

MINUTES
PERRY PLANNING COMMISSION
Monday, January 26, 2009

1. **Call to Order:** Chairman Martin Beeland called the meeting to order at 6:00pm

2. **Roll:** All Planning Commissioners were present

Staff Present: Mike Beecham, Director of Community Development and Christine Gauthier, Secretary

Press: Ms. Krystal Piner, Houston Home Journal

Guests/Speakers: Ms. Lillie Battle, Georgia Power
Mr. Penrose Wolf
Mr. Jeff Gattis, The Broadway Group

3. **Invocation** was given by Commissioner Jefferson

4. **Election of new officers:**

Chairman Beeland requested a motion for election of officers for 2009; Commissioner Hubbard made a motion to nominate Chairman Beeland as Chairman; Commissioner Cosey seconded; all in favor and was unanimously approved.

Commissioner Clarrington then made a motion to nominate as Vice Chair Commissioner Cosey; Commissioner Jefferson seconded; all in favor and was unanimously approved.

5. **Consideration of the Minutes for January 12, 2009:** Chairman Beeland recommended the minutes be approved as submitted. Commissioner Cosey motioned to approve the minutes as submitted; Commissioner Jefferson seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

6. **The Campaign Notice, per O.C.G.A. 36-67A-3,** please turn cell phones off: Chairman Beeland referred to the notice posted on the door of the City Council Chambers.

7. **Informational Hearing**

1) Review of Amendment to the PLDO: Section 147.9 – Maintenance of Completed Work – Amendment Application - # A-09-002.

Mr. Beecham opened the discussion advising that per the last meeting some clarifications had been made regarding the language; documentation had been provided noting changes, which were underlined. In reviewing the amendment, specifically paragraph 147.9.1, previous questions had arisen requiring the developer to provide a letter of credit to the city until 60% of the lots in the subdivision obtained a certificate of occupancy.

Paragraph 147.9.2 of the proposed amendment was also of concern with the thought that if there was a delay in the project, it could potentially be a number of years before a subdivision is completed and during this time heavy construction traffic use on existing streets.

Chairman Beeland requested a grammatical error be corrected in the last sentence and should read as follows, **“The extended letter of credit shall be submitted with the next phase plans and shall remain in effect until such time as 60% of the new subdivision lots are issued certificates of occupancy”**.

Discussion then ensued among the Commission regarding issuance of a bond in lieu of a letter of credit. Mr. Beecham advised City Council had previously discussed this and preferred the letter of credit.

Further discussions continued, with concerns raised by Commissioner Barker that no one would like to see a subdivision sitting unlivable for any extended period of time.

Commissioner Clarington inquired on what the average time was for completion of a subdivision and Mr. Beecham stated when the economy was good, it was 1 1/2 years to 2 years and that has since changed with the current state of the economy; it also was discussed that at this time there may not be a lot of requests for this.

Commissioner Barker then asked Mr. Beecham his opinion whether a period of time should be the guideline in lieu of a monetary one. Commissioner Mehserle then advised of the differences between the maintenance agreement and the letter of credit, which allows the city to go against and Mr. Beecham advised that it can be recommended for the letter of credit to state a period of time.

After conclusion of discussion, Mr. Beecham requested of the board their direction on how to proceed; Commissioner Hubbard requested that City Council revisit the maintenance bond issue in lieu of the letter of credit; Commissioner Barker concurred and felt that asking 60% was out of the scope of normal business practice and Commissioner Mehserle felt that having a bonding company was best as they are there to ensure the work is completed and assumes maintenance bond is the same.

Chairman Beeland then opened the floor for comment and Mr. Penrose Wolf then addressed the board and advised that he had attended the city council meeting when the issue of bonds was discussed and it was his interpretation that the letter of credit was the most cost effective.

In final conclusion it was directed that Mr. Beecham provide additional information for the February 09th meeting on bonds.

8. **New Business:**

- 1) Review of architectural standards – Dollar General located at the SE corner of Highway 127 and Chevron Drive.

Mr. Beecham read the letter as submitted to the Planning Commission on January 15, 2009 outlining compliance of the city’s architectural standards for the proposed Dollar General as noted above. Mr. Jeff Gattis with The Broadway Group is the developer/contractor of the project and provided a

photograph to the Commission on the proposed project. Which consists of the face being block and painted “Sandstone” and the side and rear of the building metal with the same painted color. The lights on the exterior are to be “bullhorn” type mounted to the front. The parking lot side will have a (5) feet wall height with one light on the back and other side.

Chairman Beeland inquired if brick could be used in lieu of steel and have it done on the entire facade. Commissioner Barker advised Mr. Gattis that he was disappointed that a “cookie cutter” plan had been submitted and the city’s requirements were not at all met and asked that the plans be re-submitted. Mr. Beecham advised that he would forward to Mr. Gattis the city’s architectural standards and the plans could be resubmitted for the February 09th meeting. Commissioner Mehserle inquired if it’s Dollar General’s practice to go along with the community’s plans and Mr. Gattis advised it was, but the decision was with the developer as Dollar General was the tenant and the building is leased to them and requires their approval. The general consensus of the board was that if Dollar General were to vacate the building, it should be marketable for another tenant.

In conclusion it was agreed, that Mr. Beecham will not submit plans that do not meet the city’s architectural standards for the Commission’s review, unless the applicant wants to appeal Mr. Beecham’s decision.

2) **Final plat approval – James M. Pensyl Subdivision– off Frank Satterfield Road – James M. Pensyl, owner**

Mr. Beecham advised that the plat provided for review consisted of three existing lots with town homes and the applicant was requesting development of Lots 4, 5, 6, and 7, also to have town homes. New development meets the city’s requirements and no new streets were to be added. It was noted on the plat that lot 1 and 1A are on the same lot and the same for 3 and 3A, but the Tax Assessors office notes this in their records with a line and it is recommended this be amended to reflect one lot for each; Commissioner Mehserle then made a motion to approve the plat with the amendment; Commissioner Barker seconded; all in favor and was unanimously approved.

9. **Old Business**

1) Review of mowing in new subdivisions

The Planning Commission was again requested to revisit the issue and provide City Council with a formal motion on the matter. Consideration was given to require only those vacant lots abutting an occupied lot to be regularly mowed, which would include the continued mowing of the four (4) feet strip and around fire hydrants. Upon further discussion, this idea and requiring the full right-of-way be mowed in lieu of just the four (4) feet was considered.

A motion was then put forth by Commissioner Cosey to recommend enforcement on all lots, including new subdivisions meet the current mowing requirements; Commissioner Hubbard seconded; all in favor and was unanimously approved.

10. **Adjournment:** There being no further business Chairman Beeland adjourned the meeting at 7:13pm.