn lane, one eastbound left-turn lane, and one westbound through lane. If future widening is required, the roadway could potentially need an additional westbound through lane and, at some point, an additional eastbound left-turn lane. Such improvements could require approximately 24-feet of additional roadway width, based upon standard 12-foot travel lanes. This widening could extend into the existing landscaped buffer areas along Pine Road and could potentially impact the onsite parking area.

Mr. Burke explained that there is approximately 20-feet from the existing edge of pavement to the right-of-way, followed by an additional 20-feet of landscape buffer. This results in approximately 40-feet between the proposed parking area and the roadway. He noted that there would be approximately 80-feet between the proposed building and the existing edge of pavement.

Attorney Lee further explained that even if right-of-way is donated, the property owner could still retain the ability to contest other compensable matters. He noted that while a donation could help address potential future roadway needs, it would not fully resolve all future compensation-related issues.

In response to a question from Chairman McKenzie, Mr. Burke explained that currently there are fifty-six (56) parking spaces planned for the development. If the building were relocated, he anticipates the loss of four (4) to six (6) spaces depending upon traffic circulation. He pointed out that another constraint related to relocating the building is site access, which is shared via an easement through the adjacent Dollar General parcel. Dollar General will still have to approve the site plan and relocating the clinic could more directly impact Dollar General's site.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fisher, Mr. Sewell explained that revising the building placement would likely obstruct the northernmost driveway entrance to the property. Generally, staff prefers that sites have two (2) points of ingress and egress, but the size of this property may not make this a significant concern.

Administrator Fouts noted that there is an additional access point north of the adjacent Dollar General property that could allow vehicles to circulate back onto Pine Road.

Mr. Handley explained he believes there is public sewer in the vicinity of the intersection and noted that the project is currently shown as being served by a septic system. He suggested that connection to the public sewer system may be a possible option which would free up the proposed site for the septic system.

Mr. Burke explained that they were informed that a force main is located at the south-east corner of Highway 29 South and that connection to a private force main would not be permitted.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Ms. Blackwell explained that the Water and Sewerage Authority had no comment regarding the proposed development. She further explained that Environmental Health indicated that they have no objections to the proposed variance request for building setbacks, but stated that the proposed parking layout may require reconfiguration to accommodate primary and replacement septic absorption fields. In addition, Environmental Health noted that the extent of any required modifications cannot be determined until a Level 3 soil analysis is submitted.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach regarding eliminating the variance request for Highway 29 South and maintaining the requested 40-foot setback reduction along Pine Road, Mr. Burke explained that the proposed site plan represents what they believe to be the most functional layout. He has not prepared an alternate design that meets the full 135-feet setback along Highway 29 South. He added that a slightly wider adjustment may allow the building to remain in a smaller configuration, but further review would be required.

Commissioner Reidelbach commented that he feels there are a number of unanswered questions and asked if the Board could defer a decision regarding this variance application until more information is gathered.

Mr. Fouts explained that the Board is required to take action on the issue, noting that if no action is taken, the variance would be deemed approved. A motion to defer this issue to a future meeting would constitute action by the Board.

In response to a question from Mr. Burke, Commissioner Reidelbach suggested that prior to the Board rendering a decision regarding the variance request that Mr. Burke consider maintaining the 135-foot setback along Highway 29 South, that he coordinate with Mr. Jay Boren and/or Mr. Rick Jones at the Water and Sewerage Authority regarding sewer infrastructure, and that he continue to work with County staff regarding additional development options for the project.

In response to a question from Commissioner Blackburn regarding whether a force main line could be adapted or "stepped down" to serve a standard commercial development, Mr. Handley explained that in prior situations, force mains have been connected to other force mains, so such a connection may be possible depending on site conditions and system capacity.

Mr. Burke explained that he believes there would be a need to cross GDOT right-of-way and GDOT does not typically allow private utility crossings within its right-of-way.

In response to questions from Commissioner Blackburn and Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Burke explained that preliminary calculations indicate that the site is adequately sized to accommodate both a primary and secondary septic system. A Level 3 soil analysis has been completed, however, a final septic footprint has not yet been incorporated into the site plan, as the design has not been fully completed.

Motion to: Defer

The Board voted to defer a decision regarding Petition # VAR 26-01 filed by Blue Frog Engineering, LLC on behalf of TSP, LLC requesting a front yard setback variance for property located at the north-west corner of Highway 29 South and Pine Road, Newnan (Parcel # 076-2072-020) until June 2, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: John Reidelbach
SECONDER: Jeff Fisher
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

9. **Recommend Denial of Petition # VAR 26-02 Filed by Virginia Singh Requesting a Buffer Variance for Property Located at the Southwest Corner of SR 34 West and Bruce Jackson Road, Newnan - District 2**

Community Development Director Ben Sewell explained that agenda items # 9 and # 10 are a pair of variance requests submitted for 1.83± acres located at the south-west corner of Highway 34 and Bruce Jackson Road, Newnan (Parcel # 026-3101-001). Mr. Sewell presented Petition # VAR 26-02 filed by Virgina Singh requesting a buffer variance along the western and southern property lines of the subject property. He explained that when incompatible zoning districts are contiguous, a vegetative screening buffer is required between the two (2) uses. In this case, the subject property is zoned *C* (*Old Commercial*) and is adjacent to property zoned *RC* (*Rural Conservation*). Therefore, a 50-foot buffer is required. He explained that the applicant is requesting a 35-foot buffer reduction (from 50-feet to 15-feet) along the western property line and a 25-feet reduction (from 50-feet to 25-feet) along the southern property line. This commercially zoned tract has existed since the original zoning designation in 1969 and is part of a large estate, with the remaining property currently being developed into 5 acre estate lots. He noted that the applicant has indicated that she has a contract on the parcels adjacent to the subject property. In closing, he explained that at the Public Hearing held by the Board of Zoning Appeals on April 23, 2026, the applicant spoke in support of the variance request and four (4) citizens spoke in opposition.

In response to questions from Chairman McKenzie, Mr. Sewell explained that this project cannot be built on the subject property as proposed without the variances. He noted that the property could still be developed commercially if the size of the project were reduced to comply with County regulations. He also explained that the zoning classification would permit multiple commercial uses in the storefront and that the County does not have regulatory authority over that. He further noted that the applicant could potentially reduce or eliminate the additional business area and redesign the project to fit within the allowable footprint.

Chairman McKenzie expressed significant concern regarding traffic safety at the intersection of Highway 34 and Bruce Jackson Road, stating that he travels through the intersection regularly. He described it as dangerous, citing numerous accidents he had witnessed over the past 25 years. He also referenced a fatal accident involving a former coworker at this intersection.

Chairman McKenzie continued by stating that he has received significant public opposition to the variance request through comments made during tonight's meeting, as well as through emails, text messages, and phone calls. He emphasized that he is not opposed to the construction of a convenience store on the property, but believes the project should comply with the County's existing development regulations. He further stated that he feels that if the County adopts development standards and buffer requirements, those standards should be consistently enforced. He expressed concern that the proposed development, at its current size, would increase traffic hazards at the intersection despite proposed roadway improvements and roadway warning improvements previously installed by GDOT.

Commissioner Reidelbach stated agreement with Chairman McKenzie's concerns and commented that if the applicant wished to construct a convenience store and gas station at the location, the project should be redesigned to fit within the existing footprint and comply with County regulations.

Mr. Sewell explained that the project involves two (2) separate variance requests and noted that this discussion only pertains to the buffer variance. The next variance request involves the front setback. Even if the project were limited solely to a convenience store, a separate variance would still be required to allow placement of the fuel canopy within the required setback area.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Sewell explained that according to the tax records, the subject and adjacent properties are under the same title ownership. Reportedly, Mr. Singh (applicant representative/co-applicant) has a contract on the subject property as well as the two adjacent tracts. He further explained that the surrounding property was being developed as an estate lot subdivision consisting of eleven (11) lots, each five (5) acres or larger.

Commissioner Fisher commented that some form of development would likely occur on the commercially zoned subject property in the future regardless of the outcome of the variance request. He further noted that, if the applicant owned the adjacent parcels, alternative development options may exist for the site. However, he expressed concern that even a reduced-scale development would not resolve the existing traffic and safety issues at the intersection. He stated that the intersection already presents safety concerns and that future commercial and residential development in the area would likely intensify those issues over time. He emphasized that, regardless of whether the variance request was approved or denied, the traffic problems at the intersection would continue and could worsen in the future, and the Board should evaluate the intersection and consider safety improvements in order to protect the general welfare of the public.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Handley explained that this intersection along Highway 34 is located in a low area for the roadway with hills on both sides, creating limited sight distances. Staff previously conducted survey work to explore possible improvements, including raising the roadway elevation on Highway 34, Bruce Jackson Road, and Pierce Chapel Road to improve the visibility and safety of this intersection. He noted that approximately fifty-five (55) crashes have occurred at this intersection over the past ten (10) years, including deer-related accidents and vehicles leaving the roadway. He also explained that other intersections in the county have experienced even higher crash totals. Unfortunately, the County does not have the funding necessary to implement transportation improvements at every intersection where development occurs.

In response to questions from Commissioner Smith, Mr. Singh explained that the adjacent property near the drain field and septic area affected by the buffer reduction request is vacant and wooded. He intends to purchase the western and southern adjacent parcels that consist of 8± acres on one side and 6.5± acres on the other. He further explained that at this time, his intention was to keep the land residential for future use. If the convenience store project is developed, he would consider building homes on the surrounding acreage.

Commissioner Fisher explained that if residential homes were planned on the adjacent property, the commercial development footprint could be reduced to better align with the Zoning Ordinance. As proposed, he cannot support the requested buffer reduction.

Mr. Singh explained that the project consists of a single convenience store with no additional business planned. He stated that the building size could be reduced, possibly allowing a larger buffer than originally requested, but noted that without approval of the canopy setback variance (Petition # VAR 26-03), the project could not be built. He reiterated that there are two (2) separate variance requests for the subject property. He noted that they plan to meet all required landscaping standards and that they have agreed to add a westbound left-turn lane onto Bruce Jackson Road to help improve traffic safety.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smith, Mr. Singh stated that he is willing to consider design changes depending on the conditions of approval, particularly if the canopy setback is not granted. Without approval of the canopy setback variance, the project is not feasible.

In response to questions from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Sewell explained that without approval of the Highway 34-related setback variance, it would be impractical or impossible to construct the fuel canopy. He further explained that even moving the building further back would not resolve the issue unless the buffer variance is also approved. He noted that with the full buffer requirement in place, fitting the proposed layout would be very difficult. If the buffer variance were granted, the site layout could potentially be adjusted further back on the property. However, these detailed site design questions go beyond what can be addressed at this stage of discussion.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smith, Attorney Lee and Administrator Fouts explained that if the applicant were only reducing the amount of the same variance request, it could continue under the existing application. However, if the applicant adds new or different variance requests, a new application would be required.

Motion to: Deny

The Board voted to deny buffer reduction for property located at the south-west corner of SR 34 West and Bruce Jackson Road, Newnan (Parcel # 026-3101-001) as requested by Petition # VAR 26-02 filed by Virginia Singh.

RESULT: Passed (4 to 1)
MOVER: Bill McKenzie
SECONDER: Jeff Fisher
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn
NAYS: Alphonso Smith

10. **Recommend Denial of Petition # VAR 26-03 Filed by Virginia Singh Requesting a Front Building Setback Variance for Property Located at the Southwest Corner of SR 34 West and Bruce Jackson Road, Newnan - District 2**

Community Development Director Sewell presented Petition # VAR 26-03 filed by Virginia Singh requesting a front building setback variance for property located at the southwest corner of SR 34 West and Bruce Jackson Road, Newnan (Parcel # 026-3101-001) along with a recommendation of denial from the Board of Zoning Appeals. He explained that the standard setback for arterial highways is 135-feet from the center of the right-of-way. The applicant is requesting to reduce the required 135-foot front building setback to 93-feet. Mr. Sewell, explained the site is approximately 300 feet by 300 feet and zoned C (Old Commercial). He further explained that at the Public Hearing held by the Board of Zoning Appeals on April 23, 2026, the applicant spoke in support of the variance request and three (3) citizens spoke in opposition. He noted that should the Board choose to grant the request, staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The setback reduction shall be clearly established at 93-feet.
2. A left-turn lane shall be constructed on Highway 34 at Bruce Jackson Road prior to the issuance of final occupancy for the site.

In response to questions from Commissioner Smith, Mr. Handley explained that Highway 34 would need to be widened for a left-hand turn lane onto Bruce Jackson Road. The purpose of the left turn lane would be to provide a designated area for vehicles turning left onto Bruce Jackson Road, allowing them to exit the through traffic lane and to prevent future rear-end accidents. In addition, Mr. Handley explained that traffic signal warrants depend on traffic volumes on both the main roadway (Highway 34) and the intersecting side streets. Under current conditions, traffic volumes on Bruce Jackson Road and Pierce Chapel Road would not be sufficient to warrant a traffic signal at this location.

Chairman McKenzie expressed concerns regarding traffic engineering evaluations and suggested that conditions on the roadway may not reflect the reality experienced by local residents. He further expressed frustration with repeated findings that traffic volumes are "not enough" to justify improvements, and emphasized his concerns about safety at this intersection. He questioned how many accidents or fatalities would be required before corrective action is taken. He clarified that his comments were not directed at staff, but rather at GDOT's methodology and approach. He explained that in his personal observation, traffic on Bruce Jackson Road and Pierce Chapel Road can back up significantly when attempting to access Highway 34 during peak morning and evening commutes when vehicle speeds are high.

In response to questions from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Sewell explained that the distance from the "right-out" lane to the intersection of Bruce Jackson Road appears to be approximately 300-feet. Mr. Handley explained that the typical guideline is to provide a minimum spacing of approximately 200-feet between driveways or intersections along this two-lane segment of Highway 34.

Chairman McKenzie asked whether the referenced access point was classified as a driveway or a public road, noting concerns about traffic operations and turning movements from the site. He also expressed concerns that vehicles exiting the parking lot and turning right would interact with traffic movements toward nearby areas, creating potential conflict points. In addition, he further noted additional traffic, including vehicles traveling from Franklin to Newnan, which could contribute to congestion and safety issues at this location.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smith, Mr. Sewell explained that a condition has been proposed that requires construction of a left turn lane on Bruce Jackson Road.

In response to a question from Chairman McKenzie, Mr. Manny Singh, applicant's representative, explained that the applicant would be responsible for funding the required roadway improvements on Highway 34 and on Bruce Jackson Road. He also explained that there will be a deceleration lane for eastbound traffic prior to the right-in/right-out entrance, including a deceleration lane associated with the entrance access on Bruce Jackson Road. In addition, a left-turn lane onto Bruce Jackson Road from Highway 34 has been recommended, and the applicant has no objection to that requirement. He acknowledged concerns regarding traffic conditions and stated that the proposed roadway improvements are intended to help address those issues and improve traffic flow. He also stated that the presence of a canopy with lighting for the fueling area will encourage drivers to reduce speed in the area. He noted that while a traffic signal may eventually be warranted at the intersection, the submitted traffic study did not recommend installation of one at this time. He further noted that if the variance request is denied, a gas station cannot be built, but the property is a commercially zoned property, so maybe storage buildings or something of that nature could be constructed on the site.

Mr. Handley clarified that a right turn lane would be constructed on Bruce Jackson Road to access the development.

A motion by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Fisher, failing by a vote of 2 to 3, with Commissioner Smith and Commissioner Fisher voting in support, and Chairman McKenzie, Commissioner Reidelbach, and Commissioner Blackburn voting in opposition to a motion to grant the variance request subject to the conditions proffered by staff, was defeated for lack of a majority.

Motion to: Deny

The Board voted to deny a front building setback reduction for property located at the south-west corner of SR 34 West and Bruce Jackson Road, Newnan (Parcel # 026-3101-001) as requested in Petition # VAR 26-03 filed by Virgina Singh.

RESULT: Passed (3 to 2)
MOVER: Bill McKenzie
SECONDER: John Reidelbach
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Bob Blackburn
NAYS: Jeff Fisher, Alphonso Smith

11. **Recommend Approval of Petition # VAR 26-09 Filed by Bryan Cahoon Requesting a Front Building Setback Variance for Property Located at 1640 Hines Road, Moreland - District 2**

Zoning Coordinator Blackwell presented Petition # VAR 26-09 filed by Brian Cahoon requesting a front building setback variance for property located at 1640 Hines Road, Moreland (Parcel # 116-2225-005) along with a recommendation of approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals. She explained that the applicant is requesting to reduce the required 100-foot front setback for a proposed guest house. She further explained that this issue arose because of a permitting miscommunication, resulting in the guest house foundation being built approximately 83-feet from the right-of-way instead of the required 100-feet. The applicant is requesting approval of the variance to allow the guest house to remain in its current location.

In response to a question from Chairman McKenzie, Ms. Blackwell explained that the zoning verification and site prep permit initially established the 100-foot required setback from the right-of-way of Hines Road. However, because the property is located in a floodplain, an elevation certificate was required, which reflected a revised setback of approximately 83-feet. The discrepancy is a result of confusion regarding whether measurements should be taken from the edge of the pavement or the right-of-way. While staff cannot fully verify verbal communication, the applicant did submit a plan showing the 83-foot setback, which was ultimately approved by staff. In addition, Mr. Cahoon is not a professional builder and may not have been expected to fully understand the technical requirements.

Administrator Fouts explained that staff is requesting that Mr. Cahoon be reimbursed the $500 variance fee should the Board approve the variance request.

Motion to: Grant

The Board voted to grant a 17-foot front building setback reduction (from 100-feet to 83-feet) for the property located at 1640 Hines Road, Moreland (Parcel # 116-2225-005) as requested in Petition # VAR 26-09 filed by Bryan Cahoon, subject to the following condition:

1. The front building setback for the guest house shall be 83 feet from the property line along Hines Road.
2. The County shall refund the variance fee.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bill McKenzie
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

12. **Request Approval/Execution of a Deed of Open Space Restriction and Easement Over Private Right-of-Way for Property Located in Cresswind at Spring Haven Subdivision, Phase 3A - District 2**

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute a Deed of Open Space Restriction and Easement Over Private Right-of-Way for property located in Cresswind at Spring Haven Subdivision, Phase 3A.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bill McKenzie
SECONDER: John Reidelbach
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

13. **Request Acceptance of Roadways and a Deed of Open Space Restriction Associated with Property Located in Fox Hall Subdivision, Phase 6 - District 1**

Motion to: Execute and Accept

The Board voted to execute a Deed of Open Space Restriction associated with Property Located in Fox Hall Subdivision, to accept Tattersall Way (extension) and First Flight Drive (extension), and the associated drainage structures and rights-of-way located in Fox Hall Subdivision, Phase 6, into the Coweta County Public Roads System, and place the constructed improvements into a three (3) year maintenance period.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Jeff Fisher
SECONDER: John Reidelbach
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Unfinished Business

14. **Request Appointments to Various Boards/Authorities**

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to take the following actions regarding appointments to various boards/authorities:

- Reappoint EMS Captain Brian Goldin as a member of the EMS Council (position # 1) for the term beginning July 1, 2026 and expiring June 30, 2029
- Reappoint Deputy Fire Chief Greg Shinkle as a member of the EMS Council (position # 4) for the term beginning July 1, 2026 and expiring June 30, 2029

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bill McKenzie
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

New Business

Bids and Contracts

15. **Request Approval/Execution of a Master Services Agreement with CorPay, Inc. of Atlanta**

Finance Director Hans Wilson explained that the County currently pays the vast majority of its vendors by check processed through its financial systems. Some payments are made by ACH (Automated Clearing House) or wire transfer depending on requirements, but these are the exceptions rather than the rule. Over the last three (3) years, numerous checks have been stolen, and in some cases have been altered and/or returned as fraudulent. Unfortunately, the County often does not become aware of these issues until a vendor reaches out at a later date to report nonpayment. The time for investigation and resolution can be quite long and cut into staff time that could be better spent on productive work. To address this, staff explored alternatives to paper checks by meeting with multiple banks and private corporations. Staff found that CorPay (private corporation) offers three (3) modalities for payment: virtual credit card, ACH, and paper checks, which CorPay would process. Under the proposed system, vendors would be able to choose how they receive payments. He further explained that virtual credit cards provide the recipient organization with benefits, including the safest and the fastest method of payment on accounts, while reducing the staff need to process paper checks. CorPay has reviewed the County's vendor payment data and estimated it could generate about $100,000 to $200,000 in rebates. The program would cost about $18,000 per year, but would also produce savings by reducing the need to buy and print checks, and pay for postage. The County currently mails about 200–250 checks per week, and postage costs are approaching $1 per check. He explained that if the County executes the contract within ninety (90) days, CorPay will waive half of the implementation fee.

Administrator Fouts explained that should the Board choose to approve this request, staff recommends that it be contingent upon final legal review since staff is awaiting several responses from Corpay.

In response to questions from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Wilson confirmed that the program would cost approximately $18,000 per year and could generate approximately $177,000 in rebates, based upon the vendor analysis of those who would accept virtual credit card payments. The rebate amount depends on how many vendors choose the virtual credit card option. The County's initial cost would be $30,000 with $15,000 waived in the next ninety (90) days. He also explained that according to the contract, liability for payment fraud would fall on the third-party company (CorPay), but legal disputes could still potentially involve the County. In addition, staff has been provided with information indicating that CorPay is compliant regarding cybersecurity standards, and the company works with other municipalities.

In response to a question from Commissioner Blackburn, Mr. Wilson explained that the County would send payment files to CorPay, which would use redundant verification systems to check vendor information before processing payments. The system is used beyond government clients and includes safeguards to detect changes in vendor banking details. For example, if a vendor changes its bank account, the payment would be flagged and require re-approval. The system is designed to prevent fraud or interception of payments by unauthorized parties. He also verified that vendors would have the option to choose payment by a paper check.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Wilson explained that the ACH transaction fees are included as part of the annual program cost.

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute a Master Services Agreement with CorPay, Inc of Atlanta to provide electronic payment to vendors, contingent upon final legal review.
RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bill McKenzie
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

16. **Request Approval/Execution of Supplemental Agreement # 2 with McCoy Grading Associated with the Southwest Connector Project (RB21.13)**

Public Workers Administrator Handley presented Supplemental Agreement # 2 with McCoy Grading associated with the Southwest Connector project (RB21.13), which includes the construction of two (2) concrete flumes to collect stormwater runoff down fill slopes in the area of the roundabout that is being constructed at the intersection of Corinth Road and Millard Farmer Road. He explained that the concrete flumes that were included in the project plans do not extend to the bottom of the fill slope in two (2) sections. He further explained that to prevent future erosion of the slopes that would occur if the slopes were left unprotected, staff has requested a cost proposal from the contractor to add concrete slope drains that would convey the runoff from the end of the flumes to the ditch at the bottom of the fill slope. He noted that the contractor submitted a price of $278.62 per square yard of concrete slope drain, and a quantity of fifty (50) square yards will be necessary for the project. Since this work was not included in the original contract, a Supplemental Agreement to add the concrete slope drains has been prepared. The total cost of the additional work will be $13,931.

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute the Supplemental Agreement # 2 with McCoy Grading in the amount of $13,391 associated with the Southwest Connector project (RB21.13).

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: John Reidelbach
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Additional Action Items

17. **Request Approval to Submit an Application Associated with the Fiscal Year 2024 State and Local Cybersecurity Grant**

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to approve submission of an application associated with the Fiscal Year 2024 State and Local Cybersecurity Grant.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bob Blackburn
SECONDER: Jeff Fisher
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

18. **Request Approval of Tax-Exempt Bonds for Monarch at the Creek Senior Living Community (RRCC) - Districts 3 and 4**

Administrator Fouts explained that the Board is being asked to consider a request to approve the holding of a TEFRA hearing in association with the issuance of tax-exempt revenue bonds through the Housing Authority of Newnan. This action is being considered in accordance with applicable federal tax regulations governing such financing mechanisms. He further explained that the request originates from a private developer, and relative supporting documentation, including project details and financial materials, has been provided in the meeting packet for the Board's review. He noted that Attorney Lee has been coordinating with the developer's attorney in advance of tonight's request.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Mr. Fouts explained that the Board did not approve the issuance of tax-exempt bonds or conduct a TEFRA (Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act) Public Hearing for the Wisteria residential project (senior living complex) directly adjacent to Monarch at the Creek.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach, Attorney Lee explained that the housing development had already received zoning approval (see May 6, 2014, minutes/Petition # 005-14) and could proceed independently. The current request relates only to a financing mechanism available under federal law for qualifying affordable rental housing projects. The proposed development is intended as an income-restricted rental community, where tenants must certify that their income falls within federally established limits. Because of those affordability requirements, the project may qualify for tax-exempt bond financing. The Commission's involvement is limited to conducting the required TEFRA Public Hearing, which is mandated under federal law before tax-exempt bonds can be issued. He further noted that the request is being presented to the Board because the project is located in the unincorporated county area, and therefore the Housing Authority could not conduct the hearing independently. He also explained that, to his knowledge, the County does not otherwise maintain operational facilities or formal ties with the Housing Authority outside the City of Newnan.

Mr. Fouts explained that the only other local housing development financed through tax-exempt bonds was Wesley Woods. In that case, the bonds were issued through the Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly Authority of Coweta County. He noted that he was uncertain whether the proposed development would qualify to use the same financing structure.

In response to a question from Commissioner Blackburn regarding whether the County has previously subsidized housing, Attorney Lee and Administrator Fouts stated that they are not aware of any such subsidies and emphasized that the current proposal should not be viewed as a direct subsidy. Instead, they described it as a financing mechanism that allows qualifying developments to utilize tax-exempt bond funding under federal law.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smith, bond counsel (for Monarch at the Creek) David Williams clarified that the Housing Authority would receive a nominal administrative fee for issuing the tax-exempt bonds associated with the project. He further explained that, unlike the Wisteria development, this project is using bond financing as part of its capital funding structure. Because tax-exempt bonds are being utilized, federal law requires County involvement through the TEFRA hearing and approval process. He noted that the Wisteria project did not use bond financing, which is why County participation was not required in that instance.

Mr. Williams continued by explaining that, under current law, housing authorities may operate anywhere within the state, provided they obtain consent from the local jurisdiction affected by the project. In this case, the request before the Commission is to authorize the Housing Authority to issue tax-exempt bonds for a development located in the unincorporated area of the county. He further explained that federal financing regulations require a public hearing and approval by the elected governing authority with jurisdiction over the project site before tax-exempt bonds may be issued.

Commissioner Reidelbach explained that the financing structure was new to the Board and referenced the County’s ongoing efforts to support affordable housing initiatives, including partnerships with Habitat for Humanity through property donations and other assistance. He asked whether there might be an opportunity for the County to collaborate with the Housing Authority and potentially share in a portion of the administrative revenue generated from the bond issuance to help support future Habitat for Humanity housing projects.

Mr. Williams explained that he has seen this done in other jurisdictions, where counties, school boards, housing authorities, and development authorities regularly collaborate and share revenue, when appropriate, to address community impacts and support development projects.

Mr. Barron explained that no one had previously suggested this idea, but he would be happy to speak to the members of the Housing Authority board about the possibility.

Commissioner Reidelbach and Mr. Barron agreed that this could provide another opportunity for collaboration between the City and the County, noting that the two entities working together would benefit the community.

In response to a question from Attorney Lee, Mr. Williams explained that the costs associated with the transaction are borne by the borrower, including legal review time.

A motion made by Commissioner Reidelbach, seconded by Commissioner Blackburn to continue any discussion or decision regarding tax-exempt bonds for Monarch at the Creek Senior Living Community until June 16, 2026, was subsequently rescinded (later in the meeting) following discussion regarding the timing for the developer to close on the project.

Commissioner Smith stated that, if the Board approves the tax-exempt bonds for the project, he does not want the approval to be contingent upon the Housing Authority agreeing to share revenue with the County. He noted that revenue sharing was a good idea, but he believes that it should not be required for the project to move forward. He feels that the project is a good idea for the community in and of itself.

In response to a question from Chairman McKenzie regarding whether the matter could also be handled through the State process, Mr. Williams explained that it could, but noted that the process takes more time. He further explained that the state can be bureaucratic on certain matters, resulting in delays, and indicated that generally this issue was one of those cases.

In response to a question from Commissioner Reidelbach regarding whether a county resident could live in a Newnan Housing Authority property, Mr. Williams explained that the project will be privately owned and that the Housing Authority's role would be limited to facilitating the tax-exempt financing. He further explained that federal tax law requires a governmental entity to issue tax-exempt bonds, meaning private companies cannot issue such bonds directly on their own. The proposed project will be owned by a private company, and they will be required to comply with all applicable fair housing laws, making the housing available to all qualified applicants.

In response to a question from Chairman McKenzie regarding whether there was any possibility of default and whether the County could be held responsible, Mr. Williams explained that there was no such risk. He further explained that the debt is solely the liability of the borrower, and that the governing documents explicitly state that the obligation is not a liability of the authority, city, county, or state, and that responsibility rests entirely with the borrower.

Attorney Lee reiterated that the project has already been approved (RRCC zoning) and can be built. He clarified that the request before the Board is only regarding a financing mechanism.

Administrator Fouts followed up by asking if the Board wanted to explore the possibility of using the Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly Authority of Coweta County to gain approval for the issuance of the tax-exempt bonds. Mr. Williams responded that, by statute, the Residential Care Authority can only issue bonds for 501(c)(3) organizations, such as Wesley Woods, which they have done in prior transactions. Unfortunately, this limitation means it would not be applicable in this case.

Commissioner Fisher expressed that if the approval was not contingent upon receiving additional information or responses, the Board should consider voting to approve the issue tonight. He suggested that any outstanding questions could still be addressed by attending the next meeting of the Housing Authority. He emphasized that, if approved, the financing would proceed regardless of subsequent answers, and reiterated that the item was solely a funding mechanism with no risk to the County.

Mr. Williams clarified that, technically, what the Board would be approving tonight would be authorization for him and Attorney Lee to proceed with conducting the required TEFRA hearing and securing an approval signature from the Commission Chairman. He noted that this process would take some time, including coordination with the Chairman. In the interim, the Commissioners could attend the next Housing Authority meeting to gain answers regarding revenue sharing.

Attorney Lee emphasized that should the Board vote to approve this request, it would be a fully approved and final decision. There will be no requirement to revisit or reapprove the matter at a later date.

In response to a question from Attorney Lee, Mr. Williams explained that he is requesting that the Board approve authorization for the Housing Authority to conduct business outside its jurisdiction and to authorize him and Attorney Lee to complete the TEFRA hearing process. This approval would be conditioned upon entering into an acceptable agreement with the Housing Authority.

Commissioner Fisher pointed out that since the approval was not intended to be contingent upon revenue sharing with the Housing Authority, the Board could proceed by simply approving the request.

Mr. Williams explained that, from a bond counsel perspective, the legal requirement is simply to receive approval from the Board. He outlined two (2) possible approaches: first, a straightforward approval authorizing the Housing Authority to operate within the jurisdiction of the County and proceed with the TEFRA process; and second, a conditional approval that would require entering into an acceptable agreement with the Housing Authority before the transaction could close.

Administrator Fouts explained that should the Board approve this issue contingent upon an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the Housing Authority, that IGA would have to be presented to the Board at a future meeting for consideration.

In response to a question from Attorney Lee, Mr. Williams explained that under the law, the hearing could be held at Mr. Lee's office and that Mr. Lee could serve as the hearing officer, rather than requiring the full Board to attend a meeting. He clarified that the vote being discussed tonight would authorize the Chairman to sign the approval on behalf of the Board.

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to authorize Attorney Lee to act as hearing officer to conduct a TEFRA hearing associated with the issuance of tax-exempt revenue bonds for the Monarch at the Creek Senior Living Community), contingent upon an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the Newnan Housing Authority.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: John Reidelbach
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

19. **Request Approval/Execution of an Amendment to Chapter 74. Traffic and Vehicles of the Coweta County Code of Ordinances to Designate No Parking Zones on Timberbrook Drive - District 1**

Public Works Administrator Handley presented an amendment to *Chapter 74* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances* to designate "No Parking" zones on Timberbrook Drive, Sharpsburg. He mentioned that there has been a commercial establishment drive-thru that is causing traffic to back up onto Timberbrook Drive and onto Highway 34. A meeting has been scheduled with the owner of this establishment to discuss an alternative solution. The request is to establish a "No Parking" zone along Timberbrook Drive, preventing vehicles from parking or queuing along the roadway, creating safety hazards and obstructions to residents and other motorists.

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute an amendment to *Chapter 74. Traffic and Vehicles* of the *Coweta County Code of Ordinances* to designate "No Parking" on Timberbrook Drive, Sharspburg.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bob Blackburn
SECONDER: Jeff Fisher
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

20. **Request from White Oak Subdivision Homeowners Association for Permission to Place Radar Speed Signs - District 4**

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute an Encroachment Agreement with Community Association of Coweta County, Inc. associated with the purchase, installation, and maintenance of two (2) radar speed signs by the White Oak Subdivision Homeowners' Association along White Oak Drive, with all costs borne by the HOA.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: John Reidelbach
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

21. **Request to Temporarily Close Tommy Lee Cook Road Between Cook Lane and Cedar**

Ridge Road for the Purposes of Lowering of the Road to Improve Sight Distance - District 3

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to temporarily close Tommy Lee Cook Road between Cook Lane and Cedar Ridge Road for a period of sixty (60) days for the purposes of lowering the road to improve sight distance.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bob Blackburn
SECONDER: John Reidelbach
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

22. **Request Approval to Assist the Town of Sharpsburg with Patching of Potholes - District 1**

Motion to: Approve

The Board voted to provide labor and equipment to assist the Town of Sharpsburg with patching potholes on Main Street and Church Street.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Alphonso Smith
SECONDER: Bob Blackburn
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Supplemental and Non-Agenda Items

No Supplemental or Non-Agenda items were added for discussion.

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.

For ease of transcription, the following speakers are not in order of appearance, but in order of topic.

The following citizens expressed concerns about the previously approved Project Sail data center and an upcoming rezoning request associated with Project Oak data center. They expressed extreme concerns about noise pollution, adverse impacts on mental and physical health, increased traffic, dust, blasting activity, proximity to residential properties, decreased residential property values, use of eminent domain being used by utility companies, recent negative comments about citizens by a Board member, failure to create long-term jobs, tax exemptions granted to data centers, failure to listen to the citizenry, erosion runoff, lack of EPA regulation of data centers, prioritizing profits over people, potentially contaminating or draining nearby lakes, ponds, and creeks, setting a precedent of creating isolated residential areas, attempts to silence speakers in opposition, and allegations regarding the illegal use of 30 million gallons of water by a data center in a neighboring county.

- Ms. Chloe Childress, District 3 (on behalf of Ms. Sheila Warner, Ms. Jill Collins, and Mr. Keo Honokaupu)
- Ms. Cathy Newman, Wagers Mill Road, Newnan
- Mr. Jimmy Newman, Wagers Mill Road, Newnan
- Ms. Tonya Smith, Ragsdale Road, Sharpsburg
- Mr. Ron Bockrath, District 2
- Mr. Benjamin Gamblin, Walt Sanders Road, Newnan

Mr. Ron Bockrath also questioned the county's spending priorities, referencing spending $800,000 to purchase property for an Animal Adoption Center and a recreation center while residents have been requesting walking trails and playgrounds. He acknowledged the need to adequately pay County employees but emphasized that priorities should focus on people rather than projects or facilities.

Mr. William Nowell, Glenleigh Way, Newnan, explained that he is a business owner and operator of a mobile home park in Coweta County. He stated that he previously met with some Commissioners to introduce a concept for an affordable housing solution for the county. He explained that the purpose of his comments was to respectfully request that the Board consider evaluating a new zoning district overlay or zoning amendment that would allow greater flexibility for attainable housing developments, particularly with regard to density, minimum square footage requirements, and modular housing communities. He stated that his request aligns with the County’s draft 2026–2046 Comprehensive Plan, noting that the mobile home park property on U.S. Highway 29 is located in a designated growth area targeted for redevelopment and infrastructure improvements. He also referenced the Plan's recognition of the housing affordability crisis and the need for more flexible housing options, including alternative housing strategies and accessory dwelling units. He stated that the proposal would encourage redevelopment within an existing growth corridor instead of contributing to urban sprawl, provide more affordable housing options for working families and other residents, and replace an aging mobile home park with a professionally planned modular home community. He further stated that redeveloping older properties could increase tax revenue, improve infrastructure and road corridors, and encourage long-term investment in the community. He also explained that modern modular homes are high-quality, energy-efficient homes built to International Residential Code (IRC) and International Building Code (IBC) standards in factories and permanently placed on foundations, making them more affordable than many traditional site-built homes. In conclusion, he respectfully asked the Board to direct staff to evaluate a new zoning district or framework that would allow flexibility in density, minimum home square footage, lot sizing, and attainable housing development standards, while still maintaining standards for appearance, infrastructure, landscaping, and long-term maintenance.

In response to a previous comment regarding the Animal Adoption Center, Assistant Administrator Mickle clarified that there had been some confusion about the $800,000, explaining that it reflects the total cost of the property purchase. Of that amount, approximately $240,000 was for the Animal Adoption Center property, while a little over $600,000 was used for a passive park that is planned behind the Center. She also noted that of the $600,000, the County received approximately $250,000 from a state grant.

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 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, County Clerk Zerangue, and Deputy County Clerk Payne.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bill McKenzie
SECONDER: John Reidelbach
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Regular Session

Motion to: Return to Regular Session

The Board discussed litigation issues during Executive Session and voted to return to Regular Session.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: John Reidelbach
SECONDER: Alphonso Smith
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Affidavit

Motion to: Execute

The Board voted to execute the affidavit for Executive Session.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Alphonso Smith
SECONDER: John Reidelbach
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith

Adjournment

Motion to: Adjourn

The Board voted to adjourn the meeting.

RESULT: Passed (UNANIMOUS)
MOVER: Bob Blackburn
SECONDER: John Reidelbach
AYES: Bill McKenzie, John Reidelbach, Jeff Fisher, Bob Blackburn, Alphonso Smith