



Planning Commission

Regular Meeting Agenda

SCAN FOR AGENDA
PACKET



Frances Meaders Council Chambers
151 Willowbend Road
February 23, 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 February 9, 2026
7. **Old Agenda Items**
 1. Discuss Text Amendment to the Land Development Ordinance, specifically Article XI - Vegetation Protection and Landscape Requirements (Kenneth Hamner)
8. **New Agenda Items**
9. **Public Hearings**
10. **Member/Staff Topics**
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, February 9, 2026
6:30 PM

Call to Order

The Peachtree City Planning Commission met at City Hall on Monday, February 9, 2026. Chairman Scott Ritenour called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Vice-Chairman Andrew Kriz, Commissioners Hans Gant, Jack Allen, Robert Halverson, and Alternate Kenneth Hamner were present. Also in attendance were Planning and Development Director Shayla Reed, Senior Planner Lora Hooks, Recording Secretary Martha Barksdale, and IT Specialists Ken Couch and Ryan Williams.

Pledge of Allegiance

Announcements

None

Presentations

None

Agenda Changes

None

Minutes

1. Planning Commission Meeting January 26, 2026

Allen moved to approve the January 26, 2026 Planning Commission meeting minutes as submitted. Gant seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

None

New Agenda Items

None

Public Hearings

1. Consider a Text Amendment to the Lighting Ordinance, specifically Sec. 731.2 of the Land Development Ordinance

Ritenour repeated the public hearing protocol.

Reed recalled the in-depth conversation they had at the last meeting, particularly about the uniformity in the color temperature of the lights. She said she had gotten some expert assistance to make sure the language was correct and that all the Commissioners' suggestions had been incorporated.

Ritenour opened the public hearing. Mr. Keith Larson said he was in favor of having a uniform color temperature for all lighting on one site. Good lighting was important for safety, and this change was needed to catch up with modern technology. No one else wished to speak, and Ritenour closed the hearing.

Kriz asked Halverson, who had knowledge of lighting, if he was pleased with the final sentence in the amended section, “all exterior lighting on a site shall maintain a consistent color temperature.” He said he was.

Gant asked if this applied only to commercial properties. Reed said it applied to commercial and industrial.

All the Commissioners said they approved of the changes. Ritenour said he was pleased with the work in ensuring uniformity.

Kriz moved to recommend approval of the text amendment to the Lighting Ordinance, specifically Sec. 731.2 of the Land Development Ordinance. Allen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Consider a Text Amendment to the Parking Ordinance, specifically Sec. 909 - Off-Street Automobile Parking Requirements

Ritenour read the protocol for conducting a public hearing.

Reed displayed the current code with the amendments indicated. At a previous meeting, it was suggested allowing five regular parking spaces to be replaced with five designated cart parking spaces. Reed said she needed to investigate the average sizes of carts so she could better understand what requirements should be imposed, and told the Commission that staff needed more time for research, especially on the parking component. She noted that Peachtree City would be the first city she knew of have cart parking regulations. Those regulations would have to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements in addition to things like parallel parking standards.

She and Hooks had looked at the parking requirements for each use, she said, and decided it would be necessary to talk with other cities that had altered their parking requirements according to the business use.

Tonight, Reed wanted the Commission to understand staff was still reviewing the parking ordinance but asked them for comments, suggestions or questions they had. Ritenour confirmed with her that they could move ahead with the public hearing. Typically, the Commission would make a recommendation of approval or denial to the City Council. Reed said the public hearing could continue, and the Commission could allow for further time. As long as the hearing was opened for public comment, it was a valid public hearing regardless of whether there was a recommendation to Council or not. There could be another public hearing, if the Planning Commission desired, once the ordinance was complete, Reed noted.

Ritenour opened the public hearing, asking if anyone wished to speak in favor of the amendments. Keith Larson, a long-time pedestrian and bicycle advocate, stepped up. He recalled the Commission’s update of the 54 West overlay that

included updates for cart and bicycle parking. He said he would be glad to offer his expertise at no charge to City staff. He noted that term “golf cart” only applied to vehicles on a golf course. They should be called “motorized carts” or “personal transport vehicle” in the ordinance.

Last year, with an eye towards the creation of a Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), the Transportation Advisory Group (TAG), of which Larson was then a member, worked out a cart parking scheme based on the size of current models. TAG also developed an ADA-accessible parking space for carts, the first in the nation. Larson again offered to share these materials with staff.

He said there were already several developments that had stipulated cart and bike parking requirements, but they were not uniform, and Larson said he discovered they were only about 10% in compliance. Larson mentioned that they needed to consider both long-term bike parking, such as for residents and employees, and short-term parking for customers and clients. Long-term bike parking needed to be sheltered from the elements.

Larson again said he would be happy to provide information to staff because he wanted Peachtree City to do better. Ritenour mentioned that they wanted to incorporate these standards into the UDO and thanked Larson for his offer. Peachtree City was moving into the redevelopment stage, Larson added, and there needed to be language to trigger the new parking requirements for those legacy projects, too.

Hamner said Larson had sent some materials in the past dealing with the UDO. He read one that said cart parking spaces should measure no less than 6 feet by 10 feet. Larson also had shared some recommendations about the location of charging stations.

No one else wished to speak either in favor or in opposition, and Ritenour closed the public hearing. He asked if any Commissioners had questions either for staff or for Larson.

Allen said they had come up with five as the number of cart spaces that could be substituted for regular spaces. He thought it might be better to use a percentage, saying the total number of spaces made a difference. Five cart spaces out of 5,000 would not be sufficient, but five out of a total of seven would be too much. He thought required bike parking was a great idea and agreed with what Larson said.

Ritenour said these were the same issues that came up when they were reviewing the 54 West Overlay. They investigated what type of bike racks would be the best and also looked into storage, but never really added details. Allen mentioned the large bike lockers used in Washington, D.C., and also in Europe. Hamner acknowledged Larson’s expertise and asked him to consider their work thus far and state the strengths and weaknesses that he had observed. Realizing

that they had a problem was the first thing they were doing right, Larson said. He said the new types and proliferation of micromobility vehicles called for a responsible community to provide ways to secure those rides at their destination. He estimated that at least 10% of the trips in Peachtree City were made by alternate means. With bike parking, both long-term and short-term parking had to be addressed.

Ritenour asked staff if it would be okay to ask Larson to send them the information he had shared with the Planning Commission, and Reed said that was fine. Maybe it was time to change the terminology, he went on, and they should look at ADA compliance. He asked Larson to send the information to them.

Hamner thanked Larson for offering his expertise.

Kriz said he agreed with Allen's suggestion of using percentages, rather than a set number. He asked staff if they could find the average number of spaces in developments throughout the city, but Reed said that number was impossible to determine because parking was based on uses, and the uses varied. There might be commercial uses sharing space with offices in one development. To get around the disparity in the number of spaces, Kriz suggested that they say something like a minimum of five cart spaces and a maximum of 10%.

He asked if they wanted to separate the bicycle parking from the rest of the parking ordinance, saying that the current ordinance did not require bicycle parking, but only allowed it. Kriz believed the Commission supported an actual requirement. Allen said he thought they had decided to separate it.

City Council had requested to keep bicycle parking in the ordinance, Reed stated. Kriz said he would like to see language that required bicycle parking in any new commercial development or redevelopment. Reed asked if bicycle parking would be required, but golf cart parking would be optional? Kriz said that was correct. He reasoned that the Commission would ask about cart parking if a plan came to them without it, but he realized that not every development was well-connected to the paths.

If they were bound to keep bike parking as part of this ordinance, Ritenour remarked, they could expand section 909.8 to cover parking, storage, and whatever other requirements they wanted or make 900.8 cover bike parking and 909.9, storage.

Allen said he thought bike parking should be required, but large storage should be an option. He agreed that they didn't have enough information to make other recommendations.

A developer, Halverson remarked, could leverage this cart parking if he didn't have enough landscape coverage by reducing the size of the parking and swapping it

out for cart parking, then adding landscape back in. He thought they should provide flexibility and think about other areas of the code. He was in favor of increasing the percentage Allen suggested up to 15% as long as they took advantage of it from a landscape perspective.

Allen showed Larson a photo of the type of bike storage locker he had mentioned earlier. Larson said those were becoming more common.

Larson also addressed the question of whether cart parking should be mandatory, saying a few businesses were not connected to either a neighborhood street or a shared-use path. They should consider an exception for those businesses. He also told them the ratio was three cart spaces for two standard spaces.

Kriz said he would love to require cart parking, but he knew some developers did not like it. However, Larson mentioned that some developers were looking for micromobility connections.

Gant said he understood the discussion about cart parking but asked if there was an issue they were trying to address with bike parking. Was there a demand for it? Allen said there was a demand, plus, if bike parking were readily available, he felt more people would ride bikes.

Ritenour noted that he was surprised when he joined the Planning Commission to learn that there were no regulations regarding cart parking. They were trying to add some recommendations while keeping the differences between developments in mind. It was the same with bicycles. They were taking baby steps, and it was important to have this discussion and put the details into it.

He asked Reed what she needed from them, acknowledging that this project had gotten bigger than they intended. Reed said she needed to talk with the City Manager and get his guidance on what direction they should go. Right now, she needed time and proposed they bring this up again at the March 23 meeting. Ritenour told her that was fine; he wanted this ordinance to be the best it could be. Reed said she would reach out to TAG about the parking space sizes.

Halverson requested that Reed, during her research on cart parking regulations in other cities, determine whether the allocation of cart spaces was mandated or discretionary. She said she had discovered so far that most places did not specify numbers of spaces. She said she would be okay with maximizing cart spaces at 10% or 15% percent, but they also needed to set a location for that parking. You didn't want all the spaces in a large development in front of one store.

Hooks asked if the percentage would be of the required number of spaces or what the developer was providing? Kriz said it would be a percentage of the required amount.

Kriz also said he would like for the City to approach existing properties after this was adopted and ask if they would be willing to offer designated cart parking.

Gant moved to recommend they defer this until the March 23 meeting. Kriz seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Member/Staff Topics

Ritenour mentioned that Reed had sent an email regarding zoning classes. He recommended the Zoning 101 class and said he hoped to take the 102 class. He urged the other Commissioners to take advantage of this training.

There was nothing on the February 23 agenda, but the March 9 meeting would be packed. The Commissioners discussed cancelling the February 23 meeting but decided to use it to discuss the native plants ordinance. Hamner said he had compiled all of their ideas with his take on the pros and cons, and he hoped they could discuss it and find a way to move forward.

Halverson asked who answered the questions during the request for proposals (RFP) process, and Reed said she did, adding that she and the procurement department were trying to figure out the scoring component for the steering committee while respecting the confidentiality of bidders.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Kriz moved to adjourn at 7:34 p.m. Halverson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary

Scott Ritenour, Chairman

Proposed Ordinance

As proposed by Kenneth Hamner

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY
ORDINANCE NO. [XXXX]

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ARTICLE XI OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE, VEGETATION PROTECTION AND LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS, TO ESTABLISH NATIVE PLANT STANDARDS, PROHIBIT INVASIVE SPECIES, AND ALIGN WITH EXISTING ORDINANCES.

Sec. 1134. Purpose.

The purpose of this ordinance is to promote ecological balance, water conservation, and fiscal responsibility by requiring the use of native plants in regulated developments, prohibiting invasive plants, and aligning planting standards with existing tree, buffer, stormwater, and irrigation ordinances.

Sec. 1135. Applicability.

This ordinance applies to all development and redevelopment projects that submit a landscape plan for City review, including:

- Commercial, office, industrial, and institutional developments.
- Public projects including parks, roadways, stormwater basins, and streetscapes.
- Subdivision common areas, including entrances and buffers.
- Parking lot landscapes and required tree islands.
- Buffer yards required by zoning ordinances (GC, GI, LI, and others).

This ordinance does not apply to individual residential yards or golf course playing surfaces, except that non-playing landscaped areas of golf courses must comply.

Sec. 1136. Standards.

A. Native plant requirements.

1. **100% native plantings required** in buffers, stormwater facilities, and City-owned projects.
2. **At least 75% native plantings required** in general commercial, office, industrial, and institutional landscapes. Approved Special Purpose Gardens (per Subsection B) shall be excluded from this percentage calculation.
3. **All required canopy trees** shall be native species.

4. **No invasive species** listed by the Georgia Exotic Pest Plant Council or the City's Prohibited Species List may be planted.

B. Flexibility provisions.

1. If a required native species is unavailable, the applicant may request substitution with documentation from at least two regional suppliers.
2. Substitutions must be functionally equivalent in canopy size, ecological role, and site tolerance.
3. Temporary non-invasive placeholders may be approved, provided replacement occurs in the next planting season.
4. Special Purpose Gardens (e.g., cultural, memorial, or specimen plantings) may be composed primarily of non-native, non-invasive species, provided: (a) The Special Purpose Garden does not exceed 10% of the total area of the site; (b) The applicant provides a Design Narrative explaining the specific theme and why non-native species are essential to that intent; and (c) Such plantings are restricted to courtyards, plazas, or building entrances and are not used in buffers or stormwater facilities.

Sec. 1137. Approved Native Species.

The City shall maintain an Approved Native Plant List, organized by canopy size, site conditions, and permitted uses. The list shall be updated periodically and made available to staff, developers, and the public.

Sec. 1138. Prohibited Invasive Species.

The following species shall not be planted within the City of Peachtree City. Where encountered during development or redevelopment, they shall be removed and replaced with approved natives.

Trees

- Bradford / Callery pear (*Pyrus calleryana*)
- Sawtooth oak (*Quercus acutissima*)
- Tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*)
- Mimosa (*Albizia julibrissin*)
- Princess tree (*Paulownia tomentosa*)
- White mulberry (*Morus alba*)
- Chinaberry (*Melia azedarach*)
- Paper mulberry (*Broussonetia papyrifera*)
- Golden rain tree (*Koelreuteria paniculata*)

Shrubs and Woody Vines

- Chinese privet (*Ligustrum sinense*)
- Japanese privet (*Ligustrum japonicum*)
- Thorny olive (*Elaeagnus pungens*)

- Autumn olive (*Elaeagnus umbellata*)
- Leatherleaf mahonia (*Mahonia bealei*)
- Winged burning bush (*Euonymus alatus*)
- Wintercreeper (*Euonymus fortunei*)
- Nandina / Sacred bamboo (*Nandina domestica*)
- Multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*)
- Japanese spiraea (*Spiraea japonica*)
- Amur honeysuckle (*Lonicera maackii*)
- Japanese honeysuckle (*Lonicera japonica*)
- Shrubby lespedeza (*Lespedeza bicolor*)
- Sericea lespedeza (*Lespedeza cuneata*)
- Red sesbania (*Sesbania punicea*)
- Bigpod sesbania (*Sesbania herbacea*)

Grasses, Groundcovers, and Herbaceous Plants

- Chinese silvergrass (*Miscanthus sinensis*)
- Fountain grass (*Pennisetum setaceum*)
- Nepalese browntop (*Microstegium vimineum*)
- Cogongrass (*Imperata cylindrica*)
- Alligator weed (*Alternanthera philoxeroides*)
- Marsh dayflower (*Murdannia keisak*)
- Japanese climbing fern (*Lygodium japonicum*)
- Vinca major (*Vinca major*)
- Vinca minor (*Vinca minor*)

Aquatic Invasives

- Kudzu (*Pueraria montana var. lobata*)
- Hydrilla (*Hydrilla verticillata*)
- Water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*)

Other Invasive Vines

- Asian wisterias (*Wisteria sinensis* / *Wisteria floribunda*)
- Periwinkles (*Vinca minor* / *major*)

Sec. 1139. Alignment with Other Ordinances.

This ordinance shall be read in harmony with:

- **Land Development Ordinance §1101** (Ecological Balance, Drought-Tolerant Plantings): compliance with native standards shall constitute compliance with §1101.
- **Zoning District Buffers (§1006–§1007, GC, GI, LI):** all required buffer plantings shall be 100% native.

- **Floodplain and Streambank Protection:** all plantings in regulated riparian zones shall be 100% native, selected from riparian-tolerant species.
- **Tree Protection Standards:** preserved native trees count toward canopy and native requirements. Replacement trees must be selected from the Approved Native Plant List.
- **Irrigation Standards:** permanent irrigation is not required in native landscapes; temporary irrigation is permitted for establishment only.

Sec. 1140. Enforcement.

Violations of this Division shall be enforced consistent with Article XI. Where prohibited invasive species are discovered on a regulated site, the City may require removal and replacement with approved native species.