



Planning Commission

Revised Meeting Agenda

SCAN FOR AGENDA
PACKET



January 12, 2026 | 6:30 PM

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Announcements**
4. **Presentations**
5. **Agenda Changes**
6. **Minutes**
 1. Planning Commission Meeting December 15, 2025
7. **Old Agenda Items**
8. **New Agenda Items**
 1. Landscape Plan, MEJA Construction Inc., 407 Dividend Drive - **POSTPONED**
 2. Building Elevation Modifications, Biscuit Belly, 238 City Circle
9. **Public Hearings**
 1. **Consider a text amendment to Section 917 of the city's Code of Ordinances related to Short-Term Rentals**
10. **Member/Staff Topics**
 1. **Introduction to Upcoming Text Amendments**
11. **Adjourn**

It is the policy of the City of Peachtree City that all city-sponsored public meetings and events are accessible to people with disabilities and are in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. If you need assistance in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability as defined under the ADA or need assistance per Title VI, please contact the City's Title VI and ADA Coordinator, Dr. Teaa Allston-Bing at (770) 632-4276 or e-mail tallston-bing@peachtree-city.org at least three (3) business days before the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation.

Planning Commission of Peachtree City
Meeting Minutes
Monday, December 15, 2025
6:30 PM

Call to Order

The Peachtree City Planning Commission met for a special called meeting on Monday Dec. 15, 2025, at City Hall. Chairman Scott Ritenour called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Members present were Vice-Chairman Andrew Kriz, Commissioners Hans Gant and Jack Allen, and Alternate Kenneth Hamner. Commissioner Robert Halverson was absent. Also in attendance were Planning and Development Director Shayla Reed, Senior Planner Lora Hooks, Recording Secretary Martha Barksdale, and IT Specialist Elijah Brewer.

Pledge of Allegiance

Ritenour opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Announcements

None

Presentations

None

Public Comment

Public comment was removed from the agenda.

Agenda Changes

Ritenour stated public comment had been removed from the agenda because a final determination has not been made between staff, City Council, and the various commissions. Reed pointed out item 3 under New Agenda Items was postponed as requested by the applicant, and staff would meet with the applicant to decide when it would be brought back.

Minutes

1. Planning Commission Meeting November 10, 2025

Allen moved to approve the minutes from the November 10, 2025, Planning Commission meeting. Kriz seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

1. Discuss Text Amendment to the Land Development Ordinance, specifically Article XI - Vegetation Protection and Landscape Requirements (Kenneth Hamner)

This proposed text amendment was initiated by both the Planning Commission and City Council, Reed explained, and staff and the City Manager had met several times over the past few months with Hamner, who was drafting the ordinance.

Hamner said he would begin with an executive summary of the ordinance as it stood right now, followed by a review of the draft memo and proposed ordinance. Then they could address concerns and consider possible approaches.

Gant wondered how this had come about, and Hamner replied that City Council had concerns about how to get rid of invasive species and promote the use of native species. He moved into the executive summary, saying they were discussing a text amendment to Article X (Vegetation Protection & Landscape Requirements). The transition to native plants should reduce maintenance costs, such as for water and fertilizers, and improve ecological resilience.

These regulations would apply to developments in areas zoned Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional, as well as to City projects such as parks and streetscapes. Residential yards and golf playing surfaces were exempt, Hamner emphasized. The draft called for 100% native plants in buffers, in certain zones, and for City projects, while General Commercial and Institutional landscapes must be at least 75% native, with the exception of theme gardens. Invasive species such as running bamboo and Bradford pears were banned.

However, there would be some flexibility regarding the native planting requirement. Hamner said the draft said that up to 10% of a site could be non-native for a particular design theme. Functional exceptions could be allowed, such as for screening in narrow areas where natives were not feasible.

Hamner then reviewed each section of the draft ordinance, listing what it said and giving the rationale behind it. The first section gave the purpose of the ordinance as to provide ecological balance, water conservation, and fiscal responsibility by the use of native plants in regulated environments, prohibiting invasive plants, and aligning the planting requirements with other City ordinances with the goal of reducing long-term maintenance costs.

The next section said this ordinance would apply to all developments that had to submit a landscape plan for City review. Gant asked if apartment, townhouse, and condominium developments were included. Reed said those typically were identified as Commercial, but it could be specified in the ordinance if they would be excluded.

The next section outlined the percentage requirements for native plants in a landscape plan, mandating 100% native plants in buffers, certain zones, and for City projects. General Commercial and Institutional landscapes must be at least 75% native, with the exception of theme gardens, which could be primarily non-native, provided they were capped at 10% of the total site.

Allen said he read that as a 90% restriction on special purpose theme gardens, meaning only 10% of their property could be allotted to the theme garden. Hamner said Section 1136(B)(4) took out 10% of the total area to begin with and also allowed non-natives on the remaining 25% where they were not required. Kriz and Allen asked for more explanation, and Hamner said 10% could be devoted to a theme garden, which left 90% of the property. Of that 90%, 75% had to be native,

but the remaining 25% of that 90% could be non-native.

Kriz said he understood what Hamner had said, but it was not clear from the way it was written and could be confusing to applicants. Section 1136 (A)(2) clarified that special purpose theme gardens were excluded from the initial 75% calculation, Hamner pointed out. That seemed overly restrictive, Kriz remarked, and it seemed that it would be difficult for applicants and staff to calculate.

These theme gardens seemed to be their only area of disagreement, Allen remarked. He wondered what would be allowed if someone wanted to open a Jimmy Buffett Margaritaville restaurant. Would 75% of the landscape have to be pine trees and other natives, with only one palm tree allowed out front? Allen stated that he saw no reason why 100% of the property that someone bought and owned couldn't be planted as they wanted. He also objected to placing the responsibility on staff to decide if a special request was worthy.

Allen told Hamner he had done a great job with this, but he did not want excessive restrictions, and Hamner agreed that it was a matter of opinion. Allen asked why it was the City's responsibility to be concerned about maintenance costs of the landscaping on private property? Hamner said the fiscal responsibility aspect applied more to public land than private. Other factors to consider, though, were the lessening of chemical use, the benefit to wildlife that relied on native plants, and if they wanted a uniform presentation for the community.

Hamner said he had written this portion as a compromise to give owners the ability to do special plantings without undermining the ordinance and the benefits it would bring to the community.

Commercial properties came in all sizes, Gant noted. Did they want to apply these percentages to the smaller developments or only to the larger ones? Kriz noted that it was by the zoning, which Gant said seemed restrictive for the small lots. He also wondered about enforcement, and Kriz said it would be done through plan reviews.

Kriz then referred to a hotel that had presented a landscape plan with an Asian garden theme. He said he believed this ordinance would have stopped the hotel from doing what they had planned. Kriz said he didn't glean from the conversation then that these strict regulations were the direction the Planning Commission wanted to go.

However, Kriz said he believed there were community benefits to encouraging native plants. He had mentioned in a previous discussion the possibility of incorporating incentives for higher percentages of native plants instead of mandating a certain percentage. He suggested lowering the required percentage to 60%, along with getting rid of the special purpose garden provision. To incentivize a greater usage of native plants, they could reduce the contribution to the tree fund

if someone used 80% or more native plantings. They had seen a lot of tree fund contributions lately because the canopy tree requirements could not be met, he remarked.

Allen said he liked the incentivization idea but thought there should be a penalty if someone used no native plants. He said he was concerned about putting the burden on staff to make arbitrary decisions, as well as looking at the ownership rights of the business. He wanted to see if there was a way to incorporate a disincentive.

Ritenour remarked that ownership rights were a concern with any ordinance. They did try to give some latitude and wanted to allow for creativity within certain guidelines. That was why they revamped the 54 West design guidelines. He noted that they were all in agreement about the invasive plants. He wanted to see some guidelines regarding natives but also allow for new ideas.

Ritenour asked if the 10% exemption meant the total site or just the total plantable area? He said he supported native plants and wanted to put in some regulations, but still allow for unique designs, such as what was proposed for the hotel. He liked the idea of incentivizing more than the idea of a major company coming in and paying a huge sum to put in whatever they wanted. Allen said he thought that would be an excellent compromise by taking the responsibility off staff as well as letting someone pay a little more to do what they wanted to do.

Ritenour said he didn't want this to look like they were downplaying staff's decision-making abilities. But, he continued, one of the reasons for this text amendment and also for the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) was to help citizens understand the regulations. He felt the best course would be to make this as simple as possible while still putting some bounds in place.

Hamner commented that he wanted to make sure they were not undermining the benefits of an ordinance like this. He said 75% was in line with similar ordinances in other areas. He understood the incentivized components, as well as the argument for property rights, but he also agreed with Ritenour that these ordinances defined what Peachtree City was. Surveys of residents always revealed that the green space was one of the top things people loved about Peachtree City. This strengthened that.

The ordinances could always be tweaked to make them more or less strict, Ritenour pointed out, so they had a little latitude. Was 75% too much? He noted that requests for themed gardens were not common—the Asian garden was the first that he could recall. It remained to be seen if there would be more such requests as redevelopment projects became more numerous.

Kriz told Hamner he believed the most important pieces of the draft ordinance would accomplish his goals. Getting rid of invasive plants and making the City use

native plants were the main points; the parts they disagreed on were smaller pieces. Kriz also mentioned something discussed in a previous meeting: what if Peachtree City was gifted trees that were not natives—maybe from a sister city in another country. Hamner noted that they did not have any sister cities but said there certainly could be unforeseen circumstances.

Gant said the numbers complicated things. He believed the draft accomplished what Hamner desired, which was to encourage the use of native plants in all developments. If someone wanted to use something else, it would require approval. He didn't want to confuse things with a lot of percentages, but Hamner said those percentages were added to incorporate flexibility. The ordinance originally called for only native plants. How could they incorporate the rare special garden request with the benefits of having native species? This was a community that cared about nature and he wanted to make sure they passed an ordinance that served those desires. The other Commissioners agreed.

Hamner returned to his presentation, first saying they needed more conversations about setting the standards in order to come to a consensus. Ritenour asked if anyone had any objections to requiring natives in buffers and on City projects. The Commissioners did not, but Hamner said the City did, and he would go into in a moment, too.

The next section said the City would maintain an approved native plant list, as well as a "do not plant" list. Another section ensured that the ordinance would work in harmony with other ordinances already on the books. Article XI already set the parameters for how this ordinance could be enforced, which could include the City ordering removal and replacement. Another section verified that there would be no budget impact.

The City Manager and the Public Works Department were of the opinion that City projects not be included in the native plant requirements, citing a need for operational flexibility in maintenance and procurement. Hamner countered this by saying the City needed to lead by example. If they determined native plants were necessary for ecological balance and fiscal responsibility, the City should have to follow the same standards as private developers. There could be exemptions if a City project had a unique constraint, and they could write into the ordinance that substitutions of non-native, non-invasive species would always be allowed under certain circumstances, such as allowing the planting of arborvitae as a screen in narrow areas. Other City changes included removing sweetgum, a native tree, from the list of invasive plants. Staff had also suggested that certain species of bamboo be listed as invasive.

The City had mentioned certain State stormwater and erosion manuals required the use of certain species that might conflict with the ordinance. Hamner suggested that the ordinance could be amended to establish a "native preference hierarchy." The applicant would be required to select a native if one was available that would

meet the engineering need. If a non-native was the only suitable plant, the manual would take precedence.

Staff had also mentioned that the draft listed specific zoning districts, but potentially omitted specialized districts, and a developer in those areas could argue that the regulations did not apply to them. Hamner proposed replacing the specific districts with general language that said the native plant requirement would apply to any buffer yard that was required by the ordinance, regardless of zoning. Staff also had asked for better clarity in some definitions.

Hamner noted that this was still a work in progress. The other Commissioners commended him for his work. Kriz said he thought all they needed to work out was the percentage level for the special purpose gardens. His preference was at the 60% level.

Allen remarked that he didn't know where this conversation would lead because there were some members in the middle, and he was on one side and Hamner on the other. Hamner said he would adjust the draft to accommodate what they agreed on, such as the bamboo and compatibility with the manuals.

As for the special purpose gardens, he offered to create a menu listing their options. At one end would be 100% native, while at the other would be no regulations. In between would be several options, and they could discuss those and come up with a compromise. The other Commissioners agreed this was a good idea.

Reed said this was not an action item, so they did not need to vote. She said she would need to know in advance when they wanted to vote so it could be advertised as a public hearing. Ritenour said he hoped they could iron everything out at their next meeting in January and maybe get it on the agenda for the meeting after that.

New Agenda Items

1. Landscape Plan, Peachtree Professional Center, 100 Gates Entry

Using a zoning map, Hooks pointed out the location near The Gates subdivision. The property was zoned Office-Institutional with conditions (OI-C). The conditions for the three properties that were rezoned together were mainly architectural requirements. The only condition relating to landscaping involved transition yard buffer requirements, and Hooks pointed out the transition yard areas.

Based on the impervious surface area of 46,609 square feet, the landscape ordinance required a minimum of 141 caliper inches of canopy trees and 94 caliper inches of understory trees, and that was what was in the proposal. The proposal also satisfied the ordinance requirement that planting areas be located in front and on the sides of all commercial buildings.

The ordinance also required that the perimeter of all parking lots be landscaped with evergreen shrubs for screening of cars and headlights, but Hooks said the applicant was proposing shrubs for screening only in a small area near the parking lot entrance. The applicant's narrative explained that the site was separated from the residential neighborhood by a transition yard spanning the length of the south and western property lines. The yard contained a slight berm and was heavily planted with existing evergreen trees that would screen most of the parking lot from the neighboring properties and prevent headlights from shining onto those properties. The shrubs proposed for the area near the entrance would fill a gap where the existing evergreen coverage was not as effective.

Hooks said five out of the eight species of the proposed canopy trees were native to eastern North America and/or the southern United States for a total of 62% native. Of the total number of trees provided, 41% were native to eastern North America and/or the southeastern U.S. The City Engineer's office had reviewed the plan and noted that some of tree groupings needed to be shifted to avoid interference with underground pipes.

Except for the requirement for perimeter parking planting, staff believed the proposed landscape plan met the City's ordinances and development requirements, Hooks concluded.

Allen asked what was behind the trees on the southwest corner where they were not supplementing the planting. Hooks said there were residential properties.

Warren Elwell represented the applicant. He explained there were a lot of existing pine trees and other plant materials in the buffer, plus there was the highway buffer with lots of trees that screened the building. There was just one house in the neighborhood that seemed like it might be troubled with headlights, which spurred them to beef up the buffer in that area, Elwell stated.

Hamner asked Elwell if he would be open to working with City staff on incorporating more native plants. Elwell said he would but wondered how specific they were in the definition of native. Hamner said he would be comfortable with something native to the southeastern U.S. in general.

Ritenour asked if he had any issues with the City Engineer's recommendation to move trees to get a separation from underground pipes. Elwell said he had not known of this issue but did not believe it would be a problem.

In regard to the native plants, Hooks pointed out there were several native plants already in the buffer, but if they could not find suitable substitutes for the others, did the Commission want a letter from the applicant stating that? Ritenour said since there was no native plan ordinance in place yet, this was only a suggestion. Elwell said they would see if natives could be substituted. Gant encouraged him to do so,

as well.

Gant moved to approve the landscape plan for the Peachtree Professional Center, 100 Gates Entry, with the suggestion that as many native plants as possible be substituted. Hamner seconded.

Kriz asked if they needed to add a condition regarding the City Engineer's suggestion, and Hooks said they did not.

Motion carried unanimously.

2. Building Elevation Modifications, Chick-fil-A, 1222 HWY 74 S

Hooks said this also was in the south end of town, zoned GC, and required to follow the Wilshire Pavilion guidelines. She showed the existing materials and colors and reminded the board that this property recently underwent expansion to the building and a modification to the parking lot to accommodate another drive-thru lane. These modifications were approved by the Planning Commission in September 2023 along with color changes to the building. There was a delay between approval and the actual work, and the painting had only recently been done. However, the colors approved in 2023 had since been replaced with a new color scheme, and that new scheme was what was used without the Commission's approval.

Hooks showed both color schemes, pointing out some differences and comparing it to the Wilshire Pavilion palette, which was similar. She said no materials were changed, only colors. Hooks had photos of the original color scheme of the building and noted that it was similar to what had just been added. She also showed photos of buildings in the area with a similar creamy white color that the Planning Commission had approved over the past couple of years.

The Land Development Ordinance (established goals for architectural design, including compatibility with surrounding development and architectural innovation. Color requirements were established that said colors should be neutral or earth tones. Staff felt that the current color for the Chick-fil-A was neutral and similar to other colors approved in the recent past for nearby properties in the design guideline area.

A Chick-fil-A representative said this was the new design spec for buildings with stucco. Hamner asked him why they went ahead with the painting without approval for this new color scheme, and the rep apologized, saying it was an oversight. Hamner said he thought the colors looked good.

Kriz thanked Hooks for a good presentation. He said he felt the new colors looked more in line with the overlay requirements. Ritenour said he liked the color scheme and felt it fit in with the Wilshire Pavilion guidelines.

However, he noted, this was the third property they had seen that had been painted without permission. The first two were from new building owners who said they did not know about the approval process, which Ritenour was skeptical of because they owned properties in other jurisdictions that had the same requirements. He remarked that he had higher expectations for Chick-fil-A. Maybe the Planning Commission needed to discuss putting some type of consequences in place for situations such as this.

Allen moved to approve the already-painted building modifications for the Chick-fil-A at 122 Highway 74 South. Kriz seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Concept Plat, Bradshaw Estates, 201 Sumner Road - POSTPONED

Item was postponed by applicant.

Public Hearings

None

Member/Staff Topics

Kriz asked where the golf cart parking ordinance change stood. Reed said the Planning Commission made a motion to take it over to Council at their last meeting, but there was a new Council member, and they didn't want to overwhelm him. Staff was preparing a summary of text amendments being considered, such as golf carts, cosmetic tattooing and roof signs, and Council would be discussing these in January.

The December 22 meeting was cancelled, Ritenour noted. The first meeting of 2026 would be January 12. He thanked the Commissioners for their diligence during a year of changes. He also thanked staff and the City Council for their work and said he was grateful to the citizens for their input.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Gant moved to adjourn at 7:47 p.m. Allen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Martha Barksdale

Scott Ritenour

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Lora Hooks, Senior Planner

DATE: January 12, 2026

SUBJECT: Landscape Plan, MEJA Construction Inc., 407 Dividend Drive -
POSTPONED

Recommendation:

Discussion:

Budget Impact:

Attachments:

None

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Lora Hooks, Senior Planner 01/07/2026
Shayla Reed, Planning Director

DATE: January 12, 2026

SUBJECT: Building Elevation Modifications, Biscuit Belly, 238 City Circle

Recommendation:

Should the Commission decide to approve this request, Staff has no recommendations.

Discussion:

The permit expediter for a new restaurant to be located at 238 City Circle in The Avenue has submitted a proposal for modifications to the exterior elevations. The new restaurant will be located in the former Highland Bakery/Friends Table tenant space.

The existing facade is unpainted red brick with a natural colored, limestone block base. The upper floor is beige stucco.

Side A - Existing



Side B - Existing



There is no change proposed for the facade of the upper floor. The proposal for the first floor is as follows:

- Field Paint (Wall color) - Benjamin Moore, Snowfall White (OC-118)
- Accent Paint (Existing light fixtures) - Benjamin Moore, Poolside Blue (2048-40)
- Storefront Finish - Dark Bronze anodized aluminum
- The natural stone at the base as well as the accent band will remain as is.

Side A - Proposed



Side B - Proposed



The tenant space is located in the HWY 54 Corridor Overlay District and therefore is subject to the GA 54 West Design Guidelines. The guidelines describe two design styles, the Traditional style and the Updated 2020 style.

The modifications being requested fall into the Updated 2020 style which states building designs shall exhibit a sense of permanence and creative expression to create a combination of unique facades that express the specific retail brands while utilizing materials and accents to create a thread of consistency.

The following guidelines apply to this request for modification:

1. Exterior materials for Updated 2020 design submittals shall blend and complement the traditional exterior building materials.

- *The Avenue development is a blend of the two styles. The paint color proposed, Snowfall White, is neutral and complements the brick used in the development. Note: painted brick is a permitted material in the Updated 2020 style.*

2. Accent colors shall be limited to no more than 15% of the total area for any single facade.

- *The accent color being proposed, Poolside Blue, is limited to the gooseneck lighting fixtures.*

Per the Land Development Ordinance (Sec. 725), general goals for architectural design are established, including compatibility with surrounding development and architectural innovation. Sections 728 through 730 establish color requirements, which state that the

predominant color should be neutral or earth tones. High-intensity colors, metallic, black, or florescent colors should not be used.

- *Benjamin Moore describes Showfall White as a bright white with a touch of warmth. Staff feels the paint color proposed is neutral and is compatible with the development. In addition, the applicant states the proposed paint color matches the adjacent restaurant (Hob Nob).*

In addition to painted brick, the proposal includes new wall sconces (see photograph below) that will replace the existing fixtures. The fixtures will accent the corner of the building with one fixture on each facade. Light is provided from an indirect light source.



Should the Commission decide to approve this request, Staff has no recommendations.

Budget Impact:

There are no budget impacts associated with this request.

Attachments:

None

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Shayla Reed, Planning Director

DATE: January 12, 2026

SUBJECT: Consider a text amendment to Section 917 of the city's Code of Ordinances related to Short-Term Rentals

Recommendation:

Consider a text amendment for a potential change to the Short-Term Rental Ordinance.

Discussion:

The purpose for the text amendment is to prepare for the FIFA World Cup coming to the United States with multiple matches being hosted in Atlanta. There is an expected impact of an influx of visitors to Fayette County, especially with the new US Soccer Headquarters being located here. This ordinance change would allow anyone to provide their property as a short-term rental during the above timeframe without having to receive a permit from the City or pay fees to the City. This would allow interested citizens to take advantage of the "Augusta Rule" that is codified in IRS Section 280A. This means that the income earned from renting a home for 14 days or less is not subject to income tax.

Budget Impact:

These potential STR operators would not pay for nor operate with permits during this time period, but regular operators would still need a permit to operate regularly throughout the year.

Attachments:

1. Sec._917.___Short_term_rental proposed text amendment

Sec. 917. Short term rental.

(917.1) Purpose.

- (a) The purpose of this section is to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare of individuals and the community at large; to monitor and provide reasonable means for citizens to mitigate impacts created by occupancy of short-term rental units; and to implement rationally based, reasonably tailored regulations to protect the integrity and character of neighborhoods in which short term rental use occurs.
- (b) This section is not intended to regulate hotels, motels, inns, or bed and breakfast establishments.

(917.2) *Zoning districts.* Short term rentals are permitted in all residential zoning districts and zoning districts where residential uses are permitted.

(917.3) Applicability.

- (a) It shall be unlawful for any owner of any property within the city to rent or operate a short term rental of residential property contrary to the procedures and regulations established in this section, other provisions of this Code, or any applicable state law.
- (b) The restrictions and obligations contained in this section shall apply to short term rentals at all times during which such residential properties are marketed and used as short term rentals.
- (c) The allowance of short term rentals pursuant to this section shall not prevent enforcement of additional restrictions that may be contained in restrictive covenants or other private contractual agreements or arrangements.
- (d) This section shall become effective on January 1, 2025; provided, however, that this section shall not be applicable or enforced for the period of June 1, 2026 through and including July 31, 2026.

(917.4) *Definitions.* The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this section, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

Bedroom shall mean an attached room which is intended, arranged, or designed to be occupied by one or more persons primarily for sleeping purposes.

City shall mean Peachtree City, Georgia.

Garbage shall mean and include all waste and accumulation of animal, fruit, or vegetable matter that attends or results from the preparation, use, handling, cooking, serving or storage of meats, fish, fowl, fruit, vegetable matter of any nature whatsoever, which is subject to decay, putrefaction, and the generation of noxious and offensive gases and odors, or which may serve as breeding or feeding materials for flies and or germ-carrying insects. Garbage, for the purposes of this section, shall also include recyclable materials and rubbish, as defined in chapter 42 of this Code.

Guest shall mean anyone who has a home address somewhere other than where he or she is spending the night and other than where he or she pays a fee for accommodations.

Innkeeper shall mean any person who is furnishing for value to the public any room(s), lodging, or accommodations.

Local contact person shall mean a person, firm or agency representing an owner or owners of a short term rental who has access and authority to assume operational management of the short term rental and take remedial measures.

Noise regulations shall mean those regulations contained in the chapter 42, article VI, noise control, of this Code.

Occupancy, transient shall mean occupancy or use by a paying guest or tenant for a period of not more than 30 consecutive days or by the offering or advertising of a residence as being available in whole or in part to be used for such occupancy. Such occupancy is characteristic of short term rentals or other establishments, by whatever name called.

Operator shall mean any person operating a short term rental (as defined in this section) in the city, including but not limited to the owner or proprietor of the premises, lessee, lender in possession, or any other person otherwise operating a short term rental.

Owner shall mean a person or entity that holds legal and or equitable title to private property.

Premises shall mean and include all physical buildings, appurtenances, parking lots, and all property owned and/or used by and for the short term rental.

Private shall mean intended for or restricted to the occupants and or guests of the short term rental; not for public use.

Rental term shall mean the period of time a person rents or leases a short term rental.

Short term rental shall mean any residential property, facility, or structure used for transient occupancy providing overnight lodging and accommodations for not more than 30 consecutive days.

Special event or private function shall mean an organized activity for profit or non-profit having as its purpose entertainment, recreation and or education, including but not limited to a festival, party, reception, celebration or assembly.

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Shayla Reed, Planning Director

DATE: January 12, 2026

SUBJECT: Introduction to Upcoming Text Amendments

Recommendation:

City staff is providing information and updates on upcoming text amendments.

Discussion:

The item before the Commission consists of a list of proposed text amendments to the city's ordinances. Some of these amendments have previously been initiated by City Council, while others were proposed by the Planning Commission.

The purpose of this agenda item is to provide the Planning Commission with an update and status of previously discussed or pending text amendments.

Budget Impact:

There are no budget impacts associated with this request.

Attachments:

1. Proposed Text Amendments (with code links)

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO Planning Commission
FROM: Shayla Reed
DATE: January 12, 2026
SUBJECT Proposed Text Amendments (Status Update)

Recommendation:

City staff is to provide status updates for previously proposed text amendments.

Sign Ordinance

- Purpose: The city's Sign Ordinance defines ([Sec. 66-3](#)) and prohibits ([Sec. 66-5](#)) "Roof Signs." However, it allows Roof Signs by way of a parapet wall, via [Sec. 66-15](#). Staff would like to have language that clearly provides direction in receiving sign applications that are placed along a parapet wall.
- Initiated by City Council
 - August 7, 2025 City Council Work Session
- Planning Commission Recommendation
 - September 8, 2025
- City Council Action (Approve/Deny)
 - **January 15, 2026, as currently advertised**

Cosmetic Tattoo and Microblading

- Purpose: The Zoning Ordinance does not define 'Tattoo Parlors,' but restricts them in [General Commercial \(GC\)](#) zoning under Sections 1006.2a and 1006C.1.2 (Property Rezoned to GC). The Ordinance also does not refer to "Cosmetic Tattooing, Microblading Services, or Body Art" in the Zoning Ordinance. These terms are only referenced in Chapter 42, Health and Sanitation. The Zoning Ordinance would include specific land-use provisions addressing Cosmetic Tattoo and Microblading.
- Initiated by City Council
 - March 20, 2025 City Council Meeting
- Planning Commission Recommendation
 - Various meetings held, most recent on September 8, 2025
- City Council Action (Approve/Deny)
 - **February 12, 2026 at 6:30 pm**

Native and Invasive Plants

- Purpose: City Council has directed staff to draft an ordinance addressing planting requirements, with the intent of prohibiting the use of invasive plant species. Additionally, the Planning Commission has requested that staff develop regulations encouraging and governing the use of native plant species.
- Initiated by City Council
 - April 3, 2025
- Planning Commission Recommendation
 - Various meetings held, most recent on December 15, 2025
 - Still under review by Planning Commission
- City Council Action (Approve/Deny)
 - **TBD (Awaiting recommendation from Planning Commission)**

Short-Term Rental

- Purpose: The FIFA World Cup will be hosted in the United States, with multiple matches taking place in Atlanta. A significant influx of visitors is anticipated in Fayette County, particularly due to the recent establishment of the U.S. Soccer Headquarters within the county. This proposed ordinance amendment would temporarily allow property owners to offer short-term rentals from June 1, 2026, through July 31, 2026, without obtaining a city-issued permit or paying associated fees.
- Initiated by City Council
 - August 21, 2025 City Council Meeting
- Planning Commission Recommendation
 - **January 26, 2026 and February 9, 2026**
- City Council Action (Approve/Deny)
 - **February 12, 2026**

Parking Ordinance (Golf Cart Parking)

- Purpose: The Planning Commission has requested that City Council consider amendments to [Sec. 909, Off-Street Automobile Parking Requirements](#), to incorporate provisions that promote golf cart parking for commercial and industrial developments. Given the city's requirement that all new developments connect to the existing golf cart path system, the Planning Commission finds it appropriate to establish standards for the provision of dedicated golf cart parking spaces. Additionally, the City Manager has recommended that staff conduct a comprehensive review of the off-street parking regulations to determine whether the current code adequately addresses the city's existing and future parking needs.
- Initiated by City Council
 - **January 5, 2026**
- Planning Commission Recommendation
 - **January 26, 2026 and February 9, 2026**
- City Council Action (Approve/Deny)
 - **March 19, 2026**

LED Lighting

- Purpose: Section 731.2, Light Fixtures, currently provides that “only incandescent, fluorescent, metal halide, mercury vapor, or color-corrected high-pressure sodium lighting may be used.” Recent development proposals, including city-initiated projects, have identified LED lighting as the preferred lighting type; however, the current ordinance does not permit its use. Accordingly, staff propose amending the code to allow LED lighting for commercial and industrial land development projects, at the discretion of the developer.
- Initiated by City Council
 - **January 5, 2026**
- Planning Commission Recommendation
 - **January 26, 2026 and February 9, 2026**
- City Council Action (Approve/Deny)
 - **March 19, 2026**