



**Planning Commission
May 24, 2007**

Meeting Minutes

Board Members Present	Roger Rupnow (Chair), Bob Wiley (Vice Chair), Susan D. Maizar, Lee Duncan, David Rubenstein, and Donald Boyken
Board Members Absent Excused	Wayne Thatcher
Staff Present	Nancy Leathers, Vann McNeil, Cesar Geraldo, Michael Zehner, Patrice Ruffin, Mark Moore and Bridgette Gray

CALL to Order	Roger Rupnow called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.
----------------------	---

I.	PREVIOUS ACTION REPORT
	ACTION: Bob Wiley moved to approve the Action Report from the April 19, 2007 meeting. Lee Duncan seconded. The April 19, 2007 Action Report was APPROVED. (6-0, Rupnow, Wiley, Boyken, Duncan, Maziar and Rubenstein for)
II.	PREVIOUS MINUTES
	ACTION: Lee Duncan moved to approve the February 15, 2007 Meeting Minutes with clarification. David Rubenstein seconded. The February 15, 2007 Meeting Minutes were APPROVED as amended. (6-0, Rupnow, Wiley, Boyken, Duncan, Maziar and Rubenstein for) David Rubenstein motioned to approve the April 19, 2007 Meeting Minutes as amended. Lee Duncan seconded. The April 19, 2007 Meeting Minutes were APPROVED as amended. (6-0, Rupnow, Wiley, Boyken, Duncan, Maziar and Rubenstein for)
III.	REZONING NEW CASES
A.	RZ07-010/CV07-010 5270 Greenland Road <i>Applicant(s): Southern Gentry Development, LLC</i> <i>Representative(s): Robert Donner</i> SUMMARY/STAFF PRESENTATION: Michael Zehner/The applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property from Cup conditional to CUP to allow for the development of 31 single family residential lots and a 10,500 square foot church. The applicant is also requesting two concurrent variances as follows: 1) Relief from the required 20 foot landscape strip around the proposed detention facilities. 2) To allow the proposed detention facilities to encroach into the required 25 foot impervious surface setback and the 50 foot undisturbed natural stream buffer. Staff would like to note that High Point Civic Association and the Applicant are in the process of working on a private agreement on the application and they have stipulated some conditions. Staff is still reviewing the conditions and a portion of those are agreeable to staff and will be incorporated into the staff report going forward to the Mayor and City Council. Applicant Presentation: Woody Galloway and Robert Donner (Invitation for public comment in support of and in opposition to the petition) • Support for the Petition: Alan Powell, 5645 Locton Drive, in support of the petition. Kathy Wright, 260 Beachland Drive, in support of the petition. Bernard S. Pollock, 505 Enclave Circle, in support of the petition

Janet Wells, 302 Beachland Drive, in support of the petition.
Tom Wells, 302 Beachland Drive, in support of the petition.

• **Against the Petition:**

Patty Berkowitz, 800 Crest Valley Drive, against the petition.

(Close of public hearing. Planning Commission questions and discussion)

ACTION: Bob Wiley moved to recommend denial of the application. Susan D. Maizar seconded. (3-3, Rupnow, Wiley and Maziar for; Boyken, Duncan, and Rubenstein against). Mr. Rupnow, Mr. Wiley and Ms. Maziar found that the proposed rectory/chapel was not a true place of worship and the proposed use was not permitted under the CUP zoning classification. These members also found that a precedent may be set should the use be permitted.

2nd Vote: Lee Duncan moved to recommend approval. David Rubenstein seconded. Recommendation for approval subject to staff conditions and the private agreement with surrounding neighbors spread on the minutes (3-3, Boyken, Duncan, and Rubenstein for; Rupnow, Wiley and Maziar against).

3rd Vote: Bob Wiley moved to defer. Lee Duncan seconded. The application was DEFERRED until the June 21, 2007 hearing (4-2, rupnow, Wiley, Duncan and Rubenstein for; Boyken and Maziar against).

Condition(s):

The Commission would like to see a finalized copy of the private agreement with the surrounding neighbors.

B. RZ07-011/CV07-012

347 Carpenter Drive

Applicant(s): Second Church of Christ Scientist

Representative(s): Nathan Hendricks, III

SUMMARY/STAFF PRESENTATION: Michael Zehner/To rezone the subject property from C-1 conditional to C-1 to allow for a church in the existing 3,242 square foot building with three concurrent variances as follows:

To change the required twenty-five foot buffer and ten foot improvement setback along the south property line adjacent to residentially zoned property to a ten foot landscape strip.

To change the required fifty foot buffer and the ten foot improvement setback along the west property line adjacent to residentially zoned property to a ten foot landscape strip.

To delete the Sandy Springs Overlay District streetscape requirements along all property frontages.

The application was heard at the April 10, 2007 Design Review Board meeting and the Board recommended approval of the application with the concurrent variances especially noting the removal of the Sandy Springs streetscape along the sidewalk.

Applicant Presentation: Nathan Hendricks, III, Attorney

(Invitation for public comment in support of and in opposition to the petition)

• **Support for the Petition:**

Jules Leni, 130 Woodland Road, in support of the petition

• **Against the Petition:**

None

(Close of public hearing. Planning Commission questions and discussion)

ACTION: Donald Boyken moved to approve. Lee Duncan seconded. The motion was APPROVED (6-0 Rupnow, Wiley, Boyken, Duncan, Maziar, and Rubenstein for). The Board recommended approval subject to the staff conditions.

Condition(s): Approval of concurrent variance #1 (buffer).

To the owner's agreement to restrict the use of the subject property as follows:

Commercial and associated accessory uses in the existing structure at a density of 7,418.76 square feet per acre or 3,242 square feet, whichever is less. The following uses permitted under the C-1 (Commercial District) zoning

classification are prohibited: Amusements, Indoor; Apartments, Above or Behind Commercial and Office uses in the Same Building; Automotive Parking Lots; Automotive Specialty Shops; Catering, Carry-out and Delivery; Clinics; Convalescent Center/Nursing/Hospice; Day Care Facilities; Delicatessens; Financial Establishments; Garage, Automobile Repair except painting, body repair and overhaul of major components; Group Residences; Gymnasiums; Hotels; Health Club/Spa; Laundromats; Landscaping Business, Garden Center ; Millinery or Similar Trade whenever products are sold retail, exclusively on the site where produced; Motels; Parking Garages\Decks; Parking Lots; Personal Care Homes; Plant Nurseries; Printing Shops, Convenience; Repair Shops not involving any manufacturing on the site; Research Laboratories; Restaurants; Retail Stores or Shops; School of Business, Dance, Music or similar schools; Service Stations except that repair and service offerings shall not include painting, body repair nor overhaul of major components, and no portion of the site shall be used for the display of cars for sale; Stadiums; Theaters; Recycling Centers, Collecting.

Variance #2 (buffer).

To the owner's agreement to abide by the following:

To the site plan received by the Department of Community Development dated March 27, 2007. Said site plan is conceptual only and must meet or exceed the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and these conditions prior to the approval of a Land Disturbance Permit. Unless otherwise noted herein, compliance with all conditions shall be in place prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

The approval excludes variance #3 (streetscape).

IV. ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

A.

A Resolution to authorize the transmittal of the Comprehensive Plan Draft Community Agenda to the Atlanta Regional Commission and Georgia Department of Community Affairs to Meet State Planning Requirements 110-12-01 for the purpose of obtaining Qualified Local Government status for the City of Sandy Springs.

(Invitation for public comment in support of and in opposition of the petition)

MINUTES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MEETING ON MAY 24, 2007 (VERBATIM)

The recorder did not capture the beginning of the meeting. It starts as follows:

Mr. Boyken: I would like to ask Ms. Mills and Mr. Mayson just to comment on based on the conversation we had a few minutes back about limiting construction new roads or widening roads, what are your feelings about the creation of this grid in the city center? Are you not in support of that, really both of you I am courageous.....

Mr. Mayson: I am hearing from the transportation committee standpoint a grid is absolutely essential.

Mr. Boyken: So then the discussion of, we started talking about the bridges over Chattahoochee and basically if you built it all you are going to do even in increased capacity beyond what you have, I see a little bit of a conflict, help me understand that.

Mr. Mayson: It is interesting last summer I took my daughter to see Pompeii grid system. The idea is that if one route is blocked you have local people that know how to get around and can avoid. I don't know where you live but the first rule of driving in Sandy Springs is to avoid Roswell Road at all costs. In order to that you have got to have a working grid.

Mr. Boyken: Why would that not apply to multiple options on crossing the Chattahoochee River?

Mr. Mayson: That is not an internal traffic solution that is original traffic solution.

Mr. Delong: We have studied that and the reason for not doing it across the Chattahoochee River is there are established neighborhoods on either side of the river. If you wanted to that you would take Johnson's Ferry and you would make it twelve lanes. So if you were looking for a place to get across that is where you put it at Johnson's Ferry or Roswell Road goes up into Roswell. Anywhere intermediate has been studied to death and you have established neighborhoods on either side. On either side once you get there where do you go? That is why we wanted it taken out because it is mute point. In terms of the city center you are talking about transportation within a circulation within a closely bounded area versus I guess when you say regional you are talking about going from one part of town to the next.

Ms. Mills: No bringing outside residents not from Sandy Springs into the city, street traffic. We don't need street traffic we are trying to improve the situation for the residents and the business people in the city.

Mr. Delong: When we looked at making a case for that the whole point of a having a bridge crossing would be to get people to 400 or from 400.

Mr. Duncan: What percentage of the people who live in Sandy Springs, work in Sandy Springs?

Mr. Rupnow: Nobody knows.

Mr. Duncan: Would that not be a germane element of this discussion? Creating live work....

Ms. Leathers: We haven't held a public hearing yet and it is running late and it would be helpful to do the public hearing and get all the comments at one time.

Mr. Duncan: Before we get into the public hearing I really would like to ask Ms. Mills one quick question. On pages 37 through 39 you have recommended final actions in here with 30 different sites. What level of involvement did the actual property owners that live in these sites have in this process and how involved were they in discussions, how were they solicited to be advised of these recommendation or was it representatives to a committee that was actually working on this?

Ms. Mills: I can tell you that with today's e-mail believe me it is better than the Tom-Tom and everybody in every neighborhood who had access to any kind of public information whether it be by e-mail or whether it be by newspaper was apprised of these meetings. I don't know whether there were other public notices placed but I know for instance when I was involved with all of these decisions, I made sure that had people come to those meetings. We didn't always get those people to the meetings. As a matter of fact, sometimes hardly anybody came to those meetings and sometimes many people came to the meetings and we were here until midnight perhaps.

Mr. Duncan: Trust me I would not have done your job and you couldn't have got me in that room and you have got my deepest sympathy, respect and admiration. But I do know that is something that we anticipate discussing and I wanted to know what the advertising process was, how the people were notified, were there actually posting in mailboxes or was it an e-mail system that went out and the process system was?

Ms. Leathers: I think probably the staff needs to respond to that because we had the responsibility for advertising. There were sixteen public meetings. Everything was on the website including all of the meetings, all of the minutes from the meetings, every map that was discussed. We had an opportunity at the beginning and ending of each advisory committee meeting for the public to speak and make comments and to raise issues. Whether they contacted us and wanted to talk about something they know that was their venue for doing it. I believe that we have probably exhausted the areas that people were interested in talking about and the things that are on this list are things that people raised in meetings. Most of them were not things that were raised just by the committee but they actually came up in public discussion and the committee then addressed. I think that it was a good deal of commenting. We certainly had a lot of people.....

Mr. Duncan: With all do respect, if we were looking at this as a zoning action that would not suffice what you did. We would have had to mail out notifications to the adjacent property owners and the impacted property.

Ms. Leathers: No all properties in Sandy Springs were available to be discussed in these meetings and we did not send notices to 87,500 people I can assure you of that.

Mr. Duncan: But we did not send notices to the people who live in these particular nodes.

Ms. Leathers: Most of them were addressed because folks from those areas actually came in and addressed the committee and asked that committee to look at changes to the plan. The committee was a conduit and that was the purpose that the Mayor and the Council set up the advisory committee which is to service the conduit back to there areas and they took that seriously. They went and talked to people during and between meetings. We encouraged people to come and they had to comment and so I would guess that every one of these had people from that area come in and actually discuss those.

Mr. Duncan: I would normally agree with you however about four or five months ago we had an incident on Robert's Road that absolutely flew in our face.

Ms. Leathers: I agree that the folks were definitely involved in this process at almost every meeting.

Mr. Duncan: That is just an example of a community that got left out.

Ms. Mills: I disagree I am sorry.

Mr. Duncan: No I mean left out, not during this process but during a previous process.

Mr. Rupnow: With that we will close the presentation and we will open the public hearing. Now we have, Ms. Gray, those people who turned in cards, I assume you have ranked them in some order or fashion and we will let her call names and you can come forward and give your name and address and we will set the clock and you will have two

minutes to present your case.

Ms. Gray: Forgive me if I pronounce this wrong, Mr. Rob Meinzen.

Mr. Meinzen: Good evening my name is Rob Meinzen I live at 4635 Mystic Drive. It is a single-family property that shares a rear boundary with the Versaille Apartments. I guess I should say that this is in respective change #39 in the plan there. The Versaille Apartments are on the back border of my property and the Citizen's Advisory Committee narrowly approved proposing change #39 to the interim land use plan. If this is adopted it would further increase a lot of residential density of that property and an additional 300% of the current Comprehensive Land Use Plan had allowed. My personal perspective I don't favor a four story building in my backyard even though I too would like to see that apartment complexes redeveloped I don't want to see that come at the expense of gridlock traffic on Roswell Road.

My biggest concern about all of this is if we approve this change I think that it is being done about the necessary homework being done on the impact and infrastructure that being Roswell Road. I also don't think that it is necessary to approve this change now in order to stimulate redevelopment. Any further redeveloper is going to come certainly with request for increases and density as part of there development plan and I think such decisions would be more appropriately made at that time rather than right now. For that reason I don't think change 39 should be included in the approved plan.

Mr. Weber: Good evening Mr. Chair of the Commission and Planning Commission. My name is Michael Weber I reside at 1403 Brighton Point that is the Elizabeth's Heights Condos. I am here representing the association under President authorized here to give my support. Before I get into that I would like to thank the CAC, the 28 member council commission. There is nothing stronger than a heart of volunteer. Whether everybody agrees or whether everybody agrees or doesn't you are always going to have that conflict.

For lack of a better comparison I will use a comment from Sy Simms, an educated consumer is best customer. I have been trying to educate myself on this whole process in the past few months. I am referring to supporting not only what you are about to vote on but in reference especially to revision #12. That is Roswell Road, Darylample, southwest corridor, the Big Lots, if you will be going from live work neighborhood to approved lived work community. After being educated about the advantages of that going to live work community we supported, we being the residents in my community, as well as, the surrounding neighborhoods. What is interesting the live work community doesn't really have according to planning and zoning a good example to look at within the city limits of Sandy Springs and I think we can pose this as an opportunity to make it a good example. You will be hearing from us again in the future about proposal on just what we can have from streetscapes to green space and the look of the community as a whole. Thank you very much.

Ms. Holcomb: My name is Marsha Holcomb and I am the President of the Cherokee Park Civic Association and I am here regarding the change to #39 that Mr. Meinzen has spoken about. We oppose the change of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan from live work neighborhood to live work community. Our concern is the fact at our neighborhood backs directly up to Roswell Road and that there would be possible four story buildings in our neighbor's backyard but also currently we get gridlock of traffic going into the city of Atlanta. The traffic overflows into our neighborhood onto Mystic Drive, Mystic Place and Kitty Hawk Drive. Carter Burgess, the City Traffic Consultant has said that the current level of service in this area is level C. If it stays at live work neighborhood it would go to EF which is considered a failure an unacceptable. So if it went to live work community I don't know what is worse than a failure. We would have terrible gridlock with cars coming through the area and completely back up. We don't think that this is right transition from an R1 R2 land use area to have a live work community. We think that we should give live work neighborhood a chance and nothing has been developed as live work neighborhood currently. We would like to see development in the area and we think that if were given a chance it would work better than the live work community.

Also, the neighborhoods north of us which would be Long Island Drive or Fountain Oaks Shopping Center were allowed to keep their live work neighborhood designation I think they were suppose to change to live work community and they were allowed to keep the live work neighborhood. We believe that would be the best use far as area also.

Mr. Wells: I live at 302 Beachland Drive, is there not an overhead projector? I came to all the meetings and listened to all the discussion and I think the best thing that happened is the restraint on keeping live work neighborhood the primary live work situation on Roswell Road. As the gentleman said a little earlier is the first thing that you do is avoid Roswell Road at all cost and that is not going to change. It can be widened so I believe that you don't build road blocks to the downtown Sandy Springs by over developing any of the access roads in particular Roswell Road so it is my feeling that from 285 to the city limits the highest density should be put in that corridor is live work neighborhood. This is the area in which I live which is between Glenridge and Mt. Perrin and that is to me is the most fragile piece of Roswell Road that there is right now. I know that people right now are going to do this that and the other but all of those are protected neighborhoods, (inaudible), Beachland, Green Hill, on the other side Marianna and the rest and I want to point out like on my street Beachland there are four left turn arrows. There is a left turn arrow in every direction. There is a yield sign. There is a yield sign on Roswell Road going on to Glenridge. Glenridge has a left turn arrow there is a left turn on Roswell Road going south. That is the biggest bottleneck we have got and would suggest to you to remain live work neighborhood is the proper designation for that area.

Mr. Duncan: Which number are discussing?

Mr. Wells: It applies to 39 that whole corridor.

Ms. Leathers: He is just discussing everything from 285 south to the city along Roswell Road.

Ms. Wright: My name is Kathy Wright I live at 260 Beachland Drive. I too am here tonight to oppose #39. In 1886 Henry Grady who was the editor of the Atlanta Constitution made a speech in New York to the New York City Society. An excerpt from that speech was we have raised a brave a beautiful city. He was talking about Atlanta, GA a 120 years after the civil war. That statement was a vision statement to me but it has lost its vision now. You can't drive down Peachtree and Piedmont Road like you could a few years ago and marvel at the beauty. Now you are seeing slabs of concrete everywhere. I think a lot of that had to do with greed not only on part of the developers but the land owners as well. Atlanta is no longer a brave and beautiful city. I think everybody in this room invites progress and quality development. But what we don't want is for developers to come in, throw up a bunch of concrete and walk out with the money. They don't live here, they don't work here and they don't care about the people who do.

Mary Galambos when she was first elected said that neighborhoods were sacred. Roswell Road was a different story. That kind of broke my heart because I live off of Roswell Road and along the Roswell Road corridor and that told me that we didn't matter and our lives were pretty expendable. Roswell Road should not be a target it should be the vocal point of Sandy Springs. It is not that hard to imagine and it is going to take a lot of hard work, a lot of time and responsible leadership. When we voted we voted for six people and entrusted them with our lives, our family and friends and our homes. They in turned appointed you. I am just asking you to look down deep in your heart and look at Roswell Road and think about we can do. My hope is that 120 years from now that we can say we did in fact raise a brave and beautiful city.

Ms. Wells: Hi I am Janet Wells and I live at 302 Beachland Drive. I am very happy to be here tonight again. I also want to thank the Advisory Board for all their hard work. We were at as many meetings as we could get to, as many meetings that we heard about. I want to tell what I am for and that is refreshing. I am for the designated #1 through 37 that it remain live work neighborhood. I am against #34. It encroaches on Glenridge Road; it looks like to me when I look at this map. First of all, you are putting deep purple that a lot of what I consider the developer could a couple of crayons and got excited. Right there if you could look at that at 285 but what does do is it really cuts over a neighborhood. I think Sherrill and Colton and it comes through to Glenridge which is already a bottleneck so I am definitely opposed to going that far with live work regional which is high rises and high density. Lastly, I also would like to say that I am against #39 again from Glenridge to Atlanta to the Sandy Springs border south I think should be named live work neighborhood and protect our neighborhoods.

Ms. Williams: Hi my name is Gaye Williams and I live at 305 Beachland Drive and I just want to say that I am basically for some positive changes in our area and I think that leaving us a fifty year old neighborhood with older homes surrounded by commercial properties and things that are going to be developed and be in our front yards and so on is probably not fair to leave us their and not give us the choice in this. We don't want to be stuck or I personally don't. Thank you.

Mr. Ballentine: I am Clarence Ballentine 5580 Genris Drive. I am a forty-three year old resident, this is south on Hammond Drive the west side Glenridge. I have a one acre property that is adjacent to Sutter's Point is one of the eight acres of fifty to sixty year old single story ranch houses extending to Glenn Forrest Road in the old General Motors building. Last year in consideration of Fulton County's five to eight units per acre designation for this property, the planning board voted five of the seven members (inaudible) one opposing, one abstaining to retain the five to eight units per acre. An action by the Mayor and City Council last year when a vote occurred, when a tie vote occurred by the Council, the Mayor voted to reduce the designation to three to five units per acre. High density is warranted for this fine property, high density surrounds this property to the north, to the south and to the east. This property faces office developments. On April 23, 2007 the Citizen's Advisory Committee were voted overwhelming to favor the restoring of the five to eight units designation to this property. I urge this honorable board to vote in favor of the five to eight units designation for this property. Any questions?

Mr. Duncan: Which change number is that, revision number?

Mr. Rupnow: I think it is 46.

Ms. Leathers: That is correct.

Ms. Lowe: Hi I am Charlene Lowe and I am here to reiterate what Clarence Ballentine just said that we are in support of what decided by the Comprehensive Plan Citizen's Advisory Committee. I am a life long resident of Sandy Springs. I am the owner of two of the eight one acre properties on Glenridge south of Hammond. These properties have been owned by family for over thirty years. The Comprehensive Plan Citizen's Advisory Committee correctly decided that the land use designation for these properties should be five to eight units per acre. Last year this Planning Commission came to the same conclusion voting that the designation should be five to eight units per acre. This is also the designation established by Fulton County. I urge you to adopt the Comprehensive Plan Citizen's Advisory Committee's decision

consistent with your own decision last year. The five to eight unit designation is clearly appropriate. Today's Glenridge Drive south of Hammond is a divided four lane highway, one of the busiest in the entire city with over thirty thousand cars per day passing in front of these properties. Moreover, all the surrounding properties on Glenridge had existing density that equals or exceeds five to eight units per acre. Across the street are multi-story office buildings, to the south is the former GM office building and to the north are the Sutter's Point Condos with existing land use of five to eight units per acre. The five to eight unit designation would provide the opportunity to do a beautiful town house development that would enhance the area and at the Sutter's Point Condo show it will provide a responsible transition from the existing offices to the Glenn Forrest Subdivision behind use. In contrast a lower density would not allow for responsible developmental this high traffic corridor and it is plainly not the highest and best use for these properties. I would also add that I am in favor of the approval of the Comprehensive Plan that was voted on.

Mr. Lowe: Hi my name is Jim Lowe and I live on 300 Green Hill Road. Regarding the section 38 on the map and I am hear supporting the live work designation the change for good land use plan. Right now I live in a twenty-one community with roughly thirteen continuous acres that is surrounding by 90% worth of commercial or high density housing and for some time now our neighborhood has actually been looking to get the land use plan changed and our area rezoned. We have been met with a lot of opposition from a lot of our neighbors who enjoy that higher density that you are seeking for our area and I think if we look in the long-term plan from the development of the Roswell corridor and the long-term vision of Sandy Springs, this type of land use plan designation would be necessary to promote that growth and to promote that vision. Thank you.

Mr. Rupnow: Let go back and ask the staff where is 38?

Mr. McNeil: If you are not seeing the number on the map that means the committee did not support it.

Mr. Zehner: It would have been Green Hill.

Ms. Maizar: What is it, just out of curiosity?

Mr. Rupnow: Can you be more specific location wise?

Mr. Lowe: Do you know where Glenridge and Roswell Road intersect? There is a Waffle House and if you where to miss the turn into the Waffle House you would turn onto Green Hill Road and would be amazed that there is smaller community back there. It is a "T" dead end.

Ms. Leathers: I believe the plan that is before you shows residential five to eight units per acre and I believe what he is supporting is live work neighborhood.

Mr. Duncan: Similar to what is just north of him.

Mr. Lowe: Exactly. To be consistent with the zoning that is surrounding me, the commercial and the higher the density just north of me. Typically when we have suggested this type of rezoning the opposition who lives just north of me, really wants to retain the trees when they look out in their backyard from their higher density condominiums. Essentially opposing what they are very much joined in that type of live work density where they are living right now their condominiums.

Mr. Duncan: You are their Central Park?

Mr. Lowe: Exactly. We are their buffer zone and have been their buffer zone for some time and they have fought very hard to keep the buffer zone at our expense.

Mr. Rupnow: You are not on Roswell Road?

Mr. Lowe: We access Green Hill at Roswell Road.

Ms. Leathers: You past through one commercial property and then the subdivisions behind it.

Ms. Maziar: This time should just comments we shouldn't be asking questions right now. I asked one too, I forgot.

Mr. Blichfledt: Good evening, Roger Blichfledt 5588 Garber Drive. I attended a lot of these meetings and you have a big job ahead of you in the short time that you have. Two hundred odd pages and the committee did a wonderful job and was a lot of hard work. I am in general agreement with most of this plan. There are some very specific areas that you will never be able to cover them in a minute and a half but I do have some issues with the vision here and I think that is something that you all might want to talk about. The vision here is that we are not going to have a population increase that Fulton County and the ARC has indicated we are. We are going to restrict growth in Sandy Springs and that is a policy and a vision in this plan that I am not sure that I agree with. We are going to, instead of having 21,000 new people as everyone else is telling us we are only going to have 7,000. But we are also going to have 21,000 new jobs and these people are not going to be able to live in Sandy Springs because there is not going to be any place for them to live. They

are going to be on our streets coming to and from. Our transportation plan, our transportation system is going to be taxed because we are not going to allow people who want to work here to live here. There are very specific areas that I think that are worth looking at where we have conflicts between some of the changes that are occurring in this plan existing zoning and future uses. Some of these areas involve the live work areas like between the central business district and Boylston. Like next to the regional unlimited areas of Northwood and Lake Forrest. My own neighborhood which has been in R3 zoning for 50 years has been changed on this plan to 1 to 2 per acre. My house is sitting on less than ½ an acre and if it went away today I would be inconsistent with this plan. These kinds of things were we are restricting growth making conflicts that you are going to have to deal with as cases come up on are not the things that I would like to see go forward so I encourage you to study it and appreciate your hard work in it and thank you.

Ms. Merrick: Lenada Merrick and I am talking about 38 and I glad that you all asked questions because a lot of you have no clue so couldn't even trick or treating' in our neighborhood if you wanted to. A member of this community in the 70's I taught at Ridge U when it was a high school. I have been a land owner since the early 80's. If I was to stand in the middle of our 13 acres I would look at the back of Plaza Jewelry, the Waffle House, the cleaners, there is something the Charleston Condos on the corner which are I think 10 to 12 units per acre. I would move to the Glenridge which is 6 to 8, I would move down to Willow Glenn again which is 6 to 8. Willow Glenn comes all the way down the eastern border of our 21 homes at our southern border. It probably 450 feet 500 feet is lesser density. So if you are on Roswell Road you have all commercial, you come to us you we are 3 to 5, you go beyond us you are either 6 to 8 or 10 to 12. We fill that the initial thought that this area be 5 to 8 is consistent, logical and it is one of those things that should work with the plan.

Mr. Rubenstein: Just so that I know where we are looking at, this is that "T" street that prior to you they were talking about?

Ms. Merrick: Yes sir. Can I walk up here and show you all? I can't use my teacher voice?

Mr. Rupnow: We could hear you but the PA system might not or the tape might not.

Mr. McNeil: That is also time. If you want her to finish

Mr. Rubenstein: Can we just ask, what are you suggesting? I am sorry I am confused.

Ms. Merrick: We are suggesting that it stay as the initial look at this.... for some reason the subcommittee said for it to go.....

Mr. Rubenstein: What is it now and what do you want it to be?

Ms. Merrick: 5 to 8. It is 3 to 5 and we are surrounded by all commercial and higher density.

Mr. Rupnow: So you want 5 to 8 and you have got 3 to 5?

Ms. Merrick: Yes sir.

Mr. Zehner: It is shown as 5 to 8 now.

Ms. Merrick: It is but the committee has asked that it not.....

Mr. Zehner: The committee recommendation is 5 to 8 I believe that you are referring to the original request of the land use subcommittee which was live work neighborhood. But then the full CAC recommended 5 to 8.

Mr. Rubenstein: What was the other gentleman, two or three people ago?

Ms. Merrick: We are saying the same thing.

Mr. Zehner: He is saying the same thing, if you could raise your hand, Mr. Lowe?

Mr. Rubenstein: They are in support of what this says?

Mr. Zehner: No. They are in support of live work neighborhood for the property.

Mr. Rubenstein: That is not what she is saying.

Ms. Maziar: She said 5 to 8.

Ms. Merrick: It is confusing. This is commercial, commercial and this is 5 to 8.

Mr. Rupnow: Thank you. The map is showing it as 5 to 8?

Ms. Leathers: That is correct and that is what she asked for was 5 to 8.

Ms. Garvey: Hi my name is Anne Garvey I am in the same 38 area. I reside at 255 Green Hill Road in Sandy Springs. I have lived here for over 15 years. There are 20 other homes on Green Hill Road and Green Hill Place. I would like to express my strong support as well as the support of my neighbors who could not be present this evening for this Planning Commission's recommendation to make area #38 the 5 to 8. Our understanding is that it is 3 to 5 we would like it to be 5 to 8. Our neighborhood is now over 90% surrounded by higher density developments. The closest development is 5 to 8 units per acre are 3 town home communities that have been around for well over 20 years. These communities are positioned similarly to our neighborhood with respect to Roswell Road and Glenridge Drive. 5 additional town home communities have been built within one half mile of our neighborhood within the past 3 to 5 years also with a density of 5 to 8 units per acre. Yet the summaries in our small neighborhoods have been single out as the necessary buffer between commercial and lower density residential areas.

In 2005 our request for rezoning for higher density was denied based on concerns of traffic congestion, however, despite these traffic concerns a new mixed use development is being prepped less than one half mile north of us on Roswell Road that will include a Publix's, Target's and Home Depot and a large number of town homes are being built less than a mile from our neighborhood at the already congested intersection near Johnson's Ferry, High Point Road, and Glenridge Drive. Recognizing these inconsistencies and the need for a well organized comprehensive plan for our new city, the Planning Commission has made the recommendation for the rezoning of area 38 as 5 to 8 units per acre. My neighborhood stands solidly behind that recommendation. That is all I have to thank you.

Mr. Duncan: Okay I am thoroughly confused. Where is item 38?

Mr. Rupnow: It isn't on the

Mr. Duncan: If it is not on there it is not due to be changed.

Ms. Leathers: It is not on the table because there was discussion of changing the category for the area but it did not get changed and because there was no change there is no number on it.

Mr. Duncan: What is the current designation?

Ms. Leathers: The current designation is residential 5 to 8 units per acre.

Mr. Rubenstein: What do they want? We have had three people that....

Ms. Maziar: They thought it was 3 to 5.

Ms. Leathers: They thought that the committee recommended 3 to 5 but they did not. The map reflects 5 to 8 units per acre.

Mr. Rubenstein: Are we all in agreement? Can we move off the mysterious 38?

Mr. Rupnow: Next speaker.

Ms. Weed: Hello my name is Jean Weed and I live at 16 Willow Glenn and I would like to support for the most part the 500 page book or the 300 page book that you have and certainly appreciate all the work that everyone has done to go into this. I would like to speak against the two proposals to change the designation to Green Hill for a lot of reasons. But mostly to change it at this point without the other neighbors that had weighed in on previous discussions I think would be very unfair. One of the neighborhoods that abuts there is certainly Willow Glenn. We have a good frontage on the south side of it. Another neighborhood that abuts that is not here is the Gentry Community, the three million dollar homes that you just heard about earlier. That is another border to that neighborhood. A third area of that is the single family homes that are on Beachland that the Wells live in and I don't remember who their next door neighbors are. To make that change now without hearing from everyone else involved I think would be very unfair.

The rationale from the neighbors before hand included the safety and the problem on entering Roswell Road with a high density neighborhood very close to the traffic like at Beachland would not allow another light. It is a very congested area. People have presented a good bit of traffic data and other data in opposition to putting that high density. In addition to that, the original plan for Roswell Road that would have commercial facing Roswell Road with protected neighborhoods behind it has been in affect for many years and if you do it here it will just keep encroaching down the line. I thank you very much and appreciate your consideration.

Mr. Rupnow: Let me just summarize your position is that you want it to be changed back to 3 to 5.

Ms. Weed: I believe that the plan as they finalized was 3 to 5 but I beg to differ with the people who really understand the plan and we have had multiple maps from this. The 3 to 5 is what argued with and got at Fulton County. Then we argued again, this is about the 4th time..... 3 to 5 is what is and I support staying there.

Ms. Berkowitz: Patty Berkowitz, you have now got a taste of what we got at 16 meetings. We had people trying to do zoning cases and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan in my opinion is suppose to serve a higher purpose. It is suppose to be us looking at what we want the city to look like, how it should flow, how to fix some of the problems that we have, not creating more problems wherever possible and set guidelines so that when zoning cases do come to you that you have frame work as to the totally of the city and how it is suppose to work. Now with that said there were a couple of particular items..... #39 as you can see we had a public participation people with particular interest. Because the neighborhood groups were lightly represented on the CAC as opposed to the development issues.

Some of the things like #39 got bumped up to a higher status. The neighbors where absolutely unanimous that the wanted that #39 to stay as a live work neighborhood and be community but some of the development interest from the possibility of putting more in on there. When you are looking at this just to try and not get into the specifics, remember that the recommendations that are coming to you came from a not always balanced thing and take that into consideration when you are looking at this.

Ms. Gray: That is the last person that is speaking. We just have the card on Bruce and Claire Danielson who wanted their comment read into the record. We oppose #39. We feel the area should remain a live work neighborhood. The proposed change would create too much density and traffic.

Mr. Rupnow: Thank you with that I will declare the public hearing closed and return it to the Planning Commission.

(Public hearing closed. Planning Commission questions and discussion)

Mr. Rupnow: Alright, lady and gentlemen we have it before us. You have heard a variety of people relating to a variety of issues and I am suggesting that maybe we can take these one at time by number and see where we go with them. I am offering that as a suggestion and I am open to any other suggestion as to how you address the request. We have three alternatives to ignore them, accept them all or work on each one of them.

Ms. Maziar: If we have comments we will just wait until we come to each one of them?

Mr. Rupnow: I think that will be fine. I will try and I have jotted down the numbers so I thought I would start will 39 that seems to be the one drew the most attention.

Mr. Boyken: Can we start with by eliminating the ones that I would say have no comment on and get rid of those?

Mr. Rupnow: There was a four position in favor of 46 by my calculation and there was a support for 37.

Mr. Boyken: You have to remember this is only one night out of 16 or more of others people's public opinions going other ways, this way and that way, so we can't really judge these on only tonight we need to judge them on all the presiding hearings too.

Mr. Rupnow: I would agree with that except if there is support for the rezoning or for the land use as it is on the map, it would seem to be that the those people are in favor of it and those we could accept. Now whether it two issues and I think that we have to decide those.

Ms. Maziar: Which ones have you pulled out?

Mr. Rupnow: According to my calculations there was a spokesperson for 446 in favor of it and there was no opposition to it. There was a support for 37 and I had no opposition for 37. There was a lot of opposition for 39, both pro and con for 39.

Ms. Maziar: 34 there is opposition. 34 is regional live work.

Mr. Rupnow: There was support for 46 that is the one in Glenridge. I think 39 was the biggest issue.

Mr. Rubenstein: 39 and 34 were the two with opposition.

Mr. Rupnow: There was a difference of opinion on 38 too but I think that

Ms. Leathers: I think we are clear on 38. I think that we all agree that the committee recommended 5 to 8 units per acre and that is what the neighbors favor.

Mr. Rupnow: Although I think there were not in favor of that here.

Mr. Duncan: Mr. Chair with all due respect, this sheet that we are looking at here is just on element of this entire comprehensive plan an if you will, I am still trying absorb what has actually been put in front of us. I am looking at designation right now which I don't really understand. For instance, on page 35 there is the legend marked 2007 FLU

classes, what is a FLU class?

Mr. Rupnow: Future land use I am guessing.

Mr. Duncan: So what does that mean to me that designation on that map?

Ms. Leathers: Michael you might want to come and talk about this map but this is the map that shows the land use node and protected neighborhoods. That was the base map that was used by the committee in developing the plan that you then have on the subsequent page.

Mr. Rupnow: The process took out most of the residential areas and dealt with those that are basically commercial or non-residential. That is basically what you see on page 35 is in color are those that are by in large commercial.

Mr. Zehner: Basically what we wanted to do by creating this map was better identify the area where the nodes are and better identify the area where the protected neighborhoods were. I think the Chairman did point out previously to me we probably have neglected to show protected neighborhood the very south east portion of the city but we didn't want to get the actual land use map to jumbled with all of this information applied to that map as well.

Mr. Duncan: Before I am comfortable getting involved in these different little, I should not use that term bad term, in these different nodes if you will, I would like to see how that marries up with all the rest of the plan in terms of transportation improvement, in terms of parks and recreation all of which we had presentation on tonight. To try to take a vote on them isolated or working without that context of totality I think is not very smart in my opinion anyway. I received this document for the first time Saturday morning and I have been going through and I have made a lot of highlights of questions that I have related to this document and I did have a document that I was working on some two, three, four months ago and that was reviewed with me on Monday. I was told that the areas that were modified were not highlighted and therefore I had to go back through and essentially start over again.

I am not comfortable at this point in time that I have the knowledge that I need to have to render an opinion one way or another on this document, not to say that it is not a good one. It may well be the best that has ever been done I just don't know. I have been through two chapters in this trying to get to what people have told me are the guts of the issues. The more I am reading the more questions that I having. The more questions I having the more references I am going to back to spreadsheets, to maps, policies, etc., etc.. This is a 260 page guide that we are going have to live with for the next five years. I think if we are going to render a recommendation it needs to be rendered based on the knowledge that we have and the ability to research the information that we have been asked to review here. I am just not smart enough to absorb this much data in three or four days.

Mr. Rupnow: I think our challenge though based on the public hearing will decide how we want to handle and I am opened to suggestions from the members of the committee. How you wish to handle a presentation by the public in connection with the public hearing.

Mr. Duncan: I think that we could pass this book on as it is with the comments added without making any recommendation whether the comments and the public hearing tonight were good or bad. They are all comments that we heard before many, many times. There input has already into the body of the book so I would have no problem at all passing on this book on to the City Council and adding that there were additional comments tonight these various other particular items.

Mr. Rubenstein: How fast do we view this? Did the Board get it Saturday too?

Mr. Rupnow: They have had this book since some time in June.

Mr. Wiley: That had this book all along as the CAC developed it and they got this book the same time that you did.

Mr. Rubenstein: They don't have to vote on it until when?

Mr. Rupnow: June.

Mr. Rubenstein: June what?

Ms. Leathers: June 19th is the public hearing and they have a work session on June 12th.

Mr. Rubenstein: They have a month but we have four days.

Ms. Leathers: Because there just isn't any more time.

Mr. Duncan: I wouldn't mind going to a special meeting if we needed to get more clarification but right now I have got highlights here on forty pages that I am trying to get some clarification on and four days worth of effort here. These folks worked hard on this thing and they deserve a good recommendation from us and I can't give it to them right now.

Mr. Rupnow: I am open to other comments from members of the commission as to how you want to approach this. Hearing none?

Ms. Maziar: I just would like to vote on 34 and 39 separately. I don't want to group it all together and just send it forward.

Mr. Rupnow: I don't have any problems with that.

Mr. Duncan: It is not a zoning node and that is the problem that we have got. This is a comprehensive land use plan all in its totality and we are voting on a complete plan if you will. They isolate a specific section and vote on that is essentially a zoning action.

Ms. Maizar: I don't want to send it forward without saying something about 34 and 39.

Mr. Duncan: I think that you can say something about 34 and 39 and editorial comment or something but I like Bob's recommendation. Just send it on without a recommendation at this point in time with comments. With a comment that we have heard it and looked at it and digested it to the best of our abilities and now it is up to the Mayor and City Council. I can make one comment and that is one page 99, item 7, require that storm water retention on named site retain any rain event up to 100 years storm event for a longer duration. That is virtually impossible I think the correct word should be detained as opposed to retained.

Mr. Wiley: I am sure that there is a bunch of wordsmithing that could....

Mr. Duncan: I think that there are and I have found several in here and I am going to have to burn up my colleague's time. There are a lot of typos I found in here which probably need to be looked at. There is....

Mr. Rupnow: Sorry Vann, I am not the only one.

Mr. McNeil: At least I did not have to meet with him on a Saturday.

Mr. Wiley: Lee those can be given to Vann and he can make those

Ms. Leathers: It would be helpful to us if you got typos because obviously we work very hard to pull this together for you and I am not going to tell you that the typing is perfect and I found things as well but if you would give us those that you have found we would certainly incorporate those.

Mr. Wiley: I would be happy to.

Mr. Rupnow: Mr. McNeil has been very helpful by listening to my editing over these weeks and months.

Mr. Duncan: When this was pulled together, population projections were based on what.

Ms. Leathers: The population and projections were prepared and presented to the City Council and the City Council adopted them in January when they submitted forward to the state the community assessment. They are the adopted policy of the city and the determination at that time was to adopt that and then to proceed to develop the plan around the projection. That is the direction to the staff and that is what we have worked with.

Mr. Duncan: Did we go backwards after the Comprehensive Land Use Plan was done and determined if the city was built out in accordance with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan would be married up with those population projections?

Ms. Leathers: We can accommodate those population projections and more onto this plan.

Mr. Duncan: That is not my question though. If we are increasing our population say 30,000 people over the next ten years and our whatever was adopted, whatever that number was and then the land use plan here anticipates a growth of 50,000 people have we moved backwards to accommodate those services and those roadway improvements and those park improvement to accommodate the extra 20,000 people?

Ms. Leathers: I am not sure that I understand your question.

Mr. Rupnow: I think the answer is the population projection only provides for 7,000 population increase and some of us including yours truly, feel that land use that we are showing here will accommodate many times that many more people and

Mr. Wiley: How do we get some feeling for that....this as I understand the state of Georgia is going to increase its population by 26, 25 somewhere the state of Georgia is going from 9.1 million to 12 ½ million people and most of those people are going to be in Atlanta and a good bit of them is going to be in Sandy Springs. It is going to be far greater than 7,000 which is 8% increase over the next 15 years. We are going to have several times the 8% that we are planning for

and that doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Rupnow: Well I have argued that and the answer seems to be that is whatever the City Council adopted and by expecting some people will leave and others will come in and that increase will be 7,000 people and I disagree whole heartedly but that is what is in the book and if you look, I know that Mr. Zehner has done this and presented this to me and I can't challenge him because I haven't done it but it seems to me if you take the densities that are shown in the live work region or the live work community and built out for those densities, you are going to have a lot more people than 7,000.

Mr. Duncan: Do you see my quandary here Don?

Mr. Boyken: I see the quandary there are lots of things that just don't match up based on what we have got. I did get some of the designations of these areas and I'm very concerned that the committee as stated by one of the committee members is there is unbalanced from the neighborhoods versus the development community and there are certain designations in which Susan has pointed out one of them in 34 where a whole area of residential goes down, I think the road is High Point?

Ms. Maziar: No, Glenridge, Sherrill and Colton. It is like they just took a paint brush and made purple.

Mr. Boyken: I am living down High Point which goes between Windsor Parkway and Glenridge and it just made all that high density area which currently right now is single family homes.

Mr. Duncan: I see a lot in the policy section that is encouraging affordable housing is the term that is used here....Zoning and development ordinances provide for innovation and housing types that allow for deviations from land development including standards for projects that demonstrate consistency with affordable housing objectives. I don't know what that means. I honestly don't know what that means and I am in the business.

Ms. Maziar: What page are you on?

Mr. Duncan: I am on page 96. What are we doing to encourage singles, young married with no children, what are doing to create product to encourage them to be moving into the city here? It seems like we spend a lot of time with the aging and the booming population we talk about affordable housing and yet we are laying restrictions in here that I am not sure that are going to accommodate affordable housing.

Mr. Rupnow: I would disagree with you in some sense because I don't think that we are doing much for the seniors in this plan.

Mr. Duncan: What I would like to see is that when you and I kind of move on and younger folks move in to take our place....

Mr. Rupnow: What was the article that appeared recently where Cobb County has created a new zoning ordinance addressing the senior location so it had better housing opportunities well....

Mr. Rubenstein: Mr. Chairman can I make a suggestion? We could literally stay here for two and a half solid days, analyzing this coming up with questions and I think Bob's idea, and I appreciate hearing all this stuff and I learn more hearing input from the citizens, but I don't know that we have the ability to make a recommendation one way or the other. Other than to tell the City Council to vote on it. It takes a month to digest all this and everybody has good points. I haven't heard really anything that I disagree with yet but I just don't think we as a body have the capacity right now to sort of micro-manage this and sort of pick out 3 or 4 different things and tell them to change it and otherwise it is good. I almost would rather give up and say look, Bob you said more articulate than I could but....

Mr. Rupnow: I think that you are right and I think that it is unfortunate in reality that the Planning Commission is in a position where it can't really spend time on this and

Mr. Duncan: Well Mr. Chair I am prepared to meet with members of the City Council either collectively or individually at some point in the future I just, Thursday night the 24th the brain is not focused on enough to be able to render a good opinion one way or the other.

Mr. Rubenstein: I think and Susan I appreciate what you are saying but if we said if we could accept #28 then it almost implies that we have read through it except #28. I would rather just give a sort of a blanket statement, we have reviewed it but we don't have the capacity to make an education recommendation at this point.

Ms. Maziar: I still would like to make a comment on something.

Mr. Rupnow: Are you willing to make a motion?

Mr. Duncan: Before you make a motion Bob...

Mr. McNeil: Roger can you move your mike closer so that it gets on the recording. Thank you.

Mr. Wiley: Aren't we as a Planning Commission making recommendations to the City Council as far as what the development should be in the city and if we just pass this thing on without any recommendation aren't we just giving up what we have been charged to do?

Mr. Rupnow: I would say yes.

Mr. Rubenstein: I would agree that is correct but given the constraints I don't think that we can make a meaningful recommendation one way or another on this thing and it's totally. We are going to obviously reserve the right to do what we do as a Planning Commission what we have been doing for the last year and a half is these developers come and they try and present their case based on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the community gives their input and they agree and sometimes they don't disagree. We take it under advisement and we vote. I think that we are always going to try and do what is best for the community but for us to make a judgment on something like this having read it for three days as we discussed it is quite overwhelming and intimidating.

Mr. Zehner: Go along with Mr. Wiley's recommendation to pass it along, they still have a work session on the 12th June at that time possibly members of Planning Commission could speak and have time to review the plan and then the Chair or himself and several other members could possibly make a presentation on behalf of the Planning Commission after the fact with a recommendation to the Mayor and City Council at that meeting.

Mr. Wiley: Can we have a work session of our own before the 12th?

Mr. Zehner: Yes we would be glad to set that up for you.

Mr. Rupnow: Let me just respond. I asked the Mayor for an opportunity to speak to the work session of the City Council, last week or two weeks ago....

Mr. Zehner: I believe that was on a different matter though.

Mr. Rupnow: I agree but the reason for not letting me do it was, if she did it to me she would have to let everybody else and I assume frankly I would argue that she, if she is going to be consistent, she is going to say you can't do it.

Ms. Leathers: I think that was a different kind of matter though. I think if under the circumstances if you believe that this Board can come together between now and then to make some recommendations I think that the Council would probably be interested in hearing a brief presentation on the suggestions that you have. I think that is the purpose of this Board, I think they will want to hear from you and we will do whatever we can to accommodate that.

Mr. Wiley: I was on the CAC Board and the land use thing along with Roger as Chairman and the Chairman and Vice Chairman of all the other boards the Design Review and the BZA and Susan was on several of the meetings and I really think that the opinions and what was presented here is a pretty representation of what the community wanted. Not 100% annual one place but overall it is pretty good. I wouldn't have a problem passing this on to the Mayor and City Council. They are going to have their opinions and they have already made a bunch of opinions and we have gotten after them and told them to back off a little bit and don't act like the damn tree committee did and make their opinion known before the fact and I hope they have taken it to heart. Once again, I would like to pass this thing on if we want to have our work session and delve into it further so you understand it. I don't have any problem with that then you can make presentations to the City Council if you want or work individually with the councilors.

Mr. Zehner: The work session is on the 12th, which is a Tuesday. There will be an opportunity on the 31st next Thursday or the 7th the Thursday after that I think that would be the most ideal base if you want to reconvene at a work session of this commission to prepare a recommendation for the Mayor and City Council. I think that those would be the best days.

Mr. Duncan: What kind of advertising period and notification period do we have to have for a work session?

Mr. Zehner: Only 24 hours for a special call meeting.

Mr. Duncan: Mr. Chair I would like to make a motion if I could, if you would entertain it, that we have a work session scheduled on this for the 7th, June 7th starting say 6:30 or so 7:00 something like that? That we engage conversation among ourselves on different matters between now and then and be prepared to look at this thing seriously on the evening of the 7th and then see if we can't make some kind of a recommendation to the City Council for their work session on the 12th.

Mr. Rupnow: Alright you have it.

Ms. Leathers: Just an additional thought. If you need to get any of your thoughts to us to try and pull something together for you. If you got questions that you need us to have answered beforehand, if you will let us know that will be helpful.

Send your e-mails to us at pz@sandysprings and we will try and to go ahead and pull things together for you.

Mr. Duncan: Do we need notify the public for public comment purposes on this?

Mr. Zehner: It is posted online that we are going to have a quorum. Are we going to have a quorum?

Ms. Leathers: The one question that we need to know is will have a quorum that evening?

Mr. Duncan: Maybe I am not going to get my motion seconded and then we get a quorum how is that?

Mr. Rupnow: A motion has been made to meet have a work session on the 7th of June at 6:30 or 7:00, there is a second to that motion. Is there any other discussion?

Ms. Maziar: I just have a question; will we eventually be voting on this and sending our recommendation forward? Is that proper for us to do at that time?

Mr. Rupnow: Can we legally vote at that point?

Ms. Leathers: Yes you can because it is a special call meeting. We will advertise it as a special call meeting.

Ms. Maziar: I agree with Don, I think that we need to act on it and then send it.

Mr. Zehner: If this motion is carried, it would be a special call meeting that you set on this date basically tonight for June 7th and so it is all notice and we will make a notice tomorrow on the website.

Mr. Duncan: Susan that was my motion is that we make a recommendation to the City Council for their June 12th work session.

Ms. Maziar: I agree with you that we need more time.

Mr. Rupnow: Any further discussion? All those of favor in that motion say Aye?

Board Members: Aye.

Mr. Rupnow: Opposed? I am going to abstain.

Mr. Wiley: You got out voted anyway so.....

Mr. Rupnow: That is true.

Mr. Zehner: We would anticipate that there will be a quorum at least four members present on June 7th.

Mr. Rupnow: I know that I won't be.

Mr. Rubenstein: I have a conflict right now that I am going to have to try and work around.

It is on my schedule.

Mr. Duncan: It is on mine.

Ms. Maziar: Maybe Wayne?

Bob we would like for you to be there.

Mr. Wiley: I will try.

You have more history with this and it doesn't make any sense for the four of us that haven't been at these meetings... I don't see any interest in trying to recreate (inaudible not speaking into the mike).

Mr. Rupnow: Well the motion has been made and carried and we will end up with that work session on the 7th of June. There is one other issue I think that's, do you have anything else? I have one other issue here and that was relating to that e-mail that I sent you in connection with additional support or support for expansion of the planning element of Ms. Leather's department. You have seen a copy of that organizational chart and I was surprised when I saw it at first and then felt that we needed to do something. I have talked to Ms. Leathers about it. I understand based on the site comment tonight that there maybe some item in the budget but I would like to have somebody or buddies appear before the City Council and its budget hearings and support Ms. Leathers and their requirement or request for additional planning support. Because if you look at the organizational chart, they are all working on zoning and there is nobody

doing any planning or at least have that as a specific obligation or responsibility at least as I read the organizational chart. I'm really disappointed that we spent a year and a half in the city and we had nobody who has really been charged with looking at the planning. We have spent time on putting this book together but hopefully we can correct that because I think and I felt strongly that was one of the reasons that we left Fulton County was to do more planning, particularly that the Planning Commission ought to do more planning and here we are with four days to adopt a comprehensive plan. Obviously that isn't their operation.....

Mr. Duncan: When is that budget?

Mr. Rupnow: Well there are several dates coming.

Mr. McNeil: I think that it is June 5th, June 12th and June 19th.

Mr. Rupnow: The 12th and 19th and don't know whether if anybody needs to sign up or can you just walk in and sing?

Ms. Leathers: You can come in and do a card there.

Mr. Rupnow: Okay. What is it?

Mr. McNeil: 12th and the 19th.

Mr. Zehner: The 19th is a public meeting and the 12th is the work session.

Mr. Rupnow: Well I would like to request, I won't be here in town and I won't be here until the next meeting of this group but I seek a volunteer or volunteers who hopefully would feel as strong as I do that we ought to have some planning people in the Planning Department who are specifically and directly assigned to look at, not only what is going to happen (inaudible) but to look at a variety of other things. Historically many Planning Department has three divisions which are Long Range, Current and Special Projects and what we have got normally the Current spends more of the time on zoning and that is what we are doing.

Ms. Maziar: How about doing a letter and having it read into the..... like they did tonight. Doing a letter and having your comments read instead of having somebody live.

Mr. Rupnow: It would seem to be the personal of the presence is more important than reading a letter but I am willing to work on either one of those.

Mr. McNeil: Mr. Chair those meetings also start at 5 on those dates.

Mr. Rupnow: Thank you.

Mr. Duncan: Mr. Chair I am of a little bit different of opinion. Before I recommend positions to the City Council, I would like to identify what these people are going to be doing specifically. Create a scope of work if you will because the operating philosophy of this city has been as opposed to where we were previously is we don't just need to add staff for the sake of adding staff. We want to make sure that there is a true need that would be served by this specific staff addition and this is a staff position that would be added as opposed to maybe contracting out, sub-contracting to a design firm or a planning company for the services that are needed and if it more desirable to bring staff on board to solve the problem that is in front of us. Right now I am not clear actually what role is being proposed for this particular Planner or Planners and I am not sure if would not be better served going to the private sector and contracting out to fill that need as opposed to bringing full-time staff on, handling all the payroll implications, payroll burdens and things such as that. I don't disagree totally with what you are saying I would just have to have a better understanding of what is being proposed.

Mr. Rupnow: I think first of all it would be a contract anyway because it would have to be done by CH2M Hill. They would be the contractor as most people are under contract to them and they are not city employees in that sense. I tried to get from the American Planning Association, some data in terms of staffing relating to cities of our size or so to get some handle on whether this is reasonable or not. Frankly, they did not answer my two or three phone calls. But nevertheless, Nancy has obviously worked on some requisition or proposal to do this and would be happy to

Ms. Leathers: Yes we have and maybe I can comment on the issues that we see. Part of the issue comes to being able to sort out what the work load is going to be. When we originally prepared the budget for the city it was not anticipated that some of the Boards would have as much work as they have had. There is a lot more activity going through the department then we had originally anticipated. We originally had a Comprehensive Planner in the budget and that person who has been converted to zoning because given the process that we have that is where the work had to be done because those things are going through. What we anticipate that this position will do is essentially three things.

One, there are follow-up, studies and work that need to be done after the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. The plan actually identifies additional studies and plans that need to be done to further work in specific areas.

Secondly, we need someone who can prepare ordinance amendments particularly things like a complete rewrite of the Overlay District for Sandy Springs which really will address carrying out the policies of this plan because the current ordinance doesn't do that and that is going to take a good deal of time and effort working with the business community and with the residents to make that happen.

The third is there are always going to a series of special projects that come in that requires someone available to do them and so those are the three major areas and we believe that there is a gracious amount of work for one full-time person.

Mr. Rupnow: Thank you. Maybe I will sit down with Bob and maybe we can put something together and then you can decide what you want to do on the 7th of June because there will be another meeting after that. What did you say the 5th and 12th?

Mr. Duncan: The 5th and the 19th.

Mr. Rupnow: The 5th and the 19th there will be an opportunity afterwards to decide whether how you want to approach it. I think unless there is anything else? I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Duncan: You got it.

Mr. Rupnow: All those in favor say Aye.

Board Members: Aye

Meeting Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Approval Signatures

Date Approved

6-21-07, Chairman

**Michael Zehner, Assistant Director
Planning & Zoning**

**Bridgette Gray, Administrative
Assistant/Transcriber**



