

MINUTES OF MEETING
CITY COUNCIL OF PEACHTREE CITY
May 2, 1991

The City Council of Peachtree City met in regular session on Thursday Night, May 2, 1991, at 7 PM in the City Hall Council Chambers.

Mayor Brown called the meeting to order and led those in attendance in the pledge of allegiance.

Members present were: Mayor Frederick Brown, Jr. and Councilmen Edward Bradford, Annie McMenamin, Robert Brooks and Rich. Parlontieri.

Addition of Agenda Items

No items were added to the agenda.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognitions

Mayor Brown read a Proclamation designating the month of May as "Older Americans Month" in Peachtree City and urged all persons throughout the City to give special honor and recognition to the older citizens.

Minutes of Meeting

Motion was made by McMenamin and seconded by Bradford that the minutes of the Council meeting held April 4, 1991 be approved as published. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

4-91-5Alcoholic Beverage License - Shanghai Chinese Restaurant

Mayor Brown explained that the application for an alcoholic beverage license for the Shanghai Chinese Restaurant located on Highway 74 was tabled at the last meeting to allow the applicant the opportunity of becoming more knowledgeable about the city regulations.

Mr. David Hii, applicant, was present and available for questions. Mayor Brown asked him if he now had a training program and had in fact trained his employees. Mr. Hii indicated that his training program was in place and his employees had been trained. Mayor Brown asked him if he understood the ordinance in its entirety and understood who should or should not be served alcohol and when it could be served. Mr. Hii answered that he did understand the ordinance regarding the selling and serving of alcoholic beverages.

Mayor Brown called for comments or questions from the Council and hearing none called for action on the application.

Motion was made by McMenamin that the application be approved. Motion was seconded by Brooks. Motion carried unanimously.

New Agenda Items5-91-1 Fourth of July Fireworks Bids

City Manager Basinger explained that after last years Fourth of July fireworks show there were several comments to the staff that the show was too long - 30 - 35 minutes and that some of the shells did not go high enough for everyone to see. This year the specifications for the bids were written to shorten the show to 20- 25 minutes and to have all larger shells.

Basinger reported that two bids were received for the fireworks. The one from Southern International Fireworks Inc. was for \$19,890 and was for a show with 441 shells five inches or larger and 500 four inch shells. The bid from Vitale Fireworks Display Company bid \$20,000 for 1268 shells with 286 five inch shells and 982 four inch or smaller shells.

Basinger stated that it was staff's recommendation that the bid be awarded to Southern International Fireworks Inc. of Woodstock, Georgia at \$19,890. He reported that there were sufficient funds in the budget for the show.

Motion was made by Parlontieri that the bid of Southern International Fireworks Inc., as presented by staff, be accepted. Motion was seconded by McMenamin. Motion carried unanimously.

5-91- 2 Meade Field Lighting Bids

Basinger reported that the City received a letter today from one of the bidders on this project expressing concerns about the bid the other company submitted. Basinger asked that the item be tabled to allow the staff time to evaluate the situation.

Motion was made by Mayor Brown that the item be tabled to the May 16th meeting. Motion was seconded by Parlontieri. Motion carried unanimously.

5-91-3 Northeast Collector Road Policy Statement

City Manager Basinger called on Jim Williams, Director of Developmental Services, to address this item. Mr. Williams explained that for several years the City had been laboring with the future development of the northeast section of the City. He explained that the area he was addressing was to the west of Peachtree Parkway and north of Walt Banks Road. Williams stated that the Land Use Plan and Major Thoroughfare Plan both show that the area was to be served by a collector road to run from Peachtree Parkway, through the property, to some point along Highway 54. The purpose of the road would be to provide a dual access to subdivisions that would eventually be built in the area.

Mr. Williams reported that there was development in the area, primarily the Smokerise Subdivision, with it's entrance onto Peachtree Parkway. He stated that Smokerise was designed for the first part of the construction to be between 100 and 150 lots and development had just about reached that point. It was the understanding that once development reached that point a second access would be provided.

Williams explained that the property north of Smokerise was owned by The Equitable and they had planned a series of subdivisions that would compliment the existing development in the north area and also would provide approximately 6000 feet of the collector road shown on the major thoroughfare plan. Williams stated that the property immediately behind Smokerise and adjacent to the Equitable property is programed to have another 6000 feet of the road go into it and it had, from time to time, been suggested as an extension to the Smokerise property.

Williams reported that the proposed road was divided into three parts. The first part would extend through the Equitable property and this part of the road had been designed into the Kedron Development Plan. He felt it would be constructed to city standards as PCDC built the northeast subdivisions.

The second part extended through non-Equitable property for a distance of about 6000 feet and the primary owner in this area was the Bradshaw estate. There was no development plan for this section as there was in the case of the Equitable property.

The third part of the collector road involved the area around Sumner Road at Highway 54. He felt there were two options there. The collector could be built over the existing Brown Road extension through the unincorporated area directly to Highway 54, or it could continue south over the existing Sumner Road within the City to Highway 54. Both options were approximately 1200 feet long.

Williams reminded Council that Mr. Bradshaw had been told several times, as a condition of the R-43 zoning of his property, that he would be required to bring some upgraded access to the property before it could be developed.

Williams indicated that what he was seeking at this time was for Council to adopt clear policies on how the northeast area would be developed. He stated that this would not be an ordinance at this time but as the area develops there might be a need to adopt official ordinances dealing with the stated policy. He felt that if developers knew the rules and policies regarding development up front it would help them in making their plans for financing etc.

Williams reported that the Planning Commission had adopted the policy guidelines and has recommended the matter be brought before Council for consideration and adoption. Williams stated that he had discussed these policies with two of the three possible developers in the proposed area and two of the three agreed with the proposal. Mr. Bradshaw did not indicate support and he had indicated that he did not want to build a road on someone else's property.

The policy statement approved by the Planning Commission at it's meeting held April 8, 1991, and recommended to Council read as follows:

1. The Peachtree City Council considers the proper development of a collector road through the northeast section of the City to be a vital part of the Master Plan of the City.

2. No subdivision of land within the northeast area of the City will be approved unless the subdivision has direct access to a major thoroughfare.
3. No subdivision of land which involves more than one hundred (100) residential lots will be approved unless the subdivision has more than one access to a major thoroughfare.
4. The proposed northeast collector should be built to minor collector road standards as a minimum (Minor collectors are considered to be major thoroughfares).
5. No individual lots should have direct access onto the northeast collector road.
6. The northeast collector is intended to extend from Peachtree Parkway to State Route 54.
7. The collector will probably have to be built in phases as land development processes in the northeast area of the City.
8. During the early stages of development, the collector will function as a temporary cul-de-sac from time to time. At no time, however, shall any segment of the collector function as a temporary cul-de-sac to serve more than 150 residential lots.
9. The developer of any tract in the northeast part of the City will be responsible for donating the right-of-way for the part of the collector needed to serve the proposed development.
10. The developer will be responsible for installing all of the collector improvements within the proposed development and immediately adjacent to the proposed development.
11. Since the purpose of the collector is to allow for the development of the area, it shall be the responsibility of the developer to construct the collector as it is needed and at no cost to the public.

Parlontieri pointed out that this policy would apply to Smokerise and asked how it would be applied to the Stoneybrook Subdivision. Williams reported that Stoneybrook was basically built out and this plan was to prevent the development of longer and longer cul-de-sacs with only one way in and out.

Brooks asked Mr. Williams to explain why Policy #3 stated that any subdivision having more than 100 residential lots would be required to have more than one access and Policy #8 allows for 150 lots. Williams replied that Policy #8 was an interim policy while the road was being built and Policy #3 was the final objective. Assuming that the road was built from one end to the other no single subdivision should have no more than 100 lots exiting onto the collector road.

Parlontieri asked what leverage the City would have in Policy #9 requiring the developer to donate the right of way. Williams explained that before a subdivision would be approved the road would have to be platted and the

right of way donated.

Mayor Brown reminded everyone that, inasmuch as the proposal was a policy, there might be a need at some later date to adopt ordinances requiring certain portions of the policy so that it would be effective.

After presenting the proposed policy for the development of the collector road, Mr. Williams explained that the best plan, in his opinion, for bringing the road out onto Highway 54 would be through property in the unincorporated area. He felt the way to proceed would be to decide which would be the best way to bring the road out, and he felt that would probably be using Brown Road, then get with the County and try to frame an application to the State for funding assistance in building the road through the unincorporated area to some point in the City that would function as the eastern leg of the collector road. He felt with the cooperation of the State and the developers this road could be built.

Mayor Brown called for comments or questions from the council or public and a discussion on the proposal ensued. McMenemy wanted assurance that any road of this nature would be built with curb and gutter and Williams assured her that the development standards would require that. Mr. John Setlock questioned several aspects of the plan as did Mr. Frank Fessenden of Sumner Road. Mr. Fessenden was concerned about the traffic through the portion of Sumner Road that is in the city limits and is unpaved at this time. Mr. Williams felt that everyone would like to see Sumner Road improved to provide better access to the properties on it. The other questions was whether or not that portion should become part of the access road. He did not feel it would be a good idea to have a collector road with driveways opening onto it. Mr. Fessenden felt that the property owners along that portion of the road would be willing to provide right of way so that Sumner Road could be improved.

Motion was made by Bradford that the NE Collector Road Policy be adopted. Motion was seconded by Brooks. Parlontieri asked what was seen as the next step in implementing the policy. Williams stated that he planned to take this policy statement to the developers proposing to develop the area and inform them on what will be expected. If ordinances are needed after that he would come back and present those. Williams explained that if the developers disagree with the policy they could move ahead without complying with it and it might be that ordinances would be needed to enforce the policy.

Brooks stated that he considered this document as a working one trying to develop dialogue with the developers of the areas with the intent of protecting residents of the City. He felt that there would be so much traffic in that area as it develops it would be a mistake for the entire City if good planning was not provided. Motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business a motion was made by Mayor Brown that the meeting be recessed to be reconvened in executive session to discuss the Black lawsuit. Motion was seconded by Parlontieri. Motion carried unanimously.

Executive Session

No action was taken in exective session and a motion was made by Mayor Brown that the meeting be adjourned. Motion was seconded by McMenamin. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM.



Frances Meaders
Director of Administrative Services

 Attest
Mayor