



CITY COUNCIL OF PEACHTREE CITY
REVISED REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
DECEMBER 16, 2021
6:30 p.m.

Peachtree City
Mayor & City Council
Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor
Phil Prebor – Post 1
Mike King – Post 2
Kevin Madden – Post 3
Terry Ernst – Mayor Pro Tem
Post 4

-
- I. Call to Order
 - II. Pledge of Allegiance
 - III. Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition
 - Supervisor of Quarter 3 – James Hughes – Corporal, Police Department
 - October Team Award – Park Enforcement Officers Richard Ferguson, Jackie Craig and Michelle Roush
 - November Employee of the Month – Ronald Grooms, Grounds
 - IV. Public Comment
 - V. Agenda Changes
 - VI. Minutes
December 2, 2021 – Regular Meeting Minutes
 - VII. Consent Agenda
 1. FY2021 Budget Amendment – Year End
 2. FY2022 Budget Amendment – Carryforward
 3. **Approval of Vehicle Replacement- Fire Department Brush Truck**
 - VIII. Old Agenda Items
 - IX. New Agenda Items

12-21-03	Public Hearing – Text Amendment to the Administrative Variance Requirements	
		(Cailloux)
12-21-04	FY 2021 Year-End Financial Update	(Salvatore)
12-21-05	Compensation/Classification/Benefits Study Evaluation and Analysis	(Brown)
12-21-06	FY 2022 Project Recommendations	(Rorie)
 - X. Council/Staff Topics
 - XI. Executive Session
 - XII. Adjourn

**City Council of Peachtree City
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, December 2, 2021
6:30 p.m.**

The Mayor and Council of Peachtree City met in regular session on Thursday, December 2, 2021. In the absence of Mayor Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor Pro Tem Terry Ernst called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Others attending: Mike King, Kevin Madden, and Phil Prebor.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition

None

Public Comment

Suzanne Brown asked why there was no prayer at the beginning of City Council meetings and when was it stopped? She suggested a Council member or a citizen say a one-minute prayer, and if no one volunteered, then there could be a minute of silent prayer.

Agenda Changes

None

Minutes

King moved to approve the November 18, 2021, regular meeting minutes. Madden seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Consent Agenda

- 1. Pool Contract**
- 2. 522 Golfview Drive Drain Improvement Bid Approval**
- 3. CCCP Pipelining Project Bid Approval**
- 4. Approval of 8 Police Vehicles Bid approval**
- 5. FY2022 Budget Amendment – Police Replacement Vehicle**
- 6. FY2022 Budget Amendment – Safebuilt Donation**
- 7. Resolution for Support of 2021-2022 TIP Project Funding**
- 8. New Alcohol License – Red Rice Bowl – 2808 Highway 54**

Madden moved to approve Consent Agenda items 1-8. Prebor seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda items

11-21-01 Peachtree City Public Facilities Authority Loan

Finance Director Paul Salvatore reminded Council that the City Manager presented a list of capital projects totaling about \$5.5 million at the November 4 meeting. Around \$3.5 million would be financed; the remainder would be paid for with cash. Expansion of the Police Headquarters would account for about half of the \$3.5 million, or around \$1.7 million, with expansions at Fire Stations 81, 82, and 83 making up the rest, along with improvements at several City buildings.

This \$3.5 million financing would be done through the Public Facilities Authority for a 10-year term. Closing costs estimated at \$69,000 would be rolled into that. They budgeted sufficient funds to cover the cost of the loan in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 at \$305,000, but the cost would be \$282,575 this year.

Placement agent Raymond James & Associates sent bid requests to 15 institutions, with seven submitting bids. Webster Bank submitted the low bid with a fixed interest rate of 1.446%. Annual debt service payments would be \$376,766.

Salvatore asked if Council had any questions? If not, he asked them to approve the authorizing resolution and lender, Webster Bank, for the 2021 Peachtree City Public Facilities Authority Loan in the amount of \$3,500,000.

Approximately seven years ago, King commented, they were forced to take out a loan because they did not have the reserve funds to cover what needed to be done. Since then, they had gotten the City's finances to a point where they could choose to borrow money. If they saved it, it would be at about the same interest rate or maybe a little better, and also allowed them to keep the cash on hand for when it was a better option to use it. Taking out this loan was a "no brainer," he continued, because they knew interest rates would be going up. It was a solid financial choice that they could make because of the situation they were in. He said he would move that they approve this.

Ernst noted the interest rate of 1.446% was the lowest he could recall out of his eight years on Council. Salvatore agreed it was a good rate and noted that a few weeks ago, they were estimating between 1.75% and 1.85%.

King moved to approve the authorizing resolution and lender, Webster Bank, for the 2021 Peachtree City Public Facilities Authority Loan in the amount of \$3,500,000. Madden seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

11-21-04 Variance – Front Setback – 243 Valley View

This was tabled from the last meeting, so there was no need for another public hearing, stated Planning and Development Director Robin Cailloux, adding that the applicant was present this time. City Clerk Yasmin Julio was serving as his interpreter, and Cailloux thanked her for her assistance in communicating with the homeowner on this request.

The lot was on the south side of the city and was zoned General Residential (GR-6). The porch was added without a permit, and the applicant had provided a survey that showed it encroached on the the setback by seven feet. Since the last meeting, they had provided letters of support from four neighbors. Cailloux showed an aerial photo of what the property looked like over a year ago and another photo showing it as it was now with the porch addition.

None of the criteria for granting a variance were met, she continued, except that it was not materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, and it did not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan, which encouraged redevelopment into property.

The applicant, through Julio, said he had a company conduct an inspection of the porch addition. Cailloux stated they required that and confirmed that the inspection showed it was built to code.

Prebor remarked that he was glad to see this had the support of neighbors, but wonder how they could prevent these after-the-fact variance requests, which had happened before?

They could always do more public outreach, Cailloux offered, but their website was up to date, with the permit process clearly stated. Maybe they could try postcard mailers or social media notices?

The bottom line, Meeker pointed out, was that this was built without a permit. That violated the ordinance and was subject to citation in Municipal Court for both the property owner and the contractor.

In this case, Cailloux commented, the homeowner was the contractor. She went on to explain that their process typically in this circumstance was to allow the homeowner to remediate it. They issued a notice of violation before issuing a citation. Prebor asked if he would still have to go to court? Cailloux replied that they did not cite him because he immediately began making progress to rectify the situation by seeking a variance.

Ernst said he was pleased to learn at the last Council meeting that Code Enforcement patrolled every subdivision at least once a week.

There was someone several years ago that repeatedly did work without permits, Prebor recalled, and Council felt like he was doing it intentionally. Meeker noted that different Councils had different responses to violations. When he first became City Attorney in 2004, someone built an addition that crossed into a setback area, and Council made them tear down what they had built. Other Councils had adopted a "forgiveness approach," where variances were granted after the fact.

Prebor said he probably would have approved this variance if it had been brought to Council before it was built. King added that he did not believe it was done intentionally, and he, too, believed they would have approved it if it had been presented beforehand. He had no issues with it.

Julio said the applicant wanted to add there should be paperwork in Spanish so he could have known he was required to have a permit. A Spanish-speaking contact in the Building Department would be helpful, too.

Cailloux said she had no problem working on producing documents in Spanish. It could be a replication of something they already had in a different language.

The applicant added that he wished there were more Police Officers who spoke Spanish and had more interaction with the Hispanic community.

Madden said he had no problem with this variance and thought the porch was a nice addition to the neighborhood. It had been inspected and was up to code. Ernst said he did not feel the applicant was trying to slip something past them. However, the new Council might want to look at this issue and make some changes.

Madden moved to approve Old Agenda item 11-21-04, Variance – Front Setback – 243 Valley View. Prebor seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

New Agenda items

12-21-01 Public Hearing – Rezoning Request from LUC to LUR – Smokerise Corners Subdivision

Cailloux reminded Council that this parcel was annexed in 2018 as a mixed-use development. The frontage along SR 54 was designated for commercial and office use, while the back part, along Sumner Road, was designated residential. Since then, the residential portion had been sold to a residential developer. He had begun building homes when he realized there were some issues with the conditions attached to the rezoning of the property.

The developer was asking to rezone the residential portion from Limited Use Commercial (LUC) to Limited Use Residential (LUR). There would be no change in the number of lots, but they would like to

reduce the side setback. Right now, it was 10 feet from each property line, creating a 20-foot separation between homes. The developer would like to reduce it to a five-foot setback, which would create a 10-foot space between buildings. This was identical to the other LUR districts in the city, Cailloux noted.

He also wanted to remove the zoning condition that required homes to comply with the examples submitted and that at least half of the homes have porches for at least half of the front elevation. Cailloux showed the photos of the homes presented during the rezoning, along with a picture of what was being constructed now. The new design had an interior courtyard, or atrium. Those homes were wider than what was originally planned, thus the setback change request. The developer also noted that a front porch would be awkward on this style of home.

Staff had reviewed the six criteria required by ordinance. The first asked if this would conform with the policy and intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. This property was annexed after the Plan was adopted, so there was no Future Land Use designated for the property. However, there was no land use change proposed. It was compatible with the surrounding development, and the surrounding development was compatible with it. The applicant had not provided any evidence that the property could not be used as currently zoned, other than he would like to build a different style home. There would be no change in land use, so there would not be any change in public services/infrastructure demands. The only change in circumstance was a new property owner. Cailloux also noted again that the request was consistent with other LUR zoning districts.

Staff was of the opinion that it met the majority of the criteria and recommended approval.

Jerry Peterson spoke for the applicant, Chadwick Homes. He noted they had built two similar small neighborhoods, Saranac and Maybeck, which had been very successful. One of the reasons for this request was that several residents of the neighboring Smokerise Estates were looking to downsize, but wanted to stay in the same area. Several had already expressed interest in these homes. They needed quality amenities, storage space, and garages. The interior atrium was available from the front door and replaced a porch as a place to relax and socialize, Peterson explained.

He recapped that they were asking for a rezoning from LUC to LUR, along with the side setback reduction and the elimination of the porch requirement.

Ernst opened the public hearing, asking who wished to speak in favor.

Gary Zarlengo said his comment was more neutral in tone. He wondered why this was not zoned LUR originally? Now a new owner wanted Council to give him a waiver. Another solution would be for him to reduce the number of units, but that would have economic impact. He recalled Prebor's comments earlier about people making "after the fact" requests and how to prevent them. This was an opportunity to send a message and let developers know they would have to stick with the zoning. He had no issue with this personally, but the City was kind of a pushover when asking for forgiveness instead of permission.

Keith Larson noted that the developer was not asking to increase density in terms of occupancy. They were providing a response from an economic delivery model to what Peachtree City was—an aging community. These citizens needed a lot size and home type that fit their needs. This was an innovative approach that would support the community.

Suzanne Brown spoke against the request, noting that the developer wanted to change the original plans and eliminate the porches, which he called "clumsy." They wanted two-car garages with a third separate garage for a golf cart or another vehicle. Rather than put a large house on a small lot, with encroachments into the side setbacks, the answer would be to build smaller houses. Brown said she did not think Council should approve this request. The developer knew what was approved when he bought the property. They could make more money by building a bigger house, she went on, but they could not do that without this variance. She referred to the fourth criteria considered for a variance, saying the property clearly had economic value without being rezoned. The developer should have to modify the house to fit the lot.

No one else wished to speak, and Ernst closed the public hearing.

King said they were all in favor of this rezoning in 2018, and it called for 26 or 27 homes. They had looked at the 28-acre tract for awhile, and it finally got annexed and approved for commercial, office, and residential use. The developer knew more about what was selling than he did, King remarked. He had no problems with this request, noting that he often rode by the developer's properties on Senoia Road, and those homes were occupied as soon as they were completed. He imagined these homes would be the same. They had been trying to get someone to develop this area, and he had no problem with this request.

Prebor said this was what was in demand as the community aged. People wanted lower maintenance, smaller yards. He had visited homes in Saranac with the courtyards, and they were very nice. If these homes were what were proposed at the rezoning, Council would have approved them, Prebor stated. This was not "after the fact" because the developer was coming to them before he built.

Madden wanted to know more about the setback change. Cailloux said the rest of the LURs had a 10-foot building separation, which was as close as you could get without installing firewalls. Some homes at Cresswind were even closer with the third garage added on.

She went on to say there were two reasons staff took the approach of changing the zoning to LUR for the residential portion instead of rezoning the whole LUC. One was that they did not want to open up the whole LUC conversation again and have them change anything with the commercial or office. Another reason was that staff found it easier to administer an LUR that was purely residential, rather than an LUC that was residential.

Cailloux clarified that it would be a five-foot setback for each home, creating a 10-foot separation between buildings. Madden said he had no problem with that if it satisfied fire codes. These homes were what people wanted.

Prebor moved to approve New Agenda item 12-21-01, Rezoning Request from LUC to LUR – Smokerise Corners Subdivision. Madden seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

12-21-02 Public Hearing – Variance Request - Encroachment into Zoning Setback – 319 Loring Lane

This was a unique property, Cailloux stated. It was part of Cavalier Manor subdivision, which had lots of more than an acre, zoned R-43. It was off Loring Lane, and some homes had access to Greenwood

Lane. The subdivision plat showed that this was lot #2, and it shared a driveway leading to Loring Lane with lot #3.

The ordinance defined a front yard as the yard adjacent to a public street or the line that the driveway crossed. This lot did not have road frontage, so the front yard was the one the driveway crossed, which here was at the south property line. However, the property was wider than it was long, which was not typical of most lots. They had decided to orient the house towards the side property line. They would be building a pool and had requested to build a 20 by 30 foot pool house that encroached into what was technically the front yard, but was being used as a side yard. If this were actually a side yard, the variance would not be needed. The applicant had provided a letter of support from the neighbor that this most affected, which was lot #3.

The request met most, if not all, of the six criteria, Cailloux reported. The special conditions of no public road frontage and a lot wider than it was deep were not applicable to other properties. The strict application of the front setback regulations would create a practical difficulty that limited the privacy and usability of the "back yard." The lot shape created an exceptional circumstance and granting this would not constitute a special privilege. It was not detrimental to public welfare, health, or safety, and Cailloux again pointed out the neighbor's letter of support. It did not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan, which encouraged investment into property while maintaining the character of the neighborhood.

Cailloux showed photos of the cleared property from various directions. It showed the neighbor's rear yard as viewed from the terrace level.

Steven Jones of the law firm Taylor English Duma represented the applicant. He reiterated that because this was a landlocked lot served by a driveway easement, the setbacks were applied in an atypical way that would prohibit the erection of the pool house if the variance was not granted. They would then be forced to move the structure inward, and it would not be aesthetically pleasing. The neighbor to the south had provided a letter of support. The applicant had also committed to installing a row of 60 Leyland cypresses along the property line to screen any visual impact. He noted that all the factors in the ordinance supported approval and asked Council to do so.

Ernst opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak either in favor or in opposition, and he closed the hearing.

Madden clarified with Cailloux that the distance from the pool house to the front setback would be about 33 feet. He asked where the Leyland cypresses would be? and Jones responded that they would be between the retaining wall and the property line.

Prebor noted that the neighbor approved this, and King said he was okay with it.

Rorie wondered if Leyland cypresses were the best choice? Cailloux said she would like to see a variety of plants. The danger of a monoculture was that it could attract blight, which was prevalent in this area. She said she would like to see a mix of evergreens, some of which could be Leylands but others, too, such as magnolias. Rorie said they should include a condition regarding the landscaping in the motion, and Cailloux said staff could do a landscape inspection. The condition should require an evergreen buffer between their lot and lot #3 that was approved by the Planning Director.

Meeker clarified with Jones that the plantings were not a condition proposed by staff; it was proffered by his client. Jones said he did not have the authority to change the type of plants, but they would comply with the will of Council.

King moved to approve New Agenda item 12-21-02, Variance Request - Encroachment into Zoning Setback – 319 Loring Lane with the condition of an evergreen buffer as approved by the Planning Director. Madden seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Council/Staff Topics

Multi-Use Path System Advisory Group Council Recommendation Presentation

Several months ago, Julio related, Council showed interest in creating a group that would solicit comments and concerns from residents regarding the impacts and conflicts regarding the multi-use path system. Eight individuals were chosen from a group of 20 nominees to serve on this group, along with staff liaisons from Public Works, Planning, Engineering, Police, and Public Communication. They held a series of meetings where staff provided information, along with feedback from group members and the community. Now they were here to present recommendations.

Paul Schultz explained that the group broke into three teams covering Safety, Education and Outreach, and Registration. There were also some results from their work that they would be reporting.

The top job of government, he stated, was to protect the residents. Path safety was a focus currently, and that was this group's primary interest. This group had suggestions for an escalated approach to safety measures, starting with some things that were easy, up to more difficult ones. For every recommendation, he noted, there was precedent. These suggestions were being used in other areas. They were not suggesting anything truly new, just enhancements. Balancing the burden versus the benefits was important. Finally, he said, this should not be just a "one and done" group; it should be an ongoing effort with citizens interacting with Council.

Keith Larson said when they talked with residents about path safety, they often mentioned things they were afraid of and concerned with. Everyone knew someone who had had a crash or an injury on the path system. At the first group meeting, Larson said Rorie told them that citizen satisfaction surveys showed Public Safety with a 90% satisfaction rating, while the path system got a 75% approval rating. Why were 25% unhappy? Safety, he responded.

Traffic safety was a defined entity to transportation planners, but path safety was not. Larson said he took the definition of traffic safety and substituted path safety. Much of traffic safety was focused on prevention of pedestrian injury. A method called Safe System had embraced a strategy called Vision Zero that sought to reduce pedestrian fatalities. Safe System had been adopted by several government agencies. It involved assessing risk levels. The highest risk was Level One and stepped down to risks that could be addressed through routine maintenance and planning. The methods used were engineering, encouragement, education, and planning.

At the highest level, they should go to the areas of highest conflict, which was along the eastern shore of Lake Peachtree, at McIntosh High School, and around the pocket parks, especially Luther Glass Park. Soon, the new middle school would create an area of high traffic.

Schultz said some members of the group toured the most heavily-traveled paths. On east Lake Peachtree, the right-of-way was the north-south path, but that was not always clear. It needed to be marked with signs, lines, speed humps or realigned. There were other areas there where speed control methods were needed. The paths from the east dropped in elevation towards the main path and signs

or speed humps were needed. Not every intersection needed signs or speed humps; they should be judicious in their use.

Near McIntosh High, the cart path at Gables Court briefly dumped into the street. It needed to be realigned so it was clearly not part of the street. A stop sign was needed at a blind corner at the top of the hill. Some speed humps were needed on the hill climb to McIntosh High that led to a T intersection. There should be a three-way stop at the top of the hill at McIntosh.

Level 2 was about real-time risk reduction by giving users specific warnings and providing controls at crossings and tunnels on arterial and collector roads. Larson said he took a five-hour tour of more than 70 miles in his truck and came up with a list of 102 crossings where there were deficiencies in the controls. There were 28 path crossings without signs warning cars that there was a crossing. Pedestrians also needed to be notified that they had to respect cars. There were probably 11 or 12 one-lane tunnels or underpasses made out of culvert-type materials. Many had a right-angle turn coming into them, so someone coming through the tunnel might meet someone else entering from the other side. There needed to be signs warning drivers to stop, look, and listen. Someone could ring a bike bell or sound a horn to announce their presence.

Bridges were another issue, and Larson said a good example was the one over SR 54 at Partners Pizza. The embankment was so steep rising up to the bridge deck that you could not see what was coming from either side. There needed to be a visual alert on the approach lane and a warning on the deck to stay right. These were all simple fixes and appealing to people's consideration.

Next, there were things that could be done as they were doing maintenance to reduce crash risk, including restriping or painting markings at road intersections. A key one for the aging population was installing curb ramps and truncated mats. Surface repair was important, as was vegetation maintenance to improve the line of sight, especially at tight corners.

Schultz displayed a couple of photos they took while on their tour that illustrated the need to cut back overgrown vegetation. One showed how brush had grown out to the path and made for a very tight turn. If it could be cut back one or two feet, there would be more visibility. Another, taken near Luther Glass Park, showed trees growing very near a path that had several curves. Another benefit of cutting trees would be less root damage to the paths. No special effort was needed; this could all be done as part of the regular maintenance program.

The path culture that had evolved in Peachtree City might be difficult to change, Larson stated. One thing they wanted to emphasize was establishing a right-of-way. There were places where people needed to stay to the right and pass on the left, such as in turns, tunnels, and when going across bridges. They needed signs to remind path users of this. Golf carts, bicycles, and other movers needed to be reminded, through signs and public service announcements, to make an audible sound when passing pedestrians. Pedestrians could usually hear a gas-powered cart, but the electric vehicles were silent.

There used to be a number of GPS marks on the paths, but those had disappeared over time. There needed to be new ones, Larson commented. Updated mapping and route finding information should be available through apps, at path kiosks, and online guides. People needed to be told how to navigate the paths through their online devices.

Branding was another need. Larson said he was asked to help in 2014 when the City applied to be designated as a Bicycle-Friendly Community. He said he noticed that every time he walked on the path system, he saw a sign that said "cart path." It was not exclusively a cart path; it was a multi-use

path system, but that was a mouthful. The City had this great amenity, but it was just called the path system. Many communities had adopted names for their path network, and Peachtree City needed to consider choosing one, as well. It would also help to promote the idea that the paths were not just for carts.

Promoting the use of the paths for commuters and shoppers was another way to reduce traffic on the streets and enhance safety. They needed to require bicycle racks at new developments. Charging stations, especially for e-bikes, were needed. There should be a speed management program. Code Enforcement and Police should be an active presence on the paths, Larson commented, noting that many cities were using alternate means to do outreach in non-criminal environments. An ambassador program was an option.

There was opportunity for ordinance review. A survey taken at the first advisory group meeting showed that nuisance behaviors, mainly noise, was a major concern. Police had no means to address nuisance behavior on the paths. There was also discussion about modifications to carts that would allow them to exceed the lawful speed. Georgia Code defined a golf cart as a vehicle that traveled at no more than 15 mph, while a motorized cart could go up to 20 mph. What happened if someone modified a cart to go faster than that? That needed to be explored, Larson remarked. A Police survey showed that about 30% of users were going 18 mph or more at high-traffic areas on the paths.

Josh Abelson presented the group's recommendations on education and outreach, which started from the premise that responsibility applied to all path users, and they needed to meet them at all levels. One area they spent a lot of time on was student drivers and how they could make parents aware of shared liability, including fines and other consequences. They recommended that digital and hard copy regulations be available at several venues.

Most people would say they understood path courtesy and etiquette, Abelson continued, but displaying them was a different matter. The group proposed introducing methods at high-density traffic areas to remind users. They were looking at stencils on trash cans with messages reminding users to slow down, stay right, and leash their pets. Stencils had already been made and were being applied to the cans and on the path itself. They could place permanent posters in places users frequented, such as cart and bike shops, veterinarians, groomers, and dog parks. They were trying to reach all users—walkers and riders of all types of vehicles.

Another key was frequent and consistent messaging. They had a diverse user group, so they had to target the messaging to reach all of them. There were a number of national observances, such as National Bike Month, they could leverage. Many large organizations sponsored relevant material that they could re-purpose. City-sponsored activities provided another opportunity to distribute messaging, and local civic groups would let them reach their membership. Finally, Abelson noted, they should create a multi-generational Path Ambassador Program to promote year-round educational outreach among the various pathway users.

Schultz stated that the group recommended changing the language of the cart registration forms to remind users of path rules and other important aspects of their use. The registration form should ask for the names of all members of the household who would be driving the cart. The registration would also have to affirm that all drivers were aware of the path rules. Registrants would be informed that the City recommended they have liability insurance on the cart. Also, and this would probably require looking at an ordinance, all drivers age 12 to 15 must complete the Police Department's driver training course.

Registration should be changed from once every three years to annually. Owners would have to update their addresses and phone numbers, which would help the Police Department if they needed to contact an owner. The initial registration must be done in person; afterwards, it could be online or through the mail. They recommended adding some "Do You Know" facts to the registration packet. Changing the vehicle tag color each year would help enforce the registration regulations. A sticker aimed at younger drivers with the five top rules for the multi-use paths could be produced. Registration decals should be relocated from the side of the cart to the front and back.

City Staff had already taken some action based on the group's recommendations over the past few weeks. Budget was, of course, a concern, and Schultz said Rorie had mentioned the cost of placing speed humps everywhere they had recommended. Another teen cart safety class had been scheduled, and the path rules brochure was being updated. Staff had created message stencils and were using them to paint reminders on trash cans and on the path surfaces. Some public service announcements had been produced, and registration forms had been enhanced.

They had a lot of good ideas, Prebor commented, although some seemed like they could be expensive. Others seemed feasible. They made a lot of sense.

Ernst thanked the committee for their work. King said he hoped the incoming three new Council members would get copies of what had been presented.

This was a comprehensive report, Madden stated. He thanked the group members and said they had presented a lot of good ideas. He expressed hope that the new Council would follow through with the Ambassadors program to monitor the path network.

Rorie said asked Julio to introduce the group members. Present at the meeting were Abelson, Schultz, Larson, Amanda Robinson, George Dillard, and Dennis Dingivan. Jacob DiPietre and Phil Castagna were not present.

Goals and priorities for the path network would be presented to Council in January, Rorie said. They were already taking action on simple things.

There being no further business, Prebor moved to adjourn. Madden seconded. Motion carried unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary

Terry Ernst, Mayor Pro Tem

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager 

FROM: Paul J. Salvatore, Financial Services Director 
Kelly Bush, Assistant Finance Director 

DATE: December 10, 2021

SUBJECT: Budget Amendments – Fiscal Year 2021
December 16, 2021 City Council Consent Agenda

Recommendation:

Approve the attached budget amendment to amend the 2021 budget resolution.

Discussion:

Attached please find budget amendment 21-22 for fiscal year 2021 submitted for your approval. This budget amendment is housekeeping in nature and is necessary to prepare for the annual audit and to issue financial statements for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2021.

Budget Impact:

The proposed budget amendment reallocates departmental savings from non-divisional throughout the department budgets.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact either Paul Salvatore or Kelly Bush.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Attachments

kbb/Reports to Council/Budget Amendments FY2021

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager 

FROM: Paul J. Salvatore, Financial Services Director 
Kelly Bush, Assistant Finance Director 

DATE: December 10, 2021

SUBJECT: Budget Amendments – Fiscal Year 2022
December 16, 2021 City Council Consent Agenda

Recommendation:

Approve the attached budget amendments to amend the 2022 budget resolution.

Discussion:

Attached please find budget amendments 22-05 and 22-10 for fiscal year 2022 submitted for your approval. Budget amendment 22-05 is housekeeping in nature and reflects the September 30, 2021 balance in each of the Special Revenue Funds brought forward to fiscal year 2022. This is done annually in lieu of trying to project the Special Revenue Funds budget balances during the budget process. Budget amendment 22-10 requests the carryover of 2021 funds for projects planned and equipment ordered but not received or completed prior to 9/30/2021. This includes: 1) Mayor and Council – Professional Services 2) Non-Departmental – General Administration Contingency 3) Public Works – Vehicle repair and maintenance. 4) Finance – Education and Training. 6) Municipal Court – Contractual Services. 7) Stormwater – Operating Supplies. 8) Stormwater – Contractual Services, and 9) Stormwater – Machinery and Equipment.

Budget Impact:

The proposed budget amendments affect the General Fund, Stormwater Fund, and several Special Revenue Fund budgets. A separate reconciliation is provided for the net effect on each fund.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact either Paul Salvatore or Kelly Bush.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY				
BUDGET AMENDMENT				
		NUMBER	22-05	
		DATE	10/01/2021	
ACCOUNT	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	INCREASE	DECREASE
200-6110-531175		Operating Supplies - Memorial Bench	260	
200-6510-531180		Computer supplies - Library	882	
200-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - Neighborhood Parks	1,141	
202-3210-531175		Operating Supplies - DARE	1,138	
202-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - DARE	1,138	
203-3210-531175		Operating Supplies - State Seizures	32,473	
203-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - State Seizures	32,473	
204-3510-531175		Operating Supplies - HAZMAT	7,034	
204-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - HAZMAT	7,034	
206-3210-512500		Tuition Reimbursement - PD Tuition Fund	4,301	
206-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - PD Tuition Fund	4,301	
207-6110-531175		Operating Supplies - Youth Council	503	
207-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - Youth Council	503	
208-3210-531175		Operating Supplies - Public Safety Grants	9,235	
208-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - Public Safety Grants	9,235	
208-0000-334106		State Operating Grant - CJCC	30,000	
208-3210-523700		Education & Training	30,000	
209-3210-531175		Operating Supplies - CERT	9,986	
209-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - CERT	9,986	
210-3210-531175		Operating Supplies - PD Donations	6,989	
210-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - PD Donations	6,989	
211-3210-523700		Education & Training - Explorer Fund	1,254	
211-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - Explorer Fund	1,254	
212-3210-531175		Operating Supplies - Federal Seizures	26,919	
212-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - Federal Seizures	26,919	
215-4100-531178		Operating Supplies - Landscaping - Tree Fund	163,218	
215-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - Tree Fund	163,218	
276-6110-522251		TC/Amph Bldg Repair & Maintenance -	132,597	
276-0000-389025		Surplus Carryover - Hotel/Motel TPD Fund	132,597	
NOW , THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this Council hereby amends the Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Resolution to establish budget for unbudgeted Special Purpose Funds based on 9/30/2021 fund balances.				

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

BUDGET AMENDMENTS - FISCAL YEAR 2022

December 16, 2021

General Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$294,375
Neighborhood Parks Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$1,141
DARE Program Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$1,138
State Seizures Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$34,473
HAZMAT Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$7,034
PD Tuition Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$4,301
Youth Council Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$503
Public Safety Grant Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$39,235
CERT Grant/Donation Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$9,986
Police Donation Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$6,989
Explorer Troop Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$1,254
Federal Seizures Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$26,919
Tree Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$163,218
Hotel/Motel TPD Fund	Increase both revenues and expenditures by \$132,597
Stormwater	Increases both revenues and expenditures by \$107,471

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor and City Council

Via: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager ✓
Paul Salvatore, Director of Finance
Kelly Bush, Assistant Director of Finance ~tb
Angela Egan, Purchasing Agent (ae)

From: Clint Murphy, Interim Fire Chief CM

Date: December 6, 2021

Subject: Approval of Vehicle Replacement
December 16, 2021 Council Consent Agenda

Recommendation:

Award the purchase of a replacement brush truck from Williams Fire Apparatus for \$149,897.00.

Discussion:

The replacement brush truck vehicle will be purchased from Williams Fire Apparatus using Houston Galveston Area Cooperative (HGAC) buying group pricing. HGAC pricing includes all fees and the graphics package. The current brush trucks will be transferred to the Public Works Department. This is on the replacement cycle and supported by the Fleet Manager.

Budget Impact:

This is a budgeted Capital expense for FY2022.

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager 

FROM: Robin Bechtel Cailloux, AICP 
Director Planning & Development

DATE: December 9, 2021

SUBJECT: Proposed Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance: Variances and Appeals
December 16, 2021 City Council agenda

Request

Staff requests that City Council approve the text amendment to the Variance ordinance in order to add additional standards to the Administrative Variance type.

Discussion

City Council has requested that staff review the Variance ordinance in order to streamline the process for certain types of regularly reoccurring variance requests while still maintaining the City's high standards.

The number of requests for rear setback variances has dramatically increased since the pandemic began in March 2020. This could be a sign of enduring trends reflecting housing needs that have changed, such as:

- Home office for those working from home
- Additional space for those teaching children at home
- Ground-level master suites for those who wish to "age in place" and stay in their current home
- Additional living space for extended families, such as mother-in-law suites
- Covered patios for outdoor living rooms

When done appropriately, additions such as these promote many of the City's goals from the Comprehensive Plan, such as promoting reinvestment in property and encouraging housing for all ages.

Existing Types of Variances

The City's ordinance creates three (3) types of variances:

- Administrative
- Special Exception
- Variance

Text Amendment: Administrative Variances

Page 2

Both the Administrative and Special Exception are intended for those variances that only have a potential impact on immediate neighbors and adjoining properties. They are each limited to the types of requests that qualify, but the Special Exception type requires a public hearing while the Administrative type requires a review board comprised of the City Manager, a City Council person, and the City Planner. The difference between the Administrative and Special Exception type is that the Administrative type only deals with existing encroachments and the Special Exception type deals with new requests.

Staff recommends combining the Special Exception type into the Administrative type while keeping all of the standards currently required in the ordinance. In addition, staff recommends increasing the rear setback permissions, but adding two requirements:

- Must provide letters of support from all adjacent property owners and active HOA
- Must be constructed of matching materials, roof pitch, and colors as the main structure

This meets the intent of the ordinance, which recognizes that these types of variances affect only the immediate property owners, and maintains the high quality construction expected in Peachtree City.

A copy of the draft ordinance is attached.

Planning Commission Workshop

The Planning Commission held a public workshop on their November 8, 2021 meeting to discuss this proposal. A member of the public voiced the opinion that all variances should be heard in a public hearing held by City Council. The Planning Commissioners noted that the proposed changes would require that applicants discuss their request with their neighbors in order to get letters of support, which is more than what is currently required. Commissioners inquired about the possibility of having either two (2) Council members on the review board or adding a Planning Commissioner to the review board.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the approval of the text amendment to the Variance ordinance in order to consolidate Special Exception variances and Administrative variances into one category, and add additional requirements.

ARTICLE XII. VARIANCES AND APPEALS¹

Sec. 1201. Purpose.

The purpose of this section is to authorize variances from the terms of this ordinance as will not be contrary to the public interest so that the spirit of this ordinance shall be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done. A variance is a request for relief from the provisions of the zoning ordinance. The power to grant a variance does not extend to use restrictions established within a particular zoning district

(Ord. No. 934, § 1, 2-21-2008)

Sec. 1202. Application.

An application for a variance may be submitted only by the owner of the property for which a variance is desired or his authorized agent. Application requirements shall be as described herein.

Variances may be considered in all districts and shall only be granted upon showing that:

- (a) Relief, if granted, would be in harmony with, or, could be made to be in harmony with, the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance; or
- (b) The application of the particular provision of the zoning ordinance to a particular piece of property, due to extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to that property because of its size, shape, or topography, would create an unnecessary hardship for the owner while causing no detriment to the public.

(Ord. No. 934, § 1, 2-21-2008)

Sec. 1203. Variance type.

The zoning administrator shall determine the type of variance required, and shall classify the request as:

- (a) Administrative variance.
- ~~(b) Special exception variance.~~
- (e b) Variance.

(Ord. No. 934, § 1, 2-21-2008)

¹Editor's note(s)—Ord. No. 934, § 1, adopted February 21, 2008, amended article XII in its entirety to read as herein set out. Formerly, article XII pertained to appeals, and derived from Ord. No. 574, adopted April 16, 1992; Ord. No. 589, adopted November 19, 1992; Ord. No. 618, adopted July 7, 1994; Ord. No. 877, adopted March 16, 2006.

Sec. 1204. Administrative variance.

Review and approval of a request for an administrative variance shall be administered by a special administrative variance committee consisting of the zoning administrator, the city manager and a member of city council. Applications may be considered for zoning setbacks only if the following requirements are met:

- ~~(a) The request only pertains to a zoning setback requirement;~~
- (a) The request ~~only~~ pertains to either an existing zoning setback violation provided that it was not created by the same property owner who was responsible for the violation; or
- (b) The request is for a **rear setback** encroachment that would not exceed **25 50** percent of the required setback **per the zoning ordinance, provided that the following conditions are satisfied:** ~~up to a maximum of ten feet~~
 - (1) The proposed structure uses similar building and roof materials, roof pitch, and color scheme as the primary structure;**
 - (2) The applicant provides written consent of the Home Owners' Association, if applicable, and all property owners adjacent to the requested property; or**
- (c) The request is for a decrease of not more than 25 percent of the minimum building setback; provided that the property line in question and the associated building setback adjoins a city-owned greenbelt or public open space and there is no other possible location on the property that would accommodate the proposed building expansion without encroaching into the established building setback, provided that the following conditions are satisfied:
 - (1) The proposed structure uses similar building and roof materials, roof pitch, and color scheme as the primary structure;**
 - (2) The applicant provides written consent of the Home Owners' Association, if applicable, and all property owners adjacent to the requested property; or**
- (b) The request is for a decrease of not more than 25 percent in the minimum number of parking spaces required by the city's parking ordinance; provided the applicant identifies on the site plan where this parking would be located if needed in the future; or
- (c) The request is for an increase in the maximum height of a fence or wall; provided that:
 - (1) Such wall or fence is justified by reason of security or privacy and will not unduly prevent passage of light and air to adjoining properties and is not incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood;
 - (2) Such greater height is justified by requirements for security of persons or property in the area;
 - (3) Such greater height is justified for topographic reasons; or
 - (4) Such greater height, in the yard or yards involved, is not incompatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

In no case shall an administrative variance be granted from the conditions of approval imposed on a parcel through a zoning change granted by the city council.

In reviewing the application, the administrative variance committee shall analyze the application to determine whether granting the request would cause substantial detriment to other property owners in the surrounding area or would impair the purposes of the zoning ordinance. If it is found that the request is in conformance with these requirements and does not adversely affect the area, the administrative variance

committee shall issue an official determination in writing approving the request. The property owner, the city clerk, and the building official shall be provided with a copy of this determination.

If it is found that the request is not in conformance with these requirements or may possibly have an adverse effect on the surrounding area, the administrative variance committee shall deny the appeal in writing, stating the reasons for the denial.

The administrative variance committee shall act on all appeals within 15 working days after the application is deemed complete by the zoning administrator.

If a request for an administrative variance is denied by the administrative variance committee, the property owner may appeal this decision to the city council in accordance with the procedures identified herein.

(Ord. No. 934, § 1, 2-21-2008)

~~Sec. 1205. Special exception variance.~~

~~A special exception variance is recognized as having a potential impact on only the immediate neighborhood and adjoining properties. Review and approval of special exception variance requests shall be administered by the zoning administrator, city staff (as applicable), the planning commission and city council.~~

~~A special exception variance may be considered for only the following:~~

- ~~(a) A decrease of not more than 25 percent of the minimum building setback; provided that the property line in question and the associated building setback adjoins a city-owned greenbelt or open space and there is no other possible location on the property that would accommodate the proposed building expansion without encroaching into the established building setback.~~
- ~~(b) A decrease of not more than 25 percent in the minimum number of parking spaces required by the city's parking ordinance; provided the applicant identifies on the site plan where this parking would be located if needed in the future.~~
- ~~(c) An increase in the maximum height of a fence or wall; provided that:~~
 - ~~(1) Such wall or fence is justified by reason of security or privacy and will not unduly prevent passage of light and air to adjoining properties and is not incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood;~~
 - ~~(2) Such greater height is justified by requirements for security of persons or property in the area;~~
 - ~~(3) Such greater height is justified for topographic reasons; or~~
 - ~~(4) Such greater height, in the yard or yards involved, is not incompatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.~~

~~In no case shall a special exception variance be granted from the conditions of approval imposed on a parcel through a zoning change granted by the city council.~~

~~(Ord. No. 934, § 1, 2-21-2008)~~

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE
PEACHTREE CITY ZONING ORDINANCE
ARTICLE XII, VARIANCES AND APPEALS,
TO AMEND THE PEACHTREE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES
SECTIONS 1203 THROUGH 1205,
AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY, AND IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED by authority of the same that:

Section 1. The Peachtree City Zoning Ordinance Article XII, Section 1203, Variance type, be revised as follows:

The zoning administrator shall determine the type of variance required, and shall classify the request as:

(a) Administrative variance.

~~(b) Special exception variance.~~

~~(c-b)~~ Variance.

Section 2. The Peachtree City Zoning ordinance Article XII, Section 1204, Administrative variance, be revised as follows:

Review and approval of a request for an administrative variance shall be administered by a special administrative variance committee consisting of the zoning administrator, the city manager and a member of city council. Applications may be considered only if the following requirements are met:

~~(a) The request only pertains to a zoning setback requirement;~~

~~(b-a)~~ The request ~~only~~ pertains to either an existing zoning setback violation provided that it was not created by the same property owner who was responsible for the violation; or

~~(c-b)~~ The request is for a rear setback encroachment that would not exceed 25 50 percent of the required setback per the zoning ordinance, provided that the following conditions are satisfied: up to a maximum of ten feet

(1) The proposed structure uses similar building and roof materials, roof pitch, and color scheme as the primary structure;

(2) The applicant provides written consent of the Home Owners' Association, if applicable, and all property owners adjacent to the requested property; or

~~(d) The setback violation being requested has been existing for at least one year; and~~

~~(e) The property owner making the request is not the same property owner who was responsible for the violation.~~

- (c) The request is for a decrease of not more than 25 percent of the minimum building setback; provided that the property line in question and the associated building setback adjoins a city-owned greenbelt or public open space and there is no other possible location on the property that would accommodate the proposed building expansion without encroaching into the established building setback, provided that the following conditions are satisfied:
- (1) The proposed structure uses similar building and roof materials, roof pitch, and color scheme as the primary structure;
 - (2) The applicant provides written consent of the Home Owners' Association, if applicable, and all property owners adjacent to the requested property; or
- (d) The request is for a decrease of not more than 25 percent in the minimum number of parking spaces required by the city's parking ordinance; provided the applicant identifies on the site plan where this parking would be located if needed in the future; or
- (e) The request is for an increase in the maximum height of a fence or wall; provided that:
- (1) Such wall or fence is justified by reason of security or privacy and will not unduly prevent passage of light and air to adjoining properties and is not incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood;
 - (2) Such greater height is justified by requirements for security of persons or property in the area;
 - (3) Such greater height is justified for topographic reasons; or
 - (4) Such greater height, in the yard or yards involved, is not incompatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

In no case shall an administrative variance be granted from the conditions of approval imposed on a parcel through a zoning change granted by the city council.

In reviewing the application, the administrative variance committee shall analyze the application to determine whether granting the request would cause substantial detriment to other property owners in the surrounding area or would impair the purposes of the zoning ordinance. If it is found that the request is in conformance with these requirements and does not adversely affect the area, the administrative variance committee shall issue an official determination in writing approving the request. The property owner, the city clerk, and the building official shall be provided with a copy of this determination.

If it is found that the request is not in conformance with these requirements or may possibly have an adverse effect on the surrounding area, the administrative variance committee shall deny the appeal in writing, stating the reasons for the denial.

The administrative variance committee shall act on all appeals within 15 working days after the application is deemed complete by the zoning administrator.

If a request for an administrative variance is denied by the administrative variance committee, the property owner may appeal this decision to the city council in accordance with the procedures identified herein.

Section 3. The Peachtree City Zoning ordinance Article XII, Section 1205 – Special exception variance, shall be repealed in its entirety.

Section 4. All ordinances or parts thereof which conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are, to the extent of such conflict and except as hereinafter provided, hereby repealed.

Section 5. Should any provision of this ordinance be declared invalid by a Court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of this ordinance as a whole or any provision thereof other than the provisions specifically declared to be invalid. The City Council declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each subsection, sentence, clause and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases may be declared invalid.

Section 6. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its official adoption by the City Council.

Done, Ratified, and Passed this 16th day of December 2021.

Vanessa Fleisch, Mayor

Phil Prebor, Post 1

Mike King, Post 2

Kevin Madden, Post 3

Terry Ernst, Post 4

Attest: _____
City Clerk

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager 

FROM: Paul J. Salvatore, Financial Services Director 

DATE: December 13, 2021

SUBJECT: FY 2021 Year-End Financial Update
December 16, 2021 City Council Meeting

Discussion:

Staff will present a Powerpoint presentation explaining unaudited estimates of revenues and expenditures for year-end FY 2021 and include the 5-Year Financial Model. This is an analysis that staff develops after the end of each fiscal year to gauge how actual results of operations compared to the budget estimates. It also helps to provide Council with some preliminary data that might be useful in developing financial and operational strategies and goals going forward.

Budget Impact

The City Manager will make recommendations to Council based on the data presented.

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor & Council Members

VIA: Jonathan N. Rorie, City Manager 

FROM: Ellece Brown, Director, HR & Risk Management

DATE: December 13, 2021

SUBJECT: Proposed Modified Employee Pay Plan
December 16, 2021, City Council Meeting

Recommendation:

That Council approve the proposed modified Employee Pay Plan as presented by staff.

Discussion

Since recruiting candidates and retaining employees has been a challenge over the past year and since it has been over seven (7) years since the City has conducted a Compensation & Benefits Study, a RFP for a comprehensive Employee Classification/Compensation/Benefits Study was issued in July 2021. Seven (7) consulting organizations responded to the RFP; a panel consisting of the Director, HR & Risk Management, Senior HR Analyst, and Purchasing Agent selected and recommended The Management Advisory Group International, Inc. (MAG). The contract was awarded to MAG, and the study began in October.

The Study included a review of the City's compensation policies, a salary survey of sixteen (16) cities/counties, a benefits comparison with the same sixteen (16) cities/counties, a proposed pay plan, FLSA and occupational recommendations, and revised job descriptions.

Management recently received a draft of the final results. After review of this draft, management made modifications to the Study which will be presented at the City Council Meeting on Thursday, 12/16/2021.