

Meeting of the Sandy Springs Planning Commission was held on June 18, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. Chair Reed Haggard presiding.

I. Call to Order

Chair Reed Haggard called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

II. Roll Call and General Announcements

Members Present: Chair Reed Haggard, Vice Chair Andy Porter, Member Robin Conklin, Member Karen Trylovich, Member Sherwin Clemons, Member Elizabeth Kelly, Member Andrea Settles

III. Approval of Meeting Agenda

Motion and Vote: A motion was made by **Member Elizabeth Kelly**, seconded by **Member Karen Trylovich** to approve the **June 18, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda**. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- A. March 19, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion and Vote: A motion was made by **Member Andrea Settles**, seconded by **Member Sherwin Clemons** to approve the **March 19, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

V. Cases

- A. **U-24-4 - 301 Johnson Ferry Road** - Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for a columbarium to be placed at an existing Place of Worship campus in the RE-2 zoning district.
(Presented by LaQuita Williams, Planner II)

Chair Reed Haggard opened the public hearing for comments.

Support

1. Jordan Edwards (The Galloway Law Group, LLC on behalf of the applicant)- 4062 Peachtree Road

Opposition

1. Josh Marks – 130 River Springs Drive
2. Mohammad Seggedi – 6620 Bridgewood Valley Road
3. Bill Reece – 110 River Springs Drive

Chair Reed Haggard closed the public hearing and open the floor for discussion.

Motion: A motion was made by **Member Andrea Settles**, seconded by **Member Karen Trylovich** approve **U-24-4** with staff recommendation.

Discussion:

Member Andy Porter asked the question if there was a modification to the package from Friday leading up to today's meeting?

Community Development Director Ginger Sottile answered yes there was. She stated that a couple of days ago Mr. Marks reached out to staff and in looking at the conditions as they were written he thought they were confusing – she added that the Attorney for the application, Jordan Edwards, also expressed some confusion. She then decided to write a memo of clarification to the Planning Commissioners and it was sent to Mr. Marks and included in the packet online.

She provided a brief explanation of her interpretation of the conditions and noted that there is now a map to show where the plantings and fencing were feasible to be installed.

Member Andy Porter asked what time did the email go out. He doesn't believe he received the email and asked the question to the board if they received it.

There was a question regarding the email, because the Commissioners indicated they did not receive the email.

Community Development Director Ginger Sottile stated that no condition was changed, and that this was simply an explanation of the intent of the two conditions.

Chair Reed Haggard stated based on the discussion that was had during the briefings and since he doesn't see anything that is structurally changed or what has been discussed for the past 2 weeks. He asked the Assistant **City Attorney William Hansard** if this would be a legal issue?

Assistant City Attorney William Hansard stated that if the conditions, the wording of the conditions themselves have not changed, nothing with the site plan or anything else have changed since it was submitted to the board. Since they have gone over it in the briefings and the board feels comfortable with it. He doesn't see a lack of notice would be an issue. He states that the memo was just to clarify and that there has not been an actual change in the wording of the conditions.

Member Andy Porter stated his disagreement with this explanation. He felt that this memo was a change after the fact and that you can't modify the package and keep the integrity of the process maintained. And again stated his feelings about this as not being positive.

Member Andrea Settles stated that she needs clarification from staff is, that it sounds like the entire neighborhood expected the fence to cover all those properties, and now because you have been out there to see it, you are implying some kind of green buffer and then the 6 ft fence. So you are not protecting the houses that are originally expected to be protected with a fence, and asked if she was clear on her question.

Community Development Director Ginger Sottile stated that her site visits revealed that fencing would provide a better visual barrier on the northern half and plantings would provide a better screening on the southern half of the parking lot, due to the vast differences in topography.

Member Sherwin Clemons stated that she did not receive the email and would like an opportunity to view it. She brought up the topic of safety, as expressed by some residents and that fencing may provide a sense of security.

Community Development Director Ginger Sottile stated that there have been no reported cases of complaints or trespass.

Member Sherwin Clemons and **Community Development Director Ginger Sottile** had a brief discussion about the buffer plantings and fencing. Additionally, there was dialogue regarding additional traffic and the visual impact of this activity on the adjacent neighbors.

Member Elizabeth Kelly stated that she did not think that the columbarium will contribute (negatively) to perceived safety issues. She stated that she did not see the memo and there was no indication that the package that they received last week had been changed.

Chair Reed Haggard asked if there were any more comments from the board.

Member Andrea Settles indicated her agreement with what **Member Sherwin Clemons** had stated. And asked if it is possible that they put in one of the conditions that we keep the fence going exactly the way the resident expected the fence to be installed.

Community Development Director Ginger Sottile stated that is a change in the condition that the board can make.

Member Andy Porter asked if C and D were amended conditions or they were the original conditions?

Community Development Director Ginger Sottile indicated the email was just a clarification.

Planning & Zoning Manager Michele McIntosh-Ross confirmed that everything is the same as of Friday except for the insertion of the picture per **Community Development Director Ginger Sottile** explanation of what was meant for clarification.

Member Andy Porter pointed out how it would be confusing and suggested we amend the motion.

Chair Reed Haggard added that, firstly, the board is an advisory group and they were going to advise Mayor City Council. They are going to take a vote and advise, and stated that Mayor and City Council is the law. He wanted to make sure that the board does not overstep their role, which is to merely make an advisory recommendation to Mayor and City Council. He goes on to state that we have legal council in the room that has stated that this is appropriate and that there is no violations being made.

Chair Reed Haggard closed the floor for discussion.

Motion: A motion was made by **Member Andrea Settles**, seconded by **Member Karen Trylovich** to approve U-24-4 with staff's recommendation. After the discussion **Chair Reed Haggard** called for a show of hands of in favor 0 and 6 opposed. The motion failed.

Assistant City Attorney William Hansard advised that the Commission to make another motion, or postpone it. However, a motion needs to be made and a vote. He advised the best way would be to call for another motion.

Chair Reed Haggard called for another motion, and asked if Member Andrea Settles would like to revise her initial motion.

Member Andrea Settles asked to see the staff's recommendations with the conditions.

Motion and Vote: A motion was made by Member Andrea Settles, seconded by Member Elizabeth Kelly to approve U-24-4 with staff's recommendations and additional consideration that the entire barrier is to be fencing regarding all of the properties that have been discussed initially. It is to be fenced the way the community assumed. The motion carried by a unanimous vote by a show of hands.

VI. Ongoing Business

Planning & Zoning Manager Michele McIntosh-Ross stated that there will be an upcoming meeting for July, August and September

VII. New Business

VIII. Adjournment

Motion and Vote: A motion was made by Member Sherwin Clemons, seconded by Member Andrea Settles, to adjourn the meeting at 7:04 p.m. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Approved by: July 16, 2025


Reed Haggard, Chair


Samantha Brown, Planning & Zoning Clerk