



Agenda

Alcohol License and Zoning Public Hearings Special Meeting

The Honorable Carmalitha Gumbs, Mayor
The Honorable Catherine F. Rowell, District 1
The Honorable Aaron V. Johnson, District 2
The Honorable LaTonya Toni Wright, District 3
The Honorable Jacey Sebastian, District 4
The Honorable Keosha B. Bell, District 5
The Honorable Natasha Williams-Brown, District 6
The Honorable Linda B. Pritchett, District 7

Tuesday, July 28, 2026

5:00 PM

City Hall

SOUTH FULTON CITY COUNCIL MISSION STATEMENT:

To provide exceptional customer service that sustains a safe, inclusive, innovative, and an economically vibrant city.

Live-stream:	Public Meeting Portal (Civic Clerk): https://southfultonga.portal.civicclerk.com
Public Comment:	https://www.cityofsouthfultonga.gov/3074/Public-Comment-at-Council-Meetings

- I. Meeting Called to Order - Mayor Gumbs**
 - II. Roll Call - Corey Adams, City Clerk**
 - III. Alcohol Licenses, Rezoning, Variance and Modification Cases (For Presentation and Public Hearing Only)**
 - A. (Public Hearing) TA26-003 An Ordinance To Amend The City Of South Fulton Zoning Ordinance, As Amended, To Repeal Ordinance 2024-034 And Replace With An Ordinance To Regulate The Development And Operation Of Data Centers Within The City Of South Fulton; To Establish Zoning, Permitting, Population Limits, And Performance Standards; To Protect Public Infrastructure And Neighborhoods
- Staff Recommendation: Approval
Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval with the following conditions:
1. Restrict data centers to M-2 districts rather than M-1 and M-2.
 2. Require the utility-capacity letter within 90 days.
 3. Require developers to repair property or infrastructure damage caused by development.
 4. Encourage utility towers and related equipment to be screened or placed away from prominent public views.
 5. Add a reference to or requirement concerning solar power.
 6. Include glycol cooling as an available cooling option.
 7. Change the minimum lot size from 20 acres to 10 acres.

IV. Proclamation Presentation

- A. Municipal Leader Community and Workplace Culture Course certificate presentation by Freddie Broome. (Councilmember Pritchett)
- B. Presentation to the Swordfish Swim Team (Mayor Gumbs)
- C. Recognition of the Finance Department for the Acceptance of the Government Finance Officers Association Distinguished Budget Presentation Award
- D. ADD ON: Presentation of the Unity in the Community Award from the South Fulton National Day of Prayer Committee

V. Executive Session, if necessary

VI. Adjournment of Meeting

TA26-XXXX AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CITY OF SOUTH FULTON ZONING ORDINANCE, AS AMENDED, TO REPEAL ORDINANCE 2024-034 AND REPLACE WITH AN ORDINANCE TO REGULATE THE DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF DATA CENTERS WITHIN THE CITY OF SOUTH FULTON; TO ESTABLISH ZONING, PERMITTING, POPULATION LIMITS, AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS; TO PROTECT PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEIGHBORHOODS; AND FOR OTHER LAWFUL PURPOSES.

Sponsors: Councilwoman Rowell, Councilwoman Bell, and Councilwoman Williams-Brown

WHEREAS, the City of South Fulton ("City") is a municipal corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Georgia; and

WHEREAS, the duly elected governing authority of the City is the Mayor and Council thereof ("City Council"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to City Charter Section 3.10 (b), the City Council is authorized to adopt ordinances and amendments it deems necessary, expedient, or helpful for the health, welfare, safety, comfort and well-being of the inhabitants of the City; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Council of the City of South Fulton finds that this text amendment to the City of South Fulton Zoning Ordinance is in the best interest of the public health, safety, and welfare; and

WHEREAS, the proliferation of data centers can bring adverse impacts to residents of communities, such as pollution, water shortages, increases in costs for energy and infrastructure, and environmental pollution; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Council of the City of South Fulton desires to protect the City and its residents from such adverse impacts.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOUTH FULTON HEREBY ORDAINS
as follows:

That section 302.48 be repealed and replaced with the following:

SECTION 1. PURPOSE AND INTENT

The purpose of this Ordinance is to establish regulations governing the location,

development, and operation of data centers within the City of South Fulton in order to:

- A. Protect residential communities from adverse impacts;
- B. Ensure responsible use of public infrastructure and utilities;
- C. Promote sustainable and environmentally sound development practices;
- D. Ensure that economic benefits are proportional to infrastructure demands; and
- E. Preserve the public health, safety, and quality of life

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS

(Sec. 904.04 - D (Definitions) of Article 9 - Glossary, of Appendix C (Zoning), shall be amended to add the following definition)

A. Data Center: A facility used primarily for the storage, management, processing, transmission and dissemination of data and information through computer systems, servers, and associated infrastructure, including backup power generation and cooling systems. As used in this ordinance, the term data center will also encompass an existing property that is being converted to a data center.

SECTION 3. PERMITTED LOCATIONS

A. Data centers shall be permitted only within industrial zoning districts, limited to M-1 (Light Industrial) and M-2 (Heavy Industrial). A special use permit shall be required for all data centers

NAICS Ref.	Principal Uses ↓ Zoning Districts →	AG-C-1	C-2	O-I	MIX	M-1	M-2	For Restrictions See Sec:	
A = Allowed		S = Allowed if Approved as a Special Use					Blank = Prohibited		
	Other Business Support Services								
5188210	Data Processing, Hosting and Related Services						<u>S</u>	<u>S</u>	
541513	Computer Facilities Management Services for Data Centers						<u>S</u>	<u>S</u>	

B. Minimum Setback: No data center shall be located within 2640 feet of any property zoned or used for mixed-use or residential purposes, measured from property line to property line.

SECTION 4. POPULATION-BASED LIMITATIONS

A. The total number of data centers permitted within the City shall not exceed one (1) data center per thirty thousand (30,000) City residents.

B. Population shall be determined using the most recent official estimate published by the Atlanta Regional Commission or the U.S. Census Bureau, whichever is more current.

C. Compliance with this population cap shall be evaluated at:

1. The time a Special Use Permit (SUP) application is deemed complete; and
 2. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
- D. The City may deny or delay approval if the population threshold is exceeded.

SECTION 5. SPECIAL USE PERMIT REQUIRED

A. All data center developments shall require approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) by the City Council.

B. In addition to standard SUP requirements, applicants must demonstrate:

1. Adequate Electrical Capacity, including utility certification;
2. No Significant Adverse Impact on surrounding properties;
3. Compliance with all environmental, water, and noise standards in this Ordinance;
4. Economic Benefit proportional to infrastructure demand.

C. Cumulative Impact Consideration: The City may deny any application if cumulative infrastructure impacts would exceed capacity or negatively affect public welfare.

SECTION 6. MINIMUM LOT SIZE

The minimum lot area shall be 20 acres.

SECTION 7. ENERGY AND UTILITIES REQUIREMENTS

A. Utility Capacity Certification

The applicant shall submit **Utility Capacity Certifications** issued by the **utility provider(s) that serve the proposed data center site**.

Depending on the service type, certifications would come from:

- **Electric Power:**
Georgia Power, Greystone Power or the applicable electric utility provider.
- **Water and Sewer:**
Atlanta Watershed, Fulton County Department of Public Works, or the City of South Fulton Public Works Department (if applicable to the service area) or the applicable provider

- **Natural Gas (if applicable):**
Atlanta Gas Light or the applicable provider
- **Telecommunications**
Major carriers (e.g., fiber providers) if redundancy and bandwidth capacity are part of the SUP criteria

B. The Infrastructure Upgrade Plan (“Plan”)

The Plan shall identify all utility and public infrastructure improvements required to support the proposed data center at full build-out and ensure such improvements are adequately funded, phased, and implemented without adverse impact on existing users.

Required Contents of Plan

The Plan shall include, at a minimum, the following components:

1. Existing Conditions Assessment

- Current capacity of all affected systems, including:
 - Electrical transmission and distribution
 - Water supply and distribution
 - Wastewater and sewer systems
 - Stormwater infrastructure
 - Transportation access (if materially impacted)
- Identification of existing constraints, deficiencies, or bottlenecks

2. Projected Demand Analysis

- Total projected demand at **full build-out**, including:
 - Peak and average electrical load (MW)
 - Water usage (gallons per day)
 - Wastewater discharge volumes
- Demand by **development phase**
- Load profiles (24-hour and seasonal variations, if applicable)

3. Required Infrastructure Improvements

- Detailed description of all required upgrades, including:
 - New substations, transmission lines, or feeders

- Water/sewer line upsizing or extensions
- Pump stations, storage tanks, or pressure improvements
- Roadway or access improvements (if applicable)
- Identification of **on-site vs. off-site improvements**
- Mapping and schematics showing locations and connections

4. Phasing Plan

- Alignment of infrastructure improvements with each phase of development
- Identification of:
 - Trigger points for upgrades (e.g., MW thresholds, occupancy levels)
 - Infrastructure required prior to issuance of building permits or certificates of occupancy for each phase

5. Implementation Schedule

- Detailed timeline for design, permitting, and construction of each improvement
- Coordination milestones with utility providers
- Critical path items that could delay service delivery

6. Cost Estimates and Financial Responsibility

- Itemized cost estimates for all infrastructure improvements
- Identification of responsible party for each cost
- Documentation demonstrating:
 - **All upgrade costs will be borne by the applicant and/or private agreements**
 - **No costs will be transferred to existing utility ratepayers or the City**

7. Utility Provider Coordination

- Written confirmation from each applicable utility provider that:
 - The proposed upgrades are sufficient and feasible
 - The Plan is consistent with utility system requirements
 - No utility upgrade costs will be transferred to existing rate payers
- Identification of any required:

- Interconnection agreements
- Service agreements
- Easements or right-of-way acquisitions

8. Redundancy and Reliability Measures

- Description of backup systems and redundancy (e.g., N+1, 2N configurations)
- Identification of how outages will be mitigated without impacting surrounding systems
- Load-shedding or curtailment strategies, if applicable

9. Environmental and Community Impact

- Assessment of impacts from infrastructure upgrades, including:
 - Land disturbance
 - Noise (especially substations and generators)
 - Air emissions
- Mitigation measures for identified impacts

10. Compliance and Monitoring

- Proposed method for tracking infrastructure capacity and usage over time
- Reporting requirements to the City (e.g., annual certification of capacity and usage)
- Identification of responsible party for ongoing compliance

C. Certification Requirement

The Plan shall be prepared, signed, and sealed by:

- **A licensed professional engineer (P.E.)** in the State of Georgia; and
- Accompanied by written concurrence from applicable utility providers.

D. Approval Standard

The City shall approve the Infrastructure Upgrade Plan only upon finding that:

1. All necessary infrastructure improvements are clearly identified and feasible;
2. Adequate capacity will exist at each phase of development;
3. The Plan prevents degradation of service to existing customers; and

4. No financial burden is shifted to the City or existing ratepayers.

E. Binding Obligation

Approved Infrastructure Upgrade Plans shall be:

- Incorporated into the **Special Use Permit conditions**;
- Enforceable as a condition of development approval; and
- Subject to revision only with City approval.

F. Failure to Comply

1. Failure to implement the Infrastructure Upgrade Plan may result in:

- Suspension of permits,
- Withholding of certificates of occupancy,
- Revocation of the Special Use Permit,
- Or other remedies available under law.

SECTION 8. WATER USE AND CONSERVATION

A. Applicants must submit a Water Impact Study evaluating projected water use and impacts on local supply.

B. All data centers shall:

1. Utilize a closed-loop reclaimed water system, where feasible; or newer, more efficient water conservation technology.
2. Implement water-efficient cooling technologies to minimize potable water consumption.

SECTION 9. NOISE STANDARDS

A. Applicants shall provide a professional Acoustical Analysis.

B. Maximum sound levels at the property line:

1. 60 dBA during daytime (7:00 AM – 10:00 PM);
2. 50 dBA during nighttime (10:00 PM – 7:00 AM).

C. Continuous monitoring and mitigation may be required.

SECTION 10. LANDSCAPING, BUFFERING, AND SCREENING

- A. Landscaping, buffering, and screening requirements are intended to minimize visual, noise, and environmental impacts of data centers on adjacent properties, particularly residential areas and public rights-of-way.

B. Perimeter Buffer Requirements

1. Minimum Buffer Widths

- Adjacent to residentially zoned or used property: Minimum 100-foot buffer
- Adjacent to non-residential property: Minimum 50-foot buffer
- Adjacent to public streets: Minimum 30-foot landscaped setback

2. Buffers shall be measured from the data center property line inward.

C. Planting Standards

1. Tree Requirements

- Minimum 1 canopy tree per 30 linear feet within buffer areas
- Minimum 1 understory tree per 40 linear feet
- Trees shall be at least:
 - 3-inch caliper at installation (canopy trees)
 - 2-inch caliper (understory trees)

2. Shrubs and Groundcover

- Minimum 10 shrubs per 100 linear feet
- Shrubs shall be at least 24 inches in height at installation
- Ground cover or turf grass required for full coverage of exposed soil

3. Spacing and Arrangement

- Plantings shall be staggered in at least two (2) rows
- Designed to achieve minimum 80% opacity within three (3) years

D. Berms and Fencing

1. Earthen Berms

- Required along any property line adjacent to residential uses

- Minimum height: 6 feet
- Maximum slope ratio: 3:1 (horizontal: vertical)
- Berms must be stabilized with vegetation or groundcover

2. Fencing/Walls

- Minimum 8-foot opaque fence or wall required along:
 - Residential-facing property lines
 - Areas containing mechanical equipment
- Acceptable materials include masonry, decorative concrete, or composite materials
- Chain-link fencing is prohibited along residential-facing boundaries

SECTION 11. OUTDOOR LIGHTING

Outdoor lighting shall comply with the standards of the International Dark-Sky Association in order to minimize light pollution.

SECTION 12. ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS AND GENERATOR EMISSIONS

A. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) performed by an independent engineering firm, licensed and registered in the state of Georgia is required for all proposed data centers.

B. Backup generators and other energy production systems shall:

1. Comply with applicable emissions standards as set by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Georgia Environmental Protection Division;
2. Any diesel generators shall meet the EPA Tier VI emission standards;
3. Utilize best available control technologies;
4. Limit testing and operational hours to reduce community impact.
5. The requirements of this subsection shall apply to all energy production systems whether such systems are temporary or permanent

SECTION 13 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

All datacenters shall be required to comply with the stormwater management standards as specified in the City's Building Code which is currently codified at Title 3, Chapter 9, Section 3-9005 of the City's Code of Ordinances

SECTION 14 PARKING

Data centers must provide minimum parking of three spaces per thousand gross square feet of office space to be occupied within the development.

SECTION 15 PHASED DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

A. Data center projects shall be developed in phases.

B. Each phase must be:

1. Aligned with demonstrated demand
2. Evaluated independently for infrastructure capacity and compliance;
3. Reviewed and approved by the City before subsequent phases begin.

SECTION 16. DECOMMISSIONING

A. Any data center that plans to cease operations shall submit a Decommissioning Plan to the City at least 60 days prior to the planned date of shutdown.

B. If a Data Center ceases operations and the shutdown is unplanned, a Decommissioning Plan should be submitted to the City within 60 days of the shutdown.

C. The Decommissioning Plan will be subject to review and approval by the City of South Fulton's Community Development and Regulatory Affairs Department.

SECTION 17. ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

A. The City is authorized to enforce all provisions through inspections, monitoring, and compliance reviews.

B. Violations may result in:

1. Suspension or revocation of the Special Use Permit;
2. Stop-work orders;
3. Fines as established by City Code;
4. Any other lawful remedy.

SECTION 18.

It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Mayor and Council that: (a) All sections, paragraphs, sentences, clauses, and phrases of this Ordinance are or were, upon their enactment, believed by the City Council to be fully valid, enforceable, and constitutional.

(b) To the greatest extent allowed by law, every section, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance is severable from every other section, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance. No section, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase

of this Ordinance is mutually dependent upon any other section, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance.

(c) In the event that any phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph or section of this Ordinance shall, for any reason whatsoever, be declared invalid, unconstitutional or otherwise unenforceable by the valid judgment or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction, it is the express intent of the City Council that such invalidity, unconstitutionality or unenforceability shall, to the greatest extent allowed by law, not render invalid, unconstitutional or otherwise unenforceable any of the remaining phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs or sections of the Ordinance.

SECTION 19.

The City Attorney, City Clerk or Codifier are authorized to make non-substantive editing and renumbering revisions to this Ordinance for proofing, codification, and supplementation purposes. The final version of all resolutions shall be filed with the City Clerk.

SECTION 20.

All ordinances and resolutions or parts thereof that are in conflict with this Ordinance are, to the extent of such conflict, hereby repealed.

SECTION 21.

The effective date of this Ordinance shall be from the date of adoption, unless provided otherwise by the City Charter or state and/or federal law.

[signatures and voting tabulations appear on the following page]

CITY OF SOUTH FULTON, GEORGIA
Planning Commission Meeting
City Hall
Wednesday, July 15, 2026, 6:00 PM



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

I. Meeting Called to Order at 6:07 pm by Commissioner Giavani Smith-Vickers.

II. Roll Call

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mike Dunn (At-Large) **PRESENT**
 Giavani Smith-Vickers, Chair (District 1) **PRESENT**
 Jackie Barrett Washington (District 2) **PRESENT**
 Vacant (District 3)
 Trone Jefferson (District 4) **PRESENT**
 Stacey Williams (District 5) **PRESENT**
 Tamiko Leverette (District 6) **PRESENT**
 Vacant (District 7)

1. Consideration of meeting minutes from the June Meeting Minutes. ***Commissioner Dunn moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.***
2. Approval of agenda. ***Commissioner Williams made a motion to approve the agenda. Commissioner Jefferson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.***

OLD BUSINESS

Case Z26-014/CDP26-004 (Public Hearing): An application by Taliya King requesting a rezoning from AG-1 (Agricultural District/Old National Highway Overlay District) to R-4 (Single-Family Dwelling District/Old National Highway Overlay District) to develop two single family detached dwelling with a land use amendment from Regional Live Work Character Area to the Suburban I Neighborhood Character Area on 0.52 acres at 5250 Northfield Blvd (Parcel ID: 13 0068 LL0888). City Council District: 5.

Staff presented the request to rezone the property from AG-1 to R-4 and amend the Comprehensive Development Plan to permit two single-family detached residences. Staff recommended **denial** of both requests. The primary concern was changing one small parcel from Regional Live-Work to Suburban 2 while the surrounding area remained designated Regional Live-Work. Staff characterized this as creating an isolated or “spot” future-land-use amendment inconsistent with the recently adopted comprehensive plan.

The applicant, representing LRP Capital, stated that:

- The property is a small infill parcel located near Northfield Boulevard and Jolly Road.
- The property would be divided into two lots.
- Both houses would face Jolly Road and have direct access from that road.
- Each house would include a two-car garage.
- The project would be low-impact and would replace a vacant area where illegal dumping had reportedly occurred.
- The parcel was too small to support the mixed-use or live-work development envisioned by the existing future-land-use designation.
- Roofline and driveway concerns raised during community participation had been addressed.
- The proposed houses would be compatible with nearby two-story homes.

No speakers formally opposed or supported the case during the hearing.

Commissioners discussed:

- Whether the two homes could comply with the existing Regional Live-Work designation.
- Staff’s concern that granting the amendment would undermine the newly adopted comprehensive plan.
- The small size of the parcel and its practical inability to accommodate both residential and commercial uses.
- Whether the proposed house design would fit the older surrounding neighborhood.
- Driveways, garages, rooflines, and neighborhood compatibility.
- Feedback from the applicant’s community meeting, where residents reportedly accepted residential development but raised design concerns.

Staff’s findings of fact were approved.

Z26-014 motion: Commissioner Dunn recommended denial and Commissioner Williams seconded the motion.

Vote: Unanimous approval of the denial motion.

CDP26-004 motion: Commissioner Dunn recommended denial and Commissioner Williams seconded the motion.

Vote: Unanimous approval of the denial motion.

Outcome: Both cases were forwarded to City Council with recommendations for denial and were scheduled for the August 11, 2026, public hearing.

Case Z26-012/CDP26-005 (Public Hearing): An application by Greater Turner Chapel AME Church c/o Darnell Moore requesting a rezoning from R3 (Single-Family Dwelling District) to SH (Senior Housing District), a future land use amendment from Suburban I Neighborhood Character Area to Community Live Work Character Area and a concurrent variance to reduce the 40ft undisturbed buffer to 20ft on the west and south side of the property to accommodate a retaining wall and walking path on 5.16 acres at 4685 Cascade Road. (Parcel ID: 14F0060 LL0524) Council District: 1.

Staff presented the request to rezone approximately 5.6 acres from R-3 to Senior Housing (SH), amend the Comprehensive Development Plan, and a concurrent variance. Staff recommended **denial** of the rezoning, future-land-use amendment, and variance. Staff had met with the applicant after the previous deferral to review the revised site plan and renderings but maintained its denial recommendation.

Staff's primary land-use concern was that the proposed senior-housing zoning and Community Live-Work designation were not considered an appropriate transition within the surrounding low-density residential area.

The applicant argued that:

- South Fulton has an aging population and insufficient senior-housing options.
- The church wanted to use its property to allow seniors to remain near their families, churches, medical providers, and support networks.
- The project would be relatively low-density and would use only part of the property.
- Independent-living units would be cottage-style homes inspired by other successful senior-cottage developments in the area.
- Landscaping and buffers would limit visibility from Cascade Road and neighboring homes.
- The assisted-living structure would be two stories, not three.
- The applicant had worked extensively with staff on turning radii, mailboxes, sidewalks, buffers, trails, amenity areas, and building design.
- Design standards could be imposed as conditions.
- The church was attempting to establish a regulatory framework before selecting a development partner.
- The development was not proposed as a Section 8 project, although the applicant acknowledged that future ownership decisions could affect operations.

A supporter emphasized:

- The need for safe, affordable, accessible housing for seniors.
- The value of allowing older adults to remain in their existing community.
- Reduced isolation and increased social interaction.
- Potential employment and economic activity.
- The project's consistency with values of dignity and care for older residents.

Numerous nearby residents opposed the project. Their principal concerns included:

- Changing the quiet, mature, single-family character of the neighborhood.
- Increased density, traffic, visitors, deliveries, and emergency-service activity.
- Possible property-value reductions.
- Reducing the buffer from 40 feet to 20 feet near established homes.
- Drainage and stormwater flowing downhill toward neighboring properties.
- Views of walls or larger buildings from adjoining backyards.

- Lack of a traffic-impact study.
- Security concerns because the project would not be gated.
- Concern that SH zoning could permit broader institutional, rental, assisted-living, or nursing-home uses.
- Fear that the rezoning could encourage additional commercial or higher-density rezonings.
- Questions regarding public-participation notices.
- The existence of other senior developments and community facilities nearby.
- Concern that the development partner and final operating model had not yet been selected.

Several opponents stated that they supported senior cottages in concept but preferred a lower-density residential zoning approach rather than the proposed SH district.

The applicant responded that:

- The assisted-living building would be two stories.
- Heavy landscaping would screen the project.
- The cottages and assisted-living facility were intended to be architecturally appropriate for the area.
- The project was not proposed as Section 8 housing.
- Approximately half of the five-acre site would remain undeveloped or landscaped.
- The church intended to partner with a developer but wanted zoning conditions established first.
- The project would address a genuine need for senior living in South Fulton.

Commissioners questioned:

- Whether the proposed zoning was compatible with the recently adopted comprehensive plan.
- Whether the project could be accomplished under a residential district with age restrictions.
- The distinction between independent senior cottages, assisted living, and a nursing home.
- Potential traffic, emergency access, buffers, drainage, building visibility, security, and neighborhood compatibility.
- Whether conditions could sufficiently limit the project's intensity and future use.
- Whether the applicant's proposal had enough specificity without a selected development partner.

Staff's findings of fact were accepted.

Z26-012 motion: Commissioner Williams recommended denial; Commissioner Leverette seconded the motion.

Result: Denial motion approved unanimously.

CV26-003 motion: Commissioner Williams recommended denial; Commissioner Leverette seconded the motion

Result: Denial motion approved unanimously.

CDP26-005 motion: Commissioner Williams recommended denial; Commissioner Leverette seconded the motion.

Result: Denial motion approved unanimously.

Outcome: All three requests were forwarded to City Council with recommendations for denial for the August 11, 2026, public hearing.

Case Z26-001/ CDP26-003 (Public Hearing): An application by Bridge Logistics c/o Henry Bailey requesting a rezoning from SUB-A (Suburban A Single-Family Dwelling District/Sandtown Overlay District) to M-1 (Light Industrial District) to develop a 1,727,500 square foot light industrial warehouse/distribution campus consisting of seven buildings on 157.86 acres; Requesting a Future Land Use Amendment from Suburban I Neighborhood Character Area to the Industrial Character Area at 0 Campbellton Road & 0, 336, 2230, 6460, 2391, 2331 Chattahoochee Drive (Parcel IDs: 14F0138 LL0068, 14F0138 LL0050, 14F0138 LL0183, 14F0138 LL0332, 14F0138 LL0282, 14F0138 LL0217, 14F0138 LL0043, 14F0138 LL0340, 14F0138 LL0357, 14F0138 LL0316, 14F0138 LL0258, 14F0138 LL0175, 14F0138 LL0167, 14F0138 LL0241, 14F0138 LL0233, 140138 LL0142, & 14F0138 LL0324). City Council District 1.

Staff presented the request to rezone property located on Hamilton Road and Chattahoochee Drive from Sub-A to M-1 for the development of a light industrial distribution campus and to amend the Comprehensive Development Plan.

Staff presented the case and recommended denial because converting a large residentially planned area to industrial use was considered too substantial a departure from the future-land-use plan.

The project underwent an Atlanta Regional Commission Development of Regional Impact review. Following ARC and staff comments, the applicant submitted a revised plan.

Staff stated that, were the Commission to recommend approval, it suggested conditions requiring:

1. Approximately 23 acres adjacent to Campbellton Road to remain under its existing residential zoning and not be included in the industrial rezoning.
2. The industrial tract and the retained residential tract to be formally subdivided before issuance of a land-disturbance permit.

The applicant's attorney stated that:

- The site is accessed only from Fulton Industrial Boulevard.
- Portions of the assemblage had already received industrial zoning approvals in 2022 and 2024.
- The current request was intended to create a cohesive phased industrial campus.
- The revised proposal reduced the number of buildings from nine to six and reduced the project by roughly 1.15 million square feet from an earlier version.
- Stream-buffer encroachments were removed except for an exempt perpendicular access crossing.
- More than 500 feet of existing vegetation would separate the industrial development from residential areas.
- Approximately 23 acres closest to Campbellton Road would remain residentially zoned.
- The development could create an estimated 1,000–2,000 permanent jobs, plus construction employment.
- The project was projected to increase the site's tax contribution substantially.
- End users had not yet been secured because industrial tenants typically wait until zoning entitlements are obtained.
- The applicant would target light-industrial users rather than heavy industries producing substantial noise, odors, or environmental impacts.
- Fulton Industrial Boulevard was presented as the most appropriate location for industrial development in the city.

An opponent living near the development argued that:

- The applicant had repeatedly expanded farther into land planned for residential use.
- The newly adopted future-land-use plan clearly established a boundary between residential and industrial areas.
- The city had already approved substantial industrial acreage nearby.
- Additional rezoning could encourage continued industrial encroachment.
- Warehouses would generate truck traffic, emissions, noise, and other effects despite vegetative buffers.
- The project lacked identified tenants, binding contracts, and guarantees regarding the number, type, or wages of jobs.
- The claimed community benefits remained speculative.
- The city should protect the residential edge rather than repeatedly moving it.

Commissioners and staff discussed:

- The lack of identified tenants or letters of intent.
- Whether speculative industrial buildings were appropriate.
- The potential range of uses permitted in M-1.
- Noise, odors, emissions, truck traffic, and visual impacts.
- Whether the 23-acre retained tract truly functioned as a buffer.
- The project's consistency with the recently adopted future-land-use plan.
- The applicant's prior rezonings and continuing expansion.
- Employment opportunities and whether residents could receive hiring preference.
- The attorney clarified that the city could not dictate whom a private company hires, although city codes may provide certain preferences in contracting or development.
- Staff's suggested conditions requiring preservation and subdivision of the 23-acre residential tract.

Staff's findings of fact were accepted.

Z26-001 motion: Commissioner Dunn recommended denial and Commissioner Williams seconded the motion.

Vote: Unanimous approval of the denial motion.

CDP26-003 motion: Commissioner Dunn recommended denial and Commissioner Williams seconded the motion.

Vote: Unanimous approval of the denial motion.

Outcome: Both requests were forwarded to City Council with recommendations for denial for the August 11, 2026, public hearing.

Case Z26-010/CV26-002 (Public Hearing): An application by 2020 Enterprise Group, LLC c/o Battle Law requesting a rezoning from CUP (Community Unit Plan/Cliftondale Overlay District) to SH (Senior Housing District/Cliftondale Overlay District) with concurrent variances to Sec. 509.05(c) to eliminate the 50' zoning buffer and improvement setback on the northwestern tip and reduce the 50' buffer to 25' on the western property line to develop a 50 unit mixed residential senior community for residents age 62 and older on approximately 13.8 acres at 7490 Butner Road. (Parcel IDs: 09C100000320370) Council District: 4.

Staff presented the case and Staff recommended conditional approval, subject to:

1. Development being limited to the site plan presented to staff.
2. Compliance with the Clifton/CLFF overlay-district regulations identified in the transcript.

When the public discussion/hearing was opened issues discussed included:

- Whether the reduced or removed buffers would adequately protect neighboring properties.
- The relationship of the proposed senior development to surrounding residential communities.
- Site-plan compliance, access, landscaping, setbacks, and overlay requirements.
- Concerns voiced by members of the public and questions regarding whether the proposed density and buffer reductions were appropriate.

Although staff recommended approval, the Commission ultimately did not support the requests.

Staff's findings of fact were approved by a majority; Commissioner Jefferson voted against accepting the findings.

Z26-010 motion: Commissioner Williams recommended denial; Commissioner Leverette seconded the motion.

Vote: Denial approved unanimously.

CV26-002 motion: Recommend denial.

Vote: Denial approved by the commissioners voting.

Outcome: Both requests were forwarded to City Council with recommendations for denial for the August 11, 2026, public hearing.

Case U26-006 (Public Hearing): An application by David Renfro requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a Farmers Market in AG-1(Agricultural District) zoning district on 6.1 acres at 4269 Stonewall Tell Road. (Parcel IDs: 09F230100840758 & 09F230100840741) Council District: 3

Staff recommended **conditional approval** with two conditions:

1. The special-use permit would be nontransferable.
2. The operator must maintain a valid City of South Fulton business license.

A representative of the applicant came up and presented the case and the applicant proposed a marketplace for:

- Locally grown produce

- Agricultural goods
- Artisan products
- Nursery and garden items
- Farm-related merchandise
- Other customary farmers-market offerings

No public-comment cards were submitted.

Commissioners questioned the applicant regarding:

- Proposed market operations and the types of products to be sold.
- Whether the activity would remain consistent with agricultural use.
- Licensing, ownership, transferability, and responsibility for operation.
- Ensuring the permit would not automatically pass to a different operator.

Staff's findings of fact were accepted unanimously.

Motion: *Commissioner Mike Dunn recommended approval subject to the two staff conditions, Commissioner Williams seconded the motion.*

Vote: *Approved unanimously.*

Outcome: *The special-use permit was forwarded to City Council with a recommendation for conditional approval for the August 11, 2026, public hearing.*

Case Z26-015/U26-007 (Public Hearing): An application by Welcome Foods is requesting a rezoning from MIX (Mixed Use) to C-2 (General Commercial) along with a Special Use Permit (SUP) to develop a 5,000 square foot gas station/convenience store with fuel pumps and 1,800 square feet drive-thru restaurant on 2.13 acres at 4225 & 4165 Flat Shoals Road District: 4

Staff presented the case and recommended **denial** of both the rezoning and special-use permit. The applicant presented the property as appropriate for commercial development and discussed the proposed gas station, convenience store, fuel pumps, and drive-through restaurant.

Commissioners considered:

- Compatibility with the surrounding area and the existing MIX designation.
- Whether the site met the city's newer gas-station regulations.
- Traffic circulation and access.
- The intensity of the proposed commercial use.
- Proximity to residences and other sensitive properties.
- Whether the proposed gas station and drive-through were consistent with the city's development objectives for the corridor.
- Staff's conclusion that the requests did not satisfy the applicable standards.

Staff's findings of fact were accepted unanimously.

Z26-015 motion: *Commissioner Williams recommended denial and Commissioner Leverette seconded the motion.*

Vote: *Denial approved unanimously.*

U26-007 motion: *Commissioner Williams recommended denial and Commissioner Leverette seconded the motion*

Vote: *Denial approved by the commissioners voting.*

Outcome: *Both requests were forwarded to City Council with recommendations for denial for the August 11, 2026, public hearing.*

Case Z26-016/CDP26-006 (Public Hearing): An application by TDC Logistics Company, LLC requesting a rezoning from AG-1 (Agricultural District) to M-1 (Light Industrial Zoning District) and a Future Land Use Amendment from Community Live-Work to Industrial Zone to develop an industrial building of 280,000 square feet on 38.94 acres at 0 Washington Road District: 3

Staff presented case and Staff recommended **denial** of both requests.

The applicant requested that the case be deferred to the September 16, 2026, Planning Commission meeting and was not present at the July meeting.

The Commission initially considered opening the public hearing because residents were present. The assistant city attorney advised that the hearing could not proceed without the applicant because zoning law required equal presentation time for the applicant and opposition.

No public hearing was held.

Motion: *Commissioner Leverette made a motion to Defer Z26-016 and CDP26-006 to September 16, 2026 and Commissioner Jefferson seconded the motion.*

Vote:

- Barrett-Washington — Yes
- Jefferson — Yes
- Williams — Yes
- Leverett — Yes
- Dunn — No

Outcome: *Deferral approved 4–1. The cases were continued to September 16, 2026.*

Case TA26-003 (Public Hearing): An ordinance to regulate the development and operation of data centers within the City of South Fulton; To establish zoning, permitting, population limits, and performance standards; To protect public infrastructure and neighborhoods.

The Commission reviewed a Council-sponsored zoning-text amendment establishing new regulations for data centers.

The draft ordinance included:

- Data centers allowed only through special-use permits.
- Data centers permitted in M-1 and M-2 districts under the initial draft.
- A citywide population-based cap of one data center per 30,000 residents.
- A minimum lot size of 20 acres.

- Utility-capacity certifications for:
 - Electricity
 - Water and sewer
 - Natural gas
 - Telecommunications
- Existing-conditions assessments.
- Development, buffering, design, utility, and operational requirements.
- Provisions addressing infrastructure demands and potential neighborhood impacts.

Commissioners raised concerns and recommendations regarding:

- Whether data centers should be restricted to M-2 rather than allowed in both M-1 and M-2.
- The appropriate minimum acreage.
- The timing and enforceability of utility-capacity documentation.
- Water and electricity consumption.
- Solar and renewable-energy options.
- Cooling technologies, including glycol-based cooling.
- Screening utility equipment and transmission infrastructure from public view.
- Responsibility for damage to surrounding property or infrastructure caused by development.
- Possible effects on nearby homes, utilities, roads, and public services.
- Ensuring the ordinance was strong enough before applications were received.

The Commission recommended approval of the ordinance with the following revisions or considerations:

1. Restrict data centers to **M-2 districts** rather than M-1 and M-2.
2. Require the utility-capacity letter within **90 days**.
3. Require developers to repair property or infrastructure damage caused by development.
4. Encourage utility towers and related equipment to be screened or placed away from prominent public views.
5. Add a reference to or requirement concerning solar power.
6. Include glycol cooling as an available cooling option.
7. Change the minimum lot size from **20 acres to 10 acres**.

Motion: *Commissioner Williams recommended approval with the listed amendments and recommendations. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion.*

Vote: *Approved unanimously.*

Next steps: *The amendment was scheduled for City Council consideration, with a first Council hearing identified for July 28, 2026, and further Council action on August 11, 2026.*

Adjournment of Meeting

The Commission adjourned at approximately **10:53 p.m.** The next regular Planning Commission meeting was announced for **August 19, 2026**

Commissioner Williams made a motion to adjourn, Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

[Meeting Adjourned]