

**Perry Planning Commission  
Minutes - April 25, 2016**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Poole called the meeting to order at 6:06pm

**ROLL:** Chairman Poole; Commissioners Beeland, Clarington, Jefferson, Mehserle, Williams, and Yasin were present.

**STAFF:** Lee Gilmour – City Manager, Robert Smith – Economic Development Director, Daniel Bass – Building Inspector, and Christine Sewell – Recording Clerk.

**GUESTS:** Mr. Dean Frith, Mrs. Mary Hart, Mr. Vernon Parker, and Mr. Edward Wrobel.

**INVOCATION:** was given by Commissioner Clarington

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM April 11, 2016 MEETING :** Commissioner Jefferson motioned to approve the minutes as submitted; Commissioner Mehserle seconded; all in favor and was unanimously approved.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Campaign Notice, per O.C.G.A. 36-67A-3; Chairman Poole referred to the notice and to please turn cell phones off.

**NEW BUSINESS**

1). Sutton Place Subdivision – Conservation Use Amendment

Staff advised and as per information provided request was to modify the density of the lots. The proposal before the board was to add a depth of 20 feet to each platted lot on Sutton Drive. This would involve 23 lots and a total of 27,600 square feet of conservation space; this would allow lots 23-34 and 61-71 to be increased in size to 7200 square feet instead of their current size of 6000 square feet. If the request is approved the density per acre for the subdivision will continue to be 2.55 dwellings per acre and the conservation space become 49.366%; it was noted the original approval was for a 2.9% density and 50% conservation space.

Mr. Dean Frith addressed the board and advised he was making the request to provide a more marketable product for home buyers and revitalize the dormant subdivision. The homes provided are 1578 to 1609 square feet with a fenced in yard. It was noted 20feet on the backyard was the end request and the lots would be 60 x 20. Mr. Dan Bass advised the board the request would only effect 2/3 of an acre overall.

Commissioner Yasin motioned to allow the requested density per acre as submitted; Commissioner Clarington seconded; all in favor and was unanimously approved.

**OLD BUSINESS**

1). #V-16-03 1001 North Davis Drive

Chairman Poole called for a motion to remove the item from the table for discussion. Commissioner Beeland motioned to remove the case from the table for discussion; Commissioner Mehserle seconded; all in favor and was unanimously approved.

Chairman Poole opened the public hearing and called for anyone in favor of the request; there being none

Chairman Poole called for anyone opposed. Mr. Parker and Mr. Wrobel both residents in the area were opposed due to the location and traffic congestion already in the area. There being no further comments the public hearing was closed at 6:26pm.

Chairman Poole referred to the memo received from Administration outlining additional research provided which referenced the 1967 Council decision to allow the sign currently in place, the notation and regulations that the parcel is in an overlay zone – Neighborhood Commercial which allows for either a pole or monument sign and if any other type was requested a variance would then be necessary.

Commissioner Mehserle motioned to deny the request as submitted as the applicant was offered the opportunity in good faith to provide an alternative design for the area; Commissioner Jefferson seconded; all in favor and was unanimously approved.

**PUBLIC HEARING** (Planning Commission Decision)

**INFORMATIONAL HEARING** (Planning Commission recommendations to City Council)

**OTHER MATTERS**

1). Update on City Strategic Plan and Capital Improvement Projects – City Manager

Mr. Smith provided the updated copy of the City Strategic Plan and noted the plan is the guiding factor for the City over the next ten years and action items have been updated to reflect progress.

Mr. Gilmour provided and reviewed a monthly report the board would now be receiving on City Capital Improvement projects.

2). Review definition in current Sign Ordinance

Mr. Gilmour advised there was no clear definition in the sign ordinance regarding illumination. Mr. Gilmour noted illumination refers to a sign that has some type of lighting on it and/or illuminated on the inside or digital. An example from a recent variance was provided. Some general questions and discussion arose with the concurrence of the board that illumination on or for signs does not include reader messages on the sign's surface, but does include any graphics, displays, eye catcher's etc. as well as signs back/overhead/side/ground lighting.

3). Perry Brand – Mr. Smith provided an update on the City's new brand.

**ADJOURN:** there being no further business to come before the board the meeting was adjourned at 7:26pm.