



Planning Commission

Regular Meeting Agenda

SCAN FOR AGENDA
PACKET



Frances Meaders Council Chambers
151 Willowbend Road
March 23, 2026 | 6:00 PM

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Announcements**
4. **Presentations**
5. **Agenda Changes**
6. **Minutes**
 1. Planning Commission Meeting March 9, 2026
7. **Old Agenda Items**
 1. Consider a Text Amendment to the Parking Ordinance, Sec. 909, Off-Street Automobile Parking Requirements
 2. Consider a 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, March 9, 2026
6:30 PM

Call to Order

The Peachtree City Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, March 9, 2026 at City Hall. 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, Assistant City Engineer John Schnick, Recording Secretary Martha Barksdale, and IT Specialists Ken Couch and Ryan Williams.

Pledge of Allegiance

Ritenour opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Announcements

Ritenour welcomed the citizens in attendance and reminded them that there would be no public comment because there were no public hearings on the agenda. He also asked that they refrain from speaking out during the Commission's deliberations.

Reed stated there was an email address for the Planning Commission, but they were not allowed to respond to those emails due to quorum requirements. She assured the writers that they were not simply being ignored.

Presentations

None

Agenda Changes

None

Minutes

1. Planning Commission Meeting February 23, 2026

Kriz moved to approve the February 23, 2026, Planning Commission meeting minutes. Allen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

None

New Agenda Items

1. Landscape Plan, MEJA Construction Inc., 407 Dividend Drive

MEJA Construction had submitted a landscape plan for its building expansion at 407 Dividend Drive. Hooks showed the location on a zoning map, saying it was zoned General Industrial (GI).

The amount of impervious surface area on the property was 99,273 square feet, and based on that, a minimum of 298 caliper inches of canopy trees and 199 caliper inches of understory trees were required. However, the Land Development

Ordinance (LDO) permitted a reduction of up to 25% of the tree requirement for developments that designated and maintained tree save areas, Hooks stated. In this case, the developer had designated a tree save area of 3,638 square feet near the front of the property, which amounted to a 2% reduction in the required amount of caliper inches to 292 for canopy trees and 195 for understory trees. The proposal exceeded that requirement with 294 canopy inches and 196 understory inches.

The ordinance said that planting areas should be in front and on the sides of all retail, commercial and industrial buildings, wherever practical. Hooks pointed out that the proposal included a planting area along the front of the building with some additional area wrapping around sides of the building. Also, the perimeter of all parking lots should be landscaped with evergreen shrubs of at least 24 inches in height for screening of cars and headlights. The applicant had proposed a combination of three evergreen shrubs along the front of the parking lot facing Dividend Drive, Hooks noted.

Also in the ordinance was the requirement that all parking islands be 100% landscaped with canopy trees, understory trees, evergreen shrubs, and/or groundcover in mulched beds. The proposal included elms, crape myrtles, and evergreen shrubs, as well as groundcovers, in the parking islands. Hooks also remarked that 80% of these trees were native to the eastern United States and/or the southeastern United States.

Matt Moore was present as the applicant's representative.

Gant and Allen had no questions. Kriz mentioned there was a staff recommendation, and Hooks explained that the City Engineer had concerns that the proposed tree placement near the monument sign might block the drainage ditch and added a recommendation that the trees be moved away from the ditch. Moore said they could do that.

Halverson had no questions, but Hamner, noting that 80% of the trees were natives, asked if they would be open to finding native substitutes for the remaining 20%. Moore said he saw no problem with that, as long as it didn't delay the project. Hamner suggested substituting fringe trees or American snowballs for the crape myrtles and American elms or hackberries for the lacebark elms. He also offered native substitutions for the shrubs and groundcovers. Moore said if he could provide this information to him, they would be happy to make the changes. Hooks noted that the 80% was only the tree species; she didn't look at the shrubs.

Ritenour said he was glad to see nice landscape designs for commercial properties. It was a suggestion to do the natives, but they didn't want to hold up construction. Moore agreed.

Kriz moved to approve the landscape plan for MEJA Construction Inc., 407

Dividend Drive, with the condition to move the trees near the existing monument sign so they did not block the drainage ditch and to use additional native plants were possible. Gant seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Landscape Plan, SWI Machinery, 400 Naeco Way

Hooks stated that Highland Land Planning had submitted a landscape plan for a new manufacturing building at 400 Naeco Way, zoned GI and in the Airport Overlay District. The amount of impervious surface area was 78,615 square feet, which called for a minimum of 236 caliper inches of canopy trees and 157 caliper inches of understory trees per the ordinance.

They also were taking advantage of the section in the LDO that allowed for a reduction in the tree requirements if they preserved a tree save area. The tree save area here would be 55,332 square feet, which allowed them to reduce the number of caliper inches required by 21%. This would reduce the number of canopy tree caliper inches to 186 and the caliper inches of understory trees to 124. Hooks pointed out the planting areas on the front and sides of the building and said while the small parking lot was separated from Naeco Way by a row of trees and the detention pond, the applicant was proposing a combination of two evergreen shrubs along the edge of the parking area.

Of the total number of trees provided, 50% were native to the eastern United States and/or the southeastern United States. She stated that staff had no conditions or recommendations for this plan.

The applicant, Jason Walls, thanked Hooks and assured the Commissioners that they would work with staff to modify the plans to accommodate more native plants.

The Commissioners had no questions, and all commended the developer. Kriz said he liked to see the big tree save area. Ritenour noted that Walls had worked with staff on other projects, and asked Hamner if he could provide some native plant suggestions to staff. He agreed.

Gant moved to approve the landscape plan for SWI Machinery, 400 Naeco Way. Allen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Concept Plat, Bradshaw Estates, 201 Sumner Road

There had been a few changes since this was presented at a January 26 workshop, Hooks noted. She indicated the property on a zoning map, zoned Single-Family Residential (R-43), and pointed out Sumner Road and Astoria Lane. The plat presented at the workshop had been revised to include a connection road between the northern and southern portions of the development instead of just the path previously proposed. This caused a reduction in the number of lots from 59 to 58.

The front setbacks for the lots would be 50 feet; the side, 15 feet; and the rear, 30

feet. The minimum lot size was one acre, and the minimum floor area of each dwelling unit was 1,500 square feet. The LDO required the developer to install a path that connected to the City's path network, and he had agreed to coordinate with the City Engineering Department to determine the best location for the path to continue southward on Sumner Road to tie into the existing path system. That was a recommended condition should the Planning Commission decide to approve the plat.

The LDO required at least three acres of open space per 100 dwelling units. The proposal was for 58 residential lots, which required a minimum of 1.74 acres of open space, and the developer provided 2.43 acres that did not include the greenbelts. Hooks indicated the locations on the site plan.

Some citizens had been concerned about buffers. Hooks explained that the LDO called for special screening for all new commercial developments and multi-family subdivisions where they abut streets or single-family residential subdivisions, but that requirement does not apply to this proposed single-family subdivision plat. Regardless, there was a 50-foot buffer proposed between the road and an adjacent subdivision.

Both the Police and Fire Departments had expressed concerns regarding existing extended response times to the rear portion of Kedron Hills along Astoria Lane and felt this new development would add further impediments. They suggested the connecting road, which was included in the revised plat. There had been several comments from citizens received since the January workshop, and Hooks said they were included in the meeting packet.

Hooks said staff felt the plat met the zoning ordinance and development standards. If the Planning Commission voted to approve, staff recommended a condition that the required path connection to the City path system be in a location coordinated with the City Engineer.

Attorney Rick Lindsey represented Chadwick Homes. He reminded the Commission that this was not a rezoning, but a concept plat approval. The property was rezoned about 20 years ago, and it and all surrounding properties in the Peachtree City city limits were zoned R-43. The neighboring property in the County had lots of similar size. The plan called for a Phase 1 and Phase 2 development, each with 29 homes, Lindsey continued. The concept plat met or exceeded all of the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the LDO, he stated, and staff had recommended approval with the one condition to which the developer had agreed, Lindsey stated.

Lindsey noted that most of the concerns from nearby residents dealt with traffic, buffers, safety, stormwater runoff, and tree clearing and grading and asked to address those. Starting with traffic, he said that the road connection between the two phases was added at the request of the Police and Fire Departments. That

should improve the safety of not only this development, but of Kedron Hills and Astoria Lane. The speed limit through this development would be 25 or 30 mph. Some people were concerned this road would be used as a cut-through, but Lindsey remarked that there were several intersections where stop signs would be placed, so that should deter through traffic.

Buffers were not required, but the developer was adding a 50-foot buffer so that no homes backed up to the homes on Ashley Way. There would be no development between the back property lines those homes shared with this property. The developer would not clear-cut this subdivision, but rather clear for the residences as the lots were sold. Lindsey said the backyards probably wouldn't be cleared at all. He noted that Chadwick Homes had developed many properties in Peachtree City, and their work spoke for itself.

As far as safety concerns, Lindsey said there were complaints now of mischief-making in the woods that currently occupied the site, so this development would eliminate that. He reminded them of the speed limits, saying children playing in the front yards should be safe. The connector road would improve safety, too.

A lot of the emails talked about current stormwater issues, and Lindsey said this development, with its curbed and guttered roads, should improve that problem. The only runoff on the southern end would be in the 50-foot buffer. Everything else would be piped to detention ponds and released to the creeks. Lindsey assured them that stormwater would be much more controlled than it was now. The creeks would be protected as the law required. He again stated this property would not be clear-cut. The roads would be cleared and graded, but the lots would only be cleared to the extent necessary.

Lindsey concluded by reiterating that Planning staff had found this plat met all requirements of the zoning ordinance and the LDO. The developer agreed with the condition regarding path placement and had added the connector road as Public Safety had requested.

Kriz asked what was the feasibility of placing a gate in this development? Reed said they had asked the developer about placing a gate on the connector road, but it was not something the City could require. Kriz mentioned the recent addition of a gate in an existing subdivision and asked how that was done.

Schnick explained that the land was conveyed to the homeowners association (HOA), and the HOA paid for the gate and now maintained the gate and that portion of the roadway.

At the workshop, the Planning Commission asked to see plans for a third phase of this development, Kriz recalled. Lindsey said that was not possible because his client did not own that property, and the conveyance of that property was not being discussed at this time. Kriz said it was his understanding that a drawing had been

made of the future development. Lindsey replied that there may have been a concept plan decades ago when the land was rezoned, but there was not one now to his knowledge. He explained his client had a contract on what would be Phase 1 and 2 that would be closed upon when the development was approved. They had nothing on Phase 3.

Kriz asked Hooks to point out the areas of open space on the plat. Kriz asked about space between lots 43 and 44, and Jason Walls stepped up to say that was for access to the detention pond. Would the greenbelts be conveyed to the City? Kriz asked, and Hooks said they would not, only a 25-foot buffer along Sumner and Smokerise Point. Any greenbelt areas developed as stormwater ponds would be conveyed to the City, Schnick added.

Halverson said the design for Phase 1 and 2 clearly indicated that there would be a Phase 3, which was what they had concerns about. They couldn't consider the population and traffic implications because they did not have the design for Phase 3.

Lindsey addressed traffic within the neighborhood, Halverson remarked, but there were concerns about traffic outside the neighborhood. He said they asked about a traffic study to show what the impact of this development would be on Sumner Road. Walls replied that they were not asked to provide a traffic study, but Halverson reminded him of a discussion at the workshop about traffic at the southern end of the development. Walls remembered that discussion but not a request for a traffic study. Hooks said she did not remember, either. Halverson said he thought they requested a traffic study and a Phase 3 sketch because it would be important to understand the impact of this development with a connecting road to Sumner Road. There would be cut-through traffic, he stated. Walls said there was already cut-through traffic on other roads, so this would provide a third route. Halverson said he would like to have that demonstrated to them.

Halverson stated he did not disagree that this plat met and exceeded all ordinances. Lindsey said Halverson was asking questions that should have been brought up 20 years ago when this property was rezoned. They did not have the right to develop Phase 3. Yes, they had stubbed out where additional houses and roads could go, but Bradshaw could sell that property to someone else. He said they were leaving options for future connectivity so everyone wasn't shuttled down to the main roads. Much of what could become Phase 3 was wetlands, Lindsey remarked, so there wouldn't be too many more homes.

He again noted this plan met all requirements, and they had addressed many of the concerns residents had mentioned in their emails. This property had been zoned for many years, and the time was right for development. City Council would have to require a gate, Lindsey said, and Allen asked if that was the only way they would consider a gate. Lindsey said the emails seemed about evenly divided on having a connector road. Planterra was the only gate he knew of on a city street,

and the difference was that Planterra was being used as a cut-through to 54 from the Industrial Park area. Here, there was no big commercial area. The drivers who were inclined to cut through would be from Kedron Hills and Astoria Lane, and the stop signs and speed limits should keep it from being a hazard. Allen said those did nothing in Planterra to control drivers, so why would they work here? Lindsey again mentioned the traffic from the Industrial Park being the source there.

Halverson read a passage from the January 26 minutes mentioning a potential traffic study and traffic issues. Ritenour said they should have made a traffic study a stipulation. He remembered that discussion and also a discussion of the commercial development planned nearby. Walls said there was a traffic study of the SR 54 and Sumner Road intersection, and he would provide it.

Hamner asked about the history of this area, saying so many problems now were related to that zoning 20 years ago. He asked if Lindsey knew anything further. Lindsey recalled that when he was City Attorney years ago, Council discussed a major road through this property to take traffic from Robinson up to Crabapple and Dogwood. He believed this property was zoned in the early 2000s as a blanket rezoning of Kedron Hills.

Ritenour said a lot of his questions had already been asked, so he moved on to Allen. Allen said his experience as a police officer told him that this road was a shortcut, and people would speed through it. He thought a gate, either over the creek or at the north end, would be the best solution for safety.

Gant noted they were looking at about 90 houses for all three phases, and that would create a lot of traffic. He said safety was his concern. He did not recommend adding a connection at Astoria Lane. Gant then asked about timing, and Walls said it would be about three years to completion. Gant recommended they work to keep the traffic from Astoria Lane.

Kriz said he had no real problems with this neighborhood in general. He believed Council could solve the problem with a gate and the deeding over of some land to a future HOA. He had a problem with the distance of the path connection from the northern part of the development. He felt there were opportunities to add golf cart paths throughout the neighborhood. Also, not seeing how the third phase would tie in was a disadvantage.

Halverson said he wouldn't repeat himself, but he did have concerns that the developers would not live up to their pledge not to clear-cut and would like to see strategic tree removal as a condition for approval.

Hamner mentioned the extraordinary amount of communications they had received from residents about this proposal. He acknowledged that the developers had addressed many of these concerns and were meeting all the requirements. So much of what they were talking about was because of the way this was set up 20

years ago. This property was in an area that was difficult to navigate. The applicants were justified in what they were asking, as were the residents. There was not an easy answer, he commented.

Hamner said he had four thoughts. The first was that no certificates of occupancy should be issued until the north/south connecting road had been fully constructed and accepted by the engineer. Secondly, the Sims Road stub off Astoria Lane should be restricted to emergency vehicle access only and secured by a gate system. Third, all construction traffic should enter and exit by Sumner Road exclusively. Finally, before any grading permit was issued, the developer should submit a construction traffic management plan to the City Engineer for review. He said this would include a staging area plan and explain how the developer would enforce the Sumner Road requirement.

Ritenour said it seemed there were concerns still with the concept plat. They could approve, deny, or approve with conditions. Were there other options? Reed replied that they had raised some new things, and, if the applicant agreed, they could grant a deferral to allow them to provide more information. The other options were valid, as well.

Kriz asked if they were approving or denying or making a recommendation to City Council? Reed said it would not go to City Council.

Ritenour remarked on the number of comments they had received, saying the issues they touched on were common in any new development. He said the connecting road would ease the Public Safety concerns. He mentioned the gate that they had discussed and said he was surprised the developer had not proposed one. Ritenour said at first he thought the gate should be between Phases 1 and 2, but he had come to think that it should be at the entrance to the development at Sims Road.

They wanted to look at this development in a comprehensive way, and the lack of a plan for Phase 3 was a problem. He suggested they include something about that in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), as well as a requirement for traffic studies.

However, this property was zoned R-43, and the proposed development was permitted in this zoning classification. While they recognized the concerns expressed by nearby residents, they also had to acknowledge the property owner's rights to develop the land in accordance with the City ordinances. Ritenour stated that this was only a conceptual plat, and there probably would be changes made going forward. Multiple additional steps had to happen where things such as stormwater would be reviewed.

He had some suggestions for conditions. He wanted a gate placed at the top of Sims Road as it came into Phase 2, accessible only to first responders. He wanted

a cart path to go around that gate, providing access from the back part of Kedron Hills. He agreed with the condition staff had put forward for that connection, but, as Kriz had suggested, wanted to see more connectivity with the paths. He also thought it was important to restrict construction traffic to Sumner Road and not through Kedron Hills.

This needed to go back and be reviewed by the applicant, Ritenour said. Before they voted, he asked Lindsey if he had any comments. Lindsey said the applicant would agree with all the conditions. He then said his client had talked to the property owner, and he had refused to work on a plan for Phase 3. He had the right to sell his property to anyone, Lindsey added, but, realistically, they were looking at no more than 20 additional lots, no matter who built it.

Like Hamner, Ritenour reflected on how all of this property had been developed piecemeal over the years. Lindsey reflected that it was easy to do those comprehensive plans when there was just one property owner, but now that they were down to the remnants, it was more difficult.

Lindsey then recapped what he understood to be the Planning Commission's wishes. He said his client had no objection to a gate open only to first responders at the northern end of the development. They were also fine with a golf cart connection on that side. Limiting construction traffic to Sumner Road would not be a problem, he stated. He said they would build the connection to Phase 2 after Phase 1 was completed. Submitting a construction traffic management plan would not be a problem. Lindsey suggested staff and the developer talk about internal cart paths connecting both phases.

Kriz said he was a visual person and wanted to see this laid out before they approved it. He suggested they defer this so the developer could come back. Kriz said he wanted to see the path connections. Lindsey stated that paths were planned further along in the process. This was a preliminary plat.

Kriz moved to defer this topic until the first meeting in April. Allen seconded. Ritenour said they were looking at the gate, the cart path connection around the gate, the C.O. for phase 2, which might take care of itself, depending on the gate, the construction traffic management plan, and the plan for path connectivity within the development.

Halverson said he wanted to see a traffic study. Ritenour asked if he meant he wanted to see the traffic study that had been done for the nearby commercial development or did he want to request a new traffic study? Halverson said he wanted a new traffic study on this area and the development across the street. Kriz said he could support that.

Again, Lindsey pointed out that this had already been rezoned. All the lots in the plan were legal. Traffic studies were very expensive and very time-consuming,

Lindsey stated. They were talking about just 60 homes, so nothing triggered the need for a traffic study. He repeated that this zoning was already approved. He didn't know what a traffic study could do; the development was already approved for this zoning. Halverson asked if he thought a traffic light was needed? Lindsey replied that there was no way a traffic light would be approved for Sumner Road and this subdivision. A light might be needed at SR 54 and Sumner Road, but not here. Allen mentioned that 15 years ago, a traffic study at SR 54 and the Chic-fil-A area was \$1.5 million.

Ritenour asked if they could provide the existing traffic study to staff, and Walls agreed. He said it was on SR 54 at Genevieve Court and the two or three intersections before and after. Halverson said that would be sufficient.

Kriz restated his motion to call for deferral of the conceptual plat for Bradshaw Estates to the April 13 Planning Commission meeting with the following considerations: the gate at Sims Road to Phase 2, cart path connection around the gate, certificate of occupancy delayed until road was constructed—Hooks stopped them to ask what was meant by that, and Hamner clarified it, but they then decided they did not need it if the gate was moved to the north. Kriz completed the motion by asking for a construction traffic management plan and paths within the development. Allen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearings

None

Member/Staff Topics

Reed gave the Commissioners an update on training sessions, and Ritenour thanked the public for their participation and showing up for the meeting.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Kriz moved to adjourn at 8:14 p.m. Halverson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary

Scott Ritenour, Chairman

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

MEMO TO: Planning Commission

FROM:

DATE: March 23, 2026

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

Recommendation:

Staff recommend consideration of the text amendment referenced below.

Discussion:

Section 909, of the city's Zoning Ordinance, establishes the requirements for off-street automobile parking and provides standards for the location and provision of parking areas in off-street locations. Off-street automobile parking is required in all zoning districts for any permitted or conditional use.

Recent discussions by the Planning Commission have identified a need to revise the existing parking regulations to incorporate provisions for golf cart parking. Additionally, city staff has identified the need for a comprehensive review of the off-street automobile parking requirements to ensure that current standards reflect evolving transportation modes, development practices, and parking demand.

Staff seeks policy guidance from the Planning Commission and City Council to inform the drafting of proposed ordinance language and ensure that revisions align with the City's long-term planning objectives and operational needs.

Budget Impact:

None

Attachments:

1. FINAL Sec. 909. Off_street_automobile_parking_requirements. Revisions 3.23.26

Sec. 909. Off-street automobile parking requirements.

Areas suitable for parking automobiles in off-street locations shall be required in all zoning districts for any permitted or conditional use. Such off-street parking areas shall have direct access to a street or drive open to public use, and shall be provided and maintained in accordance with the following requirements. These requirements are intended to meet minimum needs; however, every property owner must determine his actual needs and provide whatever spaces may be necessary beyond these minimums to remain in full compliance with the provisions of this ordinance. Shift change peaking and growth must be considered when determining parking requirements.

Such parking shall be provided in a properly graded and improved parking facility with the parking spaces composed of asphalt, concrete, porous paving blocks compacted gravel, or other materials approved by the planning commission which are unlikely to cause substantial maintenance problems.

Changes in the use of an existing structure shall also require compliance with the minimum parking requirements applicable to the new use.

Any expansion of an existing use shall be required to provide additional of-street parking related to the expansion area ~~only, and only and~~ shall not be required to provide additional off-street parking related to the existing use.

(909.1) Parking space size.

- (a) The size of a standard parking space for one vehicle shall be a rectangular area having dimensions of not less than ~~ten (10) feet in width by twenty (20) feet in length~~ nine feet × 18 feet.
- ~~(b) For those parking spaces that adjoin a median at the end of a parking bay or adjoin a median separating parking spaces in a row of parking, the width of the parking space shall be expanded to ten feet.~~
- ~~(b)~~ Parking for the physically handicapped shall be provided pursuant to the latest edition of the ~~American's~~ Americans with Disabilities Act.
- ~~(c)~~ Parallel parking spaces are allowed provided they do not exceed one-fifth of the number of required spaces. Parallel parking spaces shall have a dimension of nine (9) feet in width by twenty (20) feet in length. ~~nine feet × 20 feet.~~

(909.2) Parking area design.

- (a) All parking lots shall be designed in conformance with the provisions set forth within section 1109, parking lot design and landscape requirements, of the city's land development ordinance.
- (b) Access to parking facilities shall be designed so as not to obstruct free flow of traffic.
- (c) There shall be adequate provision for ingress and egress to all parking spaces to ~~insure~~ ensure ease of mobility, ample clearance, and safety of vehicles and pedestrians.
- (d) In developments where vehicles may be expected to wait, (including to, but not limited to drive-thru restaurants, banks, etc.), adequate stacking space shall be provided.
- (e) The width of all driving aisles shall be in accordance with the requirements specified below unless a wider drive aisle is approved by the planning commission to facilitate special vehicle requirements:

Parking angle	Minimum driving aisle width
60 degrees, golf cart and motorized cart parking	10' minimum, 12' maximum
90 degrees, golf cart and motorized cart parking	14' minimum, 16' maximum

60 degrees, <u>standard vehicle</u>	18' minimum, 22' maximum
90 degrees, <u>standard vehicle</u>	24' minimum, 30' maximum
2-way drive aisle without parking	24'
1-way driving aisle without parking	14'

(909.3) *Schedule of Minimum off-street parking requirements.*

(a) Combination of uses. If there is a combination of uses on a zoning lot, such as a motel with a restaurant, parking requirements will be computed separately for each use.

(b) Schedule of Minimum off-street parking requirements

Use	Minimum number of required parking spaces
Residential	
Assisted living	0.5 spaces per dwelling unit
Motel, hotel and bed and breakfast	1 space per guest room, 1 space for every 2 employees
Multi-family housing	2 spaces per dwelling unit
Nursing home	1 parking space for every 5 beds, 1 space for every self-care unit, and 1 space for every 2 employees on the largest shift
Single-family, attached	2 spaces per dwelling unit
Single-family, detached	2 spaces per dwelling unit
Public, civic and institutional	
Cemetery	1 space for every employee working fulltime at the site and 5 spaces for each acre devoted to cemetery use
Church	1 space for every 3 seats in the main assembly room
Club, lodge or social center	1 space for every 200 square feet of assembly area without fixed seats and 1 space for every 10 seats in an assembly area with fixed seats.
Elementary, middle, private or high school	1 space for every employee plus 1 space for every 3 students enrolled who are of driving age
Publicly-owned building	One space for every employee working at the site, one space for every ten seats in an assembly area with fixed seats, one space for every 200 square feet of assembly area without fixed seats, one space for every 300 square feet of office area, and one space for every vehicle to be stored on the site.
Vocational school	10 spaces per classroom
Eating establishments*	
With drive-thru	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area plus any outdoor dining area

With seating, high turnover	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area plus any outdoor dining area
With seating, low turnover	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area plus any outdoor dining area
Without seating	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area
Indoor recreation/entertainment	
Commercial recreation facility	1 space for every 200 square feet of general floor area plus 1 space for every 10 seats in an assembly area with fixed seats
Recreation	1 space for every 3 persons that the facility is designed to accommodate when fully occupied plus 1 space for every 200 SF of office space or similar activities
Indoor entertainment	1 space for every 200 SF of general floor area plus one space for every 10 seats in the main assembly area
Outdoor recreation	
Golf courses	4 spaces for each green, plus 50% of the total spaces required for associated uses
Riding stable	1 space for every employee and 1 space for every animal that can be accommodated in the stable.
Office	
-Medical	1 space for every 250-300 SF of gross floor area
Professional	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Radio or television station	1 space for every 500 SF of gross floor area
Real estate sales	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Retail sales and service	
Bank or financial institution	1 space for every 250-200 SF of gross floor area
Clothing store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Convenience store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Dance studio	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Department or discount store	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Funeral home	1 space for every 4 seats in the chapel or parlor, plus 1 space for every 300 SF of office space
Furniture store	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
General retail store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Grocery/specialty food store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Home furnishings	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Health club or spa	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Hotel, motel or inn	1 space for each room to be rented plus 75-55% of the total spaces required to accommodate other associated uses associated with the establishment
Liquor store	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area

Created: 2025-11-26 07:45:51 [EST]

(Supp. No. 56, Update 1)

Nightclub or bar	1 space for every 100 SF of gross floor area
Nursery	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Shopping center	1 space for every 250 SF of gross floor area
Veterinary clinic/boarding hospital	1 space for every employee plus 1 space for every 500 SF of gross floor area
Automotive sales and service	
Auto rental	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Automobile service facility	3 spaces for each service bay, or for each service employee, whichever is greater
Gasoline sales	No parking spaces are required for gas pump uses. All other uses on the site must meet the requirements for retail, service and repair as shown above
Car wash	1 space for each regular employee plus one space for each 250 SF of gross floor area
Truck and/ or trailer rental	1 space for every 300 SF of gross floor area
Industrial	
Contractor's office	1 space for every employee plus 1 space for every company vehicles stored on the site
Manufacturing	1 space for every 2,000 SF of gross office, plant or storage space
Office/warehouse, no manufacturing	1 space for every 300 SF of office space or administrative area, plus 1 space for every 500 SF of indoor sales or display area, plus 1 space for every 2,500 SF of storage space
Transportation facility	1 space for every employee, 1 space for every 500 square feet of public use area, and 1 space for every company vehicle to be stored on the site
Utility services	1 space for every employee working at the site
Wholesale, publishing or open yard business	1 space for every employee, 1 space for every 2,000 square feet of floor area, and 1 space for every company vehicle to be stored on the site

*As identified in the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Manual, latest edition.

~~(909.3) Combination of uses. If there is a combination of uses on a zoning lot, such as a motel with a restaurant, parking requirements will be computed separately for each use.~~

(909.4) *Location of parking areas.* Required off-street parking areas should be located on-site. However, off-site parking is permitted within 400 feet of the site if the owner of the off-site area relinquishes all rights to use the area for other purposes until such time as it is no longer needed for required off-street parking.

(909.5) *Common parking areas.* Two or more uses may utilize a common parking area provided the total spaces available meet their individual parking requirements and the common area will be available for parking until such time as it is no longer needed for such purpose. In determining parking requirements

Created: 2025-11-26 07:45:51 [EST]

(Supp. No. 56, Update 1)

for areas where common parking will be used, due consideration should be made of the hours when parking will be required by the various uses. In this way, it will be possible to count individual spaces more than once where appropriate, and, thereby, reduce the total area devoted to parking.

(909.6) *Off-street parking, general conditions.* In the event a use is proposed which is not specifically provided for in the list defining minimum spaces required, subsection (909.3), the zoning administrator shall adopt an appropriate standard from that list so that reasonable parking requirements are imposed and the general intent of this ordinance is carried out.

- (a) All parking areas shall be drained so as to prevent damage to adjoining properties or streets.
- (b) In all zoning districts, all off-street parking spaces shall ~~be of~~ paved ~~or with other~~ acceptable ~~all weather~~all-weather surfaces. ~~In general residential, commercial and industrial zoning districts, off-street parking spaces shall be of paved surfaces.~~
- (c) In industrial and commercial zoning districts, the Zoning Administrator may permit the establishment of temporary unpaved parking lots for a period not to exceed one year, provided the site plan for the parking area is properly designed, the parking area and its drives consist of acceptable all-weather surfaces, and a landscape plan is prepared and implemented to offset the ~~adverse affects~~adverse effects of any necessary clearing or grading on the temporary site. The zoning administrator may revoke the permit for the temporary unpaved parking area and order the immediate discontinuance of the use if the property is not maintained properly or is operated in an unsafe manner.

(909.7) Alternative Transportation Vehicles.

A. Alternative Transportation Vehicles.

For the purposes of this section, the term Alternative Transportation Vehicle includes golf carts, motorized carts, low-speed vehicle/low speed motor vehicle, and bicycles.

B. Applicability.

Parking for Alternative Transportation Vehicles shall be required for the following types of development:

- 1. New commercial developments;
- 2. New mixed-use developments; and
- 3. Major renovations or expansions exceeding 25% of existing building floor area or site development.

C. Exemptions.

Single-family detached residential dwellings shall be exempt from the requirements of this section.

(909.8) Alternative Transportation Vehicle: Designated Golf Carts and Motorized Carts Parking Areas.

A. During the Concept Plan Approval process, the city may establish designated golf cart parking and motorized cart areas in commercial, civic, and mixed-use districts.

B. Design standards for designated golf cart and motorized cart spaces:

- 1. Minimum perpendicular or angled stall width: 5 feet
- 2. Minimum perpendicular or angled stall length: 12 feet

-
3. Minimum parallel stall width: 5 feet
 4. Minimum parallel stall length: 14 feet
 5. Minimum vertical clearance: 8 feet
 6. A minimum 5-foot access aisle behind racks.
 7. Clearly marked striping or signage identifying “Golf Cart and Motorized Cart Parking Only”
 8. May be arranged perpendicular, angled, or parallel to travel lanes as approved by the City Engineer.
 9. Location: Near primary building entrances. City Engineer may consider alternatives to parking area designations.

C. Golf carts and motorized carts parking spaces may count toward required off-street parking at a ratio.

Golf Carts and Motorized Carts Ratio: Auto motorized vehicle parking spaces may be reduced when additional golf cart and motorized cart parking spaces are provided, at a ratio of five (5) golf cart or motorized cart spaces for every required five (5) standard vehicle parking spaces, with the provisions set forth within Section 909.3. No more than fifteen percent (15%) of the required minimum automobile parking spaces may be substituted with Golf Cart and Motorized Cart parking spaces.

(909.9) Alternative Transportation Vehicle: Designated Bicycle Parking Areas.

A. During the Concept Plan Approval process, the city may establish designated bicycle parking areas in commercial, civic, and mixed-use districts.

B. Design standards for designated bicycle parking spaces:

1. Bicycle racks shall:

- a. Allow locking of the bicycle frame and at least one wheel;
- b. Support bicycles in an upright position;
- c. Be permanently anchored to the ground or building;
- d. Not damage bicycle frames.

2. Each bicycle parking space shall provide:

- a. Minimum width: 2 feet
- b. Minimum length: 6 feet
- c. Minimum vertical clearance: 8 feet
- d. A minimum 5-foot access aisle behind racks

3. Short-term bicycle parking shall:

- a. Shall be designated with installed bike racks
- b. Be located within 100 feet of a primary entrance;
- c. Be visible from public right-of-way or building entrance;
- d. Not obstruct pedestrian pathways, ADA routes, or fire access.

4. Long-term bicycle parking shall:

- a. Be located in secure, covered, or monitored areas with bike racks;
- b. Be accessible to residents or employees;
- c. Be inverted "U" racks, post-and-ring racks, and similar designs approved by the Planning & Development Department.

5. Prohibited rack types include:

- a. Wheel-bender racks
- b. Designs that only secure a wheel without supporting the frame

6. Development Ratio:

- a. Commercial & Mixed-Use Developments
 - i. Minimum of two (2) bicycle parking spaces per building.
 - ii. One (1) additional bicycle space per 10,000 square feet of gross floor area.
- b. Multi-Family Residential
 - i. One (1) bicycle space per 20 dwelling units.
 - ii. At least 50% shall be long-term covered or secured parking.
- c. Civic / Institutional Uses
 - i. One (1) bicycle space per 20 vehicle parking spaces provided.
 - ii. Minimum of four (4) spaces.

(Ord. No. 862, 12-1-2005)

Editor's note(s)—Ord. No. 862, adopted December 1, 2005, changed the title of § 909 from "Off-street automobile parking" to "Off-street automobile parking requirements."

Cross reference(s)—Traffic, ch. 78.

CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY

As Proposed by Kenneth Hamner

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.

DIVISION 6. NATIVE PLANT STANDARDS AND INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL

Sec. 1134. Purpose.

The purpose of this Division is to promote ecological balance, water conservation, and long-term fiscal responsibility by requiring the use of native plants in regulated commercial, office, industrial, and institutional developments; prohibiting the planting of invasive species; and aligning planting standards with the City's existing tree, buffer, stormwater, and erosion control requirements.

Sec. 1135. Applicability.

(a) This Division applies to all development and redevelopment projects that are required to submit a landscape plan for City review, including:

1. Commercial, office, industrial, and institutional developments;
2. Parking lot landscapes and required tree islands associated with the above;
3. Buffer yards required by zoning ordinance for the following districts: GC, GI, LI, OI, LUC, and any other district where a landscape plan is required as a condition of development approval; and
4. Subdivision entrances and buffers where a landscape plan is required as a condition of rezoning approval.

(b) This Division does not apply to:

1. Individual residential yards;
2. Golf course playing surfaces (non-playing landscaped areas of golf courses must comply);
3. City-owned or City-operated properties, facilities, parks, roadways, or stormwater infrastructure. *(Note: The City's compliance with its own native plant goals shall be addressed through separate administrative policy.)*

(c) Applicability is determined at the time of landscape plan submission. Existing landscapes not undergoing redevelopment are not retroactively subject to this Division.

Sec. 1136. Native Plant Standards.

(a) Native Plant Percentage Requirement.

For all regulated development and redevelopment subject to Sec. 1135(a), at least **60 percent** of the total plants shown on the approved landscape plan shall be native species, as defined in Sec. 1102 and referenced against the City's Approved Native Plant List established under Sec. 1137.

The 60 percent requirement applies to the submitted landscape plan as a whole. It is not calculated against minimum required quantities, caliber-inch thresholds, or coverage minimums separately. It is simply 60 percent of all plants on the plan as submitted.

(b) Invasive Species Prohibition.

No species listed in Sec. 1138 (Prohibited Invasive Species) or identified by the Georgia Exotic Pest Plant Council (GEPPC) Category 1 list may be planted on any regulated site, regardless of the percentage calculation above.

(c) Flexibility and Substitution Provisions.

1. **Native species unavailability.** If a required native species is unavailable, the applicant may request substitution with written documentation from at least two regional nursery suppliers confirming unavailability. Substitutions must be functionally equivalent in canopy size, ecological role, and site tolerance, and must be selected from non-invasive species.
2. **Temporary placeholders.** Temporary non-invasive placeholder plants may be approved for newly seeded or establishment-phase areas, provided that replacement with approved native species occurs no later than the next full planting season.
3. **Stormwater and erosion control exemption.** Where plants, trees, or grasses are specifically required by the *Georgia Stormwater Management Manual* (the Blue Book) or the *Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission Manual of Best Management Practices for Erosion and Sedimentation Control* (the Green Book), such plantings are exempt from the 60 percent native plant calculation under Sec. 1136(a). Those manuals

take precedence over this Division in all areas of conflict related to stormwater management and erosion control.

Sec. 1137. Approved Native Plant List.

(a) The City shall maintain an Approved Native Plant List, organized by plant type, canopy size, site conditions, and permitted use context. The list shall be updated periodically as new regional data becomes available and shall be made available to staff, developers, landscape architects, and the public.

(b) Until a City-specific Approved Native Plant List is formally adopted and published, staff shall reference the **Georgia Native Plant Society's recommended species list for the Piedmont region** as the interim standard for determining native plant eligibility under this Division.

(c) The Approved Native Plant List shall not include any species listed in Sec. 1138 of this Division or in GEPPC Category 1 or Category 2.

Sec. 1138. Prohibited Invasive Species.

The following species shall not be planted on any site within the City of Peachtree City subject to this Division. Where any of the following species are discovered on a regulated site during development or redevelopment, they shall be removed and replaced with species from the Approved Native Plant List.

Trees

- Bradford / Callery pear (*Pyrus calleryana*)
- Sawtooth oak (*Quercus acutissima*)
- Tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*)
- Mimosa / Silk tree (*Albizia julibrissin*)
- Princess tree / Empress 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*)
- Bamboo — all running and clumping varieties, including but not limited to: *Bambusoideae* (subfamily), *Bambusa vulgaris*, and all species within *Phyllostachys*, *Pleioblastus*, and *Pseudosasa* genera

Aquatic and Riparian Invasives

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

Other Invasive Vines

- Chinese wisteria (*Wisteria sinensis*)
- Japanese wisteria (*Wisteria floribunda*)

Sec. 1139. Alignment with Other Ordinances.

This Division shall be read in harmony with the following provisions of the Land Development Ordinance and applicable external standards:

(a) Sec. 1101 — Ecological Balance and Drought-Tolerant Plantings. Compliance with the native plant standards of this Division shall constitute compliance with the drought-tolerant and ecological planting objectives of Sec. 1101 where they overlap.

(b) Zoning District Buffer Requirements (Sec. 1006–1007; GC, GI, LI, OI, LUC). All required buffer plantings on regulated sites shall comply with the 60 percent native requirement of Sec. 1136(a). Nothing in this Division supersedes minimum buffer species or quantity requirements established by zoning ordinance; native species equivalents shall be used where available.

(c) Floodplain and Streambank Protection. All plantings in regulated riparian zones, floodplain buffers, and stream setbacks shall be 100 percent native species, selected from riparian-tolerant species appropriate to site hydrology. This standard supersedes the 60 percent requirement for those specific areas.

(d) Stormwater and Erosion Control Manuals. As set forth in Sec. 1136(c)(3), plants required by the Blue Book or the Green Book are exempt from the native percentage calculation and those manuals take precedence in all matters related to stormwater management and erosion control.

(e) Tree Protection Standards (Sec. 1101 et seq.). Preserved native trees on a regulated site count toward both canopy requirements and the native plant percentage. Replacement trees required under tree removal permits must be selected from the Approved Native Plant List to the extent available.

(f) Irrigation Standards. Permanent irrigation systems are not required in predominantly native landscapes. Temporary irrigation is permitted during the plant establishment period, not to exceed two full growing seasons.

(g) Conflicts. Where a conflict exists between this Division and any other section of Article XI or any other provision of the Land Development Ordinance, the more specific provision shall control. Any unresolved conflict shall be referred to the City Attorney for interpretation. Nothing in this Division shall be construed to conflict with mandatory requirements of federal or state environmental law.

Sec. 1140. Enforcement.

(a) Violations of this Division shall be enforced consistent with the enforcement provisions of Article XI of the Land Development Ordinance.

(b) Compliance with the native plant percentage shall be verified by City staff at the time of landscape plan review and, where applicable, at the time of final landscape inspection.

(c) Where prohibited invasive species listed in Sec. 1138 are discovered on a regulated site during development or redevelopment, the City may require removal and replacement with approved native species as a condition of certificate of occupancy or final approval.

(d) The City's senior planner or designated landscape reviewer shall conduct landscape inspections to verify compliance. Where botanical identification questions arise beyond staff expertise, the City Arborist shall serve as the final authority on species classification for enforcement purposes.

DOWNSTREAM ORDINANCE IMPACTS

Here is every other section of the Land Development Ordinance that will need attention as a result of this ordinance passing.

1. Sec. 1122 — Recommended Plant List for Public Property Trees

Impact: Advisory — no action required before adoption. Because Sec. 1135(b) exempts city-owned property from this Division, the invasive species ban in Sec. 1138 does not legally apply to city plantings. No enforceable contradiction exists. The city should nonetheless consider auditing and updating the Sec. 1122 species list at a future date for internal consistency and to model the ecological standards this ordinance promotes for private development.

2. Sec. 1102 — Definitions

Impact: Requires addition. As noted above, definitions for "Native Plant" and "Invasive Plant" do not currently exist in Sec. 1102. Both must be added prior to adoption. Without them, the ordinance references undefined terms and is vulnerable to interpretive challenge at enforcement.

3. Sec. 1135 Cross-Reference — Subdivision Landscape Plan Requirement

Impact: May require clarification in existing code. The current code does not require landscape plan review for subdivision common areas as a general matter — only as a condition of rezoning for entrances and buffers. This ordinance has been drafted to reflect that reality. However, if existing language elsewhere in Article XI implies broader landscape plan applicability for subdivisions, that language should be reviewed and tightened to avoid confusion about when this Division applies.

4. Zoning Ordinance Buffer Sections (Sec. 1006–1007)

Impact: No revision required, but cross-reference recommended. These sections govern buffer yard requirements for GC, GI, LI, and other districts. This ordinance layers native plant requirements on top of existing buffer plant type and quantity requirements. No conflict exists as written, but adding a cross-reference note in Sec. 1006–1007 pointing to Division 6 would help applicants and staff connect the requirements without having to search across the code.

5. Stormwater Manual References (Blue Book / Green Book)

Impact: No revision to the LDO required, but staff process note recommended. The exemption for Blue Book and Green Book required plants is handled within this ordinance at Sec. 1136(c)(3) and Sec. 1139(d). No change to those manuals or to any LDO section governing stormwater is needed. However, a staff process note or checklist item should be added to landscape plan review reminding reviewers to flag stormwater-required plantings before calculating the 60 percent native compliance rate.

6. Sec. 1101 — Ecological Balance and Drought-Tolerant Plantings

Impact: No revision required. Sec. 1139(a) of this ordinance explicitly states that compliance with Division 6 constitutes compliance with Sec. 1101 where they overlap. No change to Sec. 1101 is needed, but staff should be aware of this equivalency for plan review purposes.

7. Tree Removal Permit and Replacement Requirements

Impact: Administrative update recommended. Wherever tree removal permits require replacement tree planting, staff should apply the Approved Native Plant List as the default species reference. This does not require a code amendment but should be incorporated into the replacement tree review checklist. If the City wishes to make native replacement trees a hard requirement rather than a staff practice, a formal amendment to the tree removal permit language would be needed — that is a policy decision for the commission.

8. New Single-Family Lot Two-Tree Requirement

Impact: Policy decision deferred — no change in this ordinance. The commission discussed but explicitly tabled whether the two 2-inch caliper trees required on new single-family lots must be native species. This ordinance does not address that requirement. If the commission wishes to revisit it in a future cycle, it would require an amendment to the applicable residential section — it should not be folded into this ordinance given the consensus to keep this Division limited to commercial, office, industrial, and institutional development.

9. City-Owned Property Compliance

Impact: Separate administrative policy recommended, not a code change. The existing ordinance exempting the city from its own code requirements means this Division cannot legally mandate native planting standards on city-owned parks, roadways, or stormwater facilities. The commission's intent — that city projects model best-in-class native planting — should be pursued through a separate City Council resolution or administrative policy directive rather than through this ordinance. That keeps the ordinance clean and legally defensible while still allowing the city to hold itself to a high standard voluntarily.

Sec. 1102 — Definitions (Additions Required)

Drafting Note: The following definitions must be added to Sec. 1102 of Article XI alongside the existing definitions. They are presented here for insertion rather than as standalone language.

Invasive Plant. A non-native plant species whose introduction into the regional landscape causes, or is likely to cause, economic harm, environmental harm, or harm to human health. For purposes of this Division, invasive plants include all species listed in Sec. 1138 and all species identified by the Georgia Exotic Pest Plant Council (GEPPC) in Category 1 or Category 2.

Native Plant. A plant species that occurs naturally in the Piedmont region of Georgia, having evolved in local ecological and climatic conditions without human introduction. Native status shall be determined by reference to the City's Approved Native Plant List (Sec. 1137) or, until such list is adopted, by reference to the Georgia Native Plant Society's Piedmont region species list.